

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	vii
Acknowledgments	xi
1. Introduction	1
2. Coleridge—Romantic, Organic, and Synthetic Prophet	9
Coleridge and Romanticism	10
Coleridge and Organicism	15
A Brief History of Form	20
Metaphors of “Mirror”, “Lamp”, and “Plant”	29
Wordsworth and Coleridge	30
Coleridge and Organic Form	31
Major Critics to Coleridge’s Romantic Organicism	34
M.H. Abrams	34
René Wellek	36
Herbert Read	39
G.N.G. Orsini	41
Gordon McKenzie	44
Contemporary Romantic Composition Theory	47
Conclusion	51
3. Davis—Prophet of Contemporary Homiletics	66
Davis—Romantic “Organic” Homiletician	67
Davis and Fosdick	70
Davis—Prophet of Contemporary Homiletics	71
Organic Synthesis	71
Organic Form	73
Organic Unity	77
Organic Process	79
Organic Law	82
Conclusion	86
4. Sermon Form from Antiquity to the Present	94
The Biblical Ages and the Early Church	95

The Middle Ages and the Reformation	100
Modern Age.....	105
Phillips Brooks.....	107
The New Homiletic	111
Fred B. Craddock	112
David Buttrick	115
Eugene L. Lowry	118
Thomas G. Long	120
Lucy A. Rose	122
Paul Scott Wilson.....	126
Conclusion.....	129
5. A Proposal of Organic Homiletic	142
The Need for an Organic Homiletic	143
A Definition for Organic Homiletic	144
Homiletic of Process	144
Homiletic of Synthesis	145
Homiletic of Dialogue.....	146
Homiletic of Intuition.....	147
Homiletic of Discovery.....	148
Practical Applications for Organic Homiletic	150
Step One: Discovery of Content	150
Step Two: Discovery of Context.....	151
Step Three: Discovery of Form	152
Conclusion.....	156
6. Conclusion	172
Significance of the Study	172
Heuristic Implications	178
Bibliography.....	185
Index.....	199

FOREWORD

There is something intuitively right about the notion of an organic homiletic. Anyone engaged in a preaching ministry with a congregation quickly discovers that sermons must be designed to speak to the same people week after week. Unlike politicians who can take stump speeches on the road or public relations consultants who present carefully crafted versions of the same strategic message before a variety of publics, preachers must draw on different personal resources of imagination and creativity to make sermons vital for a specific congregation. Pastors must be able to trust in their own intuition and imagination if they are to create faithful sermons that name God and name grace Sunday after Sunday for these people. Theological training and preaching practicums are formatively necessary, but pastors still have to find their own authentic voice in preaching.

Richard Park has provided a marvelous study that explores the historic roots of the organic metaphor as an act of creation and applies it to preaching. He proposes a homiletic that synthesizes Romanticism's integration of appeals to the emotion as well as rationality—appeals to both the cognitive and non-cognitive elements of reason. Though parishioners may come to church in search of answers, answers by themselves eventually fail those who hunger to understand faith. Park argues that listeners long for preachers who will bear witness to their own complex engagement with life as gift of God.

Park's proposal of an organic homiletic takes up and explores the implications of "personality" in the famous definition of preaching coined by Phillips Brooks in his Yale Lectures on Preaching in 1877—"Preaching is the communication of truth by man to men. It has two essential elements, truth and personality. . . . Preaching is the bringing of truth through personality."¹ If form grows out of content—an assertion that Park takes from Samuel T. Coleridge—then a listener's perception that truth has been communicated in preaching should grow from an authentic expression of the preacher's personal faith. This kind of expression can only occur when the preacher learns to transcend the rhetorical forms and formulas, that serve as preaching's "playing piano scales," and engage in honest and heartfelt efforts to witness to his or her personal faith in God. Park argues that an organic homiletic participates in the necessary "Romantic revolt against the dominance of reason."

In 1605 Francis Bacon had argued that, “The duty and office of Rhetoric is to apply imagination to reason for the better moving of the will.”² This was an early form of what in the eighteenth century became known as faculty-psychology’s division of the mind into four faculties: reason, imagination, passions, and ‘the will.’ Park would have homiletics re-engage this Romantic rebellion against any diminution of imagination in favor of serving reason alone. He desires to reassert the significance of imagination and intuition in their role to shape the will of listeners. Though Park is not limited by a faculty-psychology view of the mind, he does want to recover this Romantic concern to see imagination released once again to do the work of creating effective communication in preaching.

Park finds this insight, that values imagination as equal to reason, to be core to the thought of Coleridge, to the belief of Brooks (who Parks labels the “greatest Romantic organic preacher”) and finally in the formative homiletic of H. Grady Davis. Davis’ textbook *Design for Preaching* dominated mainline seminary homiletics coursework during the third quarter of the 20th century. Davis reclaimed the medieval notion that “a sermon should be like a tree” first depicted by Jacobus de Fusignano, a Dominican priest writing around 1310.³ But unlike the rigid rhetorical form of the three branches of Jacobus’ *arba picta*, Davis was more the Romantic, more concerned that preachers must learn to speak branches that thrust forth from the force of the preacher’s own inner life.⁴ Park follows Davis in this concern, arguing that “reason controls, but intuition liberates.”

Amidst the contemporary homiletic interest in the role of listeners, the homiletic debate over the role of persuasion, and homiletic’s formative concern to name the Other in ways that are also purposefully inclusive of other persons, Park makes a case for an organic homiletic that must also be true to the interior life of the preacher’s faith. It is a recovery of a rigorously articulated Romantic self that learns to trust the voice of intuition even as it listens to all the other voices that make claim on a preacher’s desire to be faithful. There is a deep spirituality and a trust in the numinous quality of faith’s experience in Park’s organic homiletic that is refreshing.

When I join with others to worship God and to hear a preacher witness to his or her faith in God, I am not particularly interested in hearing a well executed but uninspired travelogue of details about first century Palestine—with a moralizing application tacked on to the end. Nor am I interested in listening to someone’s well-crafted political rant concerning the grave injustices of contemporary culture. A sermon may have elements of one or the other of these concerns, but to be a sermon it must be an authentic, imaginative expression of the preacher’s desire to name God and name grace.

That is the kind of preaching I want to hear. And that is the kind of preaching Park looks for as well. May students and practitioners of this kind of preaching increase.

Robert Stephen Reid
University of Dubuque

NOTES

- 1 Phillips Brooks, *Lectures on Preaching* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1877), 5.
- 2 Francis Bacon, *The Advancement of Learning (1605) in The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*, 2nd ed., Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg, eds. (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's Press, 2001) 743.
- 3 See Otto Dieter, "Arbor Picta: The Medieval Tree of Preaching," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 51 (1965): 130. Reprinted with permission in Robert Stephen Reid, *The Four Voices of Preaching* (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2006) 46.
- 4 Henry Grady Davis, *Design for Preaching* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1958) 15.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to acknowledge the exceptional support and assistance that I have received from the dedicated members of my committee. I am grateful to Dr. Mary D. Turner from the Pacific School of Religion in Berkeley, California, who studied with Dr. Fred B. Craddock from Emory University, with whom I studied Contemporary Homiletic Theories, and Dr. Robert S. Reid from the Communication Department of the University of Dubuque, Iowa, who has offered especially powerful insight for my interdisciplinary work between Homiletic and Rhetoric throughout the years and wrote the Foreword for this book. I am particularly indebted to the coordinator of my committee, Dr. Thomas G. Rogers from the Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary, Berkeley, California, who provided me with insightful guidance, unflagging encouragement, and faithful support from beginning to end.

I received considerable help from Dr. Caroline Humfress, a former professor in the Rhetoric Department at the University of California, Berkeley, and currently a professor at Birkbeck College, London University. Her guidance throughout the exploration of Classical and Contemporary Rhetorical Theory became a solid base for my journey to Rhetoric.

The Graduate Theological Union has been a powerful supporting community, encouraging bold endeavors with freedom in its rich and diverse resources. The Homiletic Department, in particular, was the largest and possibly the finest homiletic community in the world. Dr. Jana Childers of the San Francisco Theological Seminary showed me how the Performance Theory and the Creativity Theory intertwine with homiletic. I studied the History of Preaching with Dr. Michael Monshau, OP, of the Dominican School of Philosophy and Theology, and Dr. Linda Clader of the Church Divinity School of the Pacific was my committee member for my Master of Arts thesis in Homiletic. Dean Arthur G. Holder, Assistant Dean Kathleen Kook, and Dean of Students Maureen Maloney have also provided unfailing support throughout years, from my Master of Arts to my Doctor of Philosophy in Homiletic study at Berkeley.

Reverend Bo Beom Park and the Macheon Presbyterian Church in Seoul, Korea, have been a blessing. Without their tremendous spiritual and practical support, this book would never have been produced. The Presbyterian College and Theological Seminary in Seoul, Korea, and its President and faculty have long influenced my homiletical endeavor, ever since I started to

study St. Augustine and his *De Doctrina Christiana*, the first rhetorically written homiletic textbook. They also awarded me the privilege of teaching as an assistant professor of Homiletic and Rhetoric, for which I am greatly honored.

I want to express my sincere appreciation to my greatest German friend, Reverend Dr. Wilfried Glabach, who provided spiritual and emotional support when I worked and wrote this book. I am also indebted to my German friend, Dr. Nikos Jaeger, who helped format this book in the early steps, and my young Korean friend, Reverend Kyuck Cho, who became indispensable for his help with computer editing and indexing. Above all, I dedicate this book to my wife, Sharon, and daughter, Jenny, who have always been my strongest proponents and the truest blessings in my life. My deepest love and thanks to you! Soli Deo Gloria, Amen!

Reprinted from *Design For Preaching* by H. Grady Davis copyright © 1958 Fortress Press. Used by permission of Augsburg Fortress.

R.H.C. Park

Seoul, Korea
Summer 2006

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Week after week, preachers face such an overwhelmingly burdensome task: to prepare engaging sermons for their audiences. Whether a preacher is famous or unknown, hearers demand that the sermon prepared and delivered not be a copy from someone else. In addition, there is a flood of homiletic methods marketed to preachers. The number of choices and the differences among these methods can confuse and discourage preachers. Why are there so many methods? Is there no connection among them? Must preachers know numerous models to be effective in their preaching? When famous teachers of preaching each emphasize a separate approach, who should preachers follow?

This study introduces an approach to preaching called Organic Homiletic. Organic Homiletic is not a suggestion for yet another sermon model; rather, it helps preachers to discover form that already exists in the content of the sermon and context of the preaching event. Organic Homiletic offers a process for discovering this form. Organic Homiletic functions similarly to the way nerves work in the body; they connect everything so that the body can have life. Organic Homiletic connects all the existing homiletic methods by means of utilizing the organic concept of form: an understanding that form is not separable from content in the art process. Samuel T. Coleridge influences Henry G. Davis regarding this organic concept of form, and Davis influences Contemporary homileticians in the schools of both the Old and the New Homiletics. Nonetheless, Contemporary North American homileticians seem not to have fully developed the organic theory introduced by Davis. Therefore, this study argues that, while current homiletical thought has been shaped and influenced to a degree by the concept of organic form, the discipline has fallen short of fully utilizing this resource. The work of Coleridge and Davis on organic form is mined to create an Organic Homiletic in regard to sermon content, context, and process.

While the study offers the above argument for Northern American homiletics, it may provide a different resource to preachers and homileticians in other parts of the world. Not all parts of the globe are simultaneously in synchronization in term of the homiletic theories that exert influence at any given time. For example, while North American preaching experienced the

New Homiletic over the last few decades, a country such as Korea is still greatly influenced by Broadus's form. Therefore, while North American homileticians may need to utilize Organic homiletic in order more fully to utilize what Davis began, Korean homileticians may need to utilize Organic homiletic as an introduction to challenge Davis and the Romantics raise for preachers. Consequently, this study helps preachers, American or Korean, to be authentic by synthetic approach of Organic Homiletic.

This project explores organic form theory as a useful resource for the field of homiletics. Interest in organic form has a long history. This study focuses on the English poet and literary critic Samuel T. Coleridge's (1771–1834) work on organic form in the English Romantic era. Against a backdrop of neo-classical criticism, Romantic literary theory argues for freedom of expression of inner feelings in literature and art, resisting imitation of extant norms and forms residing outside the writer or artist. Unlike Wordsworth, who claims a radical freedom of inner feelings for expression, Coleridge proposes an organic form theory (organicism) arguing for a synthesis of feeling and reason in the creation of form. For Coleridge, form grows from the organic blending of content and process in the crafting of art. Form, in art, does not come from outside of the artist; rather, it grows from within. Coleridge's understanding of organic form synthesizes the freedom of expression of inner feeling and possible interaction of reason in the process of crafting art.

The first homiletician to discuss the potential of organic form for the art of preaching is Henry G. Davis. In *Design for Preaching* (1958)¹ Davis emphasizes that sermon form should grow from within the preacher—organically—rather than strictly utilizing the rhetorical templates for form which preachers of that time typically “imported” from outside of themselves. For Davis, an appreciation of organic form means that effective sermon form might vary from preacher to preacher and from sermon to sermon. Such an approach embraces the possibility of using a multiplicity of sermon forms. Davis's adoption of organic form for sermon preparation is a call to freedom from the confines of having to make all sermons obedient to a form externally imposed upon the preacher.

Davis's work is a key influence on the shift that takes place among homiletical writers in the final quarter of the 20th century in North America. Homileticians, during this period, labeled “The New Homiletic,” challenge the long standing approach to homiletic form that can be described as deductive, argumentative, and propositional. Fred Craddock, an early leader in the New Homiletic, calls for an inductive form for preaching as opposed to a deductive approach²; other voices in the New Homiletic call for new

sermon forms centered in the concepts of narrative, moves and structures, and conversation. The New Homiletic movement does a great deal to move the discipline out from under a solitary dominance of deductive form to a greater appreciation of a plurality of forms. Nevertheless, this project proceeds on the assumption that the New Homiletic does not go far enough in utilizing all that organic form has to offer as a resource. What Davis attempts in his homiletic project is an introduction of an authentic sermon form that grows from the sermon content organically. Form should not come to the preacher from outside, as a means of controlling. For the true liberation of sermon form that Davis envisions to occur for preachers in the beginning of the 21st century, there is need for still more radical freedom for preachers. Beginning with the work of Coleridge, this study attempts to go back to the future.

For homiletics to more fully incorporate organic form as understood by Romantics such as Coleridge may, at first glance, seem like an anarchical movement regarding form because such an approach can be seen as negating any norm for form. In actuality, organic form does not negate other norms of form; rather, it opens the possibility of a sermon utilizing a wide variety of form options, the appropriate choice of which will depend upon issues of content, context, and process.

This study explores Coleridge's Romantic organicism in his major works, *Biographia Literaria*,³ *Lectures on Shakespeare*,⁴ and Coleridge's *Shakespearean Criticism*.⁵ It also critically examines Davis's *Design for Preaching* in order to distinguish similarity and dissimilarity between Coleridge and Davis concerning organic form.⁶ The study appropriates some implications of contemporary Romantic composition theories in order to connect Coleridge's Romantic theory to contemporary Romantic theory which may also have influenced Davis's Romantic organic form. The influence and incorporation of organic form in the New Homiletic is limited to a survey of seminal New Homileticians such as Craddock, Buttrick, Lowry, Long, Rose, and Wilson, as well as the modern romantic preacher Phillip Brooks.

This study operates within certain limitations. Although it deals with philosophy and literary criticism of Romanticism and organicism, it does not attempt to cover all the critical issues of Romanticism and its literary criticism per se. Unlike Paul Scott Wilson's approach to Coleridge in relation to the imagination of preaching, this study approaches Coleridge solely on the issue of organic form. It does not seriously deal with the controversial charge of plagiarism of Coleridge from German literary critics such as A. W. Schlegel in terms of organic form; rather, it proceeds with an understanding

of Coleridge as crucial Romantic poet and literary critic in relation to organic form.

The methods employed in this study are those of literary criticism of Romanticism and critical analysis of the New Homiletic movement in terms of organic (sermon) form. Also, the study examines the characteristics of Romanticism and organicism (theory of organic form) of 17th–18th century England in order to set a background of theory of organic form. The study relies upon some contemporary literary critics such as M. H. Abrams, Rene, Herbert Read, G.N.G. Orsini, Gordon McKenzie, and Isaiah Berlin to understand Romanticism, organicism and its literary criticism. Since this project is not concerned with literary criticism but homiletic form, it does not discuss critical issues in the discipline of literary criticism; rather, it appropriates literary critics' common ground to induce implications for homiletic theory. The study also includes a comparative study of Coleridge's *Biographia Literaria*, *Lectures on Shakespeare* and Coleridge's *Shakespearean Criticism*, and Davis's *Design for Preaching*. Coleridge's principles of organic form in his aesthetic approach to the art process are contrasted to Davis's acknowledgement of the importance of organic form in the art of creating a sermon. This study includes two brief histories of form and sermon form.

Organic form is not Coleridge's invention; it has a long history. Also, organic sermon form is not Davis's invention; without the name, it has existed, to a certain extent, from the beginning of Christian preaching. The study is greatly enriched by the work of M. H. Abrams, professor of English at Cornell University, and his master work, *The Mirror and the Lamp*.⁷ Although this study does not completely accept and incorporate the totality of Abrams' view, he is a great guide and lamp to the study of Coleridge's Romantic organic theory.

Chapter two, "Coleridge—Romantic, Organic, and Synthetic Prophet," investigates the relationship between Coleridge and 18th–19th century European Romanticism and its literary and aesthetic theory in regard to organic concept. Coleridge transcends the radical Romanticism of Wordsworth by turning to organicism which synthesizes intuition and reason. The chapter provides a brief history of form in art and literature to illustrate how the organic concept is not Coleridge's original invention. Coleridge has his forerunners—both domestic and abroad. The battle centers on the metaphors of the Mirror, the Lamp and the Plant. Imitation theory uses the Mirror; unbridled Romantic expressionists employ the Lamp, but Romantic organicists prefer the Plant.

Coleridge differs from Wordsworth, as noted above, in terms of the degree to which Coleridge argues for the use of the synthesis of reason and intuition.⁸ Wordsworth believes Shakespeare resorted to inner feeling from the inner soul to express inspiration, while Coleridge adds rational, critical revision to the Romantic preference of intuition. This chapter examines Coleridge's organic form followed by five major critiques to Coleridge and Romantic theory. Critics include M .H. Abrams, René Wellek, Hebert Read, G.N.G. Orsini, and Gordon McKenzie. Finally this section looks to contemporary Romantic expression composition theory to find an influence of Romantic literary theory on contemporary composition, which helps in finally constructing Organic Homiletic in chapter five.

Chapter three, "Davis—Prophet of Contemporary Homiletics," shows the relation of Henry G. Davis to Romanticism. Davis, like Phillip Brooks, is a rare combination of a contemporary Romantic and a homiletician. Davis constructs, for the first time, the beginnings of a systematic Organic Homiletic. This chapter analyzes Davis's Organic Homiletic in terms of Organic Synthesis, Organic Form, Organic Unity, Organic Process, and Organic Law.

This chapter also analyzes the relation of Davis and the great preacher of Davis's era, Harry Emerson Fosdick. His problem solving method exists in Davis's Design for Preaching as "Functional Sermon Form."⁹ Davis also suggests that Fosdick's method is organic.¹⁰ Like Coleridge, Davis's Organic Homiletic synthesizes intuition and reason along with the general and the particular. Davis develops the notions that form grows from content and context organically in the process, and that form is inherent in content already, as organic unity. Unlike the mechanical law of imitation theory, organic form has its own natural law. Organic form flows and grows naturally following an inherent law of nature.

Chapter four, "Sermon Form from Antiquity to the Present," approaches organic form historically and homiletically starting from the Biblical Age and the Early Church. In the main, Christian preaching has two major rhetorical forms: Hebraic and Hellenistic. Hebraic rhetoric has a natural flow and turn following organic development, while Hellenistic rhetoric has a systematic and logical movement. Over time, these two rhetorics evolve into the *homilia* and the *sermo*. A homily is liturgical, dialogical and expository, while a sermon is topical, monologued and argumentative. These two major forms grow and flow through history evolving into new forms by combining and changing diversely.

In this study, this process is labeled organic metamorphosis or synthesis. Organic form grows through interaction in the midst of a rhetorical

situation.¹¹ The Middle Age, the Reformation, and Modernity also show this organic metamorphosis of sermon form. In addition, the chapter examines the great romantic preacher Phillip Brooks to demonstrate how thoroughly Brooks exemplifies the Romantic organic concept of sermon form. The chapter concludes with an investigation of the New Homileticians to show how Davis's Organic Homiletic influenced them positively or negatively. Craddock, Buttrick, Lowry, Long, Rose, and Wilson are selected as representatives of the New Homiletics.

Chapter five, "A Proposal of Organic Homiletic," begins by discussing why there is value in proposing an Organic Homiletic. Organic Homiletic provides freedom for preachers from what can be a slavish reliance on methods of preaching. Organic Homiletic helps preachers to become authentic, imaginative and creative. The chapter defines Organic Homiletic from five perspectives. Organic Homiletic is 1) Homiletic of Process, 2) Homiletic of Synthesis, 3) Homiletic of Dialogue, 4) Homiletic of Intuition, and 5) Homiletic of Discovery. Organic form grows and flows in the process of time and place. Organic Homiletic begins with the initial stage of invention of what to preach, guiding preachers to use free-writing technique and meditation of *Lectio Divina*, as well as dialectical reasoning and questioning of the conscious and reason. Organic Homiletic performs double dialogues with text and audience in the rhetorical situation, seeking listening to one's self, the text, God, and others. Organic homiletic is, in this sense, a Homiletic of Discovery because it attempts to discover content, context, and form.

The conclusion addresses the significance of this study. Above all, this study helps preachers to appropriate three rhetorical appeals: logos, pathos, and ethos. Organic homiletic is a balanced Homiletic that combines all three rhetorical means. The conclusion also treats the theological and philosophical issue of the potential of preachers' free will to choose and create. *Imago Dei* has been given to every human being, which is the power of creation by the Creator Father, Creative expression Christ, and Creative Power of the Holy Spirit. Organic homiletic also claims that sermon form is limitless according to the permutation and combination of the triangle of preacher, text, and audience.

Finally, two heuristic implications are considered. Organic homiletic may provide grounding for additional work related to the integrity of pedagogy within the field. Homiletics should be a systematic and academic science that employs interdisciplinary dialogues with close disciplines such as Rhetoric, Philosophy, Art and Aesthetics, Communication, Literature, and Psychology. Homiletics should not be a mere skill that allows every

homiletician to teach homiletics randomly. Organic homiletic does not “train” but “educates” preachers who can be authentic, imaginative and creative.

The study ends by showing the possible connection of Organic homiletic to possible further work related to a Homiletic of Voices. There are two major voices: The urgently oppressed voice and the culturally different voice. Organic homiletic asks preachers to listen to self and others, mostly silenced voices. By doing so, it cooperates with the cultural concerns of homileticians such as Nieman and Rogers and a Homiletic of Resistance represented by writers like Smith, Turner and Hudson, and Gonzales and Gonzales. As such, Organic homiletic may also be a resource for future work around these issues.

NOTES

- 1 Davis, Henry Grady. *Design for Preaching*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1958.
- 2 Craddock, Fred B. *As One without Authority*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1979.
- 3 Coleridge, Samuel T. *Biographia Literaria*. The Major Works (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- 4 Coleridge, Samuel T. *Lectures on Shakespeare*. The Major Works (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- 5 Coleridge, Samuel T. *Coleridge's Shakespearean Criticism*. Raysor, Thomas Middleton, ed. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930).
- 6 Although Davis did not refer directly Coleridge, Davis utilizes the concept of organic form as a primary resource in establishing his homiletic theory, especially in chapters II and IX of his *Design for Preaching*.
- 7 Abrams, M.H. *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953).
- 8 Intuition and emotion are dealt with as the same definition, so from now on I use the word intuition when I need to use emotion.
- 9 Davis, *Design for Preaching*, chapter 8, pp.120–138. Davis changes the name from Fosdick's Preaching of Therapy or Therapeutic Preaching.
- 10 Ibid., pp.140–1. Davis evaluates Fosdick's sermon ("Forgiveness of Sins" based on Matthew 9:5, p.60) as organic. "Each one has its advantages in the right spot, and each has its own problems that grow out of its very nature."
- 11 See Bitzer, Lloyd F. "The Rhetorical Situation," in Luciates, John Louis, Condit, Celester Michelle, and Caudill, Sally, ed. *Contemporary Rhetorical Theory: A Reader* (New York: The Guilford Press, 1999), pp.217–225.

CHAPTER 2

Coleridge—Romantic, Organic, and Synthetic Prophet

Recently, I planted seeds in a small garden and was eager to enjoy a colorful English garden. However, regardless of my planting, watering, and watching, nothing happened right away, and I forgot about my garden. Later, after returning from a long trip, I was amazed to find a fully blooming garden waiting for me. I mention my garden because it serves as a metaphor for organic preaching. It seemed as if my garden suddenly burst into full bloom, but, in reality, it was a steady process. The plants of the garden grew from the seeds, following the laws of nature, forming their own shapes, not imitating.

The garden example illustrates the living power of nature that makes plant grow organically. This chapter examines a related kind of organic growth—the organic process that occurs with words and ideas. This chapter focuses on Samuel T. Coleridge’s work in relation to Romantic, expressive organic theory. By first reviewing the work of Coleridge, in regard to an organic approach to understanding the creation of art and literature, the way will be prepared for an examination of how Henry G. Davis proposed a similar organic approach in the creation of a sermon. This chapter is organized as follows: 1) Coleridge and Romanticism, 2) Coleridge and Organicism, 3) A Brief History of Form, 4) Metaphors of “Mirror” “Lamp” and “Plant,” 5) Wordsworth and Coleridge, 6) Coleridge and Organic Form, 7) Major Critics to Coleridge’s Romantic Organicism, and 8) Contemporary Romantic Composition Theory.

The Romantic organicism of Coleridge includes several major concepts: Organic Unity, Organic Form, Organic Growth, and Organic Synthesis. The primary focus of this study will be on organic form, with the ultimate goal of applying Coleridge’s work to the idea of an Organic Homiletic in terms of form. Coleridge understands form as that which grows organically from the blending of “content, context and process” in the craft of art. Form does not come from outside of the artist; rather, it grows from within. Coleridge’s understanding of organic form synthesizes the freedom of expression of inner feeling and the possible interaction of reason in the process of crafting art.

Coleridge and Romanticism

“Romanticism” is a difficult term to define narrowly. Romanticism deals with art and literature, but also it relates to other disciplines such as philosophy, politics, and music. Baldrick offers a helpful starting point. He writes,

...its chief emphasis was upon freedom of individual self-expression: Sincerity, spontaneity, and originality became the new standards in literature, replacing the decorous imitation of classical models favored by 18th-century neoclassicism. Rejecting the ordered rationality of the Enlightenment as mechanical, impersonal and artificial, the Romantics turned to the emotional directness of personal experience and to the boundlessness of individual imagination and aspiration.¹

Romanticism appears as the movement of reaction of ideas against Rationalism. Romantics resist mechanical, imitative, and artificial models. Barzun’s widely recognized definition of Romanticism may be related to Coleridge’s theory of literature.

A return to the Middle Ages, a love of the exotic, the revolt from Reason, a vindication of the individual, a liberation of the unconscious, a reaction against scientific method, a revival of pantheism, a revival of idealism, a revival of Catholicism, a rejection of artistic conventions, a return to emotionalism, a return to nature—and so on.²

Barzun also sees Romanticism as “a biological revolution” which also has some implications for organic concept. Barzun defines Romanticism as part of “the great revolution which drew the intellect of Europe...from the expectation and desire of fixity into desire and expectation of change.”³ Unlike Rationalism and Neoclassicism that have a fixed view of things, Romanticism has a view of change which also appeared in the oriental philosophies such as I-ching and Taoism. Peckham describes this characteristic of change in Romanticism.

An organism has the quality of life. It does not develop additively; it grows organically. The universe is alive. It is not something made, a perfect machine; it grows. Therefore change becomes a positive value, not a negative value; change is not man’s punishment, it is his opportunity. Anything that continues to grow, or change qualitatively, is not perfect, can, perhaps, never be perfect. Perfection ceases to be a positive value. Imperfection becomes a positive value. Since the universe is changing and growing, there is consequently a positive and radical intrusion of novelty into the world. That is, with the intrusion of each novelty, the fundamental character of the universe itself changes. We have a universe of emergents. If all these things be true, it therefore follows that there are no pre-existent patterns. Every work of art, for instance, creates a new pattern; each one has its own aesthetic law.⁴

Peckham's definition of Romanticism anticipates the Romanticism of Coleridge and his concept of aesthetic form. In Romanticism, things are not static; things are ontologically changing. For this reason, the Romantics of the 18th–19th centuries are called forefathers of process philosophy and phenomenology. Lovejoy notes that the Romantics of this period broke up "the magnificent and highly ordered metaphysical structure which had dominated European thought since the time of Plato and Aristotle."⁵ Lovejoy also observes this new era of Romanticism challenges the Great Chain of Being.

(The Great Chain is) inconsistent with any belief in progress, or indeed, in any sort of significant change in the universe as a whole. The Chain of Being, in so far as its continuity and completeness were affirmed on the customary grounds, was a perfect example of an absolutely rigid and static scheme of things.⁶

The world view of imitation has been and continues to be a powerful force in human history. Romanticism and its revolt against a rigid system of rationality were revolutionary. Romantics understood being as becoming. Truth is not given from outside; rather, it grows from inside. The same is true for form and expression of form. Enscoe points out that "the Romantic ethos is based upon acceptance of and even dedication to these natural forces"⁷ and it is "a dramatic shift away from moral evaluation based upon an abstract, intellectual system."⁸

M. H. Abrams offers a slightly different approach to defining Romanticism. He calls it "Natural Supernaturalism." Abrams says the goal of Romanticism is "to naturalize the supernatural and to humanize the divine."⁹ In a way, Romanticism saved religion from science. Religion is supernatural and mysterious, and Romanticism pursues the area of mystery and the supernatural in the natural and reasonable. Romanticism appeals through symbol and imagination, rather than by the exact scientific proof of Rationalism.

The working of the Imagination is thus for Coleridge a symbolizing activity. A symbol is only a part of the greater whole it reveals, but it implies the totality. He attempts to describe the way in which it does this by the concept of 'translucence.' In a symbol, he suggests, the material and temporal becomes as it were a lens whereby we can bring into focus for an instant the eternal abstraction of which it is a fractional and incomplete part. By insisting that a symbol was above all a living part of the unity it represents, Coleridge was able to combine Platonism with optics.¹⁰

In this respect, Romanticism which emphasizes "intuition" instead of reason seems much closer to religion and helpful for religious imagination for its philosophical, methodological, and aesthetic base. Prickett is one of

the few scholars who delved into the relation between Romanticism and religion. He observes the common ground of Coleridge and Schleiermacher, in their use of intuition, though one focuses on literature and another on religion.¹¹ Prickett deftly points to the relation of Schleiermacher to Coleridge in Romantic utility of intuition:

Thus, for Schleiermacher, in 1798, religion was a matter neither of “metaphysics” nor of “morals” but primarily a matter of “intuition.” Unlike either metaphysics or morals, intuition seems to consist of “pure receptivity.” Religious awareness thus begins with the familiar Romantic dialectic between what was conceived of as a spontaneous act of individual intuition and the more objective action of the universe upon us. We begin with what he calls an “intuition of the universe” (*Anschauung des Unendlichen*).¹²

Romanticism may be thought of as an age of recovery of intuition from the oppression of reason. There is some confusion concerning the role of intuition within the Romantic period. Sometimes radical Romanticism stresses intuition solely; other times, as in the case of Coleridge, intuition and reason are both given consideration. In so much as intuition was related with imagination during this period, Romanticism may be called an age of recovering imagination as opposed to an age of scientific proof.

As a Romantic and devout lay Christian, Coleridge in his last twenty years devoted himself to study of the Bible “searching for the radical sense of a ‘Symbolic Mythus’.”¹³ Coleridge’s Romanticism searched for aesthetic intuition against higher positivistic and historicistic method.¹⁴ In the late eighteenth century biblical criticism in Germany took an historical turn, and Coleridge who studied in Germany deplored the implicit positivism of the Higher Criticism of Germany, though he championed a more radical version of historicism.¹⁵ Kooy notes Coleridge’s Romantic revolt against Germany Higher Criticism:

He (Coleridge) criticized Lessing for assuming that the evidence of an eyewitness is necessarily transparent and Eichhorn for assuming that empirical research might exhaustively explain Biblical events. In neither case can the sacred text be subject to such piecemeal demystification. Coleridge’s response to the Higher Criticism is to valorize mythology, to defend the existence of a Christian “Mythus” discernable in part in cultural history but more clearly in Biblical history. This mythology, as Coleridge once said, is an “Idea shadowed out in an individual Instance, imaginary or historical—the truth remains the same.” In equating history with mythology Coleridge offers a stiking alternative to the critical spirit in contemporary German Biblical criticism: what was dismissed as merely so many unversifiable stories turned out to be the only possible truth.¹⁶

A Romantic reading of the Bible can prevent a demythologizing of the Bible as nonhistorical history through the help of symbol and imagination. I.A. Richards analyzes Coleridge's "fancy and imagination" not as conflicting but as symbiotic. Coleridge compares fancy and imagination with delirium and mania: "You may conceive the difference in kind between the Fancy and the Imagination in this way, that if the check of the senses and the reason were withdrawn the first would become delirium, and the last mania."¹⁷ Coleridge's Romanticism is here shown to use "the check of the senses and the reason," as synthetical and harmonical. Richards stresses the importance for readers not to misunderstand that for Coleridge "fancy and imagination are not exclusive of or inimical to one another."¹⁸ Richards made clear that, for Coleridge, "imagination must have fancy, in fact the higher intellectual powers can only act through a corresponding energy of the lower."¹⁹ Coleridge addresses three kinds of imaginations in his *Biographia Literaria* XIII,

The imagination then I consider either as primary, or seconary. The primary imagination I hold to be the living power and prime agent of all human perception, and as a repetition in the finite mind of the eternal act of creation in the infinite I am. The secondary I consider as an echo of the former, coexisting with the conscious will yet still as identical with the primary in the kind of its agency, and differing only in degrees, in order to re-create; or where this process is rendered impossible, yet still at all events it struggles to idealize and to unify. It is essentially vital, even as all objects (as objects) are essentially fixed and dead.²⁰

It seems that there is a process linking fancy and imagination. Fancy appears to come out of inner feeling without check of reason, but imagination, for Coleridge, though still symbolic and intuitive, is recreated with reason. Coleridge sees this as being both symbiotic and procedural. Paul Scott Wilson, one of the very few contemporary Homileticians who in published work refers to Coleridge, explicates Coleridge's three kinds of imagination (primary and secondary imagination and fancy):

Primary imagination, then is an act of free will that dissolves identity, recognizes opposites or discordant qualities, and reconciles them as a necessary precondition for all perception and knowledge...Primary imagination points to the origins of self-consciousness. The unconscious spirit merely exists. It fails to recognize opposites...All other reconciliations follow as part of the self-duplicating process of secondary imagination. They are different in "degree" from primary imagination...Secondary imagination brings together apparently discordant elements and fuses them into meaningful thoughts, symbols, metaphors and images. It lies at the heart of language process...Secondary imagination, for all its similarity with the primary, differs "in the mode of its operation" on three points. First, it operates

by “conscious will” rather than by the mysterious “living” or free will of the primary. As Coleridge says at the end of Chapter 7, the poetic imagination in humans is distinct from the philosophic imagination in that it involves “superior voluntary control.” Second, it has a deconstructive component: it not only dissolves the apparent identity of opposites, it also “diffuses” and “dissipates” the elements with which it is involved, something which the human primary imagination did only with the elements of subject struggles to idealize and unify, to bring order from contradiction, wherever it may be found...²¹

For Wilson, primary imagination is deemed an imagination which naturally flowed from the inner feeling, while secondary imagination is imagination worked out with control and reason and with dialectic. Wilson writes further, in regard to fancy,

Fancy is an elevated form of memory that unlike memory is active...fancy is part of Coleridge’s solution to the associationist problem of a passive mind, for all three faculties are active, sharing will in common...Second, fancy has “no other counters to play with, but fixities and definites,” and it must receive all of its materials from “ordinary memory” that operates by “the law of association.” Thus the real distinction between fancy and imagination is that the one links ideas by any means it chooses, while the other only operates by his “seminal principle” of reconciliation of opposites.²²

In Wilson’s interpretation of Coleridge’s imagination, imagination is active. Fancy utilizes the law of association which belongs to consciousness, unlike imagination that flows from the unconscious, though secondary imagination uses the check of reason later. This is unique to Coleridge’s Romantic understanding of this human faculty.

Thus, there have been varying attempts to define Romanticism. Perhaps it is useful to accept a broad definition. Narrow definitions may create difficulties. For example, when Romanticism is defined as a revolt against reason and recovery of intuition, it would be possible to argue that Coleridge cannot be categorized as pure Romantic. Berlin states, “Indeed, the literature on Romanticism is larger than Romanticism itself, and the literature defining what it is that the literature on Romanticism is concerned with is quite large in its turn.”²³ Berlin defines Romanticism as the “first attack of Enlightenment,” and he divides Romanticism into two major kinds: “restrained” Romanticism and “unbridled” Romanticism. Romanticism with radical freedom of inner feeling is “unbridled,” and Romanticism with synthesis of feeling and reason is “restrained.”

Hedley discusses the similarity between Coleridge and Augustine in that they both believed that “feeling and reason belong together, condition and intensify each other.”²⁴ “Genuine reflection upon God requires more than

mere cognition, but a passionate engagement of the soul. This is no denigration of reason; insight is the reward of a passionate, humble and spiritual inquiry. This is the conviction of Augustine, Denis, Anselm and S.T. Coleridge.”²⁵ Hedley asks if Coleridge was a Romantic, in this respect. Hedley points out that “using the vague concept of Romanticism can obscure the clarity of Coleridge’s thought.”²⁶ Hedley argues that Coleridge cannot be designated as simply a Romantic. While he shares a great deal with Romanticism, Coleridge’s thinking extends beyond that of other Romantics. He is not simply a neo-classicist because he embraces reason. It would be more correct to say that Coleridge is an unbridled Romantic who stresses using the wild expression of inner feeling but at the same time does not neglect the value of reason. With this backdrop of Romanticism in place, this chapter now focuses more specifically upon Coleridge’s contributions concerning organicism.

Coleridge and Organicism

As was the case in defining Romanticism, defining organicism has the potential for either a broad or narrow scope. One can speak of political organicism, organicism of social philosophy, organicism of aesthetics, biological organicism, economical organicism, and so on.²⁷ Bahm defines organicism as “the philosophy of interdependence.” Bahm calls it as “new philosophy” that has “the significance of the idea of interdependence as an ultimate explanatory principle in all fields of philosophy.”²⁸ As the term “organic” implies, organicism is, according to Bahm, “parts of wholes are in some sense wholes in their own right and, as such, have their own parts with which they also interdepend.”²⁹ Bahm applies organicism to almost all human liberal arts, philosophy and science.

For this reason, it is useful to be clear that organicism, in this discussion, is limited to “aesthetic organicism.” Orsini posits that “aesthetic organicism usually refers to the doctrine of organic unity and to its cognates like the idea of organic form or of ‘inner’ form.”³⁰ Orsini sees aesthetic organicism as having two major divisions: Organic Unity and Organic Form. Orsini writes,

The designation arises from the assumption that a work of art may be compared to a living organism, so that the relation between the parts of a work is neither arbitrary nor factitious, but as close and intimate as that between the organs of a living body. The classic formula for this relation is double: (1) the parts of the work are in keeping with each other and with the whole, and (2) alteration of a part will bring with it the alteration of the whole. By means of this formula the closest unity

between the parts of a work of art is predicated or, alternatively, the formula provides the closest way of conceiving aesthetic unity.³¹

The second major part of organicism deals with organic form and its relation to content. Such a relationship implies a dichotomy of content and form, and thus form comes, independently, from an outside source. In this case, content and form are independent rather than interdependent. In such a view, there is a predominance of content over form. Orsini calls this as “Contentualism,”³² in which form is indifferent. Still, there is yet another view of predominance of form: “Formalism, which makes Form everything and reduces content to nothing.”³³ However, in organicism, content and form cannot be separated; they remain interdependent. Coleridge emphasizes organic unity in *Biographia Literaria*:

The fairest part of the most beautiful body will appear deformed and monstrous, if dissevered from its place in the organic whole. Nay, on delicate subjects, where a seemingly trifling difference of more or less may constitute a difference in kind, even a faithful display of the main and supporting ideas, if yet they are separated from the forms by which they are at once clothed and modified, may perchance present a skeleton indeed; but a skeleton to alarm and deter.³⁴

Parts in art cannot be divided from the whole of arts. Form, like cloth, should not be stripped from the body, content. Coleridge suggests still further understandings of organicism. For Coleridge, organicism is a “synthesis of contraries.” The most serious synthesis of Coleridge’s organicism is organic synthesis of reason and intuition. Coleridge argues that the conscious and the unconscious are related organically—i.e. the “artificial” and “natural” are interconnected organically. Anthropologically, Coleridge synthesizes two human faculties (intellect and affection) into a single, expression of interdependence. Coleridge writes,

Grand portions are produced: we have limbs of giant growth; but the productions, as a whole, in which each part gives delight for itself, and the whole, consisting of these delightful parts, communicates the highest intellectual pleasure and satisfaction, and is the result of the application of judgment and taste. These are not to be attained but by painful study, and to the sacrifice of the stronger pleasure derived from the dazzling light which a man of genius throws over every circumstances and where we are chiefly struck by vivid and distinct images. Taste is an attainment after a poet has been disciplined by experience and has added to genius that talent by which he knows what part of his genius he can make acceptable and intelligible to the portion of mankind for which he writes.³⁵

In Coleridge, head and heart are organically related. This fact is perhaps readily accepted by most when they consider their own living body and mind.

Also, for Coleridge, organicism has deeper meaning in that the universal embraces the particular, the local and the individual. The universal and the individual are interdependent. Coleridge points to Shakespeare's expression of pure individuality that established the playwright's universal popularity for all ages:

I know no character in his plays which can be called the mere portrait of an individual: while the reader feels all the satisfaction arising from individuality, yet that very individual is a sort of class character, and this circumstance renders Shakespeare the poet of all ages.³⁶

Also, for Coleridge, organicism implies a blending of contraries such as the similar and the dissimilar. He states,

In everything the blending of the similar with the dissimilar is the secret of all pure delight. Who shall dare to stand alone, and vaunt himself, in himself, sufficient? In poetry it is the blending of passion with order that constitutes perfection: this is still more the case in morals, and more than all in the exclusive attachment of the sexes.³⁷

Abrams also supports Coleridge's organicism of synthesis in art and aesthetics. Abrams notes that art is the result of a confluence of nature and man, relationally and organically:

Coleridge's lecture "On Poesy or Art" (1818) is grounded on Schelling's metaphysics of a psycho-natural parallelism, according to which the essences within nature have a kind of duplicate subsistence as ideas in the mind. This world-view provides a new set of metaphors in which to convey the Romantic theme that art is a joint product of the objective and the projected. Art is the mediatrix between, and reconciler of, nature and man.³⁸

Cosmologically, Coleridge sees the connection between nature and man. When one creates art, the art becomes a medium that connects nature and man. This can be expressed differently as "the reconciliation of the natural and the artificial." Abrams offers his own definition of organicism as "the philosophy whose major categories are derived metaphorically from the attributes of living and growing things."³⁹

Jenkins also introduces another meaning of organicism, a German perspective which was influenced by Kant. For Kant, Organic being grows. Organism is alive, and it grows and forms its own shape like a plant. Jenkins states,

Organicism (as it emerged not only in Germany but England and Scotland as well) was a reaction against the Newtonian conception of a mechanistic universe, against the Lockean conception of a passive mind, and the classical assumption that art

should conform to external principles. Kant's philosophy which emphasized inner purposiveness gave German organicism its impetus. German thought in particular was revolutionized by the conviction that not only the natural world but art and the human mind as well manifest the properties of organic form and life. Thus it was that art was considered to grow like a plant from a seed according to its inner dynamics...Coleridge's assimilation of the organic perspective was gradual and uneven.⁴⁰

Organicism means that even art has its own life like an organism. Everything has its own life and inner power by which it grows outwardly and organically. Organicism has growth; therefore, it has meaning of "process." Art is not only a one time, instantly occurring creation; rather, art, after it is created, remains in a growth process. In this sense, organicism implies a "dynamic process, the poet's thoughts and feelings as they are being transformed into poetry."⁴¹ Coleridge's organicism has its counterpart, mechanism. Abrams analyzes "the distinction between the living imagination and the mechanical fancy"⁴² and sees A.N. Whitehead as a "modern heir" of organic theory.⁴³ It can be argued that process philosophy is also an heir of organicism. Abrams further writes,

It hardly needs to be said how strongly a mode of thinking patterned on a growing plant fostered the genetic habit of mind. From this point of view, to understand anything is to know how it has come about. Much that has hitherto been conceived as Being is now seen as itself a Becoming—the universe itself is a process, and God's creation is a continuant. Change, instead of a meaningless Heracleitian flux, is conceived to be the orderly emergence of inner forms and is held to constitute the very essence of things; and the ancient distrust of mutability is annulled.⁴⁴

As a further expansion of organicism, Phillips introduces five interrelated ideas of organicist position:

- (i) The mechanistic approach, i.e., the analytic approach as typified by the physio-chemical sciences, proves inadequate when applied to certain cases—for example, to a biological organism or to society or even to reality as a whole. (ii) The whole is more than the sum of the parts. (iii) The whole determines the nature of the parts. (iv) The parts cannot be understood if considered in isolation from the whole. (v) The parts are dynamically interrelated or interdependent.⁴⁵

Phillips understands organicism generally as organic unity rather than organic form and growth. Bahm points out still another element of organicism: spontaneity and non-spontaneity. For Bahm, "organicists accept the fact of some spontaneity in every effect, rather than attributing it to, and only to, the whole series or whole system. But they also insist on some non-spontaneity in every effect, including each particle and the whole system."⁴⁶

Additionally, Manuel points out, as another element of organicism, “natural and unnatural inequalities.”⁴⁷ According to Rousseau, for Manuel, the “distinction between natural and unnatural inequalities early in the Second Discourse seemed to imply a contradictory theory, that there were substantial natural inequalities, based on health, bodily strength, and powers of the intellect and the soul.”⁴⁸

Organicism is also found in the roots of revolutionary philosophy, such as that which instigated the French revolution wherein rebels believed that men are equal in nature. Nonetheless, from an aesthetic perspective, natural equality and unnatural inequality reveal deeper meanings than are evident in political organicism. Individuals have their own right to express their own inner feelings because everyone is equal in having inner power and inner voice. At the same time, each expression of each individual is unequal and unique. Individual, creative freedom of expression should not be oppressed. Each individual’s difference creates a kind of pluralism. Bahm utilizes a pluralistic lens in his discussion of organicism. He writes, “For organicists, every event or entity (“eventity”) is both a means and an end. Each eventity entails cause and effect.”⁴⁹ Every event is final end, so it is pluralistic. Still, it is also a means for the next process and change.

Manuel continues to pursue the question of what constitutes a law of nature. He asks, “What is the origin of inequality among men, and is it authorized by natural law?”⁵⁰ Law of nature has double meanings here. Before the law of nature all are equal, and all have their own law. It is not anarchy. That law of nature is universal and individual at the same time. Organicism has its own law of nature, as all plants have their own law of growth in nature. Organicism has its own “inherent laws of the imaginative process.”⁵¹ Consequently, organicism is attacked sometimes as being disordered and anarchical, but organicism has its own natural law when it expresses its creative content and form under the universal law of nature,⁵² although there are individual differences.

Organicism even synthesizes the observer and the observed. They are innately linked. Tong speaks to this:

In organic epistemology, empirical reality is never absolutely dependent on the perceiving subject in order to become intelligible. As a parallel existence alongside human beings, belonging together to a transcendental order, nature has its own interest and independent existence. The act of subjectivization is possible only when there is an internal and therefore organic link between the self and the empirical. That entirely subjective projection in metaphor is precisely what organicism guards against, and it is the effort to seek the innate link between the observer and the observed that characterizes organic epistemology.⁵³

Tong's understanding of organicism echoes similar thinking of Gadamer and Kierkegaard regarding "contemporaneity."⁵⁴ Truth becomes truth when the text and the audience interact together with fusion in the contemporaneity. As Tong points out, the innate link between the observer (audience) and the observed (text) is the link of organicism. In organicism, there are only two subjects which are both independent and interdependent. As writer or orator becomes audience to the text, audience also should become audience to the text and the product of the interaction of writer and the text.

While there are several and competing definitions of organicism, for Coleridge, the term "organic" itself symbolizes, aesthetic organicism as a living organ in the literature and art. It has organic unity and organic synthesis between reason and intuition and between the conscious and the unconscious. It is a process that grows. Organicism counters mechanism. Organicism acknowledges a law of nature that does not allow for anarchy. Coleridge lifts up an organicism that is "natural, unplanned, and unconscious process by which things grow,"⁵⁵ avoiding anarchical danger resulting from external rules and following a biological law of nature.⁵⁶ Therefore, Coleridge's organicism can be thought of as a restrained Romanticism or a synthetically upgraded Romanticism, which combines living power of intuition and reason, where organic unity, organic form, organic growth are emphasized and organically related.

A Brief History of Form

This chapter includes a brief history of form to illustrate the context of Coleridge's organic concept of form. The concern for form is as old as humanity's concern for art and literature. Primitive humans may well have expressed their art and literature by means of organic form since external, prescribed protocols for form did not exist. Later, there may have been some patterns of form which artists and writers could imitate rather than creating their own forms of expression. If one assumes this to be the case, it is plausible to imagine, the tension between imitating and creating form in art and literature is quite ancient. In this respect, the discussion of organic form may date back to the primitive ages. Hamm acknowledges the age of this issue:

The problem of form is one of the oldest as well as one of the most perennial in philosophy and criticism. It runs through the writings of philosophers and aestheticians from Plato to our contemporaries. We have refined its terms, and we have elaborated the sciences and the arts, but the elementary questions are still with

us: the meaning of *form* in general, in nature and in art, the affinities and differences in the forms of the fine arts, the relations between artistic form and historic forces.⁵⁷

However, after Plato introduced his form theory, the history of form became more complicated and the imitation theory was strengthened. For Plato, form is just an imitation of idea. Hamm notes, “Plato so conceived the forms of ideas of all things, even trivial human artifacts, to have an eternal and absolute existence apart from the accident of their mundane production, which was thus an imitation, more or less feeble, of their being.”⁵⁸ From this Plato’s view of form, which so powerfully influenced human creative art, an imitation theory of art and literature was developed. Such a theory asserted that, when human artists wished to express their art, they should seek their models from this world to reflect the eternal world. Aristotle offered a view of art form that revolutionized that of his teacher Plato. Aristotle argued that there are two possible forms: imitative and organic. There is debate as to whether full credit should go to Aristotle on this point or whether Aristotle merely initiated an idea that was actually developed by Coleridge and other Romantics. While some scholars lament that Aristotle did not more fully develop his organic form theory in his *Poetics*, others, like Priming, place the bulk of the credit in the 18th and 19th centuries.

This concept of form as the result of the operation of the plastic and unifying imagination was developed by Romantic criticism and aesthetics, although the concept of form as a dynamic unifying principle is as old as Aristotle. In Book 7 of the *Metaphysics* Aristotle applied to art his ontological concept of form determining matter, such as the idea of the statue which is the form in the mind of the sculptor and which he then imposes upon some kind of material: the resultant work is thus a synthesis of form and matter produced by human intelligence, while living beings are a synthesis of form and matter produced by nature. This form might therefore be said to be organic by analogy. But unfortunately in the *Poetics* Aristotle was diverted by the Greek conception of poetry as mimetic from applying this concept of organic form to poetry.⁵⁹

While some might argue that Aristotle’s view of form is conflicted, it should be noted that Aristotle has been famously known as synthetic thinker. As such, he may have attempted to synthesize and balance those two conflicting views noted by Priming. Aristotle offers a nuanced discussion on imitation, or *mimesis*:

Now epic poetry and the *poiesis* of tragedy, and further comedy and the art of making dithyrambs, and most of the art of the flute and of the cithara are all in general imitation. But imitations differ from one another in three ways, for they

differ either by being imitations in different things, of different things, or differently and not in the same way. For just as some who make images imitate many things by colors and figures (some through art and some through habit) and others through the voice, so also in the case of the arts mentioned, all make the imitation in rhythm and speech and harmony, but these either apart or mixed together.⁶⁰

Here Aristotle suggests more than imitation; he points to creative imitation. He allows for the artist's personal freedom in choosing models from many different sources and from different settings. This is not simple imitation, but something more like "organic imitation." This may be why Coleridge scholar Emerson R. Marks titles a chapter in a book on Coleridge: "Organic Mimesis and Poetic Art."⁶¹ Marks sees Coleridge, like Aristotle, harmonizing the contradictory. Driere also understands that Aristotle's work on form theory embodies a fairly complex set of meanings. Driere writes that, for Aristotle, "Form is not simply shape but that which shapes, not structure or character but the principle of structure, which gives character. So for the Aristotelian form in a work of art is not structure alone, but all that determines specific character; meaning or expressiveness, as well as structure, is a formal element."⁶²

Hamm suggests another important issue regarding form from Aristotle: the inseparable unity of form and content. Aristotle, in his *Physics*, teaches that "in both art and nature there is union of matter (*hyle*) and form (*eidōs*)."⁶³ "Matter exists potentially just because it can come to its form; when it exists actually it is in its form."⁶⁴ Aristotle raises significant issue of form theory which is found in contemporary debate of form. Form and content cannot be separated; rather, they are closely related. Content cannot exist without form, and form itself is, in a way, content. This notion may anticipate full development of organic theory of art form, because it insinuates that form is closely related to content and grows from content, not given from outside as something separate.

Abrams introduces a second interesting form theory: practical theory. Abrams points to Horace and his *Ars Poetica*, where he advises that "the poet's aim is either to profit or to please, or to blend in one the delightful and the useful."⁶⁵ Building on this, as McKeon points out, "Horace's criticism is directed in the main to instruct the poet how to keep his audience in their seats until the end, how to induce cheers and applause, how to please a Roman audience, and by the same token, how to please all audiences and win immortality."⁶⁶ This new direction of form's function may be initiated an awareness of the role of audience when considering the form of rhetoric.⁶⁷

Classical rhetoric's three functions of speech seem to have influenced form theory of art. As Augustine wrote in *De Doctrina Christiana*, rhetoric

has three basic functions: to teach (*docere/probare*), to please (*delectare*) and to move (*flectere/movere*).⁶⁸ Augustine seems to follow Aristotle's functional view of form. Augustine offers only two processes in Christian communication: "the process of discovering what we need to learn, and the process of presenting what we have learnt."⁶⁹ From Horace to Augustine, it seems that form follows function, but in Augustine one can see a fuller range of rhetorical function for form. Augustine also deals with traditional imitation theory of form, but for Augustine it seems that there is process of pedagogy of form. Infants learn from imitating, but adults express with freedom. He writes, "Infants acquire speech purely by assimilating the words and phrases of those who speak to them; so why should the eloquent not be able to acquire their eloquence not through the traditional teaching but by reading and listening to the speeches of the eloquent and by imitating them within the limits of their ability?"⁷⁰ In both Horace and Augustine, form is functionally closely related to content which is a part of organic theory of form. Form is not given from outside mechanically but grows from within according to function, content and context in the process. In organic form theory, as Preming notes, "Form is often called organic form and is sharply distinguished from abstract structure, especially as determined by genre. The external and preconceived structure depending on genre is correspondingly named mechanic or abstract form in contrast with organic."⁷¹ Schlegel also observes of organic form,

Form is mechanical when, through external force, it is imparted to any material merely as an accidental addition without reference to its quality; as for example, when we give a particular shape to a soft mass that it may retain the same after its induration. Organic form, again, is innate; it unfolds itself from within, and acquires its determination contemporaneously with the perfect development of the germ.⁷²

Preming further notes that "the free and supple form of Shakespearean tragedy is defended as organic in contradistinction of the mechanical regularity imposed by the rules and unities of neoclassicism."⁷³ A German perspective on organic thought is found in Goethe's "inner form" theory.⁷⁴ Coleridge's most famous passage on organic form shows how close his theory is to that of Schlegel's—a fact which raised the question of plagiarism.⁷⁵ Coleridge wrote,

The form is mechanic when on any given material we impress a pre-determined form, not necessarily arising out of the properties of the material, as when to a mass of wet clay whatever shape we wish it to retain when hardened. The organic form, on the other hand, is innate; it shapes as it develops itself from within, and the fullness of its development is one and the same with the perfection of its outward

form. Such is the life, such is the form. Nature, the prime genial artist, inexhaustible in diverse powers, is equally inexhaustible in forms.⁷⁶

Coleridge may not have borrowed Schlegel's thought, but it seems that Coleridge emphasizes not to have imitated or borrowed from outside as "pre-determined form" because there are inexhaustible diversity and plurality of forms. Orsini and Stempel disagree with Abrams' regarding Coleridge's dependence on Schlegel. Orsini argues against rationalizing what he understands to be Coleridge's plagiarism. Orsini notes Coleridge's own reaction to the charges.⁷⁷ Two years later Daniel Stempel presents an amazing article that raises further questions concerning Coleridge's inspiration. Stempel introduces the potential influences of Hume (1711–1776) and Kant (1724–1804). Stempel argues that, before Coleridge, Hume already had incorporated an organic concept in his *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*, which was influenced not by a German source but by Philo. Hume quotes Philo as follows:

...I affirm, that there are other parts of the universe (besides the machine of human invention) which bear still a greater resemblance to the fabric of the world, and which therefore afford a better conjecture concerning the universal origin of this system. These parts are animals and vegetables. The world plainly resembles more an animal or a vegetable, than it does a watch or a knitting-loom. Its cause, therefore, it is more probable, resemble the cause of the former. The cause of the former is generation or vegetation. The cause, therefore, of the world, we may infer to be some thing similar or analogous to generation or vegetation.⁷⁸

In Hume, one can find an organic concept which sounds much like Coleridge's synthesis: "Organic order, for Hume, is not the result of a supernatural fitting of means to ends; it is the natural product of a process of trial and error in which the only criterion of success is viability. Thus, each organism is an end in itself."⁷⁹ Stempel points out that "like Hume, Kant sees organic forms as self-organized: they are not, like works of art, composed of parts fitted together in accordance with a rational or ideal design."⁸⁰ In Kant, "the distinctive character of things considered as physical ends... things considered as physical ends are organisms."⁸¹ Stempel argues stunningly that Hume may have been the one to influence Kant⁸² and concludes that "perhaps Coleridge, like Kant, found hints toward a theory of organic form in the works of the despised Hume, whom he spurned as 'thief and blockhead'."⁸³ Another possible source of Coleridge's organic thinking is Plotinus. Abrams introduces the idea of "Cambridge Platonists." He writes,

In discussing the human perception of the divine overflow, Plotinus explicitly rejected the concept of sensations as “imprints” or “real-impressions” made on a passive mind, and substituted the view of the mind as an act and a power which “gives a radiance out of its own store” to the objects of sense. Similar metaphors of mind were particularly prevalent in the philosophy of the “Cambridge Platonist” (more Plotinists, actually, than Platonists), whom Wordsworth had read, and Coleridge had studied intensively.⁸⁴

It is also claimed that “the recognition of the relationship of the quality of Beauty to the inner form (*endon eidos*) was Plotinus’ constructive contribution to aesthetics.”⁸⁵ It is known that “Plotinus developed a unique theory of sense-perception and knowledge, based on the idea that the mind plays an active role in shaping or ordering the objects of its perception, rather than passively receiving the data of sense experience (in this sense, Plotinus may be said to have anticipated the phenomenological theories of Husserl).”⁸⁶ For Plotinus, form is not passively imitated from outside; rather, it is actively constructed from within, and this is an organic concept.

This organic concept seems also to have some roots in England, a place where free will of human beings has been historically emphasized even though it frequently involved theological controversy. It is interesting to see that Plotinus (204–270), Pelagius (354–418),⁸⁷ Arminius (1560–1609),⁸⁸ Cambridge Platonists (1614–1711), Locke (1632–1704), Hume (1711–1766), and, later, Wesley (1707–1788) are all located in or strongly influenced by England, a place where free will and freedom of human beings were given more prominence than on the European continent. Although English theological anthropology was at times charged to be heretical, the root of English thinking regarding freedom of human beings may have impacted aesthetics and literature positively.

Norwood notes that this organic concept of form and content induced a “logical corollary that there is no such thing in art as the same form with different content: alteration in one produces alteration in the other.”⁸⁹ An inseparable unity of form and content is a crucial point in understanding organic form theory. Form and content are one. They do not function as subject and object. There is no dichotomy between form and content. Form cannot control content; neither can content control form. They work together and are closely interrelated. In this relation of form and content, A.C. Bradley (1901) proposed his famous phrase “significant form” which later impacted Clive Bell’s theory of art (1913).⁹⁰ In regard to the organic unity of content and form, Bradley argues,

If the substance means ideas, images, and the like taken alone, and the form means the measured language taken by itself, this is a possible distinction, but it is a

distinction of things not in the poem, and the value lies in neither of them. If substance and form mean anything in the poem, then each is involved in the other, and the question in which of them the value lies has no sense...The true critic in speaking of these apart does not really think of them apart; the whole, the poetic experience, of which they are but aspects, is always in his mind; and he is always aiming at a richer, truer, more intense repetition of that experience.⁹¹

Form is organically related to content, and this is called “organic unity.” Form cannot be imposed from outside; rather, it grows creatively from within according to content in the rhetorical and functional situation. “Significant form” is form that is developed organically from content and within according to content. This form of organic unity is strongly generated and flows from content. Half a century after Clive Bell’s “significant form,” Schaper also questions the issue of “significant form.” For Schaper, artificiality can be added to creative art process because artificiality of artist also belongs to nature. Schaper states,

Articulated forms are forms displayed, either forms newly discovered in creative vision, or forms wrenched from their context of diffusion and interconnectedness — forms of selected events, things and situation. Art articulates these forms by making them fully apparent, not in life as lived, but in new artifacts added to life. For every work of art is a construct, something deliberately made and even contrived, not found as such or discovered in nature. Art and artificiality are connected notions, and the latter need not have any derogatory flavor. To be artificial is a positive asset of art over life.⁹²

Schaper argues here the blending of Romantic organic form and rationalistic imitative form. For Schaper, within the context in which organic unity utilizes “significant form,” art form can be “organic form” for its significance or content, but, at the same time, the form can be worked artificially. To do so does not work against the notion of significant, organic form. Consequently, there are several avenues for approaching form theory: imitative form, Romantic form of radical freedom, and Romantic organic form of moderate balance between intuition and reason (or the balance between creativity and artificiality).

Following Schaper, Lord raises a similar issue concerning organic unity.⁹³ Lord goes back to the dichotomous conflict between Platonic form and form of organic unity. As Lord puts it,

A literary work may indeed exhibit organic unity, but this kind of unity is very much less than Platonic unity. Organic unity, the unity of the living organism, entails accidental features. My second thesis enlarges the scope of our inquiry. Here I argue that although a literary work may exhibit organic unity, it need not do so, indeed that

particular kind of unity, which is organic unity, is not suitable for all genres. In fact, if achieved, it would destroy the epic or the novel.⁹⁴

Lord differs from Schaper in that Lord puts more stress on the “accidental features” of art while Schaper encourages a more “artificial” aspect of the creative process, but both are clearly in the camp of organic theorists, those who believe that form has close relation to content and form grows from within. Nonetheless, they differ in their respective arguments as to how one accepts an “accidental” element or an “artificial” one in the artistic process. Lord emphasizes that “organic unity properly understood is indeed *one* kind of unity that a work of art may exhibit, but it is not the only kind.”⁹⁵ Lord concludes that “once we free ourselves from the spell of a single model, we may embark upon a series of detailed investigations as to the different kinds of unity which works of art are privileged to exhibit.”⁹⁶ Lord argues for the plurality of organic unity. She resists the mimetic influence on the organic form theory in preference to accidental features.

When the philosophy guiding contemporary writing began to suffer from neo-classical imitation theory (a struggle for Coleridge), the organic concept resurged in the form of the contemporary composition theory. Fulkerson introduces composition theory in the eighties; Fulkerson categorizes three axiologies of composition: expressivism, formalism, and mimeticism.⁹⁷ Fulkerson includes “such charismatic leaders as Ken Macrorie, Don Stewart (author of *The Authentic Voice*) and Lou Kelly (author of *From Dialogue to Discourse*).”⁹⁸ The expressivists of composition theory are contemporary Romantic writers who were closer to Wordsworth than Coleridge. Fulkerson summarizes characteristics of these writers by quoting Kelly who taught that “the content of composition is the writer—as he reveals his self, thoughtfully and feelingly, in his own language, with his own voice... We raise questions that we hope will help our students analyze and understand their own lives, their own beliefs, their own values.”⁹⁹

Fulkerson here, however, disagrees with Berlin and others that Peter Elbow should be included in this expressive circle.¹⁰⁰ Nonetheless, it can be argued that Elbow is close to Coleridge’s thinking in this regard in that Elbow, like Coleridge, attempts to be a balanced synthetic writer. Elbow’s “Embracing Contraries in the Teaching Process” and *Writing Without Teachers* have similarities to Coleridge’s *Biographia Literaria* in their synthetic, dialectic approach to contraries. Elbow states,

In the end, I do not think I am just talking about how to serve students and serve knowledge or society. I am also talking about developing opposite and complementary sides of our character or personality: the supportive and nurturant

side and the tough, demanding side. I submit that we all have instincts and needs of both sorts. The gentlest, softest, and most flexible among us really need a chance to stick up for our latent high standards, and the most hawk-eyed, critical-minded bouncers at the bar of civilization among us really need a chance to use our nurturant and supportive muscles instead of always being adversary.¹⁰¹

Also, Elbow claims in *Writing without Teachers*¹⁰² that one needs both “the doubting game and the believing game” as an “analysis of the intellectual enterprise.”¹⁰³ As Coleridge synthesizes “head and heart” and “intellect and emotion,”¹⁰⁴ Elbow believes “doubt of intellect” should be combined with “belief of intuition.” Romantic expressive theory argues for the writer’s and the artist’s inner power of freedom of expression. Rationalism doubts inner feeling and its uncertainty. Moreover, Elbow, like Coleridge, synthesizes both. Fishman and McCarthy also highlight “parallels between Elbow and Johann Gottfried Herder, the German philosopher who was student to Kant and mentor to Goethe.”¹⁰⁵ Organic concept and organic form reappear in the contemporary composition class when the product and the process are conflicted. Some composition teachers impose merely “product”—models and rules—for students to copy and to imitate, but some few others cherish the process whereby students’ inner freedom of expression is allowed to flow. Still, some very few others (like Elbow) encourage students to rework the “flowing expression” with a critical mind. Contemporary theorist Pumphery offers almost the same phrase of Schlegel and Coleridge,

Removed from the process, he is inclined to think in terms of form aside from content. Should he decide, in the name of Order or Expediency, to impose a pre-determined form upon his student’s raw material, he runs the risk of alienating his students from language. Pleasure in language may be lost, and with it the opportunity to see writing as a process of discovery.¹⁰⁶

...Free of any pressure to pre-order his thoughts, the student can then experience the excitement of seeing form evolve out of content as his scattered thoughts come together into a new whole.¹⁰⁷

Paul C. Rodgers, Jr., critiquing Alexander Bain and his neo-classical teaching of writing, also returns to the “organic” concept for the discussion of contemporary composition. Rodgers first categorizes contemporary forms of discourse as “description, narration, exposition, and argumentation.”¹⁰⁸ Rodgers goes on to say, regarding the “organic” concept in writing,

Moreover, it was argued, the sentence, paragraph, and full discourse, each at its own level, exemplify identical organic principles.¹⁰⁹ ...The resulting paragraph will display a sound organic structure embodying...“the logical growth of its topic.”¹¹⁰

While a further discussion of the use of form in contemporary composition will occur later in this chapter, enough information hopefully has been set forth to provide a brief history of form and to conclude that debate regarding imitation theory and organic theory of form has not ended. Even today, one can hear contemporary voices that sound like echoes of Coleridge. Thus, with this brief history of form in place, the groundwork is laid for considering sermon composition in relation to some of the resources available from the liberal arts.

Metaphors of “Mirror”, “Lamp”, and “Plant”

It is necessary to address some significant metaphors employed by writers during the 18th and 19th centuries, in order to gain a clear understanding of Coleridge’s Romantic organic theory. Neo-classical art theory emphasizes imitation in the art process, adopting the metaphor of “Mirror.”¹¹¹ Radical Romanticism, as represented by Wordsworth, stresses the abrupt explosion of inner feeling. The metaphor he uses is “Lamp.”¹¹² Although Coleridge’s Romantic organic theory rejects both metaphors of mirror and lamp, Coleridge synthesizes both.¹¹³ The primary metaphor that Coleridge offers is that of “Plant.” A plant grows from an “invisible central power”¹¹⁴ of nature and its form is developed in the process. The form of a plant does not imitate other forms of plants; rather, it organically grows into its own authentic form from a seed with the help of earth, sun, water, and other elements. It creates its own form, instead of imitating forms of other plants. While neoclassical theory encourages artists to imitate prescribed forms given from outside, radical Romantic theory urges to seek explosive expression of inner feeling and intuition.

Coleridge’s more synthetic organic theory (organicism) argues a unique understanding of the artistic creative process. It starts from a radical Romantic understanding—explosion of inner feeling from the living power,¹¹⁵ but it includes later human endeavors of consciousness and reason in the creative process of art. Hard study, tough editing, and rewriting are possible in the developing process of art, because the process is also an expression of the artist’s natural humanity. In the organic process, the art form is created, grows, changes, is rewritten, develops, and sometimes may be imitated, but the entire process starts from an unconscious expression of inner feeling.

The mirror metaphor focuses on using reason in the creative process of art; the lamp metaphor focuses on using intuition. The plant metaphor

synthesizes both to promote an authentic creation of form from within rather than from without. In synthesizing the lamp and mirror metaphors, Coleridge is also synthesizing the concepts of intuition and reason. Standing alone, the two metaphors fight against one another, but Coleridge allows them to coexist together to create a way of understanding form in art.

Wordsworth and Coleridge

Although it is a challenging task to attempt to define Romanticism in terms of literature, the task is best accomplished by examining key literary critics of the period. An examination of the differences between Wordsworth and Coleridge¹¹⁶ is a good place to begin.

Romanticism began as a reaction to Rationalism's excessive emphasis upon reason, the conscious, and the machinery approach. Wordsworth's strategy, as a player in the Romantic Movement, was to declaim Rationalism. However, Coleridge, a close friend and colleague of Wordsworth, took a different approach. Wordsworth, in short, was radical reactionary (or unbridled Romantic), but Coleridge was a practical synthesizer (or restrained Romantic).¹¹⁷ A focal point of the disagreement of their approaches lay in the work of Shakespeare. Both Wordsworth and Coleridge considered Shakespeare to be a great poet and dramatist in his age and a great Romantic literary writer. Wordsworth claimed that Shakespeare was a great poet and dramatist who used his explosive inner feeling to express his intuition into poetry and drama. For Wordsworth, Shakespeare was a genius whose intuition and inner living power were explored and expressed without any conscious, rational, or editorial after-touch to the original work. Shakespeare was, to Wordsworth, the one whose inner feeling was solely incarnated.

This difference of approach to creating is similar to the difference in how the two great musicians Mozart and Tchaikovsky set about creating.¹¹⁸ Mozart almost finished the work in his mind when he composed,¹¹⁹ yet Tchaikovsky could and would rework his original, spontaneous work with his own conscious development.¹²⁰ For Coleridge, like Tchaikovsky, and also like Schlegel¹²¹ and Schelling¹²² in German Romantics, art is the medium between nature and human. Intuition and reason can be employed together in the creative process of art. Inner feeling and conscious study and reworking are all a part of the process. For Coleridge these steps do not conflict with one another but synthesize with one another. Like Schlegel and Schelling, Coleridge understands Romanticism as a synthetic philosophy which harmonizes two opposites. However, for Wordsworth, Romanticism should

be solely an explosion and expression of inner feeling and intuition into art. This is the main difference between Wordsworth and Coleridge.

Coleridge and Organic Form

Coleridge developed the concept of organic form which opposed mechanic form which is seen as coming from outside as a rule, model, or mold imposed on the artist or preacher. Coleridge's organic form would become a great liberation of form both for artists and preachers.

Coleridge's organic form theory is thoroughly based on the understanding of the plant metaphor in which the seed of a plant grows with the help of earth, air, light and water, which is contextual and circumstantial.¹²³ The seed starts to make its own form when it sprouts for the first time, grows branches and leaves, and then flowers and bears fruit. The plant has its own form from start to end. The form is from within—not from without; the form never imitates other outside forms, prescribed and predetermined. Coleridge writes,

Or to repeat the question in other words, is Shakespeare a great dramatic poet on account only of these beauties and excellencies which he possesses in common with the ancients, but with diminished claims to our love and honor to the full extent of his difference from them? Or are these very differences additional proofs of poetic wisdom, at once results and symbols of living power as contrasted with lifeless mechanism, of free and rival originality as contradistinguished from servile imitation, or more accurately, [from] a blind copying of effects instead of a true imitation of the essential principles?¹²⁴

The form is related to the internal living power. The form grows and develops from the sprout to the tree. It interacts with what it already has such as seed, sunshine, air, earth, and water. The form is the plant's content and context in the process.¹²⁵ For Coleridge, each plant's form is unique and different, because each plant has its own unique form which may or may not be the same form as another plant of the same kind.

However, according to the environment and unpredictable inner or outer influences, the form of a plant may vary unlimitedly. All humans are the same as each other in that they are all human beings, but not every human is in the same form. In the same way, organic form varies diversely and pluralistically according to circumstance. Coleridge in *Biographi Literaria* emphasizes the significance of circumstance, which is rhetorical situation:

It consists in mistaking for the *essentials* of the Greek stage certain rules, which the wise poets imposed upon themselves, in order to render all the remaining parts of the drama consistent with those, that had been forced upon them by circumstances independent of their will; out of which circumstances the drama itself arose. The circumstances in the time of Shakespeare, which it was equally out of his power to alter, were different, and such as, in my opinion, allowed a far wider sphere, and a deeper and more human interest. Critics are too apt to forget, that *rules* are but means to an end; consequently where the ends are different, the rules must be likewise so. We must have ascertained what the end *is*, before we can determine what the rules *ought* to be.¹²⁶

For Coleridge, circumstance (context/rhetorical situation) is indispensable in developing organic theory; form grows from content, “context,” and process.

No one can impose the same form of a plant on each individual form of plants because each has its own form which grows from content.¹²⁷ In terms of process, it is not only becoming but also being. The plant continues to become and to be, interchangeably. One moment it shapes, and afterwards it grows and develops to more mature forms until it reaches its own final, complete form. This may sound like anarchy of forms, but it is not, because every form of plant in the end shapes its own uniqueness and at the same time achieves, pluralistically and creatively, a homogeneous form.¹²⁸ Coleridge explicates,

That within the thing, active thro’ forms and figures as by symbols discoursing—Natur-Geist—must the Artist imitate, as we unconsciously imitate those we love. So only can he produce any work truly natural, in the object, and truly human in the effect. The idea that puts the forms together can not be itself form. It is above form, is its essence, the universal in the individual, individuality itself—the glance and the exponent of the indwelling power.¹²⁹

However, it is always impossible to predict what kind of final form it will eventually achieve. There is uncertainty until the end of creative art process. Organic form grows from within, so nobody can guarantee beforehand what form may be developed. Some musicians, painters, scientific inventors, and creative writers agree with this view. In history there have been many great discoveries and inventions which were not intended from the start.

Another reason that organic form is not lawless is because it has its own law of nature.¹³⁰ The organic form grows following its own law of nature. Every plant has its own law which is different from other plants. There are differences in when the seed should be planted, when the sprout starts, what temperature, sunlight and rainfall are needed, what kind of earth and land are

better for its growth, and so on. The process is totally dependent on the circumstance, or “rhetorical” situation of the plant. For Coleridge, circumstance, or context, appears a more important law of nature than universal mechanic law. Thus, it appears lawless, but it is not; it is full of its own law. Coleridge maintains,

No work of true genius dare want its appropriate form; neither indeed is there any danger of this. As it must not, so neither can it, be lawless! For it is even this that constitutes it genius—the power of acting creatively under laws of its own origination.¹³¹

The organic form has its own freedom and law according to its nature and true law of nature. A farmer in the field cannot be a controller of the organic plant, as there is no subject-object dichotomy. The organic form itself plays an active role in creating and developing its own form. One cannot borrow and impose pre-determined form from outside as it is final form.¹³² Coleridge’s compares organic form to mechanic form by saying,

The form is mechanic when on any given material we impress a pre-determined form, not necessarily arising out of the properties of the material, as when to a mass of wet clay we give whatever shape we wish it to retain when hardened. The organic form, on the other hand, is innate; it shapes as it develops itself from within, and the fullness of its development is one and the same with the perfection of its outward form. Such is the life, such the form. Nature, the prime genial artist, inexhaustible in diverse powers, is equally inexhaustible in forms.¹³³

However, a farmer can help the plant to grow healthily and protect the plant from being destroyed by animals and birds which come from outside. Objective control of Rationalism should be seen as subjective and interactive. Rationalism always controls its start and final products as a machine does by utilizing a prescribed imitative mold. A machine can easily produce and reproduce, with its mold, its product in the exact same form. However, Romantic organic theory (organicism) of Coleridge proposes uncertainty—out of control and mysterious in the human epistemology which cannot know everything until it reaches the end.

Organicism believes that an organic form is a living organism. Organicism believes every art form has its own life. Rationalism believes that only the human is a living being and art is a dead object, so the human can control the art. Such a belief is the antithesis of organicism. Above all, organicism believes each human being is an artist who can create art from his or her inner soul. The soul of each artist has the potential to create and achieve authentic art with its own form. Abrams notes that every soul has been given by the Creator to have the power to create by free-will¹³⁴, as

Adam created by his free-will and named all the different animals and picked whatever fruits he liked from the garden. After his corruption and banishment, Adam, as a representative of all human beings, may have lost a healthy functioning of free-will, but it is still preserved in humans in a limited or full way. However, after Christ's redemption of Adam, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit helped Adam to recover the original condition of free-will to create and to live as a "secondary creator,"¹³⁵ calling humans to have "The Courage to Create!"¹³⁶

Coleridge's organicism contains this deep theological understanding. In summary, for this section, Coleridge's organic form grows from within not imitating or experiencing an imposition from outside that destroys organic unity. In such organic growth, Coleridge's organic form is developed continually by interacting with the artist and the artist's own conscious reworking, changing, adding, or cutting from the original product in the process. This is Coleridge's organic form.

Major Critics to Coleridge's Romantic Organicism

This section introduces five major critics to Coleridge's Romantic organicism: M.H. Abrams, René Wellek, Herbert Read, G.N.G. Orsini, and Gordon Mckenzie. The inclusion of a study of Coleridge's critics helps in achieving an appreciation of the complexity of Coleridge's work. Each critic has a distinct view of Coleridge and his Romantic organicism.

M.H. Abrams

Abrams is the most thorough researcher and critic of Coleridge's organicism. Abrams devoted an entire book for only this purpose: *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition*.¹³⁷ Orsini evaluates Abrams's work of Coleridge as "one of the fullest definitions, both historically and critically, of organicism,"¹³⁸ but Orsini points out that Abrams "unnecessarily adopted Pepper's classification of kinds of theory."¹³⁹ Abrams describes Coleridge as Romantic visionary of the world.¹⁴⁰ According to Abrams, *Biographia Literaria* was "a crisis-autobiography." In the 1790s, Goethe and other German writers had developed the *Bildungsroman*, the novel about the education of the hero in life, and Coleridge's *Biographia Literaria* was similar in kind. According to Abrams, Coleridge's narrative conforms to the plot of that prototype of all spiritual

autobiographies, Augustine's Confessions.¹⁴¹ Abrams notes that in *Biographia*,

Coleridge shifts the biblical parallel for his condition at this time from Noah's flood to the Exodus, referring to the religious "mystics" as "always a pillar of fire throughout the night, during my wandering through the wilderness of doubt," enabling him to skirt, without crossing, the sandy deserts of utter unbelief.¹⁴²

Coleridge was fascinated by the French Revolution, but, after the French invasion of Switzerland, he made a drastic turn-about, and in his *Biographia* he describes his disillusionment with the French Revolution. Also, Abrams analyzes Coleridge's organicism—organic unity¹⁴³ compared to mechanical unity, as well as organic growth. Abrams writes,

Organic growth is an open-ended process, nurturing a sense of the promise of the incomplete, and the glory of the imperfect. Also as a plant assimilates the most diverse materials of earth and air, so the synthetic power of imagination "reveals itself," in Coleridge's famous phrase, "in the balance or reconciliation of opposite or discordant qualities." And only in "mechanical" unity are the parts sharply defined and fixed; in organic unity, what we find is a complex inter-relation of living, indeterminate, and endlessly changing components.¹⁴⁴

Abrams interprets Coleridge's organicism as "open-ended process," which sounds somewhat like postmodern hermeneutics and philosophy of process and phenomenology. Every thing can be changed, and every fixed thing should be open-ended for new direction. The thoughts of a new, open-ended view influenced further thinking on the part of Coleridge. Coleridge's political perspectives regarding freedom also pervade his writing. Coleridge dreamed of building utopia. He tried to establish a Utopian Pantisocracy and wrote political pieces such as *The Statesman's Manual* (1815–16) and *On the Constitution of the Church and State* (1829). Abrams introduces Coleridge's political "open-ended" thought by saying, "...he (Coleridge) claimed that the French Revolution was not only a political and social crisis but also an intellectual, moral, and imaginative one, and that this crisis interpenetrated and shaped the great new literature of the age."¹⁴⁵

Coleridge faced major political and intellectual crises in the age in which he lived. Enlightenment had been oppressing the spirit of freedom by imposing tradition, rule and form given from outside. Coleridge seems to have witnessed the cry of people from that oppression, not only in art and literature, but also in politics and philosophy. The French Revolution (1789–1795) opened a new door to human freedom and equality. Coleridge may have been influenced by French Revolution when constructing his aesthetic

paradigm. His organicism supports such revolutionary anthropology and politics, because organicism is implicitly political and equalitarian.

Organicism encourages a perspective that all humans are equal by nature, though naturally unequal. When they are considered as unique individuals, this leads to a pluralistic society where neither dictator nor authorities of norm can survive. Society can have so many authorities which illegitimately oppress people as slaves not allowing them to express their freedom of human rights and freedom of expression. Abrams noticed that anthropology in Coleridge is highly elevated from slave to the level of the sublime, secondary creator and artist. Abrams notes, "The artist from being a craftsman became a creator, for it sometimes said that of all men the poet is like God because he creates according to those patterns on which God himself has modeled the universe."¹⁴⁶ However, there is no need to fear anarchy when every human becomes equal, and there is no hierarchy because there is law of nature, inherent natural law. Even art and literature have their own law of nature, like plant. From its inner living power, it grows organically according to its law until it sprouts, grows, and blooms.

René Wellek

In terms of a historical approach to Coleridge and Romantic organicism, René Wellek is another major critic to Romanticism and Coleridge as well as a major historian of modern criticism. Wellek sees the history of literary criticism between the middle of the 18th century and the 19th as the period which most clearly raises all the fundamental issues of criticism that are still with us today. According to Wellek, "in contemporary nonacademic English and American criticism we find many tendencies and ideas which could be interpreted as a revival of neoclassical principles."¹⁴⁷

T.S. Eliot is one of the leading figures of the neoclassical movement. Eliot's influence was overwhelming in neoclassical criticism; Wellek points out,

T. S. Eliot has described his general point of view as classicist in the famous preface to *For Lancelot Andrewes* (1928), and he is the critic who has influenced contemporary criticism most profoundly, if not on all theoretical issues then at least with his individual judgments and the general bent of his taste. Eliot's emphasis on the impersonality and objectivity of the poet, his view of the poet as "the shred of platinum" (to quote the famous simile from "Tradition and the Individual Talent"), could be interpreted as a revival of neoclassical principles, and it is surely a reaction against Romantic subjectivism, lyricism, and exaltation of the ego. Eliot's constant stress on the share of the intellect in the creative process, his plea for reasonableness and toughness, and his view that poetry must be at least as well written as prose

could also be interpreted as neoclassical...Eliot voices his preference for analysis against the impressionism and “appreciation” which we have come to associate with Romantic attitudes.”¹⁴⁸

Wellek witnesses the “recent almost universal increase of interest in economy of expression, in craftsmanship, and in rhetoric and its devices might be thought of as neoclassical. The revulsion against the lyrical cry, the purely subjective, and the merely biographical is common today. Most of the so-called New Critics in the United States criticize the English Romantic poets.”¹⁴⁹ For this reason, T.S. Eliot and I.A. Richards appeal to Coleridge’s *Biographia Literaria*, because Coleridge emphasizes “imagination as the balance or reconciliation of opposite or discordant qualities.”¹⁵⁰ The Romantic movement of criticism seems to recycle and repeat its rise and fall in different ages and times. Even today, the Romantic criticism that started from Wordsworth and Coleridge has survived through classical mimetic theory. From Wellek’s analysis, one sees that there are basically three major arguments of literary criticism in relation to Romanticism: neo-classicists, unbridled Romantics, and restrained/synthetic Romantics.

Among these three positions, two are extreme, and one is moderate, in terms of how they view the relation of reason and intuition. Coleridge’s organicism may be called a restrained Romantic or moderate Romantic. Wellek summarizes the significance of Coleridge in the history of literature as follows:

J.H. Muirhead has proclaimed Coleridge the founder of the voluntaristic form of idealistic philosophy, of which “he remains to this day the most distinguished representative.” I.A. Richards has hailed Coleridge as a forerunner of the modern science of semantics. Coleridge’s “step across the threshold of a general theoretical study of language was of the same type as that which took Galileo into the modern world.” Herbert Read considers Coleridge “as head and shoulders above every other English critic” and sees him anticipating existentialism and Freud. Most recent American literary critics discuss none of the older critics except Coleridge and Aristotle. Constant references are being made to Coleridge’s principle of the reconciliation of opposites, to his definition of the imagination, to the idea of the organic whole and to his distinction between symbol and allegory.¹⁵¹

Wellek considers how Coleridge may have borrowed his thoughts from German sources. Moreover, Wellek also points to the influences of Kant, Schelling, and, needless to say, A.W. Schlegel.¹⁵² Nevertheless, Wellek champions Coleridge not as “a mere echo of the Germans with no originality and no independence.”¹⁵³ Wellek declares, “This is not the case.”¹⁵⁴ Wellek views Coleridge as someone who combined the ideas he derived from Germany rather than simply mimicking them. Coleridge combined them with

elements of 18th century neoclassicism and British empiricism.¹⁵⁵ Wellek argues that “Coleridge differs from almost all preceding English writers by his claim to an epistemology and metaphysics from which he derives his aesthetics and finally his literary theory and critical principles.”¹⁵⁶

Wellek views Coleridge as a writer who recovered the “sublime” which is “subjective.” He asserts that this is why Coleridge quotes passages from the Bible and Milton as examples of the sublime, rather than from the Greeks. “Coleridge accepts a close relation between the sublime and infinity and like Schelling and Schlegel applies it to a distinction between ancient and modern literature.”¹⁵⁷ According to Wellek, Coleridge simply adopts Kant’s analysis of taste, and he calls it an intermediate faculty between intellect and the senses and ascribes to it the role imagination plays elsewhere.¹⁵⁸ Wellek asserts that, even though Coleridge gathered different fragments on aesthetics from other sources, this did not diminish his importance. Rather, Coleridge’s unique way of synthesizing all these fragments in a holistic and logic fashion made him genuine.¹⁵⁹ Coleridge’s synthesis is seen as problem-solving. Problem-solving seeks a novel answer to an unknown, uncertain problem or thesis. It does not repeat the same answer; rather, it seeks new, different answers creatively. This is the connection of Romantic organicism and creativity of cognitive psychology with the dialectics of philosophy and invention of rhetoric and composition.¹⁶⁰ Coleridge uses a triadic scheme of dialectics: “the reconciliation of opposites, thesis, antithesis, and synthesis.”¹⁶¹ Coleridge’s synthetic aesthetics presuppose problem of thesis and anti-solution.

However, one may note a problem here. Coleridge’s organicism, in which organic unity, organic form and organic growth are discussed, does not specifically address this synthetic concept, although in organic growth and process one may find some sense of the dialectical process. Nonetheless, organic process is not necessarily dialectic; it is upwardly and outwardly progressive. It is possible to say that it is simply a limit of metaphor—all metaphors are limited in their ability to address all the concepts related to a given topic.¹⁶² In this sense, Coleridge’s thoughts cannot be solely categorized as organicism itself, as in the case of Romanticism. One can use metaphor, but metaphor cannot explicate everything; thus Coleridge’s thoughts are Coleridgean, and Richard’s thoughts are Richardian. Wellek is also aware that sometimes Coleridge sounds like “a good neoclassicist,” but Wellek stresses that Coleridge sees “the problem of the union of the particular with the general, of the concrete with the universal.”¹⁶³ This is why Coleridge sometime looks neoclassical and other time comes across as an unbridled Romantic.

Herbert Read

Herbert Read believes that Coleridge's main German source was Schelling's *Transcendental Idealism*, published in 1804 and Schelling's lecture "On the Relation of the Plastic Arts to Nature," delivered in Munich in 1807.¹⁶⁴ Read argues that Coleridge's counterpart to Schelling's work is Coleridge's 1818 lecture "Poesy or Art".¹⁶⁵ Read's view is significantly different from Abrams's view. Abrams believes that Coleridge's main source was Schlegel and his *Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature*,¹⁶⁶ and Coleridge's counterpart is his lecture on "Shakespeare's Judgment Equal to his Genius." Read describes the principle of Schelling's organic form by saying,

The principle of organic form, the specifically Romantic principle as I shall call it, rests on one of the most fundamental distinctions known to philosophy—variously expressed as the distinction between essence and existence, universals and particulars, *natura naturans* and *natura naturata*. The point at issue is not the recognition or differentiation of these two aspects of reality, but the possibility of mediating between them. How does man, a mere specimen of *natura naturata*, become aware of and make evident the process of *natura naturans*, the realm of essence? It is done, said Schelling, through the medium of art—art is the active bond between the soul and nature, between essence and existence. The work of art is the visible embodiment of the nature of being. Art is not a mere imitation of existing phenomena—it is "the holy, eternally creative elemental power of the world, which generates all things out of itself and brings them forth productive."¹⁶⁷

For Schelling, like Coleridge, art is the medium that connects nature and human. In other words, when artists create something, they work from nature and with human artificiality. The traditional classicist view is that only human reason, imitation and artificiality can have a part in creating art and literature. Schelling plays an important role in connecting two seeming contraries because, organically, nature and human beings are connected to each other and interdependent upon one another in the creation of art. Unlike Schlegel, Schelling sees art as a major medium. Art, for Schelling, is not solely and merely imitation; rather, art is created from nature with human work. Coleridge also sees art as "middle nature." He writes,

In this sense Nature itself is to a religious observer the art of God—and for the same cause art itself might be defined as of a middle nature between a thought and a thing, or, as before, the union and reconciliation of that which is Nature with that which is exclusively human.¹⁶⁸

Coleridge understands Nature as the art of God; and, in art, nature and humans are reconciled. Nature functions as the unconscious, and the human factor functions as the conscious. Read sees Coleridge's explanation as being more specific than Schelling's statement, "which sees in the best works of art a combination of conscious activity (*Tätigkeit*) and unconscious force (*Kraft*)."¹⁶⁹ According to Read, the question is: "to what extent are the images of perception significantly recombined in the unconscious? Schelling says they are recovered '*mit tausendfältigem Wucher*,' with vastly accrued interest. Some enhanced vitality is given to the artist's perception by the Life Force, the *Natur-Geist*."¹⁷⁰ In other words, traditionally, when neoclassicists create art, they did not utilize the power of nature or the unconscious. However, Schelling encourages artists to use the unconscious with the harmony of human consciousness and artificiality. Humanity has been separated from the force of nature, *Natur-Geist*, which is a characteristic of Romanticism. Religiously speaking, this may be called pantheism, yet in art and literature it is using the unconscious which every human being can use because he or she already possesses it. As Read evaluates the Ode "*Dejection*," he illumines two major requisites for writing a great poem:

It is such an intimate poem, so self-revealing and so revealing of a complex passionate situation affecting others, that no other excuse would be necessary for the considerable excisions which Coleridge made in the published version. But there was another consideration, to which I have already referred, of a more theoretical nature. Coleridge held the view, which I think we ought to share with him, that the best poetry is not written out of what we might call private situations. The best poetry is objective—it is aloof. In the *Biographia Literaria* Coleridge praises Shakespeare for possessing this quality.¹⁷¹

Read observes here that subjective and objective elements are combined when creating a poem. Bozarth-Campbell also stresses the need to combine the conscious and the unconscious when expecting creativity to take place. Campbell points out that "for creativity to occur it is necessary that the conscious ego assents to taking a passive position at some point in the process."¹⁷² Campbell introduces Carl Jung's balanced approach between the conscious and the unconscious of the psyche. According to Jung, "artistic creativity originates in unconscious depths, and that the creative process has a feminine quality that arises from the unconscious matrix of human life—'the realm of the mothers'."¹⁷³ To explore more fully the receptive, holistic mode of consciousness as a cure and replacement for the hubris of consciousness, according to Campbell, some people look to Zen; others turn to Taoism, and still others seek Christian mysticism, to balance intuition and

intellectuality.¹⁷⁴ Likewise, Read discloses Coleridge's debt to Kant and Schelling, but, in each instance, Read asserts that Coleridge is making his own application to the critical method of others.¹⁷⁵ For Read, Coleridge uses "a synthetic activity based on knowledge and experience, but this activity is dominated by the intuitive conceptions of the artist."¹⁷⁶

Read also discusses a Romantic principle—"the idea that the imagination is a shaping power, an energy which fuses, melts, and reconciles the elements of perception, and bodies them forth in an unity or synthesis which is the work of art."¹⁷⁷ For Read, "melting" is a new concept. Not only does imagination synthesize to create a new entity, but it also melts to create yet another emerging entity. According to Read, Coleridge claims the difference between "form as proceeding" and "shape as super-induced"—"the latter is either the death or the imprisonment of the thing—the former is its self-witnessing and self-effected sphere of agency."¹⁷⁸ Coleridge refuses form given from outside as prescribed; such an imposition of form is mechanic, static and frozen. Form, according to Read, should "proceed" from within. For Coleridge, form grows from within; for Read, it proceeds from inside. When content and form are "proceeded" from inside with the conscious, it creates the true voice of feeling.

G.N.G. Orsini

Another of Coleridge's critics, G.N.G. Orsini, also constructed a synthetic organic theory. Orsini first divided the organic concept into two major parts: organic unity and organic form.¹⁷⁹ He also made clear that "unity is not uniformity."¹⁸⁰ According to Orsini, the concept of organic unity was related to the problem of the One and the Many: "Organic unity is the union of several members or parts into a single whole; therefore, it is a multiplicity within a unity, thus resolving the problem of the One and the Many."¹⁸¹ Orsini's contribution to the debate was to enlarge the concept of organic unity to embrace a more pluralistic approach. Organic unity can be misunderstood to be uniform. Orsini observes that, in organic unity, there is multiplicity. Also, Orsini, like other major critics, champions a synthetic view of the organic concept by means of an idealistic philosophy. He writes,

Idealistic philosophy brings the rejection of the views that artistic creation is a mechanical arrangement or an unconscious product, and the affirmation that it is a conscious unification of a multiplicity into a greater whole, a molding of shapeless matter into shapely form, of emotion into image, and of impulse into symbol. All theories that conceive mind as a passive recipient of sense data are empirical, and

those which conceive it as the mere tool of the subconscious are naturalistic, and as such rejected by idealism.¹⁸²

The organic concept is viewed as the opposite of mechanical concept by many, but Orsini furthers his argument for the organic concept to be more inclusive by pushing for synthesizing even the mechanical view with the unbridled Romantic view. For Orsini, the unconscious and the subconscious are both used as intuitional parts of the creative process. Orsini even employs a different dichotomy for understanding the objective and subjective in organic synthesis.¹⁸³ Orsini also attends to another organic concept: growth or development. He notes that, from its beginning, a poem grows as a “mere flash of inspiration, a vague idea, a rough outline, to its completion as a finished composition. The poem may go through a number of stages until its author is satisfied with it.”¹⁸⁴ For Orsini content and form are inseparable and organically connected. He writes,

When these two elements (Content and Form) are considered the parts of a work of art, the concept of organic unity becomes applicable to their relation: the union of Form and Content becomes organic when it is conceived as indissoluble, and not contrived by juxtaposition of independently existing parts. A Form that does not fully bring out its Content, or is in some way inadequate to it, and a Content that is not in keeping with the Form, are both artistic deficiencies. It also follows, as in organic unity, that the alteration of one of the parts is an alteration to the whole.¹⁸⁵

Orsini understands that change of form or content will affect the change of other part of the process, because content and form are organically related. Form, for Orsini, flows from content organically, not given from outside as a mold. It is mechanical and imitational. Like a living organism, it has its own life (content), from which the form of the plant (or work of art) grows.

Orsini introduces a nineteenth century view of aesthetics that separates form and content. He notes that various approaches make one of the two parts primary and the other secondary. For example, Formalism assumes it is the form only of a work of art that gives it aesthetic value, and the content is merely its raw material.¹⁸⁶ This is a reaction against a classical view of form in which form was assumed merely to be an accessory, to be borrowed from outside. Orsini identifies these two points as extremes concerning the issue of form, compared to Coleridge’s synthetic, balanced view of form.

Orsini disagrees with Abrams’ definition of organicism. Abrams gives the definition of organicism as “a philosophy whose major categories are derived metaphorically from the attributes of living and growing things.”¹⁸⁷ Orsini contends that Abrams’s definition lacks “synthetic unity of multiplicity,”¹⁸⁸ and it is only shown “metaphorically, so less exactly in

living beings.”¹⁸⁹ As previously noted in this chapter, this is a further instance of the problem that an organic metaphor is incapable of embracing the totality of concepts within an organic approach. Orsini wrote an article to support his thesis that the organic metaphor is not sufficient. After re-reading Plato’s dialogues (*Phaedrus* and *Gorgias*), he writes,

To conclude, Plato made an important contribution to aesthetics in the *Phaedrus* when he enunciated the principle of the organic unity of a composition, which was to become the keystone of later systems of criticism. Plato definitely affirmed its value for the judgment of poetry, and not only for oratory, as has been thought. Furthermore, he also considered, as was his wont, the philosophical principles involved in it. I have attempted elsewhere to show succinctly the role of the principle in later thought up to the present day. As I said, using mathematical language, organic unity, if a *necessary* condition for the composition of a work of art, is not *sufficient* for it. Other factors are called for, such as imagination, feeling and taste. Without them, we may obtain a well-constructed work of the intellect or of the practical reason, but not a work of art.¹⁹⁰

Orsini suggests that organic metaphor or simile be replaced by other names such as “principle of integration,” “integral unity,” or “synthetic unity,” because organic metaphor is so limiting.¹⁹¹ Further, Orsini introduces a specific objection to the organic concept, arguing from the posture of traditional rhetoric:

(Objection) The fact that in practice composition is largely a matter of revision and rewriting, of elimination and substitution: how can these be considered processes of “slow, gradual, organic” growth? The possibility of improving writing by conscious revision and planning seems to fit in better with the doctrine of the interchangeability of parts, as in a machine.¹⁹²

Orsini suggests the answer to his objection:

(Answer) Afterthoughts, retouchings, and finishing, will be of profit only so far as they too really serve to bring out the original, initiative, generative sense in them. The effective correction is that which replaces an inorganic detail with one that is organic. The rhetoricians’ objection would be valid only against some theory of uninterrupted creation, or a too literal interpretation of the metaphor of growth. Actually, an idea can “grow” –i.e., become richer and fuller—even by successive revisions and additions.¹⁹³

Orsini argues that the significant differences in the “organic versus mechanic” concept in art, is (as Orsini suggests in his proposed answer above) are as follows: Organic Form provides for a free flow from content and inner feelings to the growing form; Organic Unity provides for each part of the work and process to fit into the whole organically; Organic Growth

provides, from the start, for the art to grow to perfection, in an outward direction. These organic concepts are not separated but interrelated, unlike classical imitation theory that does not expect the content to proceed from the inside, become unified, and grow. Unlike Abrams, who charges Coleridge for borrowing from Schlegel, Orsini champions Coleridge's originality.¹⁹⁴ As already evidenced in our look at Wellek and Read, there are, admittedly, many borrowed sources in Coleridge's work, but Orsini defends Coleridge, arguing that he synthesized all the sources into his own, unique theory of language and organic form.

Gordon McKenzie

Gordon McKenzie is another major source of critique to Coleridge's organic concepts. McKenzie introduces what he believes should be two annoyances for any reader of Coleridge: 1) the lack of an orderly plan and development (characteristic of all Coleridge's work, McKenzie would argue) and 2) the failure of many readers to understand what Coleridge is saying, and the feeling that the criticism would be much better without any attempts on the part of Coleridge to deal with philosophy and explain the principles he is using.¹⁹⁵ McKenzie suggests this is true because Coleridge did not write systematically on a topic and did not systematically develop his own thoughts; rather, he is "diffuse, repetitious, (and) digressive,"¹⁹⁶ McKenzie says, "we must accept"¹⁹⁷ the character of Coleridge. For instance, to understand Coleridge's three different kinds of imagination (primary imagination, secondary imagination, and fancy) is difficult even for experts in literature. McKenzie also asserts that Coleridge's own thoughts conflict. McKenzie notes,

Yet there is a conflict of principles in his thought, a conflict which he never formally recognized. There is undeniably present on the one hand the idea of reconciliation of opposites, and on the other there is his central principle of organic unity. It did not occur to him, apparently, that these two were in conflict, and that, although both were idealistic, formed from the same stuff, they represented different systems of thought. He makes use of them interchangeably as suits his convenience. But the greater richness of concrete application, the larger view, and the greater flexibility of organic unity give that theory a predominant position in his thought.¹⁹⁸

McKenzie's critique here may in part be tied to the limits of metaphor discussed above. The metaphor of a plant cannot adequately contain both his dialectical reconciliation and still be in line with organic unity. Organic unity and organic growth cannot logically function in parallel with the synthesis of

opposites. Nonetheless, McKenzie praises Coleridge's most important contribution, noting "his attempts to formulate a method and a technique by which literature may be approached."¹⁹⁹ For McKenzie, the most important aspect of Coleridge's work is his synthesizing ability. Coleridge synthesizes: reason and intuition; the conscious and the unconscious; the natural and the artificial; the mechanic and the Romantic; the heart and the head; the poetic and the speculative; and the universal and the individual. McKenzie attributes Coleridge's ability to synthesize so well to his personal background: "With Coleridge we are confronted at the outset by a lifelong conflict between his intuitions and mind—or his heart and head, as he himself put it. In terms of this conflict he had two impulses, both in existence from early youth, but of unequal duration. The first was poetic, the second speculative."²⁰⁰ McKenzie quotes from Coleridge's biographical retrospect:

At a very premature age, even before my fifteenth year, I had bewildered myself in metaphysics, and in theological controversy...Poetry itself, yea novels and romances became insipid to me...Well were it for me, perhaps, had I never relapsed into the same mental disease; if I had continued to pluck the flower and reap the harvest from the cultivated surface, instead of delving in the unwholesome quicksilver mines of metaphysics depths...which exercised the strength and subtlety of the understanding without awakening the feelings of the heart.²⁰¹

McKenzie acknowledges that Coleridge had a personal life in which his heart and head were closely interrelated. McKenzie suggests that Coleridge's synthetic theory of criticism and literature was generated from the personal experience of synthesis that comprised his early years.

McKenzie also praised Coleridge for his tying together the poetic and the philosophical. McKenzie writes,

The indication is that the heart is fundamentally necessary to philosophical writing. Where his head leads, Coleridge will go only if his emotions are ready to follow. Reasoning divorced from actual experience is worthless to him. Yet ultimately, reason forced under emotional control produces an unacceptable mixture, because obviously intuitions or knowledge which comes under the head of emotional assumptions should be a point of departure for philosophy, rather than a point of arrival or a fence to keep you on the road. Thinking guided by emotions led to the characteristic difficulty of temperament previously mentioned. The conflict between head and heart endured throughout his life: but it was at least partly resolved in the expression of a philosophy in which he was able to use emotions as a means of illuminating a metaphysical principle.²⁰²

Coleridge's personal life was emotionally wild and stormy. McKenzie is correct in relating Coleridge's personal life to his philosophy and his approach to literature, because every human being, especially someone who

proposes organic concept, works from within—authentically and circumstantially. Coleridge had marriage problems, drug problems, and family problems which all influenced his emotional side. At the same time he was well educated and intellectually sophisticated. He was a man of letters in his age. The many streams of Coleridge's *Sitz im Leben* clearly influenced his literary activity. McKenzie comments on four characteristics of Coleridge's organic unity which McKenzie believes were influenced by German philosophers. Based on the work of Stephen C. Pepper, McKenzie says of Coleridge's process:

- 1) It is an organizing process, growing in richness. Given any single appearance, other appearance will be attracted to it which fuse or blend and thus become organized. The additional appearances add complexity of relationship which means richness.
- 2) It is a cumulative process. The later stages of any organization include all the relevant appearances of the earlier states as well as the newest additions.
- 3) It is an economical process. All relevant appearances are saved; only those irrelevant are thrown away. But there are no appearances which are not relevant to something; each one finds its place in its proper organization.
- 4) It is a spontaneous process. It is inevitable and happens of its own accord. The scientist or artist who organizes material is a mere agent. This is the result of the conception of a dynamic active force at work in both man and nature, and has as a corollary the theory that in any single stage there is the potentiality and, in a sense, the prophecy of all later stages.²⁰³

These four characteristics of Coleridge's organic unity theory do a good job of embracing nearly all aspects of the Coleridge's work. It is a useful summary of Coleridge's work to speak of the "spontaneous process" as the starting point where inner feeling flows out. Then, speculatively and consciously, the organizing process occurs with editing and reworking. This growing process is a cumulative process from lower to higher, as is the case with any organic growth. It is an economical process whereby the end result is improved when something irrelevant is cut and thrown away.

McKenzie writings deepen one's understanding of Coleridge. McKenzie's major contributions focus on the relevance of Coleridge's personal background and an analysis of the characteristics of his synthesis of organic concepts.

Contemporary Romantic Composition Theory

Like many theories in the circle of history, Romantic organic theory repeats itself and reappears. What Coleridge discussed long before is seen again in the scene of contemporary art and literature. This is one of the reasons why it is useful to look to the Romantic theorists of art and literature in relation to studying contemporary composition and communication theories today. There is value in exploring similarities and dissimilarities.

Rex Veeder explicates Coleridge's metaphor for composition calling it, "the journey outward from the center of the self in order to embrace diversity and bring difference into harmony with the self."²⁰⁴ Veeder also says of Coleridgean composition:

Composition is rhetoric in action. What would a Coleridgean compositionist be like? In Coleridge's philosophy of composition, the self is a composing self articulating the relationships among intuitive insights and objective reality. Thus, the composer's approach to composition involves a testing of assertions against facts. The composer's attitude toward the subject would be familial. The success of the composition depends upon the writer articulating the elements of what Coleridge calls an "intimate coalition" between the subjective world and the objective one. Composition is an intimate act, tentative and exploring, where the composer reveals a sustained and personal involvement in both the subject and the process of discovering the implications of the subject's relationships to writer and audience. The composer must be less sure than we often allow and more concerned with sustaining ambiguity than arriving at a confirmation of pre-existing beliefs.²⁰⁵

A Coleridgean compositionist writes from the self; the writer's inner feeling flows; the writer invents from the unconscious, but there is not only a subjective ending. Rather, a Coleridgean compositionist works in a process that acknowledges the conscious. Without knowing where the writing will lead or what form should be developed, the Coleridgean compositionist writes with ambiguity and uncertainty but at the same time works with a critical mind and reason. Thus, "the Coleridgean compositionist would not write short essays in short amounts of time, unless those essays were seen as parts of a larger whole. Even fragments may be considered a part of larger essays, digressions, impressions, and attempts to fix attention, analyze, or synthesize."²⁰⁶ With this frame in mind, this final section of this chapter considers contemporary composition theories. Students looking to the field of contemporary composition theories find themselves facing almost the same debate which Coleridge encountered two centuries ago. There are neo-classical theorists who teach writing as imitation of content and form from outside focusing on reason only. There are also unbridled Romantic

expressive theorists who teach writing as exploring solely the inner self and the free flow, focusing on intuition_only. There are also organic restrained Romantic theorists who teach seek to combine intuition and reason in the process of writing in terms of both content and form.

Richard Fulkerson argues that contemporary composition can be distilled into three approaches to literature: Expressivism, Formalism, and Mimeticism.²⁰⁷ According to Fulkerson, “composition studies now show the emergence of a significant consensus: the widely-held position today is a rhetorical axiology. Significant disparities, however, continue to exist about process, pedagogy, and epistemology. We are closer to agreeing on where we want to go, but not on how to get there.”²⁰⁸ It can be argued that Formalism is similar to Mimeticism, because, unlike Expressivism, both Formalism and Mimeticism see content and form as separate. For this reason, for this section of this chapter, contemporary theory will be considered as having two major parts: Romantic (whether restrained or unbridled) or imitative. Romantic literary theory can be thought of as both unbridled Romantic (representative of Wordsworth) or restrained Romantic (representative of Coleridge). Contemporary Romanticism uses “expressive” for its new name, as opposed to “imitative,” or it uses “process” rather than “product,” because Romanticism (or Expressivism) stresses the process of expressing inner feeling, rather than imposing content and form as product from outside to imitate.

One of the clear signs that Romantic organic theory has repeated itself and reappeared is the work of Peter Elbow. Elbow could almost be considered a Romantic heir of Coleridge in that Elbow claims “intuition and rationality need not be separate and inimical in writing,” and Elbow chooses the metaphor of organic growth to describe the operations of composing.²⁰⁹

Although Fulkerson does not consider Peter Elbow an Expressionist,²¹⁰ Berlin sees Elbow as an Expressionist like Murray, because both Murray and Elbow seek to realize one’s unique inner voice.²¹¹ Representative leaders of contemporary Expressivism in literature include Ken Macrorie, Don Stewart (author of *The Authentic Voice*), Lou Kelly, Donald Murray, and Peter Elbow. Lester Faigley would agree that these writers represent Romantic Expressivism, although some of them are unbridled Romantics (Wordsworth) or restrained Romantics (Coleridge). They share the common tenets of Romanticism but differ in their focus and emphasis.

Elbow clearly reminds one of Coleridge. Elbow writes,

This idea of writing is backwards. That’s why it causes so much trouble. Instead of a two-step transaction of meaning-into-language, think of writing as an organic,

developmental process in which you start writing at the very beginning—before you know your meaning at all—and encourage your words gradually to change and evolve. Only at the end will you know what you want to say or the words you want to say it with. You should expect yourself to end up somewhere different from where you started. Meaning is not what you start out with but what you end up with. Control, coherence, and knowing your mind are not what you start out with but what you end up with. Think of writing then not as a way to transmit a message but as a way to grow and cook a message. Writing is a way to end up thinking something you couldn't have started out thinking. Writing is, in fact, a transaction with words whereby you free yourself from what you presently think, feel, and perceive.²¹²

Contemporary Romantic Expressionist Peter Elbow has close similarities to Coleridge and his concept of organicism. Both speak of organic form and organic growth. What is different from Coleridge is that Elbow uses a new metaphor: “cooking,” which also has similar process of development. Interestingly, Faigley too compares Elbow and Coleridge: “He (Coleridge) avoided this consequence by insisting upon the free will of the artist, that the artist has foresight and the power of choice. In much the same way, Elbow qualifies his organic metaphor.”²¹³ Faigley confirms that Elbow’s point is “one of the standards of Romantic theory: that ‘good’ writing does not follow rules but reflects the processes of the creative imagination.”²¹⁴ Like Coleridge, Elbow also argues that teachers should embrace contraries in the teaching process.²¹⁵ Elbow, like Coleridge, encourages using reason and intuition together, in his words, using the doubting game and the believing game as an analysis of the intellectual enterprise.²¹⁶ Like Coleridge, Elbow also stresses “process.” Elbow notes,

Research on invention began to take off, and this activity seemed to open the door to that resurgence of activity in our profession that came to be called the “process movement.” Indeed it was this focus on invention—activity-in-time lying behind a text-in-space—that helped to give currency to the very concept itself of “process” as opposed to “product.”²¹⁷

For Elbow, there is no writing that is exempt from a situated and interested point of view. There is no absolute objectivity in human life; thus, even good academic work can be done in a more personal tone of voice. Elbow sounds like Coleridge in this emphasis of subjectivity and revealing self.²¹⁸ However, this does not mean Elbow is a subjectivist; Elbow believes that “there’s nothing in the nature of personal and expressive writing that militates against clear claims, reasons, and evidence. A focused argument doesn’t make something less personal or expressive.”²¹⁹ Romantic rhetoric of composition is a rhetoric that recovers invention and creativity. Coleridge’s organic concept of growth and process implies developing new things from

old. Listening from inner voice is intended to lead society and art in new, creative, and plural directions, rather than remain fixed on the past and tradition.

Young, Becker, and Pike call for change in rhetoric, composition and communication in terms of discovering “invention.” They write,

We have sought to develop a rhetoric that implies that we are all citizens of an extraordinarily diverse and disturbed world, that the “truths” we live by are tentative and subject to change, that we must be discoverers of new truths as well as preservers and transmitters of the old, and that enlightened cooperation is the preeminent ethical goal of communication.²²⁰

Romanticism is a revolutionary movement in all of human activities. Lloyd-Jones summarizes Romantic revolt: “I Am Not You!”²²¹ Lloyd-Jones personifies and satires authority and tradition as “Mr. Powers” and Romantic revolt as “Mr. Neumode.” He writes,

In some ways, Mr. Powers and Mr. Neumode are new representatives of ancient arguments. They are the One and the Many of the Pre-Socratics; they are Aristotle vs. Longinus, or Samuel Johnson against Coleridge; they are the universal soul against the unique self; they are knowledge against power, invention against novelty, instruction against creation, the finite against the infinite, the knowable against the unimaginable, the practical against the dream...²²² Mr. Powers is quite capable of reducing a writing system to rules. The rules can be stated explicitly by a teacher or textbook writer and learned by students...²²³ At worst, Mr. Powers merely offers exercises in workbooks of standard forms. The “best available means” is limited to one “right” way. The formula becomes an end in itself...²²⁴

Against Mr. Powers, Pumphrey also adds, “Removed from the process, he is inclined to think in terms of form aside from content. Should he decide, in the name of Order or Expediency, to impose a pre-determined form upon his students’ raw material, he runs the risk of alienating his students from language.”²²⁵ This is very similar to Schlegel’s and Coleridge’s thinking regarding organic form. Pumphrey continues her discussion of organic growth in terms of form by saying, “One does not know beforehand what form that whole will take.”²²⁶ She also writes, “Free of any pressure to pre-order his thoughts, the student can then experience the excitement of seeing form evolve out of content as his scattered thoughts come together into a new whole.”²²⁷ There is a case to be made that, in the contemporary, Romantic, expressive, composition theories, Coleridge’s provocative Romantic, organic, expressive thought is rediscovered.

Conclusion

Coleridge is a sure son of Romanticism, a period that emphasized the rediscovery of intuition in human civilization. This emphasis was not limited only to literary work for Coleridge; the French Revolution influenced Coleridge in terms of freedom and equality for human beings. A new anthropology pervaded Coleridge's thinking. There should be no despot who or which oppresses another human being, whether in politics or the arts. Coleridge dreamed of a Romantic utopia where every human could live with absolute freedom, including freedom of expression. The American and Korean constitutions may have been influenced by this thinking: Freedom of Speech! Freedom of Voice and Expression! These cries encapsulate Coleridge's Romanticism.

Coleridge's Romanticism is not like other major Romantic fathers, especially Wordsworth. Coleridge's Romanticism thoroughly embraces Organicism. In the midst of two kinds of Romantics (unbridled and restrained), Coleridge develops the latter into organicism. Organicism includes Romantic passion of freedom and intuition but at the same time furthers its tenets by harmonizing rational function of natural humans. Coleridge's Organicism has growth, process, development, and change. Organic form, in Coleridge's organicism, is invented from the heart and intuition and then grows from the content, context, and the process.

This chapter's brief history of form in aesthetics and literature was an attempt to show how Coleridge's organic form theory is not only Coleridge's invention. It has long history. The mimetic theory of form has strong supporters from as far back as Plato and Aristotle. Still, Romanticism of the 18th and 19th centuries launched the major attack upon traditional rationalistic theory of imitative form. Later, form debate was developed to an extreme: Formalism. Thus, organic form theory can be called as balanced, synthetic form theory existing between mimetic and formalistic forms.

Many people have a mirror, a lamp, and a plant in their home. Sometimes a person needs a mirror; at night one needs a lamp, and it is good to have plants in the garden. These three symbols have been developed historically and now coexist together in the literary world. Imitation theory uses the mirror metaphor suggesting that all we can do is imitate a better outer world. We are not able to create, because we are theologically without free will and we do not have the ability to create beauty or the good. Romanticism, adopting the lamp metaphor, revolts against this passive and negative anthropology with positive and active one. There is no hierarchy or absolute authority which dominates and controls equal human being and their

expression and thoughts. Coleridge adopts the more encompassing metaphor of a plant.

Wordsworth and Coleridge were friends but differed in their theories regarding literature. In short, Wordsworth was an unbridled Romantic who emphasized explosion of inner feeling without the shackle of human norms and rules. For Wordsworth art and literature, like Shakespeare, should be free flowing from the positive human soul; rational control only harms this freedom. Coleridge, more than Wordsworth, thought that reason should not be shunned; it was helpful for human for becoming healthier and more holistic. In addition, Coleridge thought that Romantic feeling was not merely the opposite of rational thinking but assisted in growing and synthesizing contraries in the organic process.

Students of Coleridge are indebted to five major critics for better understanding Coleridge's Romantic Organicism. In regard to the main question: "Who influenced Coleridge?" Abrams argues that the influence came from A.W. Schlegel; Wellek and Read argue from Kant and Schelling; McKenzie argues from Coleridge's personal background; Orsini argues Coleridge's thoughts are largely original. Wellek, like Orsini, views Coleridge as synthetic, creative, original thinker who collected all and then digested and expressed his own thoughts. Abrams sees from Coleridge an "open-ended" plurality; Wellek sees an original and synthetic Coleridge who solves problem; Orsini considers Coleridge's organic unity not in terms of uniformity but as multiplicity; Read stresses Natur-Geist, living power in nature, and art as a medium of nature and humanity; McKenzie sees Coleridge as "diffuse, repetitious, digressive" and understands Coleridge from his personal psychological background rather than as being impacted from outside. However, all these major critics acknowledge Coleridge's contribution of organic unity, organic form, and organic growth.

While Coleridge died many years ago, the spirit of his work was resurrected in the contemporary Romantic theory of composition. Peter Elbow is a good example of one who appears to write as an heir of Coleridge. Today, the same battle field lines exist between an imitative theory and Romantic Expressivism. The battle is also expanded to include Formalism line. Still, contemporary theory of composition teaches imitation theory in which outer models and rules are imposed as "product" to students of writing, neglecting the "process" of writing in which invention happens, creativity works, and the product grows. Writing is not merely imitated and transmitted; it is something created individually from the inner soul of each individual, and in Coleridge what flowed from inside grows one's own authentic, creative form and content with an interaction with reason.

Coleridge and Elbow cooked for artists to help start a new adventure of listening to oneself and one's own inner voice and discovering one's inner form that grows from content and context in the process of art work. This new adventure can also be applied to sermon preparation. Henry G. Davis is one of the few homileticians who constructed his homiletic with "organic concept," and now it is the time to see how Davis developed his own organic homiletic and how it differs from that of Coleridge and Elbow.

NOTES

- 1 Baldick, Chris. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), s.v.
- 2 Peckham, Morse. "Toward a Theory of Romanticism" *PMLA* 66:2 part 1 (1951), p. 6. Cf., Jacques Barzun, *Romanticism and the Modern Ego* (1943).
- 3 Peckham, p.7.
- 4 *Ibid.*, pp.10–11.
- 5 Enscoe, Gerald. *Eros and the Romantics: Sexual Love as a Theme in Coleridge, Shelley and Keats*, (The Hague: Mouton, 1967), p.9.
- 6 Lovejoy, Arthur O. *The Great Chain of Being* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936), p.242.
- 7 Enscoe, p.22.
- 8 *Ibid.*
- 9 Abrams, M. H. *Natural Supernaturalism: Tradition and Revolution in Romantic Literature* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1971), p.68.
- 10 Prickett, Stephen. *Romanticism and Religion: The Tradition of Coleridge and Wordsworth in the Victorian Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), p. 19.
- 11 Also see E. S. Shaffer, "The Hermeneutic Community: Coleridge and Schleiermacher," *The Coleridge Connection: Essays for Thomas McFarland*, ed. Richard Gravil and Molly Lefebure (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990).
- 12 Prickett, Stephen. "Coleridge, Schlegel and Schleiermacher: England, Germany (and Australia) in 1798," in ed. Richard Cronin, *1798: The Year of the Lyrical Ballads* (London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1998), p.181. Prickett notes that Schleiermacher was an almost exact contemporary of Coleridge (p.176).
- 13 Kooy, Michael John. "Romanticism and Coleridge's Idea of History," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 60 (1999), p. 723.
- 14 *Ibid.*
- 15 *Ibid.*, p.724.
- 16 *Ibid.*
- 17 Richards, I. A. *Coleridge on Imagination* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1965), p. 74, and cf., Coleridge, *Table Talk*, June 23, 1834.
- 18 *Ibid.*, p.75.
- 19 *Ibid.* and cf. *Table Talk*, April 20, 1833.
- 20 Coleridge, Samuel T. *Biographia Literaria*, XIII (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p.313.
- 21 Wilson, Paul Scott. "Coherence in *Biographia Literaria*: God, Self, and Coleridge's 'Seminal Principle'," *Philological Quarterly* 72:4 (Fall, 1993), pp.464–5.
- 22 *Ibid.*, pp.465–6.

- 23 Berlin, Isaiah. *The Roots of Romanticism: The A.W. Mellon Lectures* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), p. 1.
- 24 Hedley, Douglas. "Was Coleridge a Romantic?" *Wordsworth Circle* 22:1 (1991), p. 71.
- 25 Ibid.
- 26 Ibid. Also see Ronald Primeau, "On the Discrimination of Hulms: Toward a Theory of the "Anti-romantic" Romanticism of Modern Poetry," *Journal of Modern Literature* 3 (1974).
- 27 See. Bahm, Archie J. "Organicism: The Philosophy of Interdependence," *International Philosophical Quarterly* 7 (1967).
- 28 Ibid., p.251.
- 29 Ibid., p.252.
- 30 Orsini, G.N.G. "Organicism," *The Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, ed. Philip P. Wiener (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973–74), vol.3, p.422.
- 31 Ibid.
- 32 Ibid., p.425.
- 33 Ibid. "J.C.F. von Schiller does in his Aesthetic Letters (1795, letter XXII), followed later by Oscar Wilde's "Form is everything" (1891).
- 34 Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria*, XII, p.281.
- 35 Coleridge, Samuel T. *Coleridge Lectures on Shakespeare*, "Romeo and Juliet," (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, p.640.
- 36 Ibid., p.641.
- 37 Ibid., p.651.
- 38 Abrams, M. H. *The Mirror and Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953), p.52.
- 39 Ibid., p.168.
- 40 Jenkins, Patricia Mavis. *Coleridge's Literary Theory: The Chronology of Its Development, 1790–1818* (Fairfield: Fairfield University, 1984), p.58.
- 41 Ibid., p.60.
- 42 Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp*, p. 169.
- 43 Ibid.
- 44 Ibid., p.219.
- 45 Phillips, D.C. "Organicism in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 31 (1970), p.413.
- 46 Bahm, Archie J. "Emergence of Purpose," *Journal of Philosophy* 44 (1947), p.633.
- 47 Manuel, Frank E. "From Equality to Organicism," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 17 (1956), p. 54.
- 48 Ibid., p.55, and cf., Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract and Discourse*, trans. by G.D.H. Cole (London, 1947), p.160.
- 49 Bahm, Archie J. "Emergence of Values," *The Journal of Philosophy* 45 (1948), p. 412.
- 50 Manuel, "Organicism," p.54.
- 51 Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp*, p. 123.
- 52 See Ian Wylie, *Young Coleridge and the Philosophers of Nature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), Raimonda Modiano, *Coleridge and the Concept of Nature* (Tallahassee: Florida State University Press, 1985), and Victor M. Hamm, "The Problem of Form in Nature and the Arts," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 13 (1954).

- 53 Tong, Q.S. "The Rhetoric of Organicism," *Reconstructing Romanticism, Organic Theory Revisited* (Salzburg: University of Salzburg, 1997), p.161.
- 54 Note: A key New Homiletician who studied the relation of postmodern homiletics to the work of Gadamer and Kierkegaard is Jeffrey Francis Bullock. See *Preaching with a Cupped Ear: Hans-Georg Gadamer's Philosophical Hermeneutics as Postmodern Wor(l)d* (New York: Peter Lang, 1999). For further discussion on this topic, see Richard HeeChun Park, *Language and Truth: Dialogue in the New Homiletics* (Graduate Theological Union MA Thesis, April, 2003), pp.49–53 and David P. Haney, "Aesthetics and Ethics in Gadamer, Levinas, and Romanticism: Problems of Phronesis and Techne," *PMLA* 114:1 (January 1999).
- 55 Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp*, p.222.
- 56 Ibid.
- 57 Hamm, Victor M. "The Problem of Form in Nature and the Arts," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 13 (1954), p.175.
- 58 See la Driere, James Craig. "Form," *The Dictionary of World Literature*, ed. J.T. Shipley (New York: The Philosophical Library, 1943), pp.250–253. See Plato, *Republic* (X) for this topic.
- 59 Priming, Alex. ed. "Form," *Encyclopedia of poetry and poetics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), p.286.
- 60 Aristotle, *On Poetics*, trans. Seth Benardete and Michael Davis (South Bend: St. Augustine's Press, 2002), 1447a–b, p.3.
- 61 Marks, Emerson R. *Coleridge on the Language of Verse* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), p.60.
- 62 La Driere, "Form," pp.250–253.
- 63 See Hamm, "The Problem of Form in Nature and the Arts," p.175, cf. Aristotle, *Physics* ii. 2. 194 a 21.
- 64 See Hamm, *ibid.*, and cf. Aristotle, *Metaphysics* 1050 a 15.
- 65 See Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp*, p. 16, cf. Horace, *Ars Poetica*, trans. E. H. Blakeney, in *Literary Criticism, Plato to Dryden*, ed. Allan H. Gilbert (New York, 1940), p.139.
- 66 See Abrams, *ibid.*, p. 16, cf. Richard McKeon, "Literary Criticism and the Concept of Imitation in Antiquity," *Critics and Criticism*, ed. Crane, pp.147–9.
- 67 See O'Brien, Kathleen. "Romanticism and Rhetoric: A Question of Audience," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 30:2 (Spring 2000), and Morris Eves, "Romantic Expressive Theory and Blake's Idea of the Audience," *PMLA* 95 (1980).
- 68 Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, ed. and trans. R. P. H. Green (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), IV.XII. 27, p.229. Note: Augustine's theory of form will be discussed further later in this chapter as part of the discussion of sermon form. Cf., Phillip Voollcot, Jr., "Some Considerations of Creativity and Religious Experience in St. Augustine of Hippo," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 5:2 (Spring 1966). See also Richard H. Park, *Language and Truth: Dialogue in the New Homiletics* (Berkeley: Graduate Theological Union, 2003), MA Thesis.
- 69 Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, ed. and trans. R. P. H. Green (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), IV. I.1.p.197.
- 70 Augustine, *DDC*, IV.III.5, p.201.

- 71 Preming, Alex. ed. "Form" *Encyclopedia of poetry and poetics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), p. 286.
- 72 Schlegel, Augustus William. *A Course of Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature*, trans. John Black (London: Henry G. Bohn, York Street, Covent Garden, 1846), p.340.
- 73 Preming, p. 287.
- 74 Ibid. Also, cf. Elizabeth M. Wilkinson and L.A. Willoughby, "Goethe's Conception of Form" in *Goethe Poet and Thinker* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc, 1962), pp.167–184, and David Morgan, "German Character and Artistic Form: The Cultural Politics of German Art Theory, 1773–1814," *European Romantic Review* 6:2 (1996), pp.183–212.
- 75 Abrams, *Mirror*, pp.173–175.
- 76 Coleridge, Samuel T. "Shakespeare's Judgment Equal to his Genius," *Coleridge's Shakespearean Criticism*, ed. Thomas M. Raysor, vol.1 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930), p.224. This was Coleridge's oral lecture and later his daughter made footnote from Schlegel to Coleridge's text.
- 77 Orsini, G.N.G. "Coleridge and Schlegel Reconsidered," *Comparative Literature* 16:2 (1964), pp.104–5. Orsini points to Coleridge's reaction to the charge of plagiarism: "Coleridge was told by a German auditor that his ideas on Shakespeare resembled very closely those of A. W. Schlegel (II, 126). Coleridge was disturbed and became much concerned to prove his independence from Schlegel, to the extent of claiming that he had never heard of Schlegel's lectures (II, 189)."
- 78 Stempel, Daniel. "Coleridge and Organic Form: The English Tradition," *Studies in Romanticism* 6 (1966), pp.90–1.
- 79 Ibid, p. 92.
- 80 Ibid.
- 81 Ibid., and cf., *Kant's Critique of Teleological Judgment*, tr. J.C. Meredith (Oxford, 1928), pp.16–24.
- 82 Stempel, p.93.
- 83 Ibid., p.97.
- 84 Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp*, p.59.
- 85 Preming, "Form," p. 287.
- 86 See "Plotinus," *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <http://www.utm.edu/research/iep/p/plotinus.htm>.
- 87 See <http://www.themystica.com/mystica/articles/p/Pelagius.html>. "Although little is known of him (Pelagius), only he is thought to have come from Britain and personally played an important role in shaping the early character of the Celtic Christianity. Although a priest, Pelagius was a Celtic monk and a highly respected spiritual leader for both laymen and clergy. What is recorded of his behavior denotes his Celtic heritage. He firmly believed in the individual-his free will and his ability to better himself as a spiritual being."
- 88 Norwood, Frederick A. "Arminianism." <http://mbsoft.com/believe/txc/arminian.htm>. "Jacobus Arminius (1560–1609), is a moderate theological revision of Calvinism that limits the significance of Predestination. Arminius was a Dutch Reformed theologian who studied at Leiden and Geneva. He became a professor at Leiden in 1603 and spent the rest of his life defending against strict Calvinists his position that God's sovereignty and human free will are compatible. He sought without success revision of the Dutch

Reformed (Belgic) Confession; nevertheless, he was very influential in Dutch Protestantism. English revisionist theology of the 17th century was called Arminian, although possibly without direct influence from Holland. John Wesley accepted the term for his theological position and published *The Arminian Magazine*. The tension between the Arminian and Calvinist positions in theology became quiescent until Karl Barth sparked its revival in the 20th century."

89 Ibid.

90 Premling, "Form," p. 287.

91 Ibid., cf., A.C. Bradley's inauguration lecture of 1901, "Poetry for Poetry's Sake" (pp.16–17).

92 Schaper, Eva. "Significant Form," *British Journal of Aesthetics* 1 (1960), p.35.

93 See "Coleridge on Organic Unity: Poetry," in Richard Harter Fogle, *The Idea of Coleridge's Criticism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962).

94 Lord, Catherine. "Organic Unity Reconsidered," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 23 (1964), p. 267.

95 Ibid., p.268.

96 Ibid.

97 Fulkerson, Richard. "Composition Theory in the Eighties: Axiological Consensus and Paradigmatic Diversity," *College Composition and Communication* 41 (December 1990), pp.411–414.

98 Ibid., p.412.

99 Ibid., and cf., Lou Kelly, "Toward Competence and Creativity in an Open Class," *College English* 34 (Feb, 1973): pp. p.3.

100 Fulkerson, p.412.

101 Elbow, Peter. "Embracing Contraries in the Teaching Process," *College English* 45 (1983), p.339.

102 Elbow, Peter. "The Doubting Game and the Believing Game—An Analysis of the Intellectual Enterprise," in *Writing Without Teachers* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), pp. 147–191. Elbows states, "intuition and rationality need not to be separate and inimical in writing. Each is, in fact, a necessary component of the writing process allowing more effective development of the other."("Teaching Thinking by Teaching Writing," *Change* 15 [Sept, 1983], p. 37.)

103 Ibid.

104 For instance, Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria*, I, p.168, II, p.172

105 Fishman, Stephen M and Lucille Parkinson McCarthy, "Is Expressivism Dead? Reconsidering Its Romantic Roots and Its Relation to Social Construction," *College English* 54 (Oct, 1992), p. 64.

106 Pumphrey, Jean. "Teaching English Composition as a Creative Art," *College English* 34 (1973), p.667.

107 Ibid., p.670.

108 Rodgers, Paul C., Jr. "Alexander Bain and the Rise of the Organic Paragraph," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 51 (1965), p. 402.

109 Ibid., p.405

110 Ibid., p.408.

- 111 Mirror can be replaced by “machine,” another metaphor used by Rationalists. Coleridge refers to “the contradistinction of an organ from a machine” (*Aids to reflection* p.685). Coleridge seriously challenges the machine philosophy as follows: “And we need only reflect on them with a calm and silent spirit to learn the utter emptiness and unmeaningness of the vaunted mechanico-corpuscular philosophy, with both its twins, materialism on the one hand, and idealism, rightlier named subjective idolism, on the other: the one obtruding on us a world of specters and apparitions; the other a mazy dream! Let the mechanic or corpuscular scheme, which is its absoluteness and strict consistency was first introduced by Descartes, be judged by the results. *By its fruits shall it be known*” (*Ibid.*). Coleridge strongly opposes mechanical rationalistic theory.
- 112 Abrams, *Ibid.*, p.68. Coleridge introduces lamps with other synonyms such as fountains and wind-harp.
- 113 Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp*, pp. 48–53.
- 114 Coleridge, Samuel, T. *Aids to Reflection*, in *Samuel Taylor Coleridge: The Major Works* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p.685. Regarding the metaphor of plant, Coleridge also states: “The germinal power of the plant transmutes the fixed air and the elementary base of water into glass or leaves; and on these the organic principle in the ox or the elephant exercises an alchemy still more stupendous” (*ibid.*).
- 115 Wordsworth thought that “poetry is the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings,” (Abrams, *Mirror*, p.47).
- 116 Cf., Stephen Maxfield Parrish, “The Wordsworth-Coleridge Controversy,” *PMLA* 73 part 1 (1958), Thomas MacFarland, “The Symbiosis of Coleridge and Wordsworth,” *Studies in Romanticism* 11 (1972), John Beer, “Coleridge and Wordsworth: The Vital and the Organic,” in *Reading Coleridge: Approaches and Applications*, ed. Walter B. Crawford (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1979), Paul Magnuson, “Teaching the Coleridge-Wordsworth Dialogue,” in *Approaches to Teaching Coleridge’s Poetry and Prose*, ed. Richard E. Matlak (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1991), and also Stephen Prickett, *Romanticism and Religion: The Tradition of Coleridge and Wordsworth in the Victorian Church* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1976).
- 117 Coleridge expresses, with different words, the harmony of head and heart instead of reason and emotion. See Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria*, I, p.168. “The one sacrificed the heart to the head; the other both heart and head to point and drapery.” Coleridge was reconciling the head and the heart, “yet, in the more sustained and elevated style, of the then living poets Bowles and Cowpert were, to the best of my knowledge, the first who combined natural thoughts with natural diction; the first who reconciled the heart with the head.” (p.168–9) Coleridge sees the head and the heart, “the feelings and affections blend more easily and intimately with these ideal creations...the mind is affected by thoughts.” (*Biographia Literaria* II, p.172). In Coleridge, ideal invention is connected with the using of emotion. Also, he sees the form is closely influenced by the content not separated: “...where the ideas are vivid, there exists an endless power of combining and modifying them...” (*Biographia Literaria* II, p. 172). Unlike imitation theorists of art and sermon, Coleridge sees an important connection between reason and emotion and content and. From this “relational” view of things of Coleridge, artists and preachers can overcome the harmful dichotomy of things.

- 118 McElvain, Marcia L. "The Creative Process: The Relationship of the Musical and Literary Composer," *College Composition and Communication* 19 (1968).
- 119 Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus. "A Letter (1878)" in ed. P.E. Vernon, *Creativity: Selected Readings* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1970), pp. 55–56, (except from E. Holmes, *The Life of Mozart Including his Correspondence* (Chapman & Hall, 1878), pp.211–23).
- 120 Tchaikovsky, Peter Ilich. "Letters (1906)" ed. P.E. Vernon, *Creativity: Selected Readings* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1970), pp. 55–56, (excerpts from R. Newmarch, *Life and Letters of Peter Ilich Tchaikovsky*, John Lane, 1906, pp.274–5, 280–81, 311–12).
- 121 Schlegel, Augustus William. *A Course of Lectures of Dramatic art and Literature*, Lecture XXII, p. 342. Schlegel understands the essence of the romantic as follows: "The ancient art and poetry rigorously separate things which are dissimilar; the romantic delights in indissoluble mixtures; all contrarieties: nature and art, poetry and prose, seriousness and mirth, recollection and anticipation, spirituality and sensuality, terrestrial and celestial, life and death, are by it blended together in the most intimate combination."
- 122 See ed. Thomas M. Raysor, *Coleridge's Miscellaneous Criticism*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936), Lecture XIII, Poesy or Art, in which Coleridge borrows from Schelling's oration, "On the Relation of the Formative Arts to Nature" (p.204). Like Schelling, Coleridge argues, "In this sense, Nature itself is to a religious observer the art of God—and for the same cause art itself might be defined as of a middle nature between a thought and a thing, or, as before, the union and reconciliation of that which is Nature with that which is exclusively human" (Schelling, *Werke*, ed. K.F.A. Schelling, Stuttgart und Augsburg, 1856–61). Like Schlegel, Schelling also has a synthetic view of art.
- 123 See, Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp*, pp.171–175.
- 124 Raysor, Thomas M. Ed. *Coleridge's Shakespearean Criticism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930), p.223.
- 125 Abrams connects Coleridge's aesthetics to process philosophy of Whitehead: "The fact is, Coleridge's insistence on the distinction between the living imagination and the mechanical fancy was but a part of his all-out war against the 'Mechanico-corpuscular Philosophy' on every front. Against this philosophy he proposed the same objection which is found in the writings of a distinguished modern heir of organic theory, A. N. Whitehead." (p.169) See also, Robert E. Doud, "The Trinity After Breakfast: Theology and Imagination in Wallace Stevens and Alfred North Whitehead," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 52:3 (1984). Coleridge's organic concept possesses a process concept of becoming than being in the time. Throughout time, form grows and develops. This means sometimes it may change from thesis to antithesis to synthesis, dialectically. Coleridge's organic form has "genetic" and "biological" growth in the art. Abrams (p.171) notes, "Partial and passing comparison of a completed discourse or poem to an animal body are to be found as early as Plato and Aristotle, but a highly developed organicismic theory, such as Coleridge's, differ from such precedents in the extent to which all aspects of the analogy are exploited, and above all in the extraordinary stress laid on this attribute of growth. Coleridge's interest is persistently genetic—in the process as well as in the product, in becoming no less than in being. That is why Coleridge rarely discusses a finished poem without looking toward the mental process

which evolved it; this is what makes all his criticism so characteristically psychological.”

- 126 Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria*, II, p.173.
- 127 Coleridge, *Marginalia*, p.572. Coleridge discusses here of creation *ex nihilo* and *ex aliquo*. In organic theory, form grows from content and context, so it may be right to say organic form is *ex aliquo*.
- 128 Coleridge, Samuel T. *Lay Sermon*, in *Samuel Taylor Coleridge: The Major Works*, I, p.662. “In the Bible every agent appears and acts as a self-subsisting individual: each has a life of its own, and yet all are one life. The elements of necessity and free will are reconciled in the higher power of an omnipresent Providence, that predestinates the whole in the moral freedom of the integral parts.”
- 129 Coleridge, *Miscellaneous criticism*, Lecture XIII, p.211.
- 130 Abrams resolves this seemingly lawless problem of organic form: “The logic inherent in the organic view of composition could demonstrate that this choice between rules and lawlessness was a false dilemma. A plant grows independently of imposed controls, yet in strict obedience to natural laws. By parallel reasoning, in the imagination of genius the alternative to external rules is not lawlessness, but the inherent lawfulness of organic development” (p.223). As Coleridge defended Shakespeare from lawless instinct, Abrams supports Coleridge: “Acting thus under ‘laws of its own origination, achieving works each of which is unique, the genius gives the laws by which his own products are to be judged; yet these laws are universal laws which he himself must necessarily obey, because his composition proceeds in accordance with the order of the living universe” (p.225).
- 131 Coleridge’s Shakespearean criticism, p.223.
- 132 Abrams, (*Mirror*, p.119) notes, “all genuine creation—everything that is not a mimicking of given models, or a mere reassembly of given elements into a whole which is novel in its pattern but not in its parts—derives from the generative tension of opponents forces, in creating poetry, therefore echoes the creative principle underlying the universe.”
- 133 Coleridge’s Shakespearean criticism, p.224.
- 134 Abrams sees romantic epistemology in 17–8th England was new and revolutionary in the history of idea. He wrote, “The Copernican revolution in epistemology...was affected in England by poets and critics before it manifested itself in academic philosophy. Thus generally defined, the revolution was a revolution by reaction (p.58).” Abrams also penetrates “in Coleridge’s aesthetics, no less than in his ethics and theology, the justification of free-will is a crux.” (p.174)
Abrams also notices that Coleridge may have been influenced not only by German romantics but also “Cambridge Platonist,” he wrote: “In discussing the human perception of the divine overflow, Plotinus explicitly rejected the concept of sensations as ‘imprints’ or ‘seal-impressions’ made on a passive mind, and substituted the view of the mind as an act and a power which ‘gives a radiance out of its own store’ to the objects of sense. Similar metaphors of mind were particularly prevalent in the philosophy of the ‘Cambridge Platonist’ (more Plotinists, actually, than Platonist), whom Wordsworth had read, and Coleridge had studied intensively.” (p.59) Then, what is Plotinian philosophy? Abrams answers, “If Plato was the main source of the philosophical arche-

type of the reflection, Plotinus was the chief begetter of the archetype of the projection; and both the romantic theory of knowledge and the romantic theory of poetry can be accounted the remote descendants of this root-image of Plotinian philosophy.” (p.59) In this sense, Coleridge’s aesthetics can be related to New Homiletician, Buttrick who proposes phenomenological approach to homiletics influenced by Husserl and his disciple Gadamer, and also to Bullock who constructs his homiletics from Gadamer. Coleridge, in this respect, may contribute to construct postmodern homiletics. This Coleridge’s aesthetic theology may date back to ancient church history and down to modern and postmodern church history. This theological view of Coleridge may cause theological controversy of Christian anthropology and epistemology of Plotinus, Pelagius, Arminius, Erasmus, Lock, Wesley, and Husserl, and Luther, Calvin, and Barth. Already there was serious debate between Kay and Hogan about theological anthropology and epistemology (Cf. my paper, “Feminist Invitational Rhetoric and Theology of Preaching (2004, especially from p.16)” in which I dealt the issue to resolve with the incarnational and pneumatological view based on freedom of human beings of latter Barth’s understanding of anthropology and epistemology. In short, and homiletically speaking, preachers have their own capability to create from the inner soul with the help of indwelling Spirit. Pagan may only claim inner feelings, but Christian may do both independent inner feeling and indwelling Spirit of every baptized Christians, because baptized, they could recover almost all capability of the first Adam by the help of the second Adam and his Spirit.

- 135 Samuel T. Coleridge, *Lectures of Shakespeare (1811–1812)*, “Romeo and Juliet,” *The Major Works*, p.651: “Man alone has been privileged to clothe himself, and to do all things so as to make him, as it were, a secondary creator of himself, and of his own happiness or misery: in this, as in all, the image of the Deity is impressed upon him.” Abrams (p.42) also sees artist as a creator, “The artist, from being a craftsman, became (in a momentous new aesthetic metaphor) a creator, for it sometimes said that of all men the poet is like God because he creates according to those patterns on which God himself has modeled the universe” (p.42).
- 136 See Rollo May, *The Courage to Create* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company Inc., 1975). May, in chapter 3 “Creativity and The Unconsciousness,” seems only to exchange romantic “intuition” to “the unconscious” to create, or invent (p.54).
- 137 Abrams, M. H. *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953).
- 138 Orsini, *Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, vol.3 p.427.
- 139 Ibid. Orsini points out that S. Pepper’s aesthetics (1945), “organistic criticism,” was the kind that conceives aesthetic value as “integration of feeling,” which omits the unity of the parts in the whole. (vol.3., p.427).
- 140 Abrams, M. H. “Coleridge and the Romantic Vision of the World,” *Coleridge’s Variety: Bicentenary Studies*, ed. John Beer (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1974).
- 141 Ibid., p.106.
- 142 Ibid., p.105.
- 143 See for organic unity also, James Benziger, “Organic Unity: Leibniz to Coleridge,” *PMLA* 66:2 part 1 (1951).

- 144 Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp*, p.220.
- 145 Abrams, "Apocalypse by Revolution," *Natural Supernaturalism: Tradition and Revolution in Romantic Literature* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1971), p.329.
- 146 Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp*, p.42. See also, *Coleridge's Lectures on Shakespeare*, "Romeo and Juliet," p.651, "a secondary creator."
- 147 René Wellek, *A History of Modern Criticism 1750–1950: The Late Eighteenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955), p.1.
- 148 Wellek, *ibid.*, pp.1–2.
- 149 *Ibid.*, p.2.
- 150 *Ibid.*, p.3.
- 151 René Wellek, *A History of Modern Criticism 1750–1950: The Romantic Age*, Vol. II, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955), p.151.
- 152 *Ibid.*, pp.151–157.
- 153 *Ibid.*, p.157.
- 154 *Ibid.*
- 155 *Ibid.*, p.158.
- 156 *Ibid.*
- 157 *Ibid.*, p.160.
- 158 *Ibid.*, p.161.
- 159 *Ibid.*
- 160 See Richard L. Larson, "Problem-solving, Composing, and Liberal Education," *College English* 33 (1971–2), Ann E. Berthoff, "From Problem-solving to a Theory of Imagination," *College English* 33 (1971–2), and also Ann E. Berthoff, "The Problem of Problem-Solving," *College Composition and Communication* 22 (1971).
- 161 *Ibid.*, p.161.
- 162 Coleridge critics Orsini and McKenzie raise questions in this regard. Each will be addressed later in this section.
- 163 *Ibid.*, p.172.
- 164 Read, Herbert. *The True Voice of Feeling: Studies in English Romantic Poetry* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1953), pp.15–6.
- 165 Coleridge, S.T. "Poesy or Art," *Coleridge's Miscellaneous Criticism*, ed. Thomas M. Raysor (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936), p. 204.
- 166 Schlegel, Augustus William. *A Course of Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature*, trans. John Black (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1846).
- 167 Read, Herbert. *The True Voice of Feeling: Studies in English Romantic Poetry* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1953), p.16.
- 168 Coleridge, "Poesy or Art" p.206.
- 169 Read, p.18.
- 170 Read, p.18–9.
- 171 Read, p.33.
- 172 Bozarth-Campbell, Alla. *The Word's Body: An Incarnational Aesthetic of Interpretation* (Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 1979), p.95.
- 173 *Ibid.* p.95.
- 174 *Ibid.*
- 175 Read, p.171.

- 176 Read, p. 171–2.
 177 Read, p.176.
 178 Ibid.
 179 Orsini, G. N. G. “The Organic Concepts in Aesthetics,” *Comparative Literature* 21:1 (1969), p.1.
 180 Ibid.
 181 Ibid., p.2.
 182 Ibid.
 183 Ibid., p.3.
 184 Ibid., p.5.
 185 Ibid., p.19.
 186 Ibid., p.25. See also Orsini’s “Organicism” *The Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, vol.3, p.425. Orsini explicates excellently history of form of organicism including Formalism, J.C.F. von Schiller Aesthetic Letters, Oscar Wilde’s “Form is everything” (1891).
 187 Ibid., p.27.
 188 Ibid.
 189 Ibid.
 190 Orsini, G. N. G. “The Ancient Roots of a Modern Idea,” *Organic Form: The Life of an Idea*, ed. G.S. Rousseau (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972), pp.20–21
 191 Orsini, “Organic Concept”, pp. 27–28.
 192 Ibid., p. 27.
 193 Ibid.
 194 See, Orsini, “Coleridge and Schlegel Reconsidered,” *Comparative Literature* 16:2 (1964).
 195 McKenzie, Gordon .*Organic Unity in Coleridge* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1954), p. 104.
 196 Ibid., p.104
 197 Ibid.
 198 Ibid., p.105.
 199 Ibid., p.1.
 200 Ibid., p.3.
 201 Ibid., p. 3, and cf., *Biographia Literaria*, ed. Shawcross (cited below as B.L.), vol. I, p.9.
 202 Ibid., p.4. See *Biographia Literaria* I, p.168–169. Coleridge states the union of heart and head. “The one sacrificed the heart to the head; the other both heart and head to point and drapery.”(p.168).
 203 Ibid., pp. 30–31.
 204 Veeder, Rex. “Coleridge’s Philosophy of Composition: An Overview of a Romantic Rhetorician,” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 23:2 (1993), p.22.
 205 Veeder, Ibid., p.26.
 206 Ibid., p.27.
 207 Fulkerson, Richard. “Composition Theory in the Eighties: Axiological Consensus and Paradigmatic Diversity,” *College Composition and Communication* 41 (December 1990), pp.411–414.

- 208 Ibid., p.411.
- 209 Faigley, Lester. "Competing Theories of Process: A Critique and a Proposal," *College English* 48:6 (Oct. 1986), p.530.
- 210 Fulkerson, p.412.
- 211 Berlin, James. "Rhetoric and Ideology in the Writing Class," *College English* 50:5 (Sept., 1988), p.486.
- 212 Elbow, Peter. *Writing without Teachers*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), p.15. Elbow uses organic metaphor: "It is true, of course, that an initial set of words does not, like a young live organism, contain within each cell a plan for the final mature stage and all the intervening stages that must be gone through. Perhaps, therefore, the final higher organization in the words should only be called a borrowed reflection of a higher organization that is really in me or my mind. I am projecting (23)." "...they have the life to go through the growing process (24)."
- 213 Faigley, p.530.
- 214 Ibid.
- 215 Elbow, Peter. "Embracing Contraries in the Teaching Process," *College English* 45 (1983), pp.327–339.
- 216 See Peter Elbow, "The Doubting Game and the Believing Game—An Analysis of the Intellectual Enterprise (appendix essay)," *Writing without Teachers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973).
- 217 Peter Elbow, "Forward," in Alice Glarden Brand, *The Psychology of Writing: The Affective Experience* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1989), p.xiv. Also, see M. Jimmie Killingsworth, "Product and Process, Literary and Orality: An Essay on Composition and Culture," *College Composition and Communication* 44 (Feb. 1993).
- 218 Peter Elbow defines "writing as revealing the author's self in his words." See "A Method for Teaching Writing," *College English* 30:2 (1968), p.119.
- 219 Elbow, Peter. "Forward: About Personal Expressive Academic Writing," *Pre-Text: A Journal of Rhetorical Theory*, 11 (1990) p.9.
- 220 Young, Richard E., Alton L. Becker, Kenneth L. Pike, *Rhetoric: Discovery and Change* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc, 1970), p.9.
- 221 Lloyd-Jones, Richard. "Romantic Revels—I Am Not You," *College Composition and Communication* 23:1 (1972), pp.251–257.
- 222 Ibid., p.251.
- 223 Ibid., p.252.
- 224 Ibid., p.253.
- 225 Pumphrey, Jean. "Teaching English Composition as Creative Art," *College English* 34 (1973), p.667.
- 226 Ibid.
- 227 Ibid., p.670.

CHAPTER 3

Davis—Prophet of Contemporary Homiletics

a sermon should be like a tree.
It should be a living organism:
With one sturdy thought like a single stem
With natural limbs reaching up into the light.

It should have deep roots: As much unseen as above the surface
Roots spreading as widely as its branches spread
Roots deep underground
In the soil of life's struggle
In the subsoil of the eternal Word.

It should show nothing but its own unfolding parts:
Branches that thrust out by the force of its inner life
Sentences like leaves native to this very spray
True to the species
Not taken from alien growths
Illustrations like blossoms opening from
Inside these very twigs
Not brightly colored kites
Pulled from the wind of somebody else's thought
Entangled in these branches

It should bear flowers and fruit at the
Same time like the organ:
Having something for food
For immediate nourishment
Having something for delight
For present beauty and fragrance
For the joy of hope
For the harvest of a distant day.

To be all this it must grow in a warm climate:
 In loam enriched by death
 In love like the all-seeing and all-cherishing sun
 In trust like the sleep-sheltering night
 In pity like the rain
 Henry G. Davis

This chapter traces the work of homiletician Henry G. Davis. Davis's work is examined in the wake of Coleridge, for Davis can be considered to have promoted an Organic Homiletic. He was a forerunner and prophet for considering the possibilities of an organic sermon form. Like Augustine, who applied neutral tools to the craft of preaching, adopting Cicero's rhetoric and adapting them into his *Holy Rhetoric*,¹ Davis adopted Romantic organic concepts for sermon composition and adapted them to preaching the Gospel. This chapter examines how the homiletician Davis functioned as a revolutionary Romantic prophet refusing to be bound by traditional rules and models located outside the preacher. This review is intended to show Davis's stunning ability for synthesizing disparities. This chapter is organized as follows: 1) Davis—Romantic "Organic" Homiletician, 2) Davis and Fosdick, 3) Davis—Prophet of Contemporary Homiletics, 4) Organic Synthesis, 5) Organic Form, 6) Organic Unity, 7) Organic Process, and 8) Organic Law.²

Davis—Romantic "Organic" Homiletician

Although Davis, in *Design for Preaching*, does not directly mention Coleridge as a source that influenced the homiletical theory he offers in that work, this chapter proceeds on the assumption that the similarity to Coleridge's organic thought is so great that Davis was most likely influenced by Coleridge or others espousing similar views. Nevertheless, this influence from the Coleridge and other Romantics may not have been a conscious one for Davis. Another possibility is that, just as there is debate concerning the influences of Coleridge's work (particularly in regard to the possible German sources), so there may be similar questions in regard to Davis's full disclosure of attribution. The possible seeds of influence are many. As noted in the previous chapter, even imitation theorists such as Plato and Aristotle also used the "organic" concept, and the 18th and 19th century Romantic

writers from Germany and England could have been conscious or subliminal influences for Davis's work. For example, Reid points to the "Medieval Tree of Preaching"³ as a possible source Romantic influence for Davis.

Preaching historian Alfred Ernest Garvie suggests Romantic preachers after the Medieval Age and Enlightenment may have influenced Davis. Garvie notes the relation of literary theory and homiletic theory. Just as Coleridge faced three literary traditions of rationalists, radical Romantics and moderate Romantics, and as Elbow points to the three different composition theories of expressivism, formalism, and mimeticism,⁴ Garvie classifies three different approaches to preaching: the pietists, rationalists, and mediators. Garvie writes that Phillip Jacob Spencer (1635–1705)'s Pietism gained "the importance of a religious appearance, which by its intensive insistence on the vitality of faith, on the new birth and the Christian passion for consecration, rose far above the orthodoxy of the 17th century."⁵ Rather than Spencer, who may be seen as having a relationship to Davis similar to that of Wordsworth to Coleridge, Garvie commends Schleiermacher (1768–1834—a contemporary of Coleridge) as a good example of one who sought to be mediator between reason and intuition for preaching. Garvie observes that Schleiermacher "combined piety and philosophy, culture and faith, the power of the thinker and the gifts of the speaker in so great a personality."⁶ Schleiermacher's source for the sermon was an inward experience, the religious feeling of the preacher, stimulated and confirmed by the Bible with rational illuminism, inward unity, and synthesis.⁷ Garvie writes of Schleiermacher,

As his aim was neither exposition nor instruction, but the movement of the heart, he attached no importance to logical structures. What matters in his view is that the preacher himself gets the tone of the preacher is imparted to his hearers. The sermon should be a homily or conversation, a dialogue of the preacher and the Scriptures on the one hand, and a dialogue of the preacher and his congregation on the other.⁸

In tracing the route of influence from Coleridge to Davis, and finally to contemporary Organic Homiletic, Spencer and Schleiermacher are important channels, because Schleiermacher, like Coleridge, "would subsume biblical hermeneutics, (consequently including homiletics), on the basis of a Romantic aesthetics of creative *Verstehen*, or Imagination."⁹ It can be said that Davis's homiletic is like Schleiermacher's in that both emphasize intuition and reason together in their aesthetics of Christianity.

Whereas the previous chapter discussed Coleridge's organic concept and possible (even controversial) sources which may have influenced him, specific, extant sources that may have influenced or Davis are far fewer. In

the bibliography of *Design for Preaching*, there is one book on composition theory referenced, where Coleridge is mentioned several times.¹⁰ Quiller-Couch's composition textbook, which Davis encourages preachers to read, appears as a Romantic textbook of literature. Quiller-Couch espouses a clear Coleridgean view when he writes, "balance in the mind affected by that spontaneous effort which strives to hold in check the workings of passion."¹¹ He quotes from Wordsworth, "We must be free or die! ...In everything we are sprung of Earth's first blood, have titles manifold."¹² This is a declaration of unbridled Romantics who were influenced by the French Revolution.¹³ Quiller-Couch makes an attempt to balance Coleridge and Wordsworth stating that the Romantic revival is an enemy of false classicism, not of classicism.¹⁴ Davis seems influenced by 18th and 19th century Romantic notions. In another article, Davis displays a Romantic tendency in that, like Coleridge, he emphasizes "heart,"

The heart loves: the mind tries to explain. The heart trusts: the mind theologizes. I can know faith only by trusting, love only by loving. This is the difference between grace in theology and grace in nature. A theology of love is "works"—love is grace.¹⁵

Davis understands preaching as the preacher's personal and authentic revelation, as Robert Frost believed and taught that "every true poem is a revelation, a real disclosure of truth, not by a poet but to the poet as much as to the reader. The revelatory experience in which a poem comes into being he called *The Figure a Poem Makes*."¹⁶ Davis asserts that we need to revere nature and bond ourselves to natural things, by deepening the intuitions in our hearts.¹⁷ This sounds like the radical, unbridled Romantics of Wordsworth, as Davis emphasizes the freedom of inner feeling of nature for the poet and preacher. The evidence that Davis had a Coleridgean influence seems significant; nonetheless, the evidence is not conclusive. For example, Davis considers *The Gospels in Study and Preaching* as his "workbook for trying out the principles stated in *Design for Preaching* as they apply to the texts in hand."¹⁸ In the preface, Davis summarizes the *Design for Preaching* as the "fruits of a lifelong search for light on the processes—linguistic, intellectual, and psychological—that go on in the expression of thought in general and especially in preaching."¹⁹ Consequently, the source(s) of Davis's thought may be difficult to identify.

Davis and Fosdick

When considering possible influences to Davis's work, it would be amiss not to consider the serious impact that Fosdick had on homileticians during the period when Davis wrote. Reid notes,

It is important in the United States to grasp just how significant Fosdick was into the 1950s. He was the towering presence. His style of preaching transformed American Preaching, moving it beyond three points and a poem sermon, by shifting it away from teaching content to addressing felt needs. This was so significant by the 1950s that almost every homiletic was trying to adapt to this kind of felt need based preaching as the way to make the gospel relevant.²⁰

Davis analyzes one sermon by Fosdick in his *Organic Homiletic* stating, "This sermon is so important in the study of contemporary sermonic design that we shall have to examine it closely, refer to it more than once, and treat it again under a different head."²¹ Davis, like Fosdick, claims that "therapy is clearly recognized as a function of discourse within the church."²² Davis includes three functional forms of preaching: Proclamation, Teaching and Therapeutic. Fosdick's preaching has been thought of as Problem-Solving preaching; Davis's refers to Fosdick's structural form as an organic form of induction and dialectics. Reid builds on the work of Luccock to explicate Fosdick's Problem-Solving preaching. Reid writes, "Start with a life issue, a real problem, personal or social, perplexing the mind or disturbing the conscience; face the problem fairly, deal with it honestly, and throw such light on it from the spirit of Christ, that people will be able to go out to think more clearly and live more nobly because of that sermon."²³ It seems that Davis's inductive and narrative continuity of an organic homiletic is related to Fosdick's Problem-Solving preaching.²⁴

Interestingly, contemporary composition theorists deal with the same topic debating problem-solving as a strategy for composition. One side of this debate argues for a product-pedagogy for writing in which students are given models of form from the outside; the other side in this debate argues for a process-pedagogy for writing, in which writers are encouraged to express their own solution for the need of the reader. The debate is between imposing models of form of deduction, argument, and exposition versus searching for a solution with the audience.²⁵

Davis—Prophet of Contemporary Homiletics

While some would hail Davis as a prophet for the New Homiletics of contemporary preaching theory, it is also possible to view him as a prophet of what can be called the Old Homiletics of contemporary preaching theory.²⁶ Although Sleeth, in his review of *Design for Preaching*, denied the originality and authenticity of Davis's *Design for Preaching*,²⁷ and although Randolph coined "New Homiletic" from "New Hermeneutic,"²⁸ it is possible, nonetheless, to call Henry G. Davis a prophet of the New Homiletics. In *Design for Preaching* one can find almost all the characteristics that writers for the New Homiletics later developed. From his *Design for Preaching*, one can hear the echo of Craddock's inductive homiletic, Lowry's narrative homiletic, and Buttrick's phenomenological homiletic. One also finds in Davis strong argument for the deductive approach of the Old Homiletics.

Davis's *Design for Preaching* contains the trace of Coleridgean Romanticism as he makes the argument for an "Organic homiletic." Davis's homiletic is also synthetic, reminiscent of a Coleridgean organic synthesis of disparities of the universal and the particular. For example, Davis synthesizes the tension of deduction oriented homiletic versus an inductive and narrative oriented approach. Additionally, through his surprising mixture, modification, variation, fusion, and synthesis of homiletic form, Davis opens the door for other new homiletical ideas which had yet to be considered.

Organic Synthesis

As noted to this point, in Davis, one discovers a Coleridgean Romantic view of literature and art, a restrained and balanced Romanticism. Davis also displays a synthesis of intuition and reason in his preaching. For Davis, intuition works together with rational logic in constructing a homiletic form. Davis argues for a synthesis of feeling and reason when he writes,

There is logic of impressions as well as of propositions. In a good continuity each new step will seem to the people like a natural consequence of what has gone before. There is a mental readiness for it which is as much a matter of feeling as of thinking. When the listener's view of one point has reached certain fullness, the new thrust of the idea is more natural than standing still. Something like this, a matter of intuitive feeling as much as of thought, is what often guides a preacher in arranging, the continuity of his points. It is his inner sense of form and rhythmical movement coming into play.²⁹

Davis here compares impression with proposition, feeling with thinking, and intuitive feeling with thought. In other words, when logic and continuity

work together to create sermon form, what which fills the structure is intuition and feeling. Davis states that, while preaching is delivered, preachers get some intuitional insight from the inner soul. Davis encourages the preacher to dare to grasp and use it. This shows that Davis attends to preachers' inner feelings and intuitions in the process of sermon preparation. He writes,

Furthermore, the act of communicating is a mysterious, two-way experience. If the preacher is not simply reproducing a manuscript, a sudden insight not reached in his preparation may change the last two minutes he had planned. He dare not trust that insight to come and so neglect to prepare his conclusion. But he dare not, indeed he cannot disregard it if it comes. "Clarification" Robert Frost calls this moment of heightened vision, speaking of the end of a poem.³⁰

Though Sleeth criticizes Davis pointing to the fact that his homiletic neglects delivery,³¹ it can be argued that the above passage addresses the issue of delivery in preaching quite directly. Davis knew that preaching is "a mysterious, two-way experience," in which the interaction of preacher and audience may happen in the moment of delivery.

Like Coleridge does in his organic synthesis, Davis also mixes the universal and the particular. In this sense, Davis seems to reject ties both to the Old and New Homiletics. New Homiletics emphasizes intuition and experience.³² As Reid notes, "New Homileticians are actually trying to reach the will through the imagination instead of through reason,"³³ while the Old Homiletics holds to a rationalistic, argumentative, propositional, and deductive approach. Deductive approaches start from generalization, while induction starts from particularization. However, Davis attempts to harmonize this severe dichotomy. Davis champions generalization by saying,

Thus the art of generalization is of primary importance to the preacher.

Without clearly apprehended generalizations, a sermon will always seem to be dealing with trivialities, fragments, scraps of life, and the more interesting these particular details are, the more confusing they will be. That is what has happened when we wonder what the man is driving at. He has failed to pull his material together and make a general statement about it. For it is the generalizations that organize the material.³⁴

Generalization is, for Davis, the way of organizing the sermon material. Without this, the sermon becomes trivial, fragmentary and scattered. However, Davis does not neglect the importance of the particular. He observes, "If it is true that no good sermon can exist without adequate generalizations, it is equally true that no sermon can be good without particulars. Generals and particulars do not have the same function in

communication. Each has its own separate function, and each is important. We cannot say that one is more important than the other. Each is indispensable in its place.”³⁵ Davis further emphasizes the importance of both the general and the particular when he writes,

Good thinking moves in both directions. It usually begins with particulars and goes to generals, the process of induction. But good thought, especially when being communicated, never remains general for long. After it has generalized, it moves back again to particulars.³⁶...Generalizations interpret reality, comprehend it in large masses, while particularity evokes reality by means of concrete details.³⁷

In Davis, one finds the synthesis of disparities of Coleridge. This can be called an organic synthesis because, although the metaphor of plant does not work for this topic, in human life dialectical synthesis of disparities is organic and natural. There exists always a pro and con, agreement and disagreement, and thesis, antithesis and synthesis. Conflicts are everywhere, but, through the process of synthesizing, human history grows. In the world of humans, conflicting disparities are organic; this is Coleridge’s claim as well.

To conclude this section, in Davis’s Organic Homiletic there is lack of emphasis on the role of intuition as opposed to reason; for Davis it seems that there is no organic process from a strong emphasis on intuition to a synthesis of intuition and reason. It seems that Davis starts from synthesis. This is different from Coleridge’s Romantic organicism. For Romantic organicism there is a strong emphasis on expressing inner feeling first; it then grows to the synthesis of intuition and reason, not vice versa. This reflects Coleridge’s historical context in which he moves from Romantic revolt to balanced Romantic by reconciling with reason. Davis, however, emphasizes more the organic synthesis of the particular and the general than intuition and reason.

Organic Form

Davis, like Coleridge, sees the inseparable unity between content and form. Form grows from content organically; it is not given from outside as a prescribed form. Therefore, form changes according to content. In Davis’s emphasis on textual continuity and logic in a sermon, Davis’s organic form grows according to textual continuity which is induced from content. For Davis, sermon form has no absolute norm or model, such as three points and a poem. He writes,

There is no ideal or standard form which every sermon should take. The sermon is not a species with fixed and invariable characteristics, as the form of the violet, the

lily, the leaf of the red oak, the twig of the weeping willow is fixed. There is no preexistent mold into which the substance of thought must be poured in order to make a sermon.³⁸

Davis argues that preaching is a creative art. Preachers should create a new sermon in both content and form each time they preach. This is demanding work for preachers; thus, they are tempted to become mechanic preachers, for preaching mechanically takes less time from their busy schedules of other pastoral work. Nonetheless, preaching ministry is inevitably a creative art work; it is not mechanical work. Sermons cannot be molded with a pre-existent mold, as a mason makes brick from a mold or a baker makes cookies by means of a mold. Davis, like Coleridge, understands that art is an organic process, opposed to a mechanical one. Davis notes,

The processes I have to describe seem to me to be more like the organic processes of biology than the mechanical processes of, say, carpentry.³⁹ ...The form is not something that exists apart from the idea that is apprehended and spoken of. Form is not a chalice of fixed shape containing wine today, but usable for quite different content tomorrow. I speak of substance and form rather than content and form, because the relation between them is not mechanical but organic. The sermon idea is thought having form, not thought contained within a form that might just as well contain some other thought. The form is the shape of the thought itself, its image in the human mind, its likeness to ourselves.⁴⁰

Sermon form cannot be borrowed mechanically from outside; rather, it is organic in that it grows from content. Here, like Coleridge, Davis uses a metaphor of biology and organism in sermon composition. Preachers should avoid thinking of a fixed sermon form which they could employ every time they preach. When a single form is used sermon after sermon, preachers will discover their sermons lose freshness, creativity and imagination. A redundant use of form starts to choke the living Word with dead skin.

Davis uses the phrase "inherent" in his organic sermon form. He believes that "the sermon is inherent in the thought; the sermon exists in the thought or idea as the plant exists in the germ, and the seed."⁴¹ The Medieval Tree of Preaching starts from a root, not from seeds.⁴² Davis, like Coleridge, refers to the "seed." Perhaps Dieter saw the similarity between the "Medieval Tree of Preaching" and Davis's "Preaching-Poem,"⁴³ because Dieter did not notice that Davis, unlike the "Medieval Tree of Preaching," uses the "seed" metaphor, as did the Romantics. Davis believes that "designing a sermon is more like making a plant grow to the form inherent in it."⁴⁴ Like Romantics such as Coleridge, Davis believes that a sermon, as a work of art, is a living being that has form inherent within it. This is not unlike Goethe's Inner Form

theory, discussed in the previous chapter, which is closely related to Coleridge's Organic Form. For Davis, sermon form is resided inside the main idea, or thought. Therefore, Davis argues,

There can be no real sermon without an idea, true enough, but there can be an idea without a sermon. The idea and the sermon belong together, but they are not always together. As there must be a plot, with characters and incidents, to embody the idea of a story, so there must be a plan, a movement from thought to thought toward a goal, to give body and shape to the sermon idea.⁴⁵

For Davis, this seed, or idea, grows in the process. The significance of Davis's Organic Homiletic lies in this transition of emphasis: from product to process, using the language of contemporary composition theorists. Davis critiques homiletic literatures that do not encourage preachers to create their own organic sermon in the preparation process rather than imposing products of sermon models from outside. He writes,

Homiletical literature will not give you much assistance in regard to this process of expanding the thought. The literature takes you too quickly to the types of sermon structure. But this expansion is the process of making sermons, and anything you read about sermonizing short of types of structure, applies to this work.⁴⁶

Killingsworth notes the relation of product and process in composition by saying, "Product is to literacy as process is to orality."⁴⁷ He continues by saying, "Considered in the light of ideological analysis, product and literacy tend to line up on the side of centralized authority and managerial control, while process and orality demand an atmosphere of free and open-ended exchange among social equals."⁴⁸ Like Davis, Killingsworth functions as a prophet when he critiques the "current-traditional, product-oriented" textbooks and teachers. He writes,

In the field of composition, "process, not product" emerged in the 1970s as a rallying slogan for a new generation of writing instructors (Young, Hairston). In this formulation, "process" signified an interactive approach to teaching, according to which the teacher would intervene as a personal presence early and regularly in the development of student papers. This classroom model contrasted strongly with what its advocates perceived as the dominant paradigm of writing instruction, the so-called "current-traditional" or "product-oriented" model, in which the teacher played an authoritarian role as the guardian of grammatical and rhetorical propriety and the judge of finished student papers. Whereas the "product-oriented" instructor felt most comfortable in the lecture hall and the professional office equipped with red pens and handbooks of error codes, practitioners of the new "process pedagogy" turned the classroom into a workshop and met their students after class in newly formed writing centers or labs. They introduced a more generous portion of face-to-face, one-to-one communication; dialogue generally preceded writing, and talk often

served as the chief means of feedback throughout the process of drafting and revising papers.⁴⁹

Homiletically speaking, there are two kinds of teachers of preachers (homileticians): product-oriented and process-oriented. Product-oriented homiletic teachers see that their job is to teach models and to make sure seminarians imitate and exercise them. These homileticians then evaluate the students' work with a "red pen." Process-oriented homileticians see that their job is to make the classroom a workshop or laboratory in which the teacher participates with seminarians in their sermon making process, encouraging them to induce their own voice and expression from their souls and later to work interactively with reason. The pedagogical process for this type of homiletician is that of encouraging students to find their own voice and express it freely without fear. Sermon form, in this pedagogical approach, is not taught; rather, sermon form is discovered from the content and context (in the process of preparation). The teacher's role is to teach them how they themselves find their own form, their own voice, and their own expression.

Davis's notion of plurality of organic form is also similar to that of Coleridge. Like Schlegel, Coleridge believes that art form has limitless variables according to each individual and his or her circumstances. This Organic Homiletic can help preachers to become inexhaustibly creative, imaginative, and authentic preachers in their use of sermon form. Preachers, who were educated by imitative teachers who taught them to always rely on outside sources, may come to find those sources exhausted. Such preachers may then see their own preaching ministry as exhausted and describe themselves as "burned out." Davis argues against the possibility of "burn out" as a result of having run out of possible forms for preaching. Christian ministry cannot become exhausted because God is the everlasting energetic spring of creative power and imagination. In regard to the unlimited plurality of form, Davis writes, "By organic form I mean the structure a sermon assumes as a result of the state in which the germinal thought exists in the preacher's mind. Sermon ideas do not all take the same form. The form of the original thought in large measure determines the structure of the sermon."⁵⁰ Elsewhere he notes that, as trees are not all of like organic structure, so sermons are not all of like structure. He writes, "There are two independent predicates. The sermon is like a tree that has no single trunk, but twin stems dividing near the ground."⁵¹

For Davis, sermon form, as well as content, is not to be the same in every sermon. Form is to be natural and organic allowing each seed of an idea to grow organically. Preachers should learn this organic homiletic because this

organic homiletic can help preachers to be creative and imaginative, always freshly inspired in their preaching. In sum, Davis concludes,

Nevertheless, there is a right form for each sermon, namely, the form that is right for this particular sermon. A right form can never be imposed on any sermon. If it has to be imposed it is not right. The right form derives from the substance of the message itself, is inseparable from the content, becomes one with the content, and gives a feeling of finality to the sermon. When form is rightly used, it seems to be the inevitable shape of the thought, and is then indistinguishable from the thing said; it becomes the thing itself.⁵²

For Davis, organic form is closely related to organic unity of content and form. Content and form are inseparable, and form is an expression of content organically grown. While the discussion of Davis's Organic Form in this section has, by nature of the topic, required addressing his understanding of the organic unity of content and form, the next section looks at specifically at Davis's understanding of organic unity in terms of the parts and the whole.

Organic Unity

Jesus said that every branch will be dried up if it is torn away from the true vine, so in organic unity, the parts should be connected to the whole organically with living power. Some sermons are constructed of several sermonettes in a single sermon. Each sermonette can be broken apart, and it can easily survive on its own elsewhere. In organic unity, parts should be inseparably related to the whole.

Davis sees the need for unity and coherence in a sermon. There should be no unrelated materials or irrelevance between the parts and the whole. Each part should be related to the whole thus creating an organic unity. When form is mechanically imposed from outside, organic unity is lost. Davis states,

The thought generates the sermon, and the sermon embodies the thought, thus creating not a mechanism but an organism. An organism consists of parts or members in structural and functional relation to one another and to the whole. Knowing this, it seems natural to speak of the parts, divisions, heads, and points, of a sermon as structural arts, signifying their character as organic elements of a developing idea or thought.⁵³

Davis turns to the image of a tree. From the seed, the tree starts growing. Davis argues thought creates an organism in which all the parts of the tree are alive and related to each other through "living blood:" an exchange of life from one part to the other. All parts are interdependent on each other. Without each other, the various parts cannot survive. This is an organicism, a

philosophy of interdependence. It is neither dependence nor independence; rather, it is interdependence. Bahm maintains,

In contrast with the idea of dependence, which implies that some things are completely dependent for their existence and nature upon other things, usually one or a few (such as God, Brahman, real universals such as Plato's Ideas, or Aristotle's Form and Matter, or Descartes' Spirit and Matter), the idea of interdependence involves ultimate unity as being as truly dependent upon ultimate plurality as ultimate plurality is dependent upon ultimate unity.⁵⁴... "Interdependence" involves both partial dependence and partial independence.⁵⁵

Bahm explicates organic unity in terms of "variety" or plurality following Parker who writes, "The unity is the unity of the variety and the variety is a differentiation of the unity. The variety is of equal importance with the unity, for unity can assert itself and work only through the control of a multiplicity of elements."⁵⁶

Davis's approach to organic unity goes a long ways in addressing Fosdick's Problem-Solving preaching, as discussed in the preceding section. Fosdick's approach has two dialectic problems: disequilibrium and equilibrium resolved. These are contradictory views: problem and problem solved, but it is organically united. A danger for misunderstanding organic unity lies in the idea of seeing uniformity of any form to be imitated. Davis deals with this by saying,

A part is less than the whole; a member is less than the organism. A part is within the whole and contributes to the whole. Parts, divisions, heads, points, structural assertions, structural thoughts, contributing assertions, contributing thoughts—they all designate the same elements of a sermon. The words are not important, but to preserve the sense of organism is extremely important. And it seems natural, when we are trying to think of the sermon as an organic development of a thought, to speak of its members in organic terms.⁵⁷

Like Bahm, Davis also sees that the parts contribute to and are indispensable for the whole. Davis asserts the "relatedness" of the parts to the whole and vice versa. He writes, "That is all unity is: an impression of oneness and entirety, of an ordered relatedness of parts in a whole. Its opposite is fragmentation, partition, disorder. The effect of unity is never created by pure singleness. It is always a unity achieved out of plurality and diversity."⁵⁸ Here Davis stresses not uniformity but the impression of oneness and entirety. No matter what form of inner logic and continuity is utilized, organic unity creates an impression of an ordered relatedness. Davis does not stress a pure singleness or uniformity. In this, Davis's organic homiletic has an unbelievable potential as a method for creative preaching.

Davis anticipates organic unity of plurality and diversity of homiletic form. Preachers are encouraged by Davis to enter the new world of freedom of creative preaching in authentic voice and expression. There is no need to be restricted or limited by unnaturalness or artificiality. Davis's organic homiletic, when utilized successfully, moves preachers from a static standstill into an organic process that grants true freedom and liberation

Organic Process

For Davis, preaching is like a tree; its growth is an organic process. Davis, like Coleridge, maintains, "The processes I have to describe seem to me to be more like the organic processes of biology than the mechanical processes of, say, carpentry."⁵⁹ Along with organic synthesis, organic form, and organic unity, a complete organic homiletic requires other elements: 1) Context, which includes audience-interaction with preacher that influences the whole direction of the sermon, 2) Orality for audible design of sermon, that also impacts sermon structure and style because it is not written communication. 3) The preachers' own characters and talents, and 4) the rhetorical situation⁶⁰ of the church and community in general and in particular. All of these factors impact the organic nature of the sermon; the sermon grows from the seed of the preacher's soul in a process that is interactive with time, people, and space.

Creative cognitive psychologists emphasize this aspect of a "process" as the "incubation" period of an idea, as it becomes more creative.⁶¹ Wallas introduces stages in the creative formation of a new thought: 1) *Preparation* (the stage during which the problem was "investigated...in all directions"), 2) *Incubation* (the stage during which one was not consciously thinking about the problem), 3) *Illumination* (the stage of the consisting of the appearance of the "happy idea" together with the psychological events which immediately preceded and accompanied that appearance, and 4) *Verification*,⁶² where the unconsciously incubated third problem is verified consciously,⁶³ Wallas expands upon the incubation stage as follows,

The incubation stage covers two different things, of which the first is the negative fact that during incubation we do not voluntarily or consciously think on a particular problem, and the second is the positive fact that a series of unconscious and involuntary (or foreconscious and forevoluntary) mental events may take place during that period. It is the first fact about incubation which I shall now discuss, leaving the second fact—of subconscious thought during incubation, and the relation of such thought during incubation, and the relation of such thought to illumination – to be more fully discussed in connection with the illumination stage. Voluntary

abstention from conscious thought on any particular problem may, itself, take two forms: the period of abstention may be spent either in conscious mental work. The first kind of incubation economizes time and is therefore often the better. We can often get more result in the same time by beginning several problems in succession and voluntarily leaving them unfinished while we turn to others, than by finishing our work on each problem at one sitting.⁶⁴

This psychological incubation stage may be compared to the organic process in Davis and Coleridge where the conscious (reason) and the unconscious (intuition) are working together in time and in space by growing organically and by interacting with audience and situation. Preachers should ask themselves whether their sermon had the organic process of time and space where it could grow organically. Childers notes that women stress their creative process of sermon preparation in time and space.⁶⁵ This may be thought of as acknowledging the importance of the “Incubation” stage. Wallas comments further on the “Incubation” stage by relaying an experience with “a well-known academic psychologist who is also preacher,”

He told me that he found by experience that his Sunday sermon was much better if he posed the problem on Monday, than if he did so later in the week, although he might give the same number of hours of conscious work to it in each case. It seems to be a tradition among practicing barristers to put off any consideration of each brief to the latest possible moment before they have to deal with it and to forget the whole matter as rapidly as possible after dealing with it. This fact may help to explain a certain want of depth which has often been noticed in the typical lawyer-statesman, and which may be due to his conscious thought not being sufficiently extended and enriched by subconscious thought.⁶⁶

Wallas is indirectly recommending that preachers start preparing their sermon as early as possible, even from Sunday evening for next Sunday. Dietrich Bonhoeffer offers similar advice:

It is a good idea to write the sermon during the daylight hours. Anything written at night often cannot stand the bright light of day and looks strange in the morning...The sermon should not be written all at once, but rather build a few pauses into your work. If not, we run the danger of running ahead of ourselves...It is a good rule to begin the sermon at the latest on Tuesday and to conclude it at the latest on Friday. We should seek our text on Sunday and have it decided upon by Monday. The usual sermon prepared on Saturday evening reveals an attitude that is unworthy of the work. Twelve hours' work on a sermon is a good general rule.⁶⁷

Bonhoeffer's and Wallas' comments show the need for the incubation stage in sermon creation. It is in this stage that the synthesis of the conscious and the unconscious occurs.

Davis stresses the “function” of preaching. For him, preaching has three different topics: Proclamation, Teaching, and Therapeutic. At first glance, his presentation of “functional” preaching may seem confusing because it is not clear whether he is implying homiletic forms or homiletic topics. When he says that form follows function, it sounds as if function affects the deciding of a sermon form, but, when he evaluates specific sermons as being structurally propositional, methodically descriptive, or functionally kerygmatic,⁶⁸ he seems to suggest that functional form is not homiletic form but a homiletical topic. However, when Davis says that form follows function, this idea of function is aimed at the audience and the purpose or goal of the sermon for the audience.

Davis’s attention to audience is significant. Davis’s organic homiletic acknowledges that, since preaching is not a written but an oral communication, the role of audience (the hearers in the oral event) should influence the composition of sermon. Davis writes,

Thus the listener depends on his memory, and his memory is at the mercy of my design. It is his task to listen; it is my task to know the difference between oral and written communication and to furnish an audible design which he can grasp, that is, to emphasize my important thoughts, subordinate the incidentals, and keep to a recognizable order.⁶⁹

Davis argues that preachers should strive to create a sermon that is audible rather than readable; the audience is listening rather than reading. Acknowledging the role of audience in the sermonic event is another indicator that an organic homiletic is a process, not product of models to be imitated. Davis points out,

Something very like this happens in effective oral communication. As in listening to music or a play, my hearer receives a series of thoughts and impressions. There is progress. But if my idea is to take on wholeness and reality in his mind at the end of the sermon, he must get and hold in his memory these successive thoughts and impressions. He must build them up, put them together for himself, and hold them together as a unity in his own mind. I must employ his apprehension, his memory, and his constructive imagination.⁷⁰

In short, for Davis, the organic process is a significant part of organic preaching, where there is an interaction of the biblical text, the main idea, continuity, the audience and the goal of the sermon. Also the intuitional addition, rational editing, and coherent development of parts to the whole are incorporated in the sermon preparation process, even through the moment of delivery. Through the entire organic process, from the very beginning of the creation event to the actual delivery, the sermon grows organically.

Organic Law

As the Romantics were charged as being lawless, so Davis might be charged as being lawless in his Organic Homiletic. However, like Coleridge and Wordsworth, who defended themselves by referring to the supremacy of the “law of nature,” Davis also argues that principles of preaching which are grounded in inner logic and continuity trump any external homiletic rules and models that might be foisted upon preachers. Davis argues,

These types of continuity which we are about to examine all represent patterns in which the mind naturally moves. Worked out into a clear order, any one of them provides an audible progress of thought, and the people will follow it. They will not and cannot follow a jumbled order. If the procedure is inductive, it had better be clearly ordered induction. If the procedure is logically linked, it had better be logical. If it is a dramatic continuity, it had better adhere to the dramatic order strictly.⁷¹

Davis, like Augustine, knew that rules are helpful for one who is beginning the study of oratory or, more specifically, preaching. However, when preachers are seasoned with some experience, they no longer need the constraints of the rules of rhetoric and homiletic. Davis writes, “Augustine said that a young man can quickly learn all that rhetoric has to teach him, that he ought to learn it and then no longer bother about it.”⁷² This was also a very important issue for the Sophists when they taught rhetorical rules. Augustine explicates this Sophistic understanding when he says,

It (to learn oratorical rules and to observe) is enough if this task is left to young people, and not all those whom we are not yet bound by a more pressing responsibility or one with an unquestionably higher priority. Given a sharp and eager mind, eloquence is picked up more readily by those who read and listen to the words of the eloquent than by those who follow the rules of eloquence. There is no shortage of Christian literature, even outside the canon which has been raised to its position of authority for our benefit; and by reading this...⁷³

One might argue that Augustine sounds somewhat like an imitation theorist at this point; however, it is more accurate to say that he transcends mere imitation theory in the process of learning homiletics. Augustine’s imitation is not a mere mimicking of the rules and models; rather, it involves reading and listening and, thus, incorporating resources into the preacher’s unconscious, in order for those resources to be genuinely expressed from the preacher’s inner feelings, organically. This is different from mere imitation theory dedicated exclusively to rules and models. For Davis, a good sermon is radical in that it is supposed “to break all homiletic rules.”⁷⁴ In this, Davis veers somewhat from Augustine sounding more like an unrestrained

Romantic, such as Wordsworth. Davis continues in synthesizing this radical Romantic revolt against rules by saying, “If it is a good sermon, it does not break good rules; it breaks only the unnecessary and artificial rules.”⁷⁵ Davis would agree with Augustine in his claim that “they (preachers) observe the rules because they are eloquent; they do not use them to become eloquent.”⁷⁶ In sum, it can be said that Davis does not want preachers to become mere technicians but good craftspeople.⁷⁷

Instead of creating more rules for preachers to imitate, Davis develops the continuities of the sermon body. This organic law, for Davis, like Coleridge, is not fixed; rather, it serves to open new possibilities. The idea of “types of continuity” is central to Davis’s organic homiletic. Davis, in his “Preface” explains that his intent for *Design for Preaching* is not to “present a particular method of sermon construction.”⁷⁸ His real goal is to help preachers find their own, individually different “working method” that enables them to become creative, authentic, and imaginative, “living preachers.”⁷⁹ This is a clear break from teaching “homiletic rules” that works universally for every preacher; rather, Davis’s organic rule (or law) is grounded in the inner logic of the sermon and continuity.

It seems that Davis suggests not “rules” but “principles” by which preachers can create their own authentic, creative, and organic sermons. Similar to Coleridge’s organic unity where intuition works with rational order, Davis blends together both intuition and order to construct an organic homiletic. Davis states,

...we face the fact that sermons are not all alike. The order of points is influenced by the character of the continuity. There is one order if the procedure is deductive and a different order if it is inductive. There is one order if the procedure is logically linked as in an argument, another if it is chronologically linked as in a narrative. There is still another order if the procedure is dramatic as in the acts of a play, or as in the form of the thesis-antithesis-synthesis. Let me repeat: A proper continuity is necessary for the sake of the people who have to listen. It is not a luxury or refinement to enhance the style of the preacher. It is a means to successful oral communication.⁸⁰

Davis seems also to be influenced by methods of contemporary composition theory current at the time of his writing *Design for Preaching*. His bibliography shows his wide reading of communication and composition⁸¹ that may well have influenced the arrangement he chooses to argue for preachers. Davis suggests it is advantageous to take advantage of current rhetorical resources when he encourages preachers to various kinds of discourse. Davis writes,

If you feel yourself inadequately prepared for this work, do not waste your time and effort, but begin properly by a careful study of the kinds of discourse—Exposition, Argument, Description, and Narration.⁸²

Another aspect of Davis's synthetic approach is seen in his synthesis of what would come to be understood as the Old and New Homiletic. Davis states, "Strictly speaking, these are processes of thought and not types of continuity. Both may be used in the same sermon, one point being handled deductively and another approached inductively."⁸³ He continues, "These are the major movements of thought, every sermon design itself is either deductive or inductive in method, moves either from a general assertion to particular or from particulars to a general conclusion."⁸⁴

Another striking character of Davis's Organic Homiletic that points to the fact that the sermon is a living thing is the resulting variation that inevitably occurs. Clearly, there is great variation in living organisms; one can think of the propagation of germs, the modification of species, or the mutation of cells. Living beings change as a part of the process of life itself, influenced by circumstantial situation which vary from individual to individual. Even within the same species of morning glories no one flower ever has exactly the same shape as another. According to the law of nature, every living being is different. Davis builds on this principle by suggesting the possibility of mixing the four types of discourse discussed above (Exposition, Argument, Description, and Narration) into a potentially new variety of form for each preaching situation. He offers an example from a sermon by Gannon,

The first half of the sermon is narrative...the story is vividly told. At almost the exact middle of the sermon, the idea is first generalized...from that point on to the end of the sermon, this spirit of the world is handled deductively (the Robert I. Gannon, S. J.'s "A Lenten Sermon").⁸⁵

Davis notes that these classifications are "processes of thought and not types of continuity."⁸⁶ This is why the processes of thought can be intermixed according to the rhetorical situation of preaching in the process. Davis therefore claims something upon which the Old and New Homiletics seem never to be able to agree: "Both may be used in the same sermon, one point being handled deductively and another approached inductively."⁸⁷ From the four forms of contemporary composition theory (Argument, Description, Exposition, Narration), Davis develops five continuities (Deductive, Inductive, Logical, Chronological, and Dramatic).

Another interesting source for Davis is found in his bibliography on the speech. Davis seems to have been influenced by Monroe's "types of

arrangement” of composition and communication theories. Monroe introduces five types of arrangement: “Time sequence, Space sequence, Cause-Effect sequence, Problem-Solution sequence, Special Topical sequence.”⁸⁸ In *Design for Preaching* Davis refers to two major homiletic textbooks dealing with arrangement in the sermon. Both are also listed in his bibliography: John A. Broadus’ *On the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons* (1870)⁸⁹ and W.E. Sangster, *The Craft of Sermon Construction* (1951).⁹⁰

John A. Broadus lifted up the importance of arrangement. Broadus stated that arrangement is important to the speaker himself and also as regards the effect upon the audience. He points to the necessity of unity, order, and proportion for good arrangement. Broadus classified sermons as 1) Subject-sermons, 2) Text-sermons, and 3) Expository-sermons.⁹¹ He also emphasized the functional elements of the sermon: 1) Explanation 2) Argument⁹² 3) Illustration⁹³ 4) Application.

W.E. Sangster, a main source for Davis’s Organic Homiletic, classified sermons according to subject matter: 1) Biblical Interpretation, 2) Ethical and Devotional, 3) Doctrinal, 4) Philosophical and Apologetic, 5) Social, and 6) Evangelistic,⁹⁴ according to structural type: 1) Exposition, 2) Argument, 3) Faceting, 4) Categorizing, and 5) Analogy,⁹⁵ and according to psychological method: 1) Authoritative, 2) Persuasive, 3) Co-operative, and 4) Subversive.⁹⁶

In contrast to Broadus’ and Sangster’s more exhaustive lists, Davis offers only two forms of a sermon: 1) Functional Forms⁹⁷ and 2) Organic Form.⁹⁸ Davis also suggests five continuities of sermon, which can be understood as types of arrangement.⁹⁹ Functional form, which can be confusing due to the name Davis uses, means topical or purposeful classification of a sermon, while organic form means structural types of a sermon. Admittedly, it is unclear what connection functional forms and organic forms have and what connection organic forms and continuity of arrangement have to one another. It seems that functional form, for Davis, applies not to actual sermon form but to topical division, and organic forms seems not exactly to follow Davis’s five continuities in the organic sermon forms. Davis evaluates William N. Clow’s sermon “The Cross and the Memory of Sin” as “an organic form, not a functional form.”¹⁰⁰ However, Davis analyzes Joseph Sittler’s sermon “The Cruciform Character of Human Existence” as “propositional in structure, descriptive in method, and kerygmatic in function.”¹⁰¹ Also, Davis classifies Harry Emerson Fosdick’s sermon “Forgiveness of Sins” as displaying “organic form.”¹⁰² Admittedly, such inconsistency is confusing. This is perhaps the weakest aspect of Davis’s Organic Homiletic. Therefore, it may

be useful to attempt a clarification regarding potentially confusing terminology in Davis's work:

- 1) Functional form for Davis is a topical classification not a structural sermon form.
- 2) Davis uses the term "functional" when applying his organic process with audience, rhetorical situation and the goal of the sermon.
- 3) "Structure" and "method" mean the same thing for Davis.
- 4) For Davis, organic form and functional form are not contradictory.
- 5) The five types of organic form to which Davis refers should be understood as possibilities among limitless organic forms.
- 6) Davis uses the phrase "descriptive" in regard to types of arrangement, but it is rarely found elsewhere in this writing.
- 7) The five continuities to which Davis refers should be understood as possibilities among many more potential organic continuities which, although they may not yet exist, can nonetheless be creatively and imaginatively constructed.
- 8) Davis's statement that "form follows function," can be restated as, "form grows from content, and form is influenced by the purpose of the sermon and the rhetorical situation."

Despite these issues, Davis's organic homiletic is revolutionary in that it introduces a new way of approaching homiletics—a transition from a fixed to an open-ended methodology. Organic homiletic does not suggest the need for finding the "right" sermon form out there someplace; it leads preachers to become self-made homileticians. Davis teaches a new way for every preacher to become an authentic preacher in creating their sermon form, by letting themselves find their own "working principles." Davis stresses variables of form and freedom of form which all preachers can make through their own imagination and creativity.

Conclusion

This chapter argues that the historical context of Davis's Organic Homiletic presented in *Design for Preaching* is Romantic organic development. While Davis's thought may have been influenced by many sources, the strongest influence appears to be Romantic theory of art and literature. Although Davis never directly mentions Coleridge in *Design for Preaching*, Coleridge probably was an influence, nonetheless. Davis confesses that *Design for Preaching* is not mere "restudy and synthesis of existing texts on preaching,"¹⁰³ and that it is "¹⁰⁴the fruits of a lifelong search for light on the processes—linguistic, intellectual, and psychological—that go on in the expression of thought in general and especially in preaching." Interestingly, Davis also confesses, "I borrowed and stolen, have sucked the blood of thought, from so many."¹⁰⁵

This chapter has organized Davis's Organic Homiletic theory according to 1) Organic Synthesis, 2) Organic Form, 3) Organic Unity, 4) Organic Process, and 5) Organic Law. Like Coleridge, Davis emphasizes organic synthesis between intuition and reason. Coleridge was a restrained Romantic; consequently, Davis appears closer to Coleridge than to Wordsworth. In Davis one finds almost exactly the same organic concepts as in Coleridge. For Davis, organic synthesis is enlarged to include the particular and the general, as well as the conscious and the unconscious. Thus, for Davis, organic form also leads to a synthesis of content and form. Classical theorists believed that form is given from outside to be imitated, but organic form theorists claim that form is inseparable from content. It grows in the organic process. It grows in time and in space interacting with audience, the oral situation, the preacher's character and talents, the goal of sermon, and the wider context of the community. In that organic homiletic refuses authority of form outside preachers, it may appear to be an anarchical theory, but organic law replaces the rules of form. Organic law presupposes the law of nature. Every living being has its own inner law. For Davis, there is logic of continuity. Davis develops five continuities: inductive, deductive, logical, chronological and dramatic. Introduction and conclusion of the sermon also should follow organically this continuity so that the audience can hear an audible design in the sermon event. Davis emphasizes orality of communication. Davis analyzes several sermons as being organic and allows for a mixture and modification of forms.

While Davis offers tremendously important contributions, he does not, in the end provide a complete systematic organic homiletic. Consequently, it is to be expected that others would build on his work. The following chapter examines this process by exploring what extent the New Homiletic was influenced by Davis's *Design for Preaching* and to what degree New Homiletics utilized Davis's Organic Homiletic. Chapter IV will also survey a brief history of homiletic form from antiquity to the present, including the New Homiletic, with a comparing to "A Brief History of Form" from chapter II.

NOTES

- 1 See Park, Richard H. "Cicero and Augustine: A Comparative Study of Relation between Cicero and Augustine in Rhetoric," unpublished paper for University of California Ph.D. seminar, Classical Rhetorical Theory, Fall, 2001. The author argues for the necessity of learning from Augustine who sees rhetoric, whether Romantic rhetoric or other liberal arts, as neutral and available for Christian preachers to adopt and adapt for our holy mission, by instrumentalizing it (p.14).
- 2 Sections 4–8 represent aspects of Davis's *Design for Preaching*. This classification is strictly the design of this author and will receive further development and verification later in this work.
- 3 See Dieter, Otto A. "Arbor Picta: The Medieval Tree of Preaching," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 51:2 (1965). "That a sermon is an organic development of a potent thought in a fertile mind (p.129)." In this article, Dieter mentions Davis's homiletic theory of preaching on the "similarity" to a tree like the Medieval Tree of Preaching (p.144). Note: In an unpublished letter (March 9, 2005) to this author, Robert S. Reid, in reference to Dieter's article, notes, "the organic metaphor for preaching was so prevalent in the Medieval church...and it was a conception with which Coleridge was probably familiar and Davis rather oddly."
- 4 Fulkerson, Richard. "Composition Theory in the Eighties: Axiological Consensus and Paradigmatic Diversity," *College Composition and Communication* 41:4 (1990).
- 5 Garvie, Alfred Ernest. *The Christian Preacher* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937), p.187.
- 6 Ibid., p.207.
- 7 Ibid., p.208.
- 8 Ibid., p.209.
- 9 E.S. Shaffer, "The Hermeneutic Community: Coleridge and Schleiermacher," *The Coleridge Connection: Essays for Thomas McFarland*, ed. Richard Gravil and Molly Lefebure (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990), p.200.
- 10 See Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch, *On the Art of Writing* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1916), p.46, 47, 48, 77, 79. For Coleridge; see p.14, 177, 224 for Wordsworth.
- 11 Ibid., p. 77.
- 12 Ibid., p.14.
- 13 Ibid., p.224.
- 14 Ibid.
- 15 Davis, Henry G. "Nature, Love, and Robert Frost," in *The Scope of Grace: Essays on Nature and Grace in honor of Joseph Sittler*, ed. Phillip J. Hefner (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), p.58.
- 16 Ibid., p.51.
- 17 Ibid., p.44.

- 18 Voobus, Arthur and Henry Grady Davis, *The Gospels in Study and Preaching* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), "A Homiletical Preface," viii.
- 19 Ibid., vii.
- 20 Reid, Robert S. Unpublished letter to Richard H. Park, (March 9, 2005).
- 21 Davis, *Design for Preaching*, p.60.
- 22 Ibid., p.131.
- 23 Reid, Robert S. *The Four Voices of Preaching* (Brazos Press), forthcoming book. Cf., Halford E. Luccok, *In the Minister's Workshop* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1944), p.51.
- 24 For instance, Davis's narrative continuity has three phases (Exposition /Complication/Resolution), but it is actually two phases of problem/solving. Later Lowry's narrative homiletic seems a little more complicated than Davis's and Fosdick's. "Upsetting the Equilibrium/Analyzing the Discrepancy/ Disclosing the Clue to Resolution/Experiencing the Gospel/Anticipating the Consequences" (See Eugene L. Lowry, *The Homiletical Plot: The Sermon as Narrative Art Form* (Louisville: Westminster John Know Press, 2001), pp.27–89.
- 25 See Flower, Linda. *Problem-Solving Strategies for Writing*, 2nd ed. (New York: Harcourt, 1985), p.1. "Good writing is intensely functional. It goes beyond mere correctness to meet the need of the reader." See also Larson, Richard L. "Problem-solving, Composing, and Liberal Education," *College English* 33 (1971–2). Larson introduces problem-solving's phases: 1) Definition of the problem 2) Determination of why the problem is indeed a problem 3) An enumeration of the goals that must be served by whatever action is taken 4) Determination, where possible, of the goals which have highest priority 5) "Invention" of procedures that might attain the stated goals. 6) Prediction of the results that will follow the taking of each possible action 7) Weighing of the prediction 8) Final evaluation of the choice that seems superior. See also Berthoff, Ann E. "The Problem of Problem Solving," *College Composition and Communication* 22 (1971) and "From Problem-solving to Theory of Imagination," *College English* 33 (1971–2). See also House Elizabeth B. and William J. House, "Problem-Solving: The Debates in Composition and Psychology," *JAC* 7 (1987).
- 26 This is because Davis synthetically employs both the deductive sermon of the Old Homiletics and the inductive/narrative one of the New Homiletics. Davis explicates "deductive, inductive, logical, chronological, and dramatic continuities" (*Design for Preaching*, pp. 163–185).
- 27 Sleeth, Ronald E. "Design for Preaching: A Review," *Religion in Life*, 28 (1958–9), pp.155–6.
- 28 Randolph, David, James. *The Renewal of Preaching in the 21st Century*, (Babylon: Hanging Gardens Press, 1998). Randolph proposed using "intentionality" of the New Hermeneutic for new homiletic and also using different biblical rhetorical types, dividing direct and indirect approaches. Randolph opened a new understanding of preaching hermeneutically and introduced a biblio-rhetorical approach to homiletics. As such, Randolph may also be called forerunner of the New Homiletics.
- 29 Davis, *Design for Preaching*, p.179.
- 30 Ibid., p. 197.

- 31 Sleeth, Ronald E. "Design for Preaching: A Review" *Religion in Life* 28 (1958-9), "I find it difficult to see how delivery can be left out of such a book. Since delivery is form, then obviously delivery is part of the substance too."(p.156). Also, Davis deals with delivery when he discusses "Audible Design (p.169)." It much sounds like Ong's Orality in delivery.
- 32 Reid, Robert Stephen. "Postmodernism and the Function of the New Homiletic in Post-Christendom Congregations," *Homiletic* 20:2 (1995), p. 8. "...it is fair to claim that a central, if not the central, unifying thread in the New Homiletic is the variety of ways in which each of the theorists are intent on creating an experience for an audience."
- 33 Reid, Robert, Jeffrey Bullock, and David Fleer, "Preaching as the Creation of an Experience: The Not-So-Rational Revolution of the New Homiletic," *The Journal of Communication and Religion* 18:1 (March 1995), p.7.
- 34 Davis, *Design for Preaching*, p.245.
- 35 Ibid., p.246.
- 36 Ibid., p.247.
- 37 Ibid., p.246.
- 38 Ibid., p.8
- 39 Ibid., p.18.
- 40 Ibid., p.19-20.
- 41 Ibid., p.21
- 42 Dieter's "Tree" has problem of metaphor that has been existed always. Medieval Tree of Preaching has no expression of "seed" like Romantics which used frequently "seed" which symbolizes inner feeling from which imagination explodes outwardly like volcano.
- 43 Davis, *Design for Preaching*, p.15.
- 44 Ibid., p.21.
- 45 Ibid., p.42.
- 46 Ibid., p. 97.
- 47 Killingsworth, M. Jimmie. "Product and Process, Literacy and Orality: An Essay on Composition and Culture," *College Composition and Communication* 44 (February 1993), p. 26.
- 48 Ibid.
- 49 Ibid., pp.26-7. See also Faigley, Lester. "Competing Theories of Process: A Critique and a Proposal," *College English* 48:6 (1986).
- 50 Davis, *Design for Preaching*, p. 139.
- 51 Ibid., p.140.
- 52 Ibid., p.9.
- 53 Ibid., pp.22-23.
- 54 Bahm, Archie J. "Organicism: The Philosophy of Interdependence," p.251.
- 55 Ibid., p.252. Bahm traces his philosophy of organicism to Alfred North Whitehead's "Philosophy of Organism"(p.257).
- 56 Ibid., p.271. Cf. Parker, DeWitt H. *The Principles of Aesthetics* (New York: F. S. Crofts, 1946), Chapter 5.
- 57 Davis, *Design for Preaching*, p.23.
- 58 Ibid., p. 35.

- 59 Ibid., p.18.
- 60 See Bitzer, Lloyd F. "The Rhetorical Situation," *Contemporary Rhetorical Theory: A Reader*, ed. John Louis Lucaites, Celester Michelle Condit, and Sally Caudill (New York: The Guilford Press, 1999). Bitzer concludes, "In the best of all possible worlds, there would be communications perhaps, but no rhetoric—since exigencies would not arise. In our real world, however, rhetorical exigencies abound; the world really invites change—change conceived and effected by human agents who quite properly address a mediating audience (p.225).
- 61 See Park, Richard H. "Creativity and Homiletics: Save Preachers from Boredom!" Unpublished paper, (Berkeley: Graduate Theological Union, 2005).
- 62 This is similar to Coleridge's organic unity that utilizes both intuition and reason in the creative process and similar to Davis's using reason and intuition together in the creative process of preaching preparation.
- 63 Vernon, P.E., ed., *Creativity: Selected Readings*, (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1970), pp. 91–92; cf. Wallas, Graham. *The Art of Thought*, (London: Jonathan Cape, 1926), pp.79–96.
- 64 Wallas, Ibid., p.94.
- 65 See Childers, Jana ed., *Birthing the Sermon: Women Preachers on the Creative Process*, (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2001). It is interesting to note that the women in this book stress the importance of starting the process more than a week in advance, allowing for ample time in the "incubation" stage.
- 66 Wallas, p.94. Cf. Clark, Jere W. "On Facing the Crisis of Intellectual Poverty," *The Journal of Creative Behavior* 3:4 (Fall, 1969). Clark deplores the intellectual poverty of our society and suggests that our society needs to transition from a narrow, mechanical, static base of specialization and fragmentation to an open-ended, dynamic base of adaptability and synthesis (p.260). Note: This argument is similar to Coleridge's and Davis's urge to be creative, authentic, and organic. It introduces the metaphor of allowing preachers to get out of homiletical poverty. Also see May, Rollo. *The Courage to Create* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc, 1975), pp.40–50. May deals with the relation of creative process to using unconsciousness.
- 67 Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Worldly Preaching: Lectures on Homiletics*, ed. and trans. Clyde E. Fant (New York: Crossroad, 1991), pp.120–121.
- 68 Davis, *Design for Preaching*, p.149.
- 69 Ibid., p.168.
- 70 Ibid.
- 71 Ibid., p.173.
- 72 Ibid., p.13.
- 73 Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, ed. and trans R.P.H. Green (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995),p.199.
- 74 Davis, *Design for Preaching*, p.9.
- 75 Ibid.
- 76 Augustine, *DDC*, p.201.
- 77 Davis, *Design for Preaching*, p.9.
- 78 Ibid., "Preface," vi.
- 79 Ibid.

- 80 Ibid., pp.173–4.
- 81 See Connors, Robert J. “The Rise and Fall of the Modes of Discourse,” *College Composition and Communication* 32 (1981), and Rodgers, Paul C. Jr., “Alexander Bain and The Rise of the Organic Paragraph,” *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 51 (1965).
- 82 Davis, *Design for Preaching*, p.162. Cf., Brooks, Cleanth and Robert P. Warren, *Modern Rhetoric* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1949), p.52.
- 83 Davis, *ibid.*, p.174.
- 84 Ibid.
- 85 Ibid., p.176.
- 86 Ibid., p.174.
- 87 Ibid.
- 88 Monroe, Alan H. *Principles of Speech*, 4th edition, (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1958), pp.139–143.
- 89 Broadus, John A. *On the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1944). This book was first published in 1870, then 1898, 1926, and finally 1944, influencing Northern American preaching and other Christian mission countries including Korea, for more than one century. Broadus’ influence declined with the publication of Henry G. Davis’s *Design for Preaching* in mainline churches and further still with the publication of Haddon W. Robinson’s *Biblical Preaching: The Development and Delivery of Expository Messages* (1980).
- 90 W.E. Sangster, *The Craft of Sermon Construction and Illustration* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1951).
- 91 Broadus, pp.133–154. These three forms for a sermon influenced Korean Preaching in that Broadus was a great influence on Charles Allen Clark, a missionary and professor of preaching for 36 years in the Pyong Yang Presbyterian Seminary. Clark wrote: *Lectures on Homiletics*, trans. in Korean 3rd edition, (Seoul: The Christian Literature Society, 1990), first publication (1925), and second edition (1954). Clark borrowed heavily from Broadus’ theory classifying sermons as 1) Topical (or Title), 2) Textual, and 3) Expository. See, pp.57–69 (Topical and Textual) and pp.265–273 (Expository).
- 92 Broadus classifies principal varieties of argument: 1) Argument from Testimony, 2) Argument from Induction, 3) Argument from Analogy, and 4) Argument from Deduction, pp.167–195.
- 93 Broadus divides the sources of illustration: 1) Observation, 2) Pure Invention, 3) Science, 4) History, and 5) Scripture, pp.196–209.
- 94 Sangster, W. E. *The Craft of Sermon Construction and Illustration* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1951), pp.29–61.
- 95 Ibid., pp.62–102.
- 96 Ibid., pp.103–118.
- 97 By this Davis means: 1) Proclamation, 2) Teaching, and 3) Therapy.
- 98 Davis, *Design for Preaching*, pp.99–162. 1) A Subject Discussed, 2) A Thesis Supported, 3) A Message Illumined, 4) A Question Propounded, and 5) A Story Told.
- 99 Ibid., pp. 163–185. 1) Deductive, 2) Inductive, 3) Logical, 4) Chronological, and 5) Dramatic continuities.
- 100 See Davis, *Design for Preaching*, p.71 and p.143.
- 101 Ibid., p.149.

- 102 Ibid., p.141.
- 103 Davis, *Design for Preaching*, preface, vi.
- 104 Davis, *The Gospels in Study and Preaching*, a Homiletical Preface. vii
- 105 Davis, *Design for Preaching*, preface, vii.

CHAPTER 4

Sermon Form from Antiquity to the Present

This chapter examines organic form in the history of preaching from antiquity to the present. The goal is to demonstrate 1) that an aspect of organic form has been in existence from as far back as ancient Hebraic homilies and Hellenistic sermons and 2) that over time there has been an ongoing metamorphosis of this form.

Organic form is unpredictable and unprecedented. In the process of composition, there is variety, synthesis and (consequently) change. In the organic unity of disparities, two forms, for example, which look unrelated and opposite, can be synthesized in within the scheme of organic form. As noted in the previous chapter, Davis is able to blend deductive sermon form and narrative sermon form. The organic form, as Coleridge notes, allows for innumerable options. There is a huge potential for many varieties in one sermon form according to the text, the preacher, the content, the context, and the process.

The brief historical survey of sermon form that follows shows major elements in the exploration of sermon forms in the history of preaching. In earlier preaching (influenced by Hebraic rhetoric and Hellenistic rhetoric), organic form is not manifested in a concrete sermon form; rather, it is a principle that helps preachers to create and blend their own authentic sermon form by organic metamorphosis and synthesis. This chapter begins by looking at various periods in the history of preaching and concludes by tracing how Davis's organic form has influenced the New Homileticians, both positively and negatively. The chapter is organized by addressing the following periods and individuals: 1) The Biblical Ages and the Early Church, 2) The Middle Ages and the Reformation, 3) Modern Age (Phillips Brooks), 4) The New Homiletics (Craddock, Buttrick, Lowry, Long, Rose, and Wilson).¹

While it may seem both naïve and risky to attempt to set down a brief historical survey of sermon form, it is, nonetheless, a potentially valuable activity. Most of books on the history of preaching deal primarily with individual preachers and their theology and hermeneutics and do focus

directly on sermon form. Laying out such a history also allows one to see how Coleridge's and Davis's organic concepts fit into the larger scheme—particularly in relation to their utilization by New Homiletic theorists.

The Biblical Ages and the Early Church

Stanfield notes that, besides Romantic organic form, there are two major sermon forms: Hebraic and Hellenistic.² Another set of terms for the categories are homily and sermon. Stanfield states,

Thus these two antecedents of the art of preaching developed at the same time; yet they were independent of each other. In Christian preaching, the two streams of "speech art" were to merge. The contribution of Hebrew preaching was primarily content, i.e., Scripture. The basis for the Hebrew message was the Word of God. Ancient rhetoric made its contribution primarily to form, i.e., the rules of rhetoric.³

Authors such as Cole and Clarke argue that the homily grew out of Judaism's use of the Old Testament in the synagogue reflecting verse by verse, expository preaching; the sermon, influenced by Hellenistic rhetoric, is forensic, argumentative, and thematic preaching.⁴ In contrast to this perspective, Dargan sees three elements in the origins of Christian Preaching:

These three elements of origination, named in the ascending order of their immediacy and importance, are the ancient oratory, the Hebrew prophecy, and the Christian Gospel. From this last, as directly resting upon the second, and after a time considerably influenced by the first, came preaching as history knows it. Oratory and prophecy were preparatory and contributing forces, the gospel was the real originating cause, which took to itself elements of tendency and power from both the others.⁵

As noted in previous chapters, sermon form can be metamorphic and can blend easily; thus, it may be difficult sometimes to demarcate boundaries. Hellenistic, forensic, and thematic preaching, which were started from Paul's preaching in the New Testament, continue to develop, and the early church's dialogic homily is modified into more sophisticated, expository homily, as exemplified by Chrysostom.

It would be possible to call the prophets of Old Testament era "Romantic" preachers, because "as a divine message welled up within, they were forced to declare it."⁶ This prophet preaching is echoed in the pietism of Romanticism in that it emphasizes intuition and its volcanic outpouring of inner feeling. Brilioth summarizes characteristics of the Old Testament prophet's preaching as follows:

Prophecy has been even more significant for the tradition of the holy address and the development of veneration for the holy word. Like cultic speech, it emerged out of a sacral form, out of speaking in oracles. It placed ecstatic inspiration in the service of both religious renewal and the personal life of the spirit. In its most proper sense, prophecy asserted itself as a holy address, a compelling word of God put into the mouth of his servants and messengers. In recent biblical research it has been customary to emphasize the ecstatic and revelatory elements in the testimony of the prophets.⁷

Old Testament prophets, like later Romantics, use intuition and the unconscious. Given they may have not prepared a sermon beforehand, their preaching would have been extemporaneous, and their sermon form may have been unplanned, uncertain and unknown. Jesus also encourages this type of Romantic form of preaching as Augustine emphasizes in relation to the Holy Spirit's role in the preaching. Augustine writes,

"Do not worry about what to say or how to say it; for you will be given words to speak what to say the time comes. For it is not you who speak, but the spirit of your father who speaks within you." If the Holy Spirit speaks in those who are delivered to their persecutors for Christ's sake, why should he not also speak in those who deliver Christ to their pupils?⁸

As an Augustinian monk, Luther also sometimes follows this organic Romantic formless form of preaching.⁹ This organic, formless, and intuitional form from the Old Testament prophet continues to influence the pietistic preachers of Romanticism. Contemporary performance theorist Bozarth-Campbell states, "The Romantic theorists Schleiermacher and Schlegel believed that hermeneutics assumed elements of intuition and understanding of style, not by any rules of method, but according to the comprehending nature or re-creative art—re-experiencing the mental processes of the author."¹⁰ It may be plausible that, where the unconscious and intuition work together for an authentic and organic creation of content and form, the Spirit does there its work.¹¹ Romantic organic concepts enable preachers to be free from shackles and the controls of reason and the conscious; they also enable preachers to dare to attempt "formless" form which grows inside them.

Unlike the prophets, the scribes of synagogue imitated their preaching from the tradition and the past like the imitation theorists of Neoclassicism. The scribes "interpreted the history, the law, and the prophets, and from these Hebrew preachers came the term *homily*, meaning a talk based on Scripture."¹² Waznak introduces the characteristics of an ancient homily. He writes,

It was Origen (185–254) who for the first time in Christian usage supplied a definition to the word “homily.” He called his thirty-nine discourses on Luke *homilia*. They (1) were preached in a liturgy, (2) had a prophetic quality, (3) were based on a running or continuous exposition of the biblical text, and (4) were conversational in tone. Origen’s pastoral zeal for the spiritual needs of the people was more important to him than the exaggerated rhetoric of his day (the Second Sophistic). He made a distinction between *logos* or *sermo* and *homilia* or *tractatus*. *Logos* followed the shape of classical rhetoric, while the form of *homilia* was direct and free. *Homilia* was a popular, allegorical exposition and application of Scripture. It had its roots in the hermeneutical practices of midrash haggadah or narrative expansion that commented on Scripture through imaginative instruction and exhortation.¹³

This classification of two sermon forms as *homilia* versus *sermo* significantly influences the history of sermon form. As shown above, the homily has to do with narrative sermon form because it respects the biblical literary shape to follow. Also, homily has a “conversational” character. Additionally this homily is related to organic form in terms of what Waznak terms, “its apparent artlessness, which marked off the homily from studied and stylized speech.”¹⁴ This “artless” or “formless” form is organic form. It goes through a metamorphosis, and variations, which were before unknown and nonexistent, emerge. Organic form also has its own form which grows organically from content, context and process. For this reason, one could argue that a homily is close to organic form in principle. Lienhard says of the homilies of Origen,

They were utterly lacking in rhetorical polish, and showed the simplicity that led the church to choose to call discourse on the scriptures *homilia*. After the reading, and with little or no introduction, Origen would begin to explain the scripture, verse by verse. He dealt first with the literal sense, then with any spiritual senses he discovered. He always tried to find a way for his hearers to apply the passage to their lives. He ended his homilies, sometimes quite abruptly, with a doxology.¹⁵

One can detect violent hostilities between liberal and evangelical homiletics, between New Homiletics and Old Homiletics, and between inductive and narrative approach to sermon form versus a deductive expository sermon form. However, it seems that Augustine holds up rhetorical form as neutral, as that which can be used for either good or bad.¹⁶ Above all, as shown in the ancient history of homily, expository, verse by verse sermon form is kin to narrative and conversational sermon form. In terms of homiletic form, there is no opponent. Allen and Bartholomew support this claim. They write,

A preacher derives great benefit from such a large array of approaches. He or she can select or create a homiletical form that serves the needs of a particular sermon to a particular congregation in a particular situation. We can even imagine congregational settings in which the structure of three points and a poem can offer an articulate and evocative homiletical witness.¹⁷

There is no need to shrink from learning from other alternatives and methods of sermon form because of one's theological position. Even though liberals may have neglected this expository, verse by verse, form just as the evangelicals have neglected an inductive or narrative approach, Allen and Bartholomew continue by encouraging a broader acceptance of form. They write,

However, one historic voice has been strangely quiet in the current homiletical revival in the pulpits of the long-established denominations. To our knowledge, few in these churches are giving significant attention to the sermon that moves through the text verse by verse, essentially providing a running commentary on the text. This type of preaching goes by different names in different eras and in different books and articles about preaching. It is sometimes called expository preaching, or textual preaching, or continuous exposition, or verse by verse preaching...Preaching verse by verse has shown remarkable power to help congregations in many different times and places to encounter the living God.¹⁸

In the Old Testament, there are poets, the wise, scribes, and prophets; each perform his or her own function for God and God's people. Holistic ministries utilize a wide range of human faculties of persuasion genres such as narrative, poem, wisdom, history, prophetic argument, and dialogues. Likewise, in the New Testament, according to Amos Wilder, the same biblical forms of dialogue, story, and parable are utilized by the Gospels.¹⁹

Wilson addresses Paul's argumentative sermon form in the New Testament. "Foremost among these is that Paul's preaching differs radically from the pre-gospel preaching of his contemporaries in the Jerusalem-centered church. It is primarily centered in conceptual argument, not narratives which dominate the Jesus traditions."²⁰ Also, Kennedy notes the influence of classical rhetoric in the Paul's letters.

Some biblical scholars see in his epistles a strong influence of the arrangement of contents, argumentation, and figures of speech of classical rhetoric which also appear in the diatribes of Stoic and Cynic philosophers. The Epistle to the Galatians, for example, can be analyzed in terms of an "apology" of the classical sort, with exordium, narration, proposition, proof, and conclusion, and rhetorical structure and devices have been seen in some of his other letters as well.²¹

These streams of speech create the Christian sermon form, and continue to influence each age in accordance with its rhetorical situation. When apologetics are needed to defend Christian truth and gospel, then argumentative, forensic *sermo* are utilized; when what is needed is strengthening of those who already believed, then expository, epideictic *homilia* is developed. These sermon-forms historically alternate with each other depending on the exigencies of a given age.

A look at the early history of preaching shows that there is a degree to which preaching form has always been malleable. The differing concepts of homily and sermon are an example of the synthesis that occurred. Pfeiffer notes the cultural mixing of Judaism and Hellenism that he calls “Hellenistic Judaism.” He states that “Greece was bound to introduce Western modes of thought alien to Hebrew and Aramaic.”²² As the cultural amalgamation of Hebraism and Hellenism occurs creating the new species of Hellenistic Judaism, likewise sermon form begins to draw upon the distinctly different resources of *homilia* or *sermo*, according to varying particularities. For example, Gregory of Nazianzus uses *sermo*, or discourses (*logoi*), while Basil the Great and Gregory of Nyssa employ traditional *homilia*.²³ After the three Cappadocian fathers, John Chrysostom of Antioch continues expository homilies “on consecutive sections of entire biblical books rather than on pericopes appointed for the liturgical lectionary.”²⁴

Augustine synthesizes three different styles: teach/prove (*docere/provare*), delight (*delectare*), and move (*flectere/movere*).²⁵ Augustine teaches that the “Christian orator should not only teach his listeners so as to impart instruction, and delight them so as to hold their attention, but also move them so as to conquer their minds.”²⁶ Additionally, Augustine provides organic synthesis and organic metamorphosis, stating that “nobody should think that it is against the rules of the art to combine these styles. On the contrary, our discourse should be varied by using all three, as far as is possible without impropriety.”²⁷ Therefore, one can argue that the origins of sermon form of Christian preaching are Hebraic *homilia* and Hellenistic *sermo* and an amalgam of both. From these main streams of form, Christian sermon form has grown and developed.

Romanos (490–560) from Constantinople is considered an important forerunner, from antiquity, of the narrative sermon form. Wilson introduces Romanos’ “poem-sermon” and “story-sermon” by saying,

Romanos’ poem-sermons have an introduction followed usually by twenty-four stanzas of identical design, even to the number of syllables in each line. The preacher-narrator takes us from beginning to end through the biblical story being preaching. Along the way he is also the voice for two or three other characters or

groups. Each character or group is given a sustained focus and opportunity to speak. The drama and the theology are of the utmost simplicity and clarity. Information and moral instruction are placed in the mouth of one of the speakers. By the end of sermon, the congregation has heard the choir sing the same refrain, which functions as the sermon's central idea, at least twenty-five times and would be joining in.²⁸

An examination of sermon form during the biblical ages and the early church reveals the initial and interactive development of the Hebraic dialogic, expository and the Hellenistic forensic, argumentative sermon. From the start, sermon form has been in the process of metamorphosis and synthesis as a part of an ongoing quest to create a proper form that fits each individual situation of preaching.

The Middle Ages and the Reformation

A look at preaching form in the Middle Ages reveals a continuing tension between the expository homily and the forensic topical sermon (also known as the university sermon). During the early Middle Ages, since clergy were not well educated, the primary manner of preaching is for priests to read from homiliaries, collections of homilies (verse-by-verse expositions and applications) designed for use in a liturgical setting. Edwards notes,

The result is that the only new homiletical materials created during the period were not new sermons but collections of patristic sermons called homiliaries by later scholars. "Homiliaries" are obviously collections of homilies, of verse-by-verse expositions and applications of scriptural readings from the liturgical lectionary. Such reflections on the biblical passages for the particular day in the church's calendar were the most common form taken by the preaching of the Latin Fathers. Homiliaries were not devoted to the sermons of any single one of the Fathers, nor were they arranged topically. Rather, they were anthologies following the liturgical year and incorporating sermons by a number of different preachers.²⁹

Moving further into the Middle Age, with the advent of greater educational opportunities for clergy, this verse-by-verse exposition, liturgical sermon form comes under attack by those who would argue for a more argumentative topical sermon. Such a form reflects the forensic rhetoric of monastic preachers. Reflecting on this period, Broadus states that there were three sermon forms—topical, textual, and expository.³⁰ Alan of Lille, a Cistercian, French monk from this period, is a good example of a proponent of the "textual" sermon. (Note: The introduction of this "new" form is another example of organic metamorphosis and organic synthesis.) Alan

synthesizes an expository form and a topical form together; the amalgam is a “textual” sermon form.³¹ Edwards writes of this textual form,

One of the ways in which Alan’s *Art of Preaching* most resembles the treatises that are to follow is in his insistence that every sermon should develop from a theological authority. For practical purposes, this means that sermons should be based on biblical texts. An “authority” is a quotation that authorizes an assertion a speaker or writer makes, functioning almost as a proof text.³²

In a textual sermon, an expository homily is merged with argument and proof. Whereas early Middle Ages expository homilies has multiple topics and themes, proclamation in the textual form has only one theme. The goal is to move from plural points to a singular point in order to become more persuasive in regard to a main idea. Edwards notes that, “After centuries of expository preaching in patristic homilies, textual preaching now emerges, reflecting as it does the preoccupation of the age with argument and proof.”³³

Wilson’s comments on textual form undergird the argument that an appreciation of form that later evolves into the Romantic notion of form, exists as an extension of preaching form as early as the Middle Ages. He writes,

In many of the homiletical manuals the sermon began with a scriptural quotation, a statement of the theme (*prothema* or *antethema*), and a prayer. What we would consider to be the actual sermon then began and included a restatement of the theme in an introduction (*introductio thematis*) and a division of the argument (*divisio thematis*)—often using rhyming key words from the theme—usually into three points with subdivisions. Sermons were evaluated in part by (1) the unity of focus on one main idea, (2) the manner of the division, and (3) the proof of the argument (*confirmatio*). It is this point-form of preaching which has passed down to the modern day.³⁴

In contrast to those who employ the form of the Cistercian textual sermon, others of this period follow what became known as the Rule of St. Benedict—the form that evolved to become the standard for most of Western monasticism. This form of homily interprets biblical passages analogously to apply to the hearer’s spiritual life. Edwards notes that in this way the preaching is more like homilies of the fathers than like the thematic sermons that were soon to characterize university preaching.³⁵

After the Benedictine homily, the Order of Preachers of Dominic develops a most thematic, topical, and forensic sermon form. Dominican preachers, in critique of a formless homily form, develops a sermon form which resembles the lecture of the university; consequently, it is named the “university sermon.” This sermon form radically synthesizes the existing

topical and thematic sermon forms that had been influenced by Aristotelian logic. Once again, one witnesses an instance of organic metamorphosis in regard to the blending of different forms.

Edwards observes that “the taste for thematic sermons reflects the excitement over dialectic that characterized European consciousness after the logical works of Aristotle had been acquired from the Arabs.”³⁶ The topical sermon form is the most sophisticated choice for the Dominican university sermon.³⁷ The thoroughness of this form that encourages the making of logical sub-points and subdivisions later influences the topical sermon form utilized during the age of Rationalism and during the Evangelical and Revival movements. This form does not utilize multiple biblical passages; rather, it uses one verse from scripture from which a long lecture is deployed. Edward writes,

With the preaching of the friars there developed the first real homiletical form that was not just a shapeless verse-by-verse comment on a passage from the Bible. Each sermon was constructed on the basis of a single verse of the Bible that was broken down into its component parts. A manuscript illumination from the time sees an analogy to the development of a sermon in the branching of a tree. The text or theme of the sermon was divided into a number of parts, usually three, and these were, in turn, subdivided into three sub-points. The initial division of the theme was generally preceded by an introduction that was in effect a mini-sermon on another theme making the same points as the main one. Each of the affirmation made in the sermon was expected to be backed up by the quotation of authorities, biblical first, then patristic and classical. Each subdivision had to be “dilated” or developed using established techniques, including illustration by *exempla*. This type of sermon has been given various designations, such as artistic and modern. Later scholars have called them university, scholastic, or school sermons, but thematic seems to be less misleading than any of the other designation. It has been thought by some that the thematic structure would be appreciated only by a learned audience, but surviving popular sermons show that the form had great appeal to ordinary people as well.³⁸

Thus, one can see the logical evolution of this apologetic, argumentative form for preaching, with its points and subdivisions set to defend truth. It is this same highly rationalistic and argumentative sermon form which later becomes foundational in the contemporary Old Homiletic—the same form that comes under attack from Romantic preachers and later New Homileticians.

Pieterse points out one of the reasons that this form is eventually challenged: it is exceptionally rigid. He writes,

In practice, this sermon form (topical) is applied to every literary genre in Scripture. The message of the portion selected—whether discourse, narrative, proverb, poem, parable or whatever—is pinpointed by the analytical-synthetic method and then argumentatively conveyed by this form of sermon. It is highly questionable whether ones can apply this form indiscriminately to any subject matter.”³⁹

The Franciscan Order of Preachers rejects the form for a different reason. St. Francis of Assisi objects to the scholastic sermon with its endless divisions and points. He prefers the *sermo humilis* since the goal of his preaching is bring good news to “the unlearned people through visible and simple things.”⁴⁰ In order to reach the simple people to whom he preached, Francis draws upon the lyrics of the popular songs of his day. His concern for the listener evolves into a Franciscan form of preaching distinguished by its simplicity, concreteness, immediacy, and affectivity.⁴¹

This Franciscan form of preaching also develops in Rhineland mystics of early 14th century in Germany. Rhineland Dominicans join the revolt against the form of the university sermon. Edwards notes that, representative of the German adaptation, Meister Eckhart “taught his views by sermons that followed the pattern of a homily, with continuous exegesis of a passage.”⁴²

The pendulum begins to swing again when there rises up those who would revolt against the revolvers. There are some who believe that the Franciscan form is perverted when used to excess. For example, John Wycliffe, a forerunner of the Reformation challenges the form. “He (Wycliffe) began to attack the friars, being especially critical of their preaching. He held that their *exempla* were often told more for entertainment than for edification and were sometimes off color and that the friars favored thematic sermons over the patristic form of homily that he preached.”⁴³ It can also be argued that Wycliffe’s challenge also involves a concern to control a monopoly on authoritative sermon form.

During the Reformation, Erasmus, reflecting a Humanist point of view, argues that “the adversarial nature of forensic oratory made it inappropriate for Christian preaching, but that both deliberative and epideictic sermons could be preached.”⁴⁴ Luther, the most influential figure of the Reformation in regard to preaching, contributes a new sermon form which fits his own individuality and circumstance. In Luther, one again has the opportunity to see sermon metamorphosis and synthesis at work in the historical development of sermon form. Although Luther begins with medieval thematic sermons, “he went on to develop a form that was unique. It resembles that of patristic homilies but concentrated not so much on individual verses as what he considered to be the ‘center of meaning,’ the ‘heart point,’ or the ‘kernel’ of the passage’.”⁴⁵ Luther’s sermon form

resembles verse-by-verse expository homily, but it has a main idea, reminiscent of the textual sermon form. Some Luther scholars might argue that Luther's sermon form is a precursor of the formless form later to be associated with organic form of the Romantic period. Edwards writes,

Having identified that, he would develop an outline that would enable him to get the point across. Yet he did not prepare by writing out a manuscript; instead, he immersed himself in the text and then preached extemporaneously, beginning with a statement of the *Herzpunkt* and going from there to extract that meaning from his text. In the pulpit he would have no more than a brief outline of what he meant to say, his *Konzept*, but he departed from that often enough for someone to say that the structure of his sermons was one of "heroic disorder." His most common principle of organization was an antithesis.⁴⁶

Although in some respects Luther's sermon form is similar to the textual form described above, it also includes a sense of randomness. Not unlike the organic form later promoted by Davis, Luther's "heroic disorder" has its own inner law of sermon logic not given from outside but grown from within the preacher.⁴⁷ In this sense, one may go so far as to call Luther an organic preacher.

Unlike Luther, Calvin uses a more humanistic, exegetical sermon form for a homily,⁴⁸ because Calvin's "humanistic training made him an extraordinary well-equipped exegete for his Day."⁴⁹ Calvin follows the expository sermon form of patristic homily. This is the form that will later influence Barth,⁵⁰ who opposes the Greco-Roman forensic, argumentative sermon form in favor of an expository, formless/artless, homily form of the early fathers.⁵¹

In England, under the influence of Erasmus, another example of organic metamorphosis and organic synthesis occurs in the blending of "exposition of homily and classical rhetoric's disposition."⁵² Puritanism, influenced by Calvin's expository form for the homily, provides a major influence on preaching form in England. This Puritan sermon form then influences the sermon form utilized in early American preaching. Perkins explicates the characteristics of Puritan sermon form:

1. To read the Text distinctly out of the canonical scripture.
2. To give the sense and understanding of it being read by the scripture itself.
3. To collect a few and profitable points of doctrine out of the natural sense.
4. To apply (if he [sic] has the gift) the doctrine rightly collected to the manners of men [sic] in a simple and plain speech.⁵³

This expository sermon form becomes one of the main sermon forms in that part of the American preaching experience that was influenced by the Puritans. Broadus embraces this expository Puritan sermon form in the homiletic he promotes.

Modern Age

The Age of Reason & Enlightenment brings with it a neoclassical emphasis on authority of classical manuals of rhetoric. A concern for rationalistic thought aligns nicely with the forensic preaching form, descended from Hellenistic rhetoric, which is dedicated to proof and argument. This form includes “exordium, explication, proposition, partition, argumentation, application, and conclusion. Inevitably, such sermons were topical, constructed around the need to discuss a subject rather than to expound scripture.”⁵⁴

In reaction to what is considered to be the excesses of the approach of Rationalism, Romanticism (the Age of Feeling) emerges. The Romantic preachers stress an inwardly subjective appropriation of the Christian faith rather than objective appeals to scripture and tradition.⁵⁵ Beneath the umbrella of Romanticism, Evangelical preaching provides still another example of organic metamorphosis and organic synthesis. The sermon form utilized by the Romantic evangelist preachers maintains a rationalistic, argumentative topical form, while, at the same time, embracing a Romantic concern for an intuitional appeal to the audience. Whitefield, an Episcopalian preacher with a Calvinistic theology,⁵⁶ and Wesley are examples from this period who embrace this type of sermon form. Edward writes,

“Whitefield created the basic pattern of evangelistic preaching. The sermon was usually based on a short text and, after an introduction and some background; there was an announcement of the points that would be made. After that, the sermon developed topically, with each of the heads having several subheadings, all leading to a conclusion. So far, the evangelistic sermon followed neoclassical lines. But the greatest dread of the neoclassicists was “enthusiasm.”⁵⁷

The choice of sermon form adopted by the Romantic evangelistic preachers is, in a way, ironic. One would expect that a revolt against the Rationalists should include a revolt against the rationalistic sermon form focusing upon the use of argument in topical sermon, but Romantic evangelistic preaching embraces this aspect of the rationalistic method combining it with a concern for intuition within the sermon. The result is

argumentative, evangelistic, and intuitional preaching. Rationalism and Romanticism are both represented in this kind of preaching. Campbell, a Scottish preacher and rhetorician (1719–1796), provides a good example of this mixture of sermon form in his *Philosophy of Rhetoric*.⁵⁸ He synthesizes rationalistic argument and Romantic imagination; he combines reason and intuition to produce an amalgam of sermon form. Edwards notes an example of Campbell's multi-faceted concerns in a sermon by observing how Campbell argued for "A theory of persuasion that moved through four steps: instruction, imagination, passions, and motivation of the will."⁵⁹ In a way, Campbell anticipates Coleridge's synthesis of intuition and reason. In regard to the discussion in chapter two concerning Coleridge's possible sources, it is possible to add Campbell to the list of those who have may have exerted some influence. Coleridge's famous discussion of imagination and fancy is even present, in a similar form, in Campbell's work.

The movement through imagination was a key because it permitted the mind to conceive of things with which it was not familiar. It is to that faculty that fables, parables, allegories, and poetry are addressed...Thus it is through the imagination that the emotions are engaged. In this way Campbell understood persuasion to depend on a combination of strong rational arguments and closely related appeals to the passions. His understanding of reasoning was not the classical dependence on syllogisms but a more empirical approach consistent with developing scientific thought.⁶⁰

If Campbell is a possible source for Coleridge, it is also possible that Empiricist John Locke (1632–1704) of England may have influenced Campbell. Campbell blends intuition, not with syllogistic logic, but with empirical logic.⁶¹ For this reason, a case can be made that the subsequent "inductive" sermon form that emerges in the New Homiletic may be traced to Campbell, in that he combines empirical rational argument with imagination and intuition.

In Campbell's disciple Richard Whatley, the pendulum of sermon form swings again to the side of Rationalism, as Whatley serves as a strong advocate for logical argumentation in sermon form. However, the pendulum swings again to the side of Romanticism, as Whately's student Henry Newman emphasizes imagination over the certainty of logic.⁶² For Newman, preaching should employ a religious rhetoric of probabilities rather than one of logical proofs. The pendulum swings quite far back to Rationalism in the work of another of Whately's students: Baptist homiletician and rhetorician John Broadus. Broadus' choice in sermon form reflects a prevalent concern in the Modern age. The church, in general, becomes involved in many controversies: natural vs. supernatural, liberal vs. fundamental, and creation

vs. evolution.⁶³ In the face of enemies, once again forensic rhetoric of Hellenism becomes desirable. Pieterse observes this to be part of the reason for a resurgence of dominance of topical sermon form during this period.⁶⁴ Broadus' sermon form follows a classical rhetoric forensic design: 1) Explanation, 2) Argument, 3) Illustration, and 4) Application. He also encourages a variety of arguments: 1) Argument from Testimony, 2) Argument from Induction, 3) Argument from Analogy, and 4) Argument from Deduction.⁶⁵ However, even though it may seem that Broadus swings the pendulum exceptionally far to the Rationalistic side, with his heavy emphasis on argument, nonetheless, the pendulum moves a bit from this extreme when he suggests the potential for some variety in preaching by introducing three different sermon forms: Topical, Textual, and Expository.⁶⁶

Phillips Brooks

Within this brief history of sermon form, it is important to stop, as a part of examining of the Modern Age, to focus upon a particular preacher who can be called a forefather of Henry Davis. Phillip Brooks (1835–1893) is a contemporary of Broadus but is his opposite in regard to an opinion of what constitutes appropriate sermon form.

Hethcock describes Brooks' sermon form as "atypical."⁶⁷ Indeed, Brooks' form is certainly not typical of the kind of form proposed by Broadus; since it is influenced by Romantic organic form, it is considered by some to be formless and artless. Reno argues that 19th century Romanticism influenced Brooks specifically in the form of the great Romantic preacher, Horace Bushnell (1802–1876).⁶⁸ Bushnell, like Coleridge, encourages using head and heart together but to rely more on intuition:

Intellectual doubts continued for some time, but his ship was launched; he was headed for the open sea. Henceforth he was to be guided by heart as well as by head, to rely more on feeling, on moral intuition, on observation and experience, than on cold, intellectual reasoning and logic that draw relentless conclusions despite the warm, quivering protest of the moral sentiments, and spin lofty metaphysical speculations with little meaning for life.⁶⁹

Reno summarizes Brooks' preaching that emphasizes Romantic intuition rather than reason:

The first and most important change occurred in what we might call religious epistemology. As Harp's fine study shows convincingly, Brooks was greatly influenced by nineteenth-century Romanticism. The effect was to turn him away from doctrinal systems and toward religious feelings. In his influential reflections on

the task of preaching, Brooks argues against expository preaching that relies upon doctrine. Instead, for Brooks, the essence of good preaching is “truth through personality.” The authenticity, sincerity, and honesty of the preacher serve as the core of evangelism. The preacher does not just bear witness to some creed—he bears witness to the truths that live in his heart and, in so doing, communicates these living truths to the hearts of others.⁷⁰

At a glance, this position of Brooks appears closer to Wordsworth rather than Coleridge in that Brooks places more emphasis on inner feelings and its uncontrolled flow through the preacher’s personality.⁷¹ One hears echoes of Schlegel, Coleridge and Davis in Brooks in regard to the need for each preacher to create his or her own individual sermon form. Brooks writes,

Nay, we may carry this farther. No live man at any one moment is just the same as himself at any other moment, nor does he see truth always alike, nor do men always look to him the same; therefore, in his sermons there must be the same general identity combined with perpetual variety which there is in his life. His sermons will be all alike and yet unlike each other. And the making of every sermon, while it may follow the same general rules, will be a fresh and vital process, with the zest and freedom of novelty about it. This is the first thing that I wish to say. Establish this truth in your minds and then independence comes. Then you can stand in the right attitude to look at rules of sermon-making which come out of other men’s experience. You can take them as helpful friends and not as arrogant masters.⁷²

One can get a sense of Brooks’ resistance to the mechanical uncreative “trained” preachers versus creative and imaginative “educated” preachers by looking backwards at Brooks through the eyes of Joseph Sittler, Lutheran theologian and preacher (1904–1987). Sittler writes,

“College faculty should be educated persons. This is often not the case. Many of them are trained—not educated. You can train dogs to jump, and you can train people to report what is going on in chemistry and transmit that information. But education means training the mind to unfold to the multiple facets of human existence with some appreciation, eagerness and joy. It is, in essence, the opposite of being dull. We’ve got plenty of trained, dull people on our faculties, but not many educated people.”⁷³

One can almost imagine these words of Sittler coming from Brooks. The concern is similar to Brooks’ concern between “product” and “process” in homiletic pedagogy. Brooks argues that preachers need to be more inventive and creative rather than just copying models as mechanically trained technicians. Brooks states,

The lack of flexibility in the preacher, resulting in the lack of variety in the sermon, has very much to do with our imperfect education. The true result of education is to

develop in the individual that of which I have been speaking, the clear consciousness of identity, together with a wide range of variety. The really educated man will be always distinctly himself and yet never precisely the same that he was at any other moment. His personality will be trained both in the persistency of its central stock and in its susceptibility and responsiveness to manifold impressions. He will have at once a stronger stand and a wider play of character. But an uneducated man will be either monotonously and doggedly the same, or else full of fickle alteration. The defects of our education are seen in the way in which it sometimes produces the narrow and obstinate specialist, sometimes the vague and feeble amateur in many works, but not often the strong man who has at once clear individuality and wide range of sympathy and action.⁷⁴

Brooks suggests a sermon form that does not neglect inner law. Like Coleridge and Davis, Brooks stresses an “organic law,” rather than the kind of rules that seek to exert external control. Brooks writes,

One prevalent impression about sermons which prevails now in reaction from an old and disagreeable method is, I think, mistaken. In the desire to make a sermon seem free and spontaneous there is a prevalent dislike to giving it its necessary formal structure and organism. The statement of the subject, the division into heads, the recapitulation at the end, all the scaffolding and anatomy of a sermon is out of favor, and there are many very good jests about it. I can only say that I have come to fear it less and less. The escape from it must be not negative but positive. The true way to get rid of the boniness of your sermon is not by leaving out the skeleton, but by clothing it with flesh. True liberty in writing comes by law, and the more thoroughly the outlines of your work are laid out the more freely your sermon will flow, like an unwasted stream between its well-built banks.⁷⁵

Brooks’ advice to preachers is to, “give your sermon an orderly consistent progress, and do not hesitate to let your hearers see it distinctly, for it will help them first to understand and then to remember what you say.”⁷⁶ Brooks notes the close relationship of preaching to art; he writes, “Let your pulpit be to you what his studio is to the artist, or his court room to the lawyer, or his laboratory to the chemist.”⁷⁷ Again, like Schlegel, Coleridge and Davis, Brooks refuses to rely on generic, universal sermon forms. For Brooks, every pattern of sermon forms needs to be shaped by preachers own situations. He argues,

“The first good consequence of the emphatic statement that a sermon is to be considered solely with reference to its proper purposes will be in a new and larger freedom for the preacher. We make the idea of a sermon too specific, wishing to conform it to some pre-established type of what a sermon ought to be. There is nothing which a sermon ought to be except a fit medium of truth to men. There is no model of a sermon so strange and novel, so different from every pattern upon which sermons have been shaped before,

that if it became evident to you that that was the form through which your message which you had to tell would best reach the men to whom you had to tell it, it would not be your right, nay, be your duty to preach your truth in that new form”⁷⁸

While Brooks is clearly a proponent for organic form, he also displays the capacity for organic metamorphosis and organic synthesis. In “The Sermon: A Harmonious Blend,”⁷⁹ he suggests blending different kinds of sermon forms. He advises preachers to blend the expository homily with the topical sermon. For Brooks, a discreet classification of a sermon form is of little importance. Brooks prophetically argues:

I am inclined to think that the idea of a sermon is so properly a unit, that a sermon involves of necessity such elements in combination, the absence of any one of which weakens the sermon-nature, that the ordinary classifications of sermons are of little consequence. We hear of expository preaching and topical sermons, of practical sermons, or hortatory discourses, each separate species seeming to stand by itself. It seem as if the preacher were expected to determine each week what kind of sermon the next Sunday was to enjoy and set himself deliberately to produce it. It may be well, but I say frankly that to my mind the sermon seems a unit, and that no sermon seems complete that does not include all these elements, and that the attempt to make a sermon of one sort alone mangles the idea and produces a one-sided thing.⁸⁰

While at times Brooks sounds like the radical, unbridled Romantics of Wordsworth’s ilk, at other times he appears to be a restrained, Coleridgean Romantic encouraging the use of all the many different faculties of rhetorical appeal: heart, conscious and reason. Brooks asserts that each rhetorical appeal has its own rhetorical situation in which it best fits for the achievement of rhetorical goal in mind:

Now here we have the suggestions of three different sermons. The message which we have to bring is the same message, but we bring it to three different doors of the same manhood which it desires to enter. And one preacher will bring his message oftenest to one door, appealing mostly in his sermons to the soul, or to the conscience, or to the practical sense. And one congregation or on generation will have one door more open than the others, its circumstances in some way making it most approachable upon that side. Here is the free room for the personal differences of men to play within the great unity of the sermon idea.⁸¹

Brooks appreciates the potential depth of a rhetorical situation to which each appeal may be applied.⁸² He sees that the preacher’s choices of form should be different according to different audiences and according to different generations.

It is interesting to note that Brooks actually shows even more concern than Davis for the role of the audience in regard sermon form. For Brooks,

sermon form should not be a product of the individual preacher's heart to the point that it neglects the audience and the importance of its relation to the form of the sermon. Long's critique of Davis is that, "What is largely missing from Davis's equation, however, is the somewhat messier actuality of the listening context"⁸³ Such a critique cannot be as easily applied to Brooks. Brooks writes,

"The real question about a sermon is, not whether it is extemporaneous when you deliver it to your people, but whether it ever was extemporaneous, whether there ever was a time when the discourse sprang freshly from your heart and mind. The main difference in sermons is that some sermons are, and other sermons are not, conscious of an audience. The main question about sermons is whether they feel their hearers. If they do, they are enthusiastic, personal, and warm. If they do not, they are calm, abstract, and cold. But that consciousness of an audience is something that may come into the preacher's study."⁸⁴

Reno points out another potential anarchical danger of free expression of inner feeling in Romantic preaching.

We can recognize that the emphasis on feeling has produced a remarkable spiritual self-indulgence in institutions such as the contemporary Episcopal Church. We can see how Brooks' vision of preaching as an expression of "personality" leads to the arrogant posturing of "prophetic" preachers who parade their unreflective progressive sensibilities as oracles of the divine.⁸⁵

This brief historical survey of sermon form has so far shown that sermon form is not a fixed product but is always changing, like in the process of metamorphosis. Sermon form need not be seen as a fixed given located outside the preacher. The varying resources received from the influences of Hebraism and Hellenism may be used to create a form that addresses a specific rhetorical situation and a particular rhetorical goal.

The New Homiletic

As this brief history turns to look at the 20th century and the New Homiletics, particular attention is given to exploring how Davis's synthetic (not divided) and organic (not imitating) homiletic influences the work of key writers in the New Homiletics. Niedenthal notes the impact that Davis has on 20th century homiletics, noting that *Design for Preaching* has been "one of the most widely used textbooks in homiletics in the last thirty years. Many contemporary issues in homiletical thought and research may be found in

embryonic form in Davis's work."⁸⁶ Niedenthal acknowledges that the themes and concerns latent in Davis are developed by contemporary homileticians—for example, narrativity, images, metaphors and poetic language, form and movement of thought.⁸⁷ Ironically, Niedenthal does not point to evidence of Davis's synthetic and organic theory being developed in the New Homiletics. Rose also acknowledges Davis's profound influence on the 20th century. She observes that "while the first half of this (20th) century could be designated the Broadus era,"⁸⁸

In 1958, a second era began with the publication of H. Grady Davis's *Design for Preaching*. Before long this book had ousted Broadus's as the leading textbook. In a survey of preaching professors in 1974, over half of the respondents selected Davis's *Design for Preaching* as their textbook of choice. Between 1958 and 1974, the earlier consensus that had looked to Broadus to define the tasks of preaching had dissolved and a new consensus had formed around Davis.⁸⁹

While the Davis text was the most popular in 1974, by 1984, its dominance has waned. Although the Davis's dominance dissipates, no other single textbook rises to take its place.⁹⁰ It seems that, after Davis, homiletics is fractionized, propagating into new and innumerable species—something which, in itself, is quite organic. The remainder of this brief history focuses on the way in which central figures utilize (or perhaps under-utilize) Davis.

Fred B. Craddock

One can clearly see traces of Coleridge's and Davis's organic thinking in Craddock. However, while, as Rose points out, Craddock "popularized" Davis's inductive form,⁹¹ Craddock certainly does not embrace all of Davis's appreciation for an organic homiletic. Whereas Davis continues to embrace deductive argument as one possibility for his organic form, Craddock, like Wordsworth, revolts against authoritarian monopoly of the deductive form calling for "abolition."⁹² At the same time, Craddock does not lobby for another form (other than deductive) to serve as the only form to be used by preachers. Craddock writes,

"While the guidelines suggested may inform a variety of sermon shapes, this in no way implies that the method discussed here is *the* method. In fact, forms of preaching should be as varied as the forms of rhetoric in the New Testament, or as the purpose of preaching or as the situations of those who listen."⁹³

Craddock speaks in favor of using a variety of sermon forms allowing the biblical text, the goal of the preaching, and the rhetorical situation of the

audience to drive the choice for a particular sermon. Craddock demonstrates an instance of organic metamorphosis when he says, "Communication may be narrative-like and yet contain a rich variety of materials: poetry, polemic anecdote, humor, exegetical analysis, commentary."⁹⁴ Craddock instructs preachers to select a form congenial to the purpose of the preacher. While such an approach may appear to be in complete opposition to the Romantic organic revolt against standards of form, Craddock, nonetheless, believes there is value in working with standard forms; consequently, he suggests several sermon models which the preacher may employ and imitate in molding a sermon. Craddock writes,

"First, the forms of which we speak are and have been for centuries the common store of writers and public speakers. In other words, these structures have demonstrated repeatedly that they can carry the burden of truth with clarity, thoroughness, and interest, and, therefore, have come to be regarded as standard. From such a supply of forms, many of us recognize and perhaps have used some of the following: 1) What is it? What is it worth? How does one get it? 2) Explore, explain, apply, 3) The problem, the solution, 4) What it is not, what it is, 5) Either/or, 6) Both/and, 7) Promise, fulfillment, 8) Ambiguity, clarity, 9) Major premise, minor premise, conclusion, 10) Not this, nor this, nor this, but this, 11) The flashback (from present to past to present) and 12) From the lesser, to the greater."⁹⁵

With these recommendations, Craddock remains consistent with an appreciation for a neoclassical imitation theory of form. This constitutes an example of how Craddock does not completely embrace organic theory. Craddock more closely approximates Davis's organic homiletic in terms of a concern for the sermon's listeners in relation to the sermons' form.

For Craddock, sermon form significantly impacts the degree of participation by the audience. Some sermon forms engage the audience until the end by means of delaying the conclusion.⁹⁶ Craddock notes the close relation of sermon form to audience, even to the point of the affect that form can have on the audience's faith. Some sermon forms can produce argumentative, bipolar, simplistic, bigoted Christians. Craddock says, "Form is so extremely important. Regardless of the subjects being treated, a preacher can thereby nourish rigidity or openness, legalism or graciousness, inclusiveness or exclusiveness, adversarial or conciliating mentality, willingness to discuss or demand immediate answers."⁹⁷ In addition, Craddock points to two additional factors that influence plurality of sermon form: 1) the pastor's sense of congregational need,⁹⁸ and 2) plurality of literary forms of the Bible.⁹⁹ Both are important contextual considerations for preachers concerned with organic process. For Craddock, "the preacher has made an interpretive and homiletical decision and bears the responsibility for

it.”¹⁰⁰ Considerations in regard to text, audience, and goal of the sermon are factors that ultimately impact the authenticity of a selected sermon form, and working with these factors is not always a clear, cut and dry process. For example, a narrative sermon form can allow for a great deal of variety and vagueness in that this form is, by its very nature, organically alive.

When it comes to selecting and borrowing a sermon form, Craddock may appear to be a bit of a neoclassicist; nonetheless, much of Craddock’s work does affirm Davis’s organic theory. For example, Craddock speaks of “congenial” form.¹⁰¹ For Craddock, like Coleridge and Davis, “form and content are of a piece.”¹⁰² There should be a form congenial to content. Craddock does not, however, incorporate Davis’s view that it is content rather than form, in the organic union of the two, which is primary. Nonetheless, For Craddock, “Form is not simply a rack, a hanger, and a line over which to drape one’s presentation, but the form itself is active, contributing to what the speaker wishes to say and do, sometimes no less persuasive than the content itself.”¹⁰³ Like Coleridge and Davis, Craddock acknowledges the importance of form, but he does not develop the organic notion into his inductive homiletics as fully as he might. Craddock perhaps comes closest to the perspectives of Coleridge and Davis when he writes,

What is important is that the preparation has followed the contours of this particular communicative task with this particular group of hearers on this particular text or theme. The form of such a sermon is therefore a part of the warp and woof of the message itself and was not laid as a grid over the message, alien to it and rising from another source.¹⁰⁴

While it may not be possible to find direct references to organic growth and organic development of sermon form in Craddock’s work, there is some evidence that he is influenced by a Romantic organic notion. For example, Craddock notes that form cannot be imposed from outside because it is “alien,” not “congenial.” Craddock also encourages preachers to create sermon form that has previously been “uncharted,” fearing not the “nagging” of old homiletics textbooks.¹⁰⁵ Such language is consistent with the Romantic revolt against sermon models and rules.

Like contemporary expressive composition theorists, Craddock emphasizes the “process” of invention. For example, it almost sounds as if the words could have come from Peter Elbow when Craddock writes, “Play with the idea. Be playful, jot down ideas but forget about order or sequence.”¹⁰⁶ Craddock’s approach to preaching form also resembles that of Invitational rhetoric in that Craddock agrees that persuasion of an audience should take place indirectly, such as by means of Kierkegaard’s method of

overhearing.¹⁰⁷ Building on Kierkegaard, Craddock proposes an ethical communication of indirection as a part of his inductive method. Concerning such a method, he writes,

It leaves one free to listen because, since she is overhearing and therefore not directly addressed, there is no feeling of being threatened, challenged, and exhorted by the message of the text. Being thus free, she finds herself being drawn in, identifying, empathizing, and really hearing what is being said.¹⁰⁸

To conclude, while Craddock does not specifically develop a synthetic organic homiletic, the inductive sermon form that he does offer can be thought of as a branch on the tree of organic form. Although Craddock's inductive form theory does not incorporate a synthetic organic form theory (which grows from inside—from content, context, and the process) as much as he might, his inductive approach does embrace the use of empirical argument, and it employs the aspects of narrative and drama inherent in moving from problem to resolution.

David Buttrick

While Buttrick is influenced by Davis's work, he does not fully appreciate Davis's homiletical concerns, referring to them as "preaching as self-expression."¹⁰⁹ Buttrick goes on to develop his own homiletical approach, one that is somewhat antagonistic to the Romantic aspects of Davis's organic approach. Buttrick offers a strong critique to an expressive, Romantic homiletic. He does not understand preaching as "art." Even though many consider most creative work, including creative sermon composition, is an "art" instead of a "craft," Buttrick swims against the stream, by stating,

Our excursion into language may have given the impression that ministers must be verbal artists. But no, preaching is always more craft than art. What is more, preaching is a considered craft. We never pursue effect for the sake of effect; we are always concerned with usefulness. Preachers will toss around words such as "creative" or "intuitive" or "imaginative," artistic terms that are less than helpful. Though preaching may well be "creative" and may draw on a playful "imagination," preaching is *not* an art. In preaching, self-expression is disciplined by both the content of the gospel and a concern for the congregation. After all, preaching *is* mediation.¹¹⁰

A craft is understood to be something dealing with mechanics, while art is creative and organic. Nonetheless, Buttrick states, "Preaching is always more craft than art. What is more, preaching is a considered craft."¹¹¹ It is not mechanical work but a work that requires authenticity and creativity.

Buttrick appears in complete opposition at this point with Coleridge's organic theory of form that presupposes that every creative work is art rather than a mechanical craft. Buttrick, however, does agree that "preaching, while not an art form, is a creative process."¹¹²

Buttrick opposes Romantic Organic Homiletic based on his social and historical epistemology. This critique is similar to that of contemporary composition theorist Berlin against Romantic expressive theorist Peter Elbow.¹¹³ Like Berlin, Buttrick is concerned that "Preaching as self-expression places too much burden on self and on religious affections: Our Christian faith is both *social* and *historical*."¹¹⁴ Buttrick may have concern in regard to the potential dangers of Romanticism and Pietism, in that a heavy emphasis upon the individual is too subjective. Buttrick relates Phillip Brooks' "Truth through personality" preaching to a "guru-seer" image of the ministry¹¹⁵ and concludes the Romantic "model is, in final analysis, inadequate."¹¹⁶ For him, self and intuition are excluded from the Coleridge's synthesis of reason and intuition.

While Buttrick argues that individualistic and subjectivistic Romanticism cannot be applied to authentic homiletics, he seems self-contradictory in his argument. The phenomenological roots of his homiletic are found in Wittgenstein and Heidegger, both of whom have their own roots in Romanticism (including Coleridge).¹¹⁷ Buttrick refuses a Romantic epistemology of linguistic turn arguing from his social and historical epistemology while at the same time following contemporary Romantic phenomenology. Buttrick admits this phenomenological standpoint when he says,

The pulpit may be similarly indicted. We seem to have great difficulty breaking free from the biblical world so as to trace God's ways in contemporary experience. Somehow we must name grace by drawing together symbols of revelation with earthly images of being-saved-in-the-world.¹¹⁸ Buttrick also criticizes that the effect of narrative preaching is to "entertain, excite, and inform; it does not necessarily shape faith-consciousness. Story qua story may not be an adequate preaching."¹¹⁹

Despite all this hostility toward a Romantic homiletic, Buttrick nonetheless incorporates aspects of that very homiletic in the creation of his own. Like Davis, Buttrick employs the concept of "logic of movement," or arrangement. Buttrick understands that "The logic of connection—contrast—is natural to human consciousness."¹²⁰ Above all, for Buttrick, like Davis, the sermon composition process is still open-ended; at this point, Buttrick's comments also harmonize with those of Elbow, who explains how the doubting game and believing game is continued until the end, which is

inventing and editing.¹²¹ In a like vein, Buttrick states, “Some preachers will outline and re-outline many times before battering a sermon into some final form. The final preaching script you produce—still open to some improvisational elaboration.”¹²²

One also discovers traces of organic metamorphosis in Buttrick’s explanation of synthesis, in African-American preaching. He points to the telling of a biblical story as present-tense narrative but moving in and out of the story with ideal moves.¹²³ Buttrick elaborates further on what could be labeled an organic metamorphosis by saying,

As the story moves along, episode by episode, we interrupt the story line with “It’s like...” explanation, with answers to questions from our sleepy-headed audience, with images drawn from a child’s own lived experience. Such a technique comes to us naturally and does give us unusual freedom for interpretation. Certainly, the method is more attractive than telling a Bible story and then unpacking ponderous moral points or applications: “Now, what do we learn from the story?” ...Great advantages of the method are the unfolding of a crisp plot that sustains narrative excitement, and freedom for the exploration of our own lives within narrative structure.¹²⁴

Though Buttrick rejects a Romantic organic sermon form, calling it “preaching as self-expression,” he himself adopts an organic form theory of sorts. For him, every sermon form should be different. He writes, “In general, every move within a sermon scenario ought to be shaped differently.”¹²⁵ He expands by saying,

Usually the cause of our boredom is a similarity in developmental systems—many of the ideas being presented come to us in the same rhetorical shape. So, unless a speaker is skilled enough to shape deliberately two different ideas in the same way so that they will overlap in consciousness, the general rule will be different development for different ideas.¹²⁶

Such a statement is quite consistent with an organic theory of sermon form. While it does not discuss plurality of form per se, it argues for an unlimited number of potential sermon forms. Buttrick refuses the notion of plurality of form, stating that “Forms are not interchangeable.”¹²⁷ Buttrick responds to theorists who propose that literary forms of the Bible may help preachers to regenerate the original rhetorical function of a given text by refuting the idea that biblical forms can be imitated in our preaching—a story for a biblical story, a hymnic sermon for a psalm, an imagistic protest poem for some prophetic passage. No, preaching does not dabble in imitative art forms; it is public speaking to a known audience. Preaching must be what it

is. Forms of speech that were instrumentally useful in biblical times—forms that were designed to do—may not achieve the same ends now.¹²⁸

According to his phenomenological understanding of the past text and the present audience, Buttrick, like Gadamer and Kierkegaard, emphasizes “contemporaneity.” For him the past text should not control the present rhetorical situation and rhetorical goal.

Buttrick develops phenomenological moves of sermon forms, which have different points-of-view through the movement. His phenomenological and pluralistic views of truth appear in his sermon form where different views can be openly discussed together. Different views are deployed, although his sermon forms are so open-ended that, in the conclusion, the audience can decide for themselves. Nonetheless, because of his rejection of Romantic organic concepts, Buttrick is the most different of the New Homileticians discussed here from the Organic Homiletic of Davis.

Eugene L. Lowry

Unlike Buttrick who never mentions Davis’s name in his discussion of Homiletics, Lowry appears to be a faithful disciple of Davis. Lowry, in *The Homiletical Plot*, notes how Davis influenced his own narrative sermon form.¹²⁹ Lowry inherits Davis’s appreciation of the generative idea and the importance of the continuity or the movement of a sermon rather than allegiance to an outline. This is a key of Romantic organic form theory. Idea grows, following the inner logic of continuity.

Lowry, like Davis, also acknowledges the value of a pluralistic approach to sermon form. Lowry sees that “the method of solution invariably is to invert, to reverse, and to twist the problem picture so that a new picture abruptly emerges.”¹³⁰ In Lowry’s approach, the narrative continuity allows for a great plurality when preachers reverse the disequilibrium through reversal to equilibrium: the cause-effect reversal, the inverted cause reversal, the inverted assumption reversal, and the inverted logic reversal.¹³¹ Such a sweeping approach to narrative sermon form allows for limitless varieties.

In addition, Lowry introduces four different kinds of story sermon forms:

- 1) Running the Story (following the biblical story through actual flow provided by the biblical text itself),
- 2) Delaying the Story (congregational issue and then turn to the text for resolution),
- 3) Suspending the Story (beginning with the text, move away from the text to contemporary situation in order to find a way out, looking a clue to resolution.. never return to the text),
- 4) Alternating the Story (biblical narrative

sermons include a contemporary story running parallel to the text. The preachers alternate the telling with the text and then moving to the other.¹³²

Unlike Craddock's and Long's finite varieties of standard sermon form, Lowry suggests only principles by which preachers can multiply and propagate by organic metamorphosis and organic synthesis. One could say that Lowry actually introduces the fact that his homiletic theory has an organic metamorphosis when he says, "I begin inductively (with Fosdick), move toward the clue to resolution which reveals the dead-end of the "human fulfillment" mentality and turns matters upside down, and then proclaim the gospel deductively (with Scherer)."¹³³ As shown from this historical survey of sermon form to this point, it is apparent that Lowry is acknowledging his own organic metamorphosis. He combines inductive, narrative, and deductive sermon form. This approach assumes a very creative and imaginative art work, with no imitating of outside sources. Lowry also notes the work of one exceptionally synthetic homiletician, David Schlafer, who, similarly to Davis, synthesizes argument, story, and image.¹³⁴ Lowry, in reference to Schlafer, writes,

The Scriptures engage our senses and our emotions directly by means of images. They also invite us to enter participants in stories—historical, fictional, and mythical narratives. They further confront us with arguments—orderly presentations of evidence intended to lead us to certain conclusions.¹³⁵

In keeping with the tradition that asserts that sermon forms can grow from inside the preacher as generative ideas or inner feelings, Lowry claims that the "preacher cannot control or even predict the result of sermons."¹³⁶ Preachers also cannot control and predict their creative sermon work. Lowry also claims that "stereotyping and labeling are extremely prevalent and effective perceptual blocks."¹³⁷ In Lowry's work, organic synthesis of the general and the particular also are addressed. He writes, "Move from the subjective to the objective, form particular to general—and back again."¹³⁸

Lowry discusses an approach to sermon preparation similar to that proposed by contemporary Romantic expressive theorists of composition. He writes,

We can identify two preliminary stages in sermon preparation that typically occur prior to the stage of sermonic formation proper. The first is a state of "wandering thoughtfulness" about the Sunday morning sermon. Likely we have jotted down some notes about possible ideas, read the lectionary passages for the day, pulled out a file containing scattered notes written earlier when planning the year of preaching, and/or checked the denominational calendar.¹³⁹

He also encourages preachers to use the unconscious (i.e. the intuition and depth of the inner self) in the preaching preparation process. Lowry seems to be influenced by creative psychologists of Romanticism when he writes, “When you drop your conscious intentionality in order to do something else, your preconscious mind is let loose, without such tight parameters of control. While you sleep, you really are still working on that sermon—only in a different mode.”¹⁴⁰ As noted in the chapter two, such an understanding is akin to the incubation step of the creative process of G. Wallas. Romantics, like contemporary expressive theorists of composition, understand intuition as an integral part of the inventive process. In this regard, Lowry’s homiletic may be seen as more fully developed than that of Davis’s or at least more in keeping with the Romantics who place most significant emphasis on using intuition and inner feeling. Given this, Romantic artists stress the art process of invention, not the imitation of the pre-established models. In this respect, Lowry not only receives Davis’s organic homiletic but improves upon it.

Thomas G. Long

Long appraises Davis’s historical significance in the field of preaching by noting that for over two decades his text was “the most widely used preaching textbook in North American seminaries and divinity schools.”¹⁴¹ According to Long, Davis’s *Design for Preaching* was “the first raindrop in a fast-moving thunderstorm of homiletical books and monographs on sermon form,” and “a bridge spanning the gap between the traditional approach to form and those developments yet to come.”¹⁴² However, Long critiques Davis’s homiletics as being unrealistic. Long writes,

There was, however, something vaguely Platonic about this view. Davis’s notion of pure forms shimmering inside sermon ideas sprouting into ideal organic structures seems more suited to the greenhouse than to the backyard, where real sermons actually grow.¹⁴³

As noted in the short history of form in chapter two, the philosophical influence of Coleridge and Davis may have come from Plotinus rather than Plato. Plato and Aristotle are theorists of classical imitation. Elsewhere in Long’s work it does not appear that he has excessive confidence or trust in organic homiletic for the abovementioned reasons. Long also points out what he considers to be Davis’s neglect of “the somewhat messier actuality of the listening context,”¹⁴⁴ Long’s critique on this account can be lessened, if not

mutated by pointing to Davis's emphasis on orality and the listening process in preaching.¹⁴⁵

Long's alternative to Davis's organic form is "finding" a satisfactory form for the preacher. For Long, unlike Buttrick, "Good sermon form is an artistic achievement, and no universally accepted and always reliable process exists for creating a satisfactory sermon form."¹⁴⁶ Although he uses the word "create," it does not seem to mean creative organic form; rather, he means "creatively finding" form. Long states, "The preacher should choose the sermon form that best allows the hearers to exercise their ministry of active and creative listening."¹⁴⁷ Long also, like Craddock, suggests using a homiletic stockroom of standard sermon models.

Concerning the plurality of sermon form, Long appears to vacillate some concerning the ultimate value of limitless varieties of form. He says, "Every sermon event possesses its own set of variables and peculiar circumstances, and therefore we have insisted that every sermon form must be freshly minted and custom made."¹⁴⁸ However, concerned about busy and uncreative preachers who cannot create their own organic form every Sunday, Long reverses his position by saying, "The idea of running a never-before-seen, never-before-tried form out onto the test track every Sunday strains our creative energies and boggles the mind."¹⁴⁹

Long sees organic metamorphosis of sermon form even in the traditional approach of Luccok's sermon models, but Long claims that it yields "an impressive variety of sermon configuration."¹⁵⁰ For Long, sermon form exists mechanically from outside and is offered to the preacher as options or "products." For this reason, Long seems to put a different spin on Davis's theory when Long writes, "Every sermon has contained in its central idea, like a DNA code, the pattern for its own ideal form. In Davis's view, good sermons are not given a form; they *take* form. Wise preachers do not force the sermon into a form; they discover the form embryonically present in the germinating idea."¹⁵¹

Long's central thrust in regard to sermon form rests in his proposal that preachers regenerate the impact of the biblical text following the form of the text for the form of the sermon. Long asks exegetical (1–4) and homiletical (5) questions:

1. What is the genre of the text?
2. What is the rhetorical function of this genre?
3. What literary devices does this genre employ to achieve its rhetorical effect?
4. How in particular does the text under consideration, in its own literary setting, embody the characteristics and dynamics described in questions 1–3?

5. How may the sermon, in a new setting, say and do what the text says and does in its setting?¹⁵²

According to radical postmodern philosophers, these questions themselves are problematic in terms of linguistic epistemology. Following Gadamer and Bullock,¹⁵³ these questions should be fused between the past and the present by “contemporaneity.” This brief history has already shown how Craddock, Buttrick and Lowry respond to this proposal: the control of the literary form of passages to the contemporary sermon form should be moderated with the contemporary rhetorical situation and purpose. Likewise, Long also points out that, “while the literary form of the sermon, on other occasions the preacher, in order to be faithful to the text, will select for the sermon a markedly different pattern.”¹⁵⁴ Unlike Craddock, who dares to urge the preacher to create a sermon form, Long does not opt to employ the power of inner feeling to invent the preacher’s own form, organically. Also Long does not construct or develop another alternative of sermon form. Though Long acknowledges Davis’s impact upon homiletics as being significant, Long does not himself utilize Davis’s Organic Homiletic.

Lucy A. Rose

As mentioned above, Rose sees the significance of Davis’s Homiletics in Contemporary preaching history. She freely admits her own homiletic theory is influenced by Davis.¹⁵⁵ Rose even analyzes Davis’s influence on Craddock in that Davis’s “A Question Propounded,” which is an option of Davis’s organic sermon form,¹⁵⁶ was developed and popularized in Craddock.¹⁵⁷ Like Long, Rose opposes traditional homiletical theory as being “crimped by its implicit one-size-fits all,”¹⁵⁸ but also sees the organic metamorphosis in traditional homiletical theory in that “no single form characterizes traditional homiletics, and an unfair caricature equates traditional homiletical theory with ‘three points and a poem.’”¹⁵⁹ Every sermon movement and continuity produces huge unpredictable varieties in sermon form because form in art is organic and living. Therefore, rather than trying to determine the correct options for sermon forms, it is more correct and realistic to attempt to understand organic metamorphosis in form. Rose complains because there is no sermon form to fit her homiletical project of conversational preaching, in which “communal, heuristic, and nonhierarchical”¹⁶⁰ principle can be constructed. She writes,

There’s classical theory that defines preaching as persuasively presenting a truth so that the ideas in the preacher’s mind are shaped in the minds of the congregation.

There's kerygmatic theory that defines preaching as faithfully communicating the gospel so that God becomes the Preacher and the sermon becomes a saying event. There's contemporary theory that defines preaching as replicating a transforming experience of the text so that congregation has the same experience of transformation. The problem is that none of these fit what I try to do when I stand in the pulpit and what I hope for when I sit in the pew.¹⁶¹

She contrasts "points-sermons" in which stories illustrate truth with the story-sermons in which the stories are truth in themselves; she also contrasts deductive versus inductive, and thinking versus feeling.¹⁶² Unlike Davis, Rose does not appear to acknowledge an organic synthesis of reason and intuition. Nonetheless, Rose argues for organic unity of content and the form. She says, "Conversational preaching's 'how' works hand in hand with these understandings of preaching's 'why' and 'what.'"¹⁶³ Rose proposes a new sermon form: conversational, dialogic preaching. In the process of introducing her sermon form, Rose seems to utilize organic metamorphosis:

The two forms that I will describe are, first, a combination of inductive and narrative, and, second, story. The first form charts the preacher's journey toward the discovery of meaning and invites others to "think (their) own thoughts and experience (their) own feelings." As they formulate their own meanings, my proposal here builds on the insights of H. Grady Davis, Craddock and Lowry.¹⁶⁴

In noting that Rose's conversational preaching resembles inductive and narrative sermon form, one may also note a problem that arises for Rose. Although inductive and narrative preaching have the principles of conversational preaching (communal, heuristic, and nonhierarchical), inductive and narrative are not exactly dialogic forms. Rose envisions that,

the preacher and the congregation explore together the mystery of the Word for the lives of the worshippers, as well as the life of the congregation, the larger church, and the world. The preacher and the congregation gather symbolically at a round table where there is no head and no foot, where labels like clergy and laity blur, and where believing or wanting to believe is all that matter.¹⁶⁵

A charge may be raised that Rose's homiletic project of conversational preaching is at this point methodologically underdeveloped. Rose herself admits, "Because these are my wagers, they are undeniably limited and partisan, dependent on others for broader vision."¹⁶⁶ From this humble invitation come many efforts to develop conversational preaching as sermon models. Examples include McClure's *The Round Table Pulpit* and Kelchner's proposal in "Toward a Collegial Homiletic."¹⁶⁷ McClure penetrates the failure of Dialogic Preaching in the 1960s because of its "failure to discern the précis nature of dialogic speech,"¹⁶⁸ and he, like Rose,

turns to inductive and narrative form where a congregation can “overhear its own struggle to interpret and respond faithfully to the gospel of Jesus Christ.”¹⁶⁹ McClure suggests a sermon brainstorming group (the sermon roundtable) for indirectly providing feedback.¹⁷⁰ Still, this does not seem to claim that conversational preaching has a dialogic form. Also, Kelchner’s proposal does not show a methodological building up of dialogic sermon form; his proposal “A New Preaching Paradigm for a New Day,”¹⁷¹ like Rose and McClure, simply repeats philosophical principles of conversational preaching. This failure to develop more completely this sermon form raises some questions. One can wonder what a conversational sermon form would actually be, if it were developed as an authentic dialogic sermon form. Is Conversational Preaching solely a principle like the organic principle that can make synthesis and metamorphosis? Thus, can Conversational Preaching employ all possible sermon forms for its purpose?

In conjunction with this aspect of Rose’s work, it is useful to note that Fosdick also wants sermons to be conversational, a co-operative dialogue in which the congregation’s objections, questions, doubts and confirmations are fairly stated and addressed.¹⁷² Another Contemporary narrative homiletician Steimle (1907–1988), who has been influenced by the New Testament scholar Amos Wilder, also stresses dialogical preaching. Steimle calls his “Protestant Hour” homilies “conversations” instead of “sermons,” and they are rich with the sounds of exchange with the hearer.¹⁷³ In addition, Catholic homiletician Waznak traces the dialogic character in homilies from the early church, especially those from Origen. Waznak points out that Origen’s artless homily is different from the studied and stylized speech of his day.¹⁷⁴ Waznak also looks to the philosopher’s dialogical teaching with their pupils as evidenced, for example, in Plato’s dialogue.¹⁷⁵ Even Henry Davis analyzes early church’s homily as digressive and discursive talk that has no particular theme. Davis states of the character of homily in *Design for Preaching*:

The homily is not a definite sermonic form. In its early phase, it was an informal, discursive talk, in which digression, passing from one subject to another, was rather the rule than the exception. The early homily used no text and developed no particular theme. Later in the history of preaching, the term came to mean almost the opposite: an ordered exposition of a passage of Scripture. The hundreds of sermons by Chrysostom, Augustine, and the other fathers, have come down to us as “homilies” in this latter sense.

What really matters here is to distinguish the homily of Origen from Chrysostom. Origen’s homily is the verse-by-verse exegetical, plural-points, dialogic, liturgical, using three pericopes from the lectionary,¹⁷⁶ while Chrysostom’s homily is consecutively exegetical of a single biblical text. It

employs classical rhetoric to make a singular point, expositively.¹⁷⁷ This means there are two different expository homilies: one that has plural points and another that has a single point. A plural-point homily follows verse-by-verse exposition with interactive dialogue and application between preacher and audience; whereas, a singular point homily is influenced by forensic persuasive rhetoric. Today, this distinction also can resolve some of the confusion in the debate on sermon form.

Historically, an expository dialogic homily is not an opposite of a narrative, inductive, conversational sermon form. In fact, at a point in the historical development, the expository homily experiences an organic metamorphosis into a forensic and argumentative rhetoric that has a main idea, so that the hearer may be persuaded by rhetorical means. This expository, singular-point, homily may even stand as a possible contender in the debate with the New Homiletics over viable sermon forms. Pieterse points out this characteristic of the homily:

Obviously, the homily has always been related to the dialogue form and has always belonged in an intimate, confidential situation. E. P. Groenewald has shown that the Pauline *dialogesthai* generally implies an exchange in which the audience poses questions in which discussion poses questions in which discussion and even argument may arise. This was Paul's preferred method of preaching.¹⁷⁸

Pieterse argues that the homily "generally has no theme and deals with a pericope, which is expounded sentence by sentence and verse by verse. It is largely an analytical exposition and does not include a synthesis, though a summary and application are sometimes provided at the end."¹⁷⁹ Pieterse goes on to say that the homily is an excellent method of preaching because it can avoid the "poor communication of a monologue."¹⁸⁰ Questions, objections and contributions can be discussed in and after the sermon, and it can help the audience's active participation into the process of searching for truth by themselves.¹⁸¹ It satisfies Rose's, McClure's, and Kelchner's philosophical requirements for conversational preaching, because the homily is, dialogically, communal, heuristic, and nonhierarchical.

In summing up Rose's contribution in the history of sermon form, one can say that she pursues her conversational models not only from inductive and narrative theory, but also from the early church's dialogic and liturgical approach to the homily.¹⁸² She may have laid the way for the ancient dialogic and liturgical expository to be perceived by current preachers as a homiletically solid model of conversational sermon form.

Paul Scott Wilson

“The sermon or homily will begin to write itself if we use the imagination,” Wilson states.¹⁸³ Wilson understands that sermon form is not an object that can be manipulated by preachers. For Wilson, like for Coleridge, an art form is viewed as a living organism; it grows organically from its own inner living power. It is neither dead nor passive; it is active and self-achieving, like water that finds its way as it flows from a mountain top to the ocean.

Wilson is unique among New Homileticians in most fully utilizing Coleridge’s understanding of organic unity—moving out from disparity from wherein imagination grows. Wilson notes that, for Coleridge, imagination comes from the “reconciliation of opposite.”¹⁸⁴ Wilson goes on to develop his own sermon form, which utilizes a dialectical logic of movement, reminiscent of Luther’s use of law and gospel. Wilson displays another Coleridgean trait when he distinguishes between static unity and organic unity—a distinction similar to Coleridge’s separation of mechanic and organic unity.¹⁸⁵ Wilson views Davis’s contribution largely as an embracing of Coleridge’s organic unity. He states that Davis’s pioneering work with organic unity in *Design for Preaching* was arguably influential at the beginning of the current revolution in homiletics.¹⁸⁶ He also attributes Davis as being the key founder of homiletics as it is practiced today. Additionally, he acknowledges that, in 1958, Davis was one of the first voices to signal a shift to a new understanding of unity in the sermons.¹⁸⁷

In terms of Wilson’s view of organic unity, it seems that Wilson’s homiletics of dialectical sermon form is a natural consequence of his interest in organic unity. Wilson even acknowledges Coleridge’s role in regard to alerting the world to the concept of organic unity. Wilson writes, “Samuel Taylor Coleridge was one of the pioneers for us in seeing that each part of a written text related to the meaning of the whole and the whole affected the meaning of its parts.”¹⁸⁸ “Organic unity,” according to Wilson, “came to prominence in the Western world through the Romantic revolution in the art roughly between 1790-1840. The Romantics were reacting to classical art, urbanization, and the industrial revolution.”¹⁸⁹ Applying this to homiletics, sermon form is organically united with sermon content and the preacher; it is not received separately and mechanically, from outside the immediate context of content and preacher.

Influenced by John Wesley, Wilson constructs his dialectical sermon form which contrasts law with grace. However, this may confuse preachers familiar with the Wesleyan quadrilateral authorities: Bible, Tradition, Reason,

and Experience, in that they do not actually relate to Wilson's "four pages" sermon form. Wilson writes,

As John Wesley once said, every law contains a hidden promise. Every door of judgment is an opening of grace; every sinful act of humans is met by God in Christ. When we exclude trouble or grace from a sermon we make a choice. We opt for a theology in preaching that is an incomplete expression of the faith, a less than full encounter with God's Word.¹⁹⁰

Eslinger, in *Web of Preaching*, summarizes Wilson's sermon form as four steps:

1. Trouble and conflict in the Bible
2. Trouble in the world
3. Grace and good news in the Bible
4. Grace for us and for our world.¹⁹¹

These four sermon movements of Wilson show a double dialectical structure: Bible vs. World, Trouble vs. Grace, and World in the Bible vs. our World. This dialectical logic, by Wilson, arouses imagination within preachers. However, this seriously dichotomized sermon form, if preached regularly, may cause the problem with which Craddock was concerned:

Form shapes the listener's faith. It is likely that few preachers are aware how influential sermon form is on the quality of the parishioners' faith. Ministers who, week after week, frame their sermons as arguments, syllogism armed for debate, tend to give that form to the faith perspective of regular listeners. Being a Christian is proving you are right. Those who consistently use the "before/after" pattern impress upon hearers that conversion is the normative model for becoming a believer. Sermons which invariably place before the congregation the "either/or" forms as the way to see the issues before them contribute to oversimplification, inflexibility, and the notion that faith is always an urgent decision. In contrast, "both/and" sermons tend to broaden horizons and sympathies but never confront the listener with a crisp decision. Form is so extremely important. Regardless of the subjects being treated, a preacher can thereby nourish rigidity or openness, legalism or graciousness, inclusiveness or exclusiveness, adversarial or conciliating mentality, willingness to discuss or demand immediate answers.¹⁹²

Thus, Wilson's dialectical four pages sermon form resembles the "before/after" and "either/or" forms which, according to Craddock, may cause legalism, rigidity, and bigotry of Christians who see the clear distinction of this world and that world like contemporary Gnostics.

Nevertheless, Wilson notices the tendency toward an organic metamorphosis in recent years regarding sermon form which "provides the kind of integration and flexibility of overall form."¹⁹³ For instance, Wilson

introduces Ronald Allen's organic metamorphosis of sermon form. Allen revives Topical Preaching from the Old Homiletics. Allen shows even Topical Preaching has "a variety of intriguing possibilities in form for preacher to try."

1. Deductive form of description, evaluation, and application
2. Methodist quadrilateral (Bible, Tradition, Experience, Reason)
3. Practical Moral reasoning
4. General inductive
5. Structure as praxis (from Buttrick)
6. Focus on mind, heart, and will.¹⁹⁴

This shows that limiting a definition of sermon form to a standard or norm is impossible in terms of organic metamorphosis. Like a cell propagating, sermon form grows organically synthesizing and morphing in the process. Wilson sheds further light on this organic synthesis and organic metamorphosis in his analysis of Lowry's narrative sermon form:

Currently, much synthesizing work is underway in relation to form, content, and function. In particular, two of Eugene L. Lowry's works, *The Homiletical Plot* and *How to Preach a Parable: Design for Narrative Sermon*, while specifically arguing for narrative, in fact articulate how sermons that were not necessarily narratives can nonetheless employ organic principles from narrative.¹⁹⁵

For Wilson, like Coleridge and Davis, form and meaning are related. Wilson states,

We want something that will encourage us to think of the sermon or homily as growing, organic, or living, as having movement and rhythm. We want a notion of structure that has elasticity and flexibility. To talk about the flow may be better than to speak of an outline. We should be thinking of a river current, or of a conversation flowing, or of ideas and emotions joining together.¹⁹⁶

For Wilson, likewise, "each sermon or homily may have its own unique form, reflecting the uniqueness of each encounter with God's word."¹⁹⁷ Thus Wilson is the sole Contemporary homiletician to extensively employ Coleridge's Romantic organic theory, especially the concept of organic unity, in his homiletics.

Wilson constructs a sermon form that utilizes "dialectical" continuity (from Davis's deductive, inductive, logical, chronological, and dramatic continuity) and the idea of "Trouble to Grace" (probably from Davis's "A Question Propounded" dealing with inductive). Nonetheless, like other New Homileticians who, to some extent, may be said to have developed Davis's

organic homiletic, Wilson appears to have underutilized the potential of Davis's work.

Conclusion

Organic metamorphosis has been the major lens utilized throughout this chapter in examining the history of sermon form. How do sermon forms interact with each other? How do sermon forms combine and synthesize new varieties by means of organic metamorphosis? What are the consequences of the organic metamorphosis? All these questions have been brought to bear in this chapter, and, in attempting to answer these questions, in the various stages of homiletical development, one can see that the history of preaching has been a history in which organic metamorphosis has been generated from antiquity to the present.

The two major roads taken in the organic metamorphosis of sermon form are the Hebraic, dialogic, expository homily and the Hellenistic, forensic, argumentative sermon. These two major paths of sermon form have traveled from the Old Testament to the New Testament, to the early Church, to the Middle age, to the Modern and Reformation ages, to contemporary, and, finally, to the New Homiletics. Throughout this historical and homiletical development, sermon form has been historically enriched with the exploration of a variety of sermon forms. However, the mechanical form of classicism and neo-classicism has always served as a check and balance for those promoting organic form, particularly pre-Romanticism and 18th and 19th century Romanticism. Therefore, the history of sermon form can be understood as one that has been dialectical in its development. From the distinct sermon forms of *homilia* and *sermo*, through this check and balance of mechanic and organic principles of form, every generation, every church, and every pulpit has created its own authentic, organic, and imaginatively "new" form.

Origen's dialogic, liturgical, multiple-points, expository homily checks Chrysostom's monologic, teaching, singular-point, expository homily, to make way for Augustine's synthetic, balanced, combination of homiletics. Likewise, liturgical homiliaries of the early Middle age are challenged by a Dominican defense of the University sermon, while Alan synthesizes these two into a Textual sermon that has both exposition and argument. Following Wycliffe and Erasmus, Luther and Calvin preach exegetical sermons, but scientific preaching of rationalism gives birth to Romantic intuitional preaching, generating new a metamorphosis of sermon form: Campbell's

preaching and the Evangelical sermon, in which rational argument and emotional appeal¹⁹⁸ are synthesized. After the great Romantic, organic preacher Brooks, sermon form starts its segmentation and cleavage into homilies and sermon, reminiscent of the situation in the early church, to the extent that the two become enemies to each other: those forms that once could have been considered partners. Coleridge, a prophet and catalyst of organic metamorphosis and organic synthesis, impacts Henry G. Davis in his attempt to rectify this shameful family dispute. Nonetheless, the heirs of Davis, the New Homileticians, although they offer many suggestions, do not seem to be able to create a harmonious unity.

With this brief history of sermonic form in place, it can be argued that there continues to be a need for a homiletic of sermon design that more fully harmonizes the tensions that have plagued preaching theorists throughout the ages. Therefore, this study attempts, by more fully utilizing the organic theory introduced by Coleridge and applied by Davis, to propose a new Organic Homiletic, with the help of organic synthetic comrades from the university.

NOTES

- 1 While the New Homileticians selected here cannot completely represent the wild thunderstorms of the New Homiletic revolution, it is hoped that an examination of their work will at least provide a comprehensive representation of the major sermon forms emerging from New Homiletics, namely Inductive, Moves, Narrative, Biblical Literary Form, Conversational, and Dialectical and Imaginative.
 - 2 Stanfield, Vernon L. "The History of Homiletics," *Baker's Dictionary of Practical Theology*, ed. Ralph G. Turnbull (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1967), p.50.
 - 3 Ibid., p.51. It is possible to question Stanfield remarks especially in the latter portion. Hebrew preaching also developed sermon form, homily, and expository design, which influenced the church fathers and reformers and contemporary evangelicals such as Dallas Theological Seminary.
 - 4 Cole, Thomas. *The Origins of Rhetoric in Ancient Greece* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), and Clarke, M.L. *Rhetoric at Rome: A Historical Survey* (London: Routledge, 1953).
 - 5 Dargan, Edwin Charles. *A History of Preaching*, vol. I., (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1954, 1974), p.14.
 - 6 Stanfield, "The History of Homiletics," p.50.
 - 7 Brilioth, Yngve. *A Brief History of Preaching*, trans. Karl E. Mattson, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1945), p.3. See also Lindblom, Johannes. *Prophecy in Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1962), p.311.
 - 8 Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, IV. xv. 33, p.237.
 - 9 Edwards, O.C. "History of Preaching," William H. Willimon and Richard Lischer ed., *Concise Encyclopedia of Preaching*, (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), "Yet he (Luther) did not prepare by writing out a manuscript; instead, he immersed himself in the text and then preached extemporaneously, beginning with a statement of the *Herzpunkt* and going from there to extract that meaning from his text. In the pulpit he would have no more than a brief outline of what he meant to say, his *Konzept*, but he departed from that often enough for someone to say that the structure of his sermons was one of "heroic disorder." His most common principle of organization was an antithesis (p.205).
 - 10 Bozarth-Campbell, Allan. *The Word's Body: an Incarnational Aesthetic of Interpretation*, (Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 1947), p.25.
 - 11 See Park, Richard H. "Creativity and Homiletics: Save the Preachers, from the Boredom," Unpublished paper, Graduate Theological Union, Spring 2005.
 - 12 Stanfield, "The History of Homiletics," p.50.
 - 13 Waznak, Robert P. *An Introduction to the Homily* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1998), pp.4-5.
- See also Carroll, Thomas K. *Preaching the Word, Message of the Fathers of the Church*, vol. 11 (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1984), p.43. Waznak quotes from Davis's *Design for*

- Preaching* (p.162) and critiques Davis's "characterization of the early homily as a meandering talk that had no 'text and developed no particular theme' harsh and sweeping judgment" (p.5).
- 14 Waznak, *An Introduction*, p.5. See also Lienhard, Joseph T. "Origen as Homilist," *Preaching in the Patristic Age: Studies in Honor of Walter J. Burghardt*, S.J., ed. David G. Hunter (New York: Paulist Press, 1989), p.45. Cf., Park, Richard H. "The Problem of Allegory in Origen," Unpublished paper, Graduate Theological Union, Fall 2003.
 - 15 Ibid.
 - 16 See Lischer, Richard. "Preaching and the Rhetoric of Promise" *Word & World* 8:1, pp.66–79; Kay, James F. "Reorientation: Homiletics as Theologically Authorized Rhetoric," *Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 24/2003, pp.16–35; Hogan, Lucy Lind, "Homiletics: The Never-Ending Holy Conversation," *Homiletic* 21:2 (1996), pp.1–10; Hogan, Lucy Lind. "Rethinking Persuasion: Developing as Incarnational Theology of Preaching," *Homiletic* 24:2 (1999), pp.1–12; and Park, Richard H. "Feminist Invitational Rhetoric and Theology of Preaching," Unpublished paper, Graduate Theological Union, 2005.
 - 17 Allen Ronald J. and Gilbert L. Bartholomew, *Preaching Verse by Verse*, (Louisville: Westminster John Know Press, 2000), vii.
 - 18 Ibid., vii-viii.
 - 19 Wilder, Amos N. *Early Christian Rhetoric: The Language of the Gospel* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964), pp.40–117. F. Wellford Hobbie, in his article "The Play is the Thing: New Forms for the Sermon," *Journal for Preachers* 5:4 (1982), summarizes Wilder's contribution: "Again, the focus of concern is upon form. Wilder is helpful in identifying the major modes of discourse as dialogue, narrative, parable and poetry, but more importantly, he identifies certain characteristics of these forms. These characteristics are proximity to oral conversation in that the language is immediate, spontaneous and not discursive in style; the speech is related to the everyday concrete life of the community of faith; and the speech places the listener into the scene, to evoke from him or her some response" (p.18).
 Walter Ong, stresses Orality as a part of everyday concrete life of the community of faith. Ong's work anticipates Mary Catherine Hilkert's *Naming Grace: Preaching and the Sacramental Imagination* (New York: Continuum, 2002). Hilkert defines preaching as "an art of naming the grace discovered in the experience of the community of the faith, both past and present (p.141).
 David M. Greenhaw and Ronald J. Allen (ed.) wrote in the introduction of *Preaching in the Context of Worship* (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2000), "Worship is at the center of the Christian life. Worship is both expressive and formative. In liturgy the church expresses its thoughts and feelings to God through hymns, prayers, and other words. The sermon, too, is sometimes a means through which the Christian community expresses itself to God" (xi). One can compare Tom Long's endeavor to attend to rhetorical intentionality of all literary forms of scripture with Wilder's stress on Jesus' rhetorical form in the context of liturgy, because preaching is not solely one expression in the liturgy.
 - 20 Wilson, Paul Scott. *A Concise History of Preaching*, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1992), p.25.

- 21 Kennedy, George A. *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1980), p.130.
- 22 Pfeiffer, Robert H. *History of New Testament Times: with an Introduction to the Apocrypha* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1949), p.182.
- 23 Edwards, O.C., Jr. "History of Preaching," *Concise Encyclopedia of Preaching*, ed. William H. Willimon and Richard Lischer (Louisville: Westminster John Know Press, 1995), pp.190–1.
- 24 Ibid., 191.
- 25 Augustine, *DDC*, IV.xii, 27, p.229.
- 26 Ibid., IV.XIII, 29, p.233.
- 27 Ibid., IV.XXI, 50, p.267. See also Kerr, Hugh Thomson. *Preaching in the Early Church: The Moore Lectures* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1940).
- 28 Wilson, A Concise History of Preaching, p.49.
- 29 Edwards, "History of Preaching," p.195. Note: Today, in Korea, preachers use similar contemporary "homiliaries." This may serve to show how preaching form stretches elastically from age to age. It may also be one of the reasons why Korean preachers are challenged in being creative and authentic.
- 30 See Broadus, On the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons, pp.134–155.
- 31 See Alan of Lille, *The Art of Preaching*, *Cistercian Fathers Series*, no. 23, trans. Gilian R. Evans (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1981), pp.15–22, from Richard Lischer, *Theories of Preaching: Selected Readings in the Homiletical Tradition* (Durham: The Labyrinth Press, 1987).
- 32 Edwards, "History of Preaching," p.197.
- 33 In Korea, most of preachers have preached utilizing this textual sermon form, which falls somewhere between topical and expository sermon form.
- 34 Wilson, A Concise History of Preaching, p.71.
- 35 Edwards, "History of Preaching," p.197.
- 36 Ibid., p.200.
- 37 Dargan, Edwin Charles. *A History of Preaching, Vol. I: From the Apostolic Fathers to the Great Reformers*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1974), p.229. Dargan explains the rhetorical situation for the development of the Dominican forensic sermon form. Dominican friars' first and main goal was to defend truth from heresy. For this reason they needed an argumentative university sermon form.
- 38 Edwards, "History of Preaching," p.199.
- 39 Pieterse, H.J.C. "Sermon Forms," *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 36:1 (1981), p.14.
- 40 See Thomas of Celano, *The Second Life of St. Francis*, LXXIII, 107 in *St. Francis of Assisi: Writings and Early Biographies*, ed. Marion A. Habig (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1973), p.450. Note: It can be argued that the *sermo humilis* form of preaching has patristic roots. See Park, Richard H. "Simplicity as the Common Denominator: A Study of Preaching Style in Multi-Cultural Preaching," Unpublished paper, Graduate Theological Union, 2002.
- 41 See Blastic, Michael W. "Franciscans," *Concise Encyclopedia of Preaching*, p.158–160.
- 42 Edwards, "History of Preaching," p.201.

- 43 Ibid.
- 44 Edwards, p.203. Cf., George A. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1980), pp.205–206.
- 45 Edwards, “History of Preaching,” p.205.
- 46 Ibid. Cf. Stanfield in “History of Homiletics,” *Baker’s Dictionary of Practical Theology*. Stanfield Quotes Luther from *Luther’s Table Talk* (a section titled “On Preachers and Preaching,”), “A preacher should be logician as well as rhetorician.” p.53. This is another example of Luther’s ability to embrace organic metamorphosis and organic synthesis.
- 47 See Meuser, Fred W. *Luther The Preacher* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1983). According to Meuser, Luther did not follow “set pattern” of sermon form before him; rather, Luther made “changes in the form of the sermon.”(p.46) Meuser states that “Luther’s method has often been called that of the homily, but that is really inaccurate.”(p.47). Luther also anticipates Barth’s view of introduction in that he “rejected the art of fancy introduction in favor of a simple statement of the text’s center.”(p.48). Meuser treats “Luther’s Preaching Method” (pp.45–50).
- 48 See Parker, T.H.L. *Calvin’s Preaching* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992). Parker mentions that almost all Calvin’s sermons are connected series on books of the Bible: New Testament on Sunday mornings and afternoons (sometimes Psalms in the afternoon), and Old Testament on weekday mornings (p.80), also see Calvin’s “expository method” (pp.79–92).
- 49 Edwards, “History of Preaching,” p.208.
- 50 See Barth, Karl. *Homiletics*, trans. Donald E. Daniels (Louisville: Westminster/John Know Press, 1991). Because of Barth’s insistence not to use an introduction or conclusion and his urging of the use of expository sermons, Barth’s work has been perceived as being critical to the New Homileticsians. However, there are traces in Barth’s homiletics of the Romantic organic form theory of Coleridge and Davis “The sermon must be independent. Preachers often have a model in mind. Nevertheless, they must put themselves in the pulpit, for they are the ones who are called. Even the very best things, when taken over from others, are no longer what they were when spoken by those others. We must not slip into comedy in borrowed robes” (p.83).
- 51 In this respect, the antipathy against Barth’s critique of the New Homileticsians ought to be considered in relation to the historical development of sermon form.
- 52 Edwards, “History of Preaching,” p.210.
- 53 Edwards, *ibid.*, p.211. See also Perkins, William. *The Art of Prophesying* (Latin 1592, English 1607).
- 54 *Ibid.*, p.213.
- 55 *Ibid.*, p.177. See also Garvie, Alfred Ernest. *The Christian Preacher*. Garvie explicates the Romantic preaching of Johann Gotfried Herder (1744–1803), which requires sincerity and simplicity, no assumption and no artificiality but preaching based on intuitive experiences (p.205) and another Romantic preacher Friedrich D. Schleiermacher (1768–1834), whose sermon form was neither exposition nor instruction but the movement of the heart with no significant consideration to logical structure (p.209).

- 56 Holland, DeWitte T. *The Preaching Tradition: A Brief History* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1980). Interestingly, Holland describes Whitefield's sermon form as "drama." "He acted out human-interest stories and gave colonial America a real demonstration of drama in the pulpit" (p.57). "Whitefield preached extemporaneously, moving freely about the pulpit, never using the manuscript—a characteristic of other Calvinists of the day" (ibid.).
- 57 Edwards, "History of Preaching," p. 215.
- 58 Cf., Golden, James L. and Edward P.J. Corbett, *The Rhetoric of Blair, Campbell, and Whatley* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1990), Book III, iii, "Of Vivacity as Depending on the Arrangement of the Words."
- 59 Edwards, "History of Preaching," p.219.
- 60 Ibid.
- 61 Smith, Craig R. *Rhetoric & Human Consciousness: A History* (Prospect Heights: Waveland Press Inc, 2003). "Like Descartes, Locke claimed his knowledge of self was intuitive; the understanding is 'not taught to reason' by syllogisms" (p.244).
- 62 Hogan, Lucy Lind and Robert Reid, *Connecting with the Congregation: Rhetoric and the Art of Preaching* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999), p.39. See also Park, Richard, *Language and Truth: Dialogue in the New Homiletics*. Thesis, Graduate Theological Union, pp. 69–104.
- 63 Edwards, "History of Preaching," p.220.
- 64 Pieterse, "Sermon Forms," p.13.
- 65 Broadus, John. *On the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1944), pp.156–222.
- 66 Broadus, ibid., "Three Sermon Forms," pp.134–155.
- 67 William Hethcock, "Phillip Brooks," *Concise Encyclopedia of Preaching*, p.47.
- 68 Reno, R. R. "The Great Delayer," a review of Brahmin Prophet: Phillips Brooks and the Path of Liberal Protestantism, *A Monthly Journal of Religion and Public Life*, 145 (2004), p.64. See also Wilson, A Concise History of Preaching. Wilson introduces Bushnell's sermon method. "Bushnell was a Romanticist not least in believing Christians could be united in their "imagination forms" (i.e., metaphors) if they dropped their "word-logic forms" (i.e., rational attempts at literal discourse)." (p.142). Also Wilson wrote Bushnell, following Coleridge and Kant, argued that imagination was in itself a mode of both perception and discernment that complemented the different thought processes involved in the logic of reason. Understood as such, imagination is larger and more important for the theological enterprise than a mere equation with creativity (reason is also creative) and limitation to a particular form" (p.146). See also C. Harwood Pattison, *History of Christian Preaching* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1909). Pattison points out Coleridge's influence on Brooks (p.385).
- 69 Thompson, Ernest Trice. *Changing Emphases in American Preaching: The Stone Lectures for 1943* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1943), p.15. Thompson points out, Bushnell's book was a "protest a revivalism that stifled the proper religious development of American youth" (pp.9–10).
- 70 Reno, R. R. "The Great Delayer," p. 64.
- 71 See Barth, Karl. *The Word of God and the Word of Man*, trans. Douglas Horton (Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1978). "We are offered the magnificent, productive, hopeful

life of a grain of seed, a new beginning, out of which all things shall be made new. One cannot learn or imitate this life of the divine seed in the new world. One can only let it live, grow, and ripen within him" (p.41).

- 72 Brooks, Phillip. *Lectures on Preaching*, in the new title, *The Joy of Preaching* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1989), p.114.

- 73 Sittler, Joseph. *Christian Century* 105:4 (1988), p.104. See also Joseph Sittler, *The Ecology of Faith* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1961); in the Lyman Beecher Lectures on Preaching (1959), Sittler states, "Forms of communication must change as one's mind and spirit grope toward larger meanings and as one sees the faces that look up at him to be eloquent with fresh problems, apprehensions, loves, hopes" (p.2). In Sittler, like Coleridge, "Ecology is defined as the science that deals with the mutual relationship between organism and their environment" (p.3). See also Sittler, *The Anguish of Preaching* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), Sittler re-reads New Testament as both kerygmatic and narrative. Like Amos Wilder, who points out Jesus' rhetoric as dialogue, story, parable, and poem, Sittler also attends to "narrative preaching" of Synoptic Gospels and Acts (p.20). Sittler also mentions the synthesis of the universal and the particular, See "Faith and Form" (Theology Today 19:2), "What this surely adds up to is that the artistic way to the universal is by way of the particular, that what is most universal is achieved as a result of precise attention to and effort to articulate the particular" (p.210). Sittler's thought here can also be understood as the unity of generalization (idea) and particularization (image or story).

- 74 Brooks, *Lectures on Preaching*, p.127.

- 75 Ibid., p.133-4.

- 76 Ibid., p.134.

- 77 Ibid., p.134. Cf., Davies, Horton. *Varieties of English Preaching 1900-1960* (Bloomsbury: SCM Press Ltd, 1963). Davies treats Brooks' influence of Romantic creative sermon form in England in chapter 4: "The Preaching of Truth through Personality: 'Dick' Sheppard and Studdert Kennedy" (pp.92-115).

- 78 Brooks, *Lectures on Preaching*, p.95.

- 79 Ibid., p.104. Blending of three different rhetorical appeals was originated with Aristotle. Cf., *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*, trans, George A. Kennedy (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), Book 1 (logos) and Book 2 (pathos and ethos).

- 80 Brooks, *Lectures on Preaching*, p.104.

- 81 Ibid., p.106.

- 82 See Herrick, James A. *The History and Theory of Rhetoric: An Introduction* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1997). Herrick argues that Rhetoric (1) is planned, (2) is adapted to an audience, (3) reveals human motives, (4) is response, and (5) seeks persuasion. Herrick writes, "Typically a rhetor must make an educated guess about the audience she is addressing. This imagined audience is the only audience present when a message is actually being crafted, and it often guides the inventional process in important ways" (p.8).

- 83 Long, Thomas. "Form," *Concise Encyclopedia of Preaching*, p.148.

- 84 Brooks, *Lectures on Preaching*, p.130.

- 85 Reno, R. R. "The Great Delayer" A Review, *A Monthly Journal of Religion & Public Life*, 145 (2004), pp.67-8.

- 86 Niedenthal, Morris J. "Henry G. Davis," *Concise Encyclopedia of Preaching*, p.97.
- 87 Ibid.
- 88 Rose, Lucy Atkinson. *Sharing the Word: Preaching in the Round Table Church* (Louisville: Westminster John Know Press, 1997), p.7
- 89 Ibid., p.7.
- 90 Ibid., p.8.
- 91 Ibid., p.113.
- 92 Craddock, Fred B. *Preaching* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1985), p.170.
- 93 Craddock, *As One Without Authority* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1979), p.45.
- 94 Craddock, *Overhearing the Gospel* (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2002), p.117.
- 95 Craddock, *Preaching*, pp.176–7.
- 96 Ibid., p.174.
- 97 Ibid., p. 173.
- 98 Ibid., p.180.
- 99 Ibid., p.177.
- 100 Ibid., p.178.
- 101 Ibid., p.182.
- 102 Craddock, *As One without Authority*, p.18.
- 103 Craddock, *Preaching*, p.172.
- 104 Ibid., p.189.
- 105 Ibid.
- 106 Craddock, *As One without Authority*, p.127.
- 107 See Park, Richard. "Feministic Invitational Rhetoric and Theology of Preaching." Unpublished paper, GTU, spring, 2005. Cf., Richard Lischer, "Preaching and the Rhetoric of Promise," *Word & World* 8:1 (1988), pp.66–79.
- 108 Craddock, *As One without Authority*, p.109.
- 109 David Buttrick, *Homiletic: Moves and Structure* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), "The Expressive Model," pp.177–9.
- 110 Buttrick, *Homiletic*, p.193.
- 111 Ibid.
- 112 Ibid., p.317.
- 113 Berlin, James. "Rhetoric and Ideology in the Writing Class," *College English* 50:5 (1988). Berlin Classifies Cognitive Rhetoric, Expressionistic Rhetoric, and Social-Epistemic Rhetoric (pp.477–404).
- 114 Buttrick, *Homiletc*, p.179.
- 115 Ibid., p.178
- 116 Ibid., p.179.
- 117 See chapter two of this study.
- 118 Ibid., p.260.
- 119 Ibid., p.335.
- 120 Ibid., p.310.
- 121 Elbow, Peter. *Writing without Teachers*, "The Doubting Game and the Believing Game—An Analysis of the Intellectual Enterprise," pp. 146–191.
- 122 Buttrick, *Homiletic: Moves and Structures*, p.316.
- 123 Ibid., p.335.

- 124 Ibid., p.334.
- 125 Ibid., p.48.
- 126 Ibid.
- 127 Buttrick, David. *A Captive Voice: The Liberation of Preaching* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994), p.86.
- 128 Ibid.
- 129 Lowry, Eugene L. *The Homiletical Plot: The Sermon as Narrative Art Form* (Louisville: Westminster John Know Press, 2001), p.2, 5, 14.
- 130 Ibid., p.65.
- 131 Ibid., p.72.
- 132 Lowry, Eugene L. *How to Preach Parable: Designs for Narrative Sermons* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1989), "Four Options," pp.38–41.
- 133 Lowry, The Homiletical Plot, p.79.
- 134 Lowry, *Sermon*, p.73, "David Schlafer believes that after listening carefully to the various voices of text, congregation, liturgy, culture, and self, one of the first step in sermon preparation is to decide whether the sermon-to-be will be integrated by means of argument, story, or image."
- 135 Lowry, *Sermon*, p.73. Cf., David Schlafer, *Surviving the Sermon* (Cambridge: Cowley Publications, 1992), p.29. Also see Schlafer, David J. "Where does the Preacher Stand? Image, Narrative, and Argument as Basic Strategies for Shaping Sermons," *Homiletic* 19:1 (1994), pp.1–5. Another excellent homiletic synthesis appears in Wardlaw, Don M. "Preaching as the Interface of Two Social Worlds: The Congregation as Corporate Agent in the Act of Preaching," Arthur Van Seters, ed. *Preaching as A Social Act Theology & Practice*, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1988), Wardlaw questions the linear model in the sermon, from preacher to congregation; instead he proposes a dynamic, multi-dimensional model interfacing two horizons. In Wardlaw, Biblical text, congregation, preacher, tradition, and cultural context interact all together. Wardlaw's model, like Schlafer's, represent the synthetic, organic homiletic that Coleridge and Davis propose. Ronald Allen, ed. in *Patterns of Preaching: A Sermon Sampler* (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 1998), classifies the sermon as either *exposition* of a biblical text or interpretation of a *topic* (x). He understands the sermon along two axes: content and patterns of movement. Allen collects 34 models of sermon form and categorizes them according to four kinds: expository-deductive, expository-inductive, topical, deductive, and topical-inductive (x–xi). Allen also shows his concept of organic metamorphosis. "These patterns can be combined in a single sermon. A sermon may begin inductively and reach a conclusion that is then developed deductively. A sermon could begin with an exegesis of a biblical text, but conclude with a more general, topical, consideration of an idea or image that is suggested by the text" (xii). Allen states, "The 34 sermons in that book are not exhaustive. We could identify many other approaches to preaching in the contemporary church." (xiii) Allen does not mention organic form that grows from within unpredictably. If preachers should learn these over 34 sermon models to preach and many more, it would be absurd. This book should be a model for diversities of organic sermon form, not models that preachers are expected to learn and imitate. However, Lucy Lind Hogan and Robert S. Reid's *Connecting with the Congregation: Rhetoric and the Art of Preaching* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999) is a model which

attempts to balance reason and intuition. Reid points out the overemphasis on logos in the previous generation and calls for balance with pathos and ethos (pp.41–42). Don M. Wardlaw, ed. in *Preaching Biblically: Creating Sermons in the Shape of the Scripture* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1983) also suggests how to create sermon form by means of several factors: Language of the Text, the Context of the Text, Plot of the Text, Interplay of Text and Metaphor, Structure of the Text, Shape of Text and Preacher, and Encounter of Text with Preacher. This book shows possible ways for preachers to avoid becoming fragmentary.

- 136 Lowry, Eugene L. *The Sermon: Dancing the Edge of Mystery* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), p.37.
- 137 Ibid., p.94.
- 138 Lowry, The Homiletical Plot, p. 113.
- 139 Ibid., p.15.
- 140 Lowry, *The Sermon*, p.99.
- 141 Long, Thomas G. "Form," *Concise Encyclopedia of Preaching*, p.147.
- 142 Ibid.
- 143 Ibid, p.148.
- 144 Ibid.
- 145 Davis, *Design for Preaching*, "Writing for the Ear," pp.265–294.
- 146 Long, Thomas G. *The Witness of Preaching* (Louisville: Westminster/John Know Press, 1989), p.106.
- 147 Ibid., p.111.
- 148 Ibid., p.126.
- 149 Ibid.
- 150 Long, "Form," p.146.
- 151 Ibid., p.147.
- 152 Long, Thomas G. *Preaching and the Literary forms of the Bible* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), p.24.
- 153 See Bullock, Jeffrey F. "Preaching in a Postmodern Wor(l)d: Gadamer's Philosophical Hermeneutics as Homiletical Conversation," *AAR/SBL* (1997). Also see Bullock, Jeffrey F. *Preaching with a Cupped Ear: Hans-Georg Gadamer's Philosophical Hermeneutics as Postmodern Wor(l)d* (New York: Peter Lang, 1999).
- 154 Long, *Preaching and the Literary Form of the Bible*, p.33
- 155 Rose, *Sharing the Word*, p.114.
- 156 Davis, *Design for Preaching*, pp.154–7.
- 157 Rose, *Sharing the Word*, p.113.
- 158 Ibid., p.14.
- 159 Ibid., p.18.
- 160 Rose, Lucy A. "Conversational Preaching: A Proposal," *Journal for Preachers* 19:1 (1995), p.29.
- 161 Ibid., p.26–7.
- 162 Rose, Lucy A. "The Parameter of Narrative Preaching," *Journeys toward Narrative Preaching*, ed. Wayne B. Robinson (New York: The Pilgrim Press, 1990), p.24.
- 163 Rose, "Conversational Preaching: A Proposal," p.29.
- 164 Rose, *Sharing the Word*, p.114.

- 165 Rose, "Conversational Preaching: A Proposal," p.27.
- 166 Rose, *Sharing the Word*, p.131.
- 167 Kelchner, Alan D. "Toward a Collegial Homiletic: The Conversational Preaching Paradigm of Lucy Atkinson Rose in light of the Conversational Hermeneutics of David Tracy," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, (Berkeley: Graduate Theological Union, 2003).
- 168 McClure, John S. *The Roundtable Pulpit* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995), p.40.
- 169 Ibid., p.51.
- 170 Ibid., p.50.
- 171 Kelchner, pp.15–127.
- 172 Wilson, *History*, p.157, Robert Moats Miller, "Fosdick," "History of Preaching" *Concise Encyclopedia*, 156, McClure, *Table*, p.46. McClure critiques problem-solving rhetoric as manipulative.
- 173 Long, Thomas G. "Edmund A. Steimle," *Concise Encyclopedia of History of Preaching*, pp. 453–4.
- 174 Waznak, Robert P. *An Introduction to the Homily* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1998), p.5.
- 175 Ibid.
- 176 Edwards, "History of Preaching," p.189.
- 177 Ibid., p.191.
- 178 Pieterse, "Sermon Forms," p.12.
- 179 Ibid.
- 180 Ibid.
- 181 Ibid., p.13
- 182 See *Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1975). Homily (*ὁμιλία*), from which homiletics' (*ὁμιλέω*) is coined, has multiple definitions: a being together, communion, intercourse, converse, company, sexual intercourse, instruction, association, and company (p.555).
- 183 Wilson, Paul Scott. *Imagination of the Heart* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1988), p.172.
- 184 Ibid., p.34
- 185 Wilson, Paul Scott. *The Practice of Preaching* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995), p.202.
- 186 Ibid., p.204.
- 187 Ibid., p.199.
- 188 Wilson, *Imagination of the Heart*, p. 54.
- 189 Wilson, *The Practice of Preaching*, p.202.
- 190 Wilson, Paul Scott. *The Four pages of the Sermon: A Guide to Biblical Preaching* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999), pp.79–80.
- 191 Eslinger, Richard L. *The Web of Preaching* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002), p.209.
- 192 Craddock, *Preaching*, p.173.
- 193 Wilson, *The Practice of Preaching*, p.215.
- 194 Ibid., p.216–7.
- 195 Ibid., p.216.
- 196 Wilson, *Imagination of the Heart*, p.171.
- 197 Ibid., p.172.

- 198 I use here the word “emotional” because for Evangelical preaching it is more affectionate than intuitional.

CHAPTER 5

A Proposal of Organic Homiletic

My proposal of Organic Homiletics may contribute to Northern American Homiletics by helping preachers to be able to synthesize all the diversified sermon forms option as one family, rather than as opponents. Organic Homiletic can assist preachers in moving from the divisive tendency of contemporary homiletics to become organic, authentic, imaginative, creative, and synthetic preachers. Also this proposal may help Korean preachers. As mentioned earlier, Korean preaching has also been dominated and monopolized by Broadus's singular form (deductive, argumentative and expository) for more than a century. It is advantageous for Korean preachers to move on in order to experience change and freedom from this control. However, without having first experienced the Henry Davis' theory of synthetic organic preaching, Korean preachers are being introduced to North American New Homileticians such as Lowry and Craddock. Organic Homiletic, with its emphasis upon Davis's theory, may be a very helpful resource for Korean preachers. Without this, a transition from singular form to plural form may cause chaos, disorder, and frustration for Korean preachers.

The previous chapter suggests that, while leaders in the development of the New Homiletic in North America incorporated organic form to some extent, this resource was underutilized. This chapter proposes a homiletic approach that more fully utilizes organic form in regard to sermon content, context, and process. Such a proposal is based on the conviction that a more fully developed Organic Homiletic will help preachers to have a more authentic voice and to achieve an authentic expression, free from the controlling authority incumbent in dependence upon outside sources. This chapter is organized as follows: 1) The Need for An Organic Homiletic, 2) A Definition for Organic Homiletic, and 3) Practical Applications for Organic Homiletic. The second section, dealing with definition, is structured according to: a) Homiletic of Process, b) Homiletic of Synthesis, c) Homiletic of Dialogue, d) Homiletic of Intuition, and e) Homiletic of Discovery. The third section, dealing with practical applications, is structured according to a) Discovery of Content, b) Discovery of Context, and c) Discovery of Form. Finally, this chapter seeks to appropriate an authentic

structure of deployment: Dialogic Structure. Extensive endnotes are employed as a way to model conversation with other voices, following the example of Derrida in his autobiographical *Jacques Derrida*.¹

The Need for an Organic Homiletic

Why would one argue the need to construct and propose an Organic Homiletic? Does such a proposal simply constitute another method in an already full house of contemporary homiletic models? If one were to assume that yet another homiletic approach is needed, why would preachers need for it to be “organic?”

The argument for proposing a more fully developed Organic Homiletic is grounded in a desire to provide preachers freedom from the authoritarian control of sermon models. By eliminating a reliance on imitating models that may suffocate preachers’ own authentic expression, those preachers embrace the experience of structuring and preaching sermons that flow from their own authentic voice. A fully developed organic approach to preaching can assist preachers in achieving a radical liberation from the oppression inherent in being a slave to the authoritarian power of sermon models.² Reason controls universally, yet intuition liberates particularly. Organic Homiletic emphasizes utilizing intuition in harmony with reason. Reason helps people to remain the same; intuition helps them to become different. Reason helps people to be certain; intuition allows for uncertainty and probability. By employing intuition with reason, preachers can be particular, authentic, and local in their role as communicators.³

In reaction to perceived excesses of the Enlightenment and Rationalism, Romanticism and Post-modernism stresses contextual, situational, and circumstantial truth—like the sophists of antiquity who opposed the general and universal truth of philosophers.⁴ Organic Homiletic sides with Romanticism and Post-modernism in this respect. Organic Homiletic strives to be particular, contextual, and circumstantial. Organic Homiletic aims to create preachers with a kind of “local voicing”—authentic preachers who preach out of their own authentic expression. Such an approach understands form and content to be inseparable from each another; it is a marriage or partnership that cannot be broken. If content cannot be induced via an authentic voice, there is no hope for authentic form. From content, form flows.⁵ From content, form grows. From content, form develops. Sermon form is not imposed from somewhere outside of preachers;⁶ preachers do not need to hunt and ferret form from distant fields and mountains. The best

fitting sermon form is hidden in the preachers' own gardens. The treasure is buried at home, not at some far away neighbor's home. All that preachers need to do is to stay home and open their eyes to discover their own homemade form.

This need for an organic approach is consistent with the hearer's need in a sermon. Every audience of preaching expects their preachers to be different from other all preachers in terms of content. If they discover their preacher is copying, imitating, or borrowing, sometimes to the extent of plagiarism,⁷ they will be discouraged and feel cheated. This demand for creativity and authenticity, week after week, can create overwhelming pressure for preachers. There is indeed a need for an Organic Homiletic to help preachers address this overwhelming task to which they are called.

A Definition for Organic Homiletic

As stated initially, the purpose of this chapter is to propose a homiletic approach that more fully utilizes organic form. The process of defining such an Organic Homiletic is complex enough to merit approaching it from several perspectives. The definition that follows is structured according to: 1) Homiletic of Process, 2) Homiletic of Synthesis, 3) Homiletic of Dialogue, 4) Homiletic of Intuition, and 5) Homiletic of Discovery.

Homiletic of Process

Organic Homiletic is grounded in process. Such an approach to preaching asserts that a sermon is not created in a static or fixed moment or place. Organic Homiletic develops in time, so it is Homiletic of time. From the initial stage of choosing a text or deciding upon a topic or a direction, to the final stage of delivery, Organic Homiletic constitutes involvement and participation. Therefore, for a preacher utilizing Organic Homiletic, the act of sermon preparation, from inception to delivery, covers a wide range. For Organic Homiletic, invention is inseparable from arrangement and delivery; it is quite unlike the serious dichotomy and disunion that exists in rationalistic Homiletic where invention and arrangement are separated, neither interconnected nor interdependent.⁸ In contrast, Organic Homiletic interconnects invention and arrangement, claiming that content is inseparable from form. In this process, Organic Homiletic grows and develops, open-ended, until the end of the sermon creation process. Even in the act of delivery, Organic Homiletic allows for integration. Extemporaneous

preaching⁹ allows for the possibility for intuition to intervene; therefore, even during the moment of preaching, the preacher's intuition may instigate a change from what the preacher had planned to say to what he or she actually does say.

Sermon preparation is, in Organic Homiletic, a process that continues until the very last word of the sermon. While some preachers argue that sermon preparation is accomplished within a certain, fixed time, Organic Homiletic asserts that the sermon grows in time and in a process that includes uncertainty. Preachers do not, in advance, know what the final feature of the sermon will be until there has been an interaction of text, preacher, and audience. As a result, sermon preparation in keeping with Organic Homiletic is always an unfinished symphony. The preacher, as the composer of this symphony, is always in the process of preparing sermon content as it is influenced by sermon context, until finally, in the moment of delivery, the sermon remains open-ended until the last note has been sounded.

Homiletic of Synthesis

Organic Homiletic is a Homiletic of synthesis. Organic Homiletic synthesizes reason and intuition; invention and arrangement; content and form; natural order and artificial order; system and randomness; chaos and control; order and disorder; control and creativity; Hebraic rhetoric and Hellenistic rhetoric¹⁰, and natural formless form and artificial persuasive form. One should not misunderstand Organic Homiletic as being exclusively a radical, unrestrained heir of Romanticism. It is a balanced, synthetic, and harmonized Romantic homiletics. Organic Homiletic, though influenced by Romanticism, is more akin to a Coleridgean Organicism that synthesizes reason and intuition, as a reconciliation of opposites. Coleridgean Organicism is Romanticism that seeks balance and synthesis. Organic Homiletic, similar to the approach employed by Peter Elbow, embodies both a believing and a doubting of intuition and reason, as preachers approach the tasks of invention and elaboration. Organic Homiletic does not neglect the sermon models that have accumulated over time;¹¹ on the contrary, Organic Homiletic considers the large range of sermon models as possible branches and fruits of Organic Preaching. Organic Homiletic does not provide a specific sermon model for preachers; rather, it provides working principles that nurture the development of preachers' own creative, authentic sermon form. Many sermon models and variations are counted as possibilities that Organic preachers might eventually develop; however, they are not viewed as initial models to be imitated or copied. In this respect, apprentice

preachers can get help from these models in order to become familiar with the possibilities and potential boundaries of sermon form, but beginning preachers should not view them as models to imitate.

As shown in the previous chapter, Christian preaching has dual origins: Hebraic and Hellenistic. Hebraic rhetoric is a natural, formless form, and Hellenistic rhetoric is an artificial, persuasive form. It contains a natural flow by means of dialogue. It explicates the biblical text verse by verse, resulting in a structure that flows. In contrast, Hellenistic form is artificially persuasive. It has its own system leading to a product, unlike Hebraic form that is random, focusing more on the process. Both of these early forms have influenced Christian preaching, and these dual influences have at times been blended by metamorphosis, synthesis, or interdependence. Organic Homiletic also attempts to synthesize logic and rhetoric. Logic is an important resource for preachers, but Aristotelian logic should not be allowed to function as the sheer authority for preaching. Preachers need to understand the relationship of logic to rhetoric. Rhetoric embraces logic. Rhetoric also has its own natural logic.¹² Hellenistic forensic rhetoric is a logical rhetoric; whereas, Hebraic rhetoric is a natural and organic one. Organic rhetoric, therefore, aims to synthesize these two major rhetorics to produce organic preaching, an approach to preaching that honors a process that addresses both content and context.

Homiletic of Dialogue

Organic Homiletic is a Homiletic of dialogue. Organic Homiletic has two dialogue partners: text and audience.¹³ The dialogue on Organic Homiletic is double dialogue. These dialogues create particularity in Organic preaching. The particularity of a biblical text, its shape, and its intention affect the authenticity of preaching.¹⁴ Similarly, the particularity of the audience in a specific time and place also impacts the authenticity of preaching. Additionally, the particularity of preachers themselves is also a factor. These three variables create particular, authentic, and creative Organic sermons by means of an ongoing dialogue. Preachers start an initial dialogue with the biblical text. In the meantime, preachers converse with God through the text, seeking to determine what God wants to communicate to the audience through the preaching. In this sense, Organic Homiletic allows preachers to become mediums of the dialogue between God and the audience. This happens in a specific time and in a specific place. Preachers also converse with the text and the original audience. This dialogue is not a direct transmitting of truth from the past, nor is it a regenerating of the original

intent of the text. Rather, this dialogue functions as a preparatory dialogue that prepares preachers for the dialogue they need to have with their contemporary audiences—a dialogue centered on the same topic as it applies to the contemporary situation. In this way, preachers equally face two dialogue partners of audience: the original and the contemporary. There is no power-over authority in regard to one or the other.¹⁵ While the importance of each dialogue is equal, the timing in the process varies; the dialogue starts with the original audience, and the process then continues with the dialogue with the contemporary audience. In Organic Homiletic, preachers should continue in a dialogue with their contemporary audience even into the final moments of delivery. An extemporaneous preaching style allows the dialogue to continue until the final word of the sermon. The actual delivery of the sermon is a true dialogue in that preachers read the body language of their audience, and the preachers then use their intuition in shaping the sermon that finally gets preached. Organic Homiletic liberates preachers to converse with the audience, free from the control of reason inherent in an over-reliance on manuscripts or outlines.

Homiletic of Intuition

Organic Homiletic is a Homiletic of intuition.¹⁶ This is not to say that Organic Homiletic neglects reason; rather, it is a claim that it is not enough to rely only on reason. Preachers need to supplement reason with intuition. Reason controls, but intuition liberates. Romanticism focuses on intuition in response to the excessive focus on reason by Rationalism. When preachers utilize reason alone, all preaching becomes, if not the same, at least similar. Using intuition allows preachers to be different from one another in their preaching. It is important to note that similarity in preaching is not necessarily always a bad thing; however, sameness is not always the greatest attribute of preaching. Reason may provide unity in preaching, but intuition allows for diversity. Reason lifts up the general; intuition accents the particular. When individual preachers incorporate intuition into the preaching process, preaching becomes more colorful. Audience members are allowed to taste a variety of fruits. Reason emphasizes the universal, but intuition addresses the local. Local preachers have their own local voice and expression when they use their own, individual intuition. When they listen to their own deep feelings of intuition, they can become authentic. Meditation within their own deep souls leads to listening to their own intuition. In this respect, Organic Homiletic attempts to recover the ancient monastic tradition of meditation, *Lectio Divina*.¹⁷ Also Organic Homiletic can utilize advice

from modern cognitive psychology, a strategy that helps people to listen to their own intuition in order to be more creative. In addition, Organic Homiletic can profit from conversation with the Contemporary, expressive composition theorists who acknowledge the importance of utilizing intuition, as well as reason, in composition.

Intuition is a part of the process of invention, arrangement, and delivery for organic preachers. Through intuition, a creative voice flows; consequently, through intuition, an authentic voice emerges. Therefore, intuition plays a significant role in the early stage of invention (i.e. the discovery of sermon content). Organic preachers use intuition and reason simultaneously when they produce what they are to preach, by utilizing meditation techniques and contemporary psychological techniques of pre-writing or free-writing. By means of intuition preachers can reach into the rich reservoir of human memory. Intuition is a tool for preachers to listen deeply within their own soul. In addition to discovering sermon content, intuition can lead preachers to discover analogies that may also serve as metaphors for “naming grace.”¹⁸ It is not mere illustration but deep life experience that connects a message to an audience.

Intuition also intervenes in the moment of extemporaneous delivery, even when preachers are utilizing manuscripts or outlines. Following intuition, preachers should interact and even change the prepared sermon based on the dialogue and interaction that occurs with the live audience. There is a sense in which one can liken the process to improvisation by Jazz musicians.¹⁹ Utilizing intuition maximizes the potential for an appropriate diversity of communication. Since all preachers may read the same biblical text, the same commentary, and the same preaching materials, there is a tendency for them to become the same preacher. However, when they also acknowledge the value of the unconscious, wherein lies intuition, their imagination, creativity, and authenticity as preachers are increased. Organic Homiletic aims at making possible this unpredictable journey for each preacher.

Homiletic of Discovery

Organic Homiletic is a Homiletic of discovery. Traditionally, homiletic has primarily emphasized sermon form and delivery. Invention (the discovery of what to preach) has often been viewed as the responsibility of those areas of a seminary focusing on biblical theology and systematic theology. However, such a view does not hold, because form flows from content. Content is inseparable from form, and, as a result, content and form are unified.²⁰

Consequently, Organic Homiletic crosses the borderline that many have understood as the traditional demarcation between theoretic theology and practical theology. Organic Homiletic, in a way, transcends the borderline that caused homiletics to be viewed exclusively as a practical or applied discipline. Exegesis and theological inquiry should also be incorporated through dialogue when preachers consciously work on discovering what to preach. At the same time, by means of an unconscious process utilizing intuition, preachers creatively construct bridges among the original audience and message and the contemporary audience and message. Organic Homiletic turns traditional homiletics into homiletics of discovery. Organic Homiletic leads preachers to discover what to preach as well as how to preach. The homiletical discovery process includes a concern for content as well as form.²¹

Traditionally, preachers have been taught that they should borrow sermon forms, but Organic Homiletic challenges such a mechanical and artificial employment of sermon models, imposed from outside preachers. Sermon form needs to grow from within preachers. It can be discovered from the preachers' content and context in the process; it need not be provided from outside the preachers' experience. Sermon form, in Organic Homiletic, develops as part of an ongoing process. Organic Homiletic discovers its authentic content and form, because each individual preacher has her or his own authentic voice and expression according to the variables of text and audience. However, Organic Homiletic also employs reason in order to discover what to preach. While the use of meditation and pre- or free-writing calls for intuition,²² the use of questions and research calls for reason. Unlike those who operate from a traditional bias regarding reason, Organic Homiletic employs reason and intuition as complementary partners.

Another valuable aspect of discovery regarding Organic Homiletic is that, as preachers seek to discover their own authentic voice, the process can help to encourage the hearing of the marginal voices of the society. By paying attention to audience, the authentic voices of the marginalized within that audience can indirectly be heard in the sermon. The result can be liberation from the voice of authority. Likewise, organic sermon form can provide liberation from the dominance that can come from using authoritarian sermon forms.²³ By enabling preachers to produce independent, creative, and authentic sermon forms that reflect the individuality of each preacher as well as the exigencies of each individual audience, Organic Homiletic goes a long way in recovering and revitalizing the best of the revolution of radical pluralism.

Practical Applications for Organic Homiletic

The goal of Organic Homiletic is to enable preachers to discover content, context, and form. Both intuition and reason are employed in this process of discovery throughout the sermon creation process, and the text and audiences (both ancient and present) are dialogue partners with preachers as the process culminates in preaching with authentic voice and authentic expression. This section discusses the practical steps that preachers can take when preparing and delivering a sermon within the construct of an Organic Homiletic.

Step One: Discovery of Content

In the initial stage of sermon preparation, discovery of content, what matters most is the particular text and particular preacher. Later in the process, discovery of context, the relation between sermon and audience is of greatest importance. Therefore, in this first stage, the preacher pursues a dialogue with a biblical text and the preacher's self. While employing traditional biblical exegesis and research for preaching, organic preachers also attend to their deep inner soul and intuition as they meditate and reflect upon the biblical text. Organic preachers read the biblical text imaginatively, making good use of their intuition. The first thing for preachers to do is to allow their deep self to converse freely and unconsciously with the text; they should do so without fear of coming up with a bizarre interpretation or application. Neither should they harbor any guilt for not capitulating completely to the role of reason at this stage. The goal is for the dialogue to flow freely. In this stage of the process, preachers utilize pre- or free-writing techniques²⁴ and the monastic meditation tradition of *Lectio Divina*.²⁵ Without worrying about how what one is doing might possibly be critiqued, preachers should concentrate on producing as much as possible through the combined use of both intuition and reason. In this step, preachers can spend time in a library or their personal study, or they may make use of a retreat center or meditative garden or park for solitary prayer.

The timing for this first step may vary. Overall, the earlier that one can begin the sermon creation process, the better. Some preachers, who preach weekly, use Sunday evening to start the process of creating the sermon that will be preached the following Sunday morning. Allowing almost an entire week for the process ensures a better chance for there to be enough time for the sermon to grow. On a Sunday evening, preachers may begin an encounter with the biblical text, getting a main idea or a main direction for the sermon. Every morning of the ensuing week, preachers can meditate and free-write.²⁶

They may also devote two or three morning hours during the week to research and study. As Bonhoeffer advises, it would be better to avoid sermon work in the evening or at night when the preacher is already tired from a day's work.²⁷ Since most preachers are also pastors, some of their available weekly hours are spent doing pastoral work; they cannot spend all their time on preaching every day. Nonetheless, it is important to begin the sermon preparation process as early as possible so that there will be adequate time for the "incubation" of the sermon. Cognitive psychologists advise that an incubation period allows a sermon to grow and deepen.²⁸ During this stage of the process, preachers need not worry about any kind of evaluation or critique regarding what they are discovering—that which might become the content of what they will preach. During this period, all preachers need to do is to initially gather as much content as possible by using both intuition and reason. What is important is to write down, jot down, or scribble down anything that comes to light from the dialogue between text and preacher. If analogies or metaphors surface at this point, preachers should capture them in writing as well.

During this step, preachers can employ the inventive method of raising questions: "What?", "Why?", "Where?", "Who?", "When?", and "How?" Preachers may also utilize more sophisticated, imaginative and creative questions for interpretation and application.²⁹ From this process of discovery of what to preach, preachers discover a particular voice from the encounter between the particular preacher and the particular text. The discovered message does not necessarily need to be the same as the original message to the original audience. The goal is not to regenerate a past truth; rather, the goal is to create a contemporarily applicable message for the present audience that will experience the sermon.

Step Two: Discovery of Context

In the discovery of context step, organic preachers draw another conversation partner into the ongoing dialogue: the contemporary audience. The dialogue with the contemporary audience may occur in time and space, or it may be imagined. There are several options for creating an actual conversation: 1) Preachers can organize lay lectionary discussion groups and enter into conversations with congregants concerning both the text itself and/or the preacher's initial interaction with the text, 2) Preachers can utilize the internet for an asynchronous or real time online conversation, 3) Preachers can schedule time to visit parishioners and talk with them, face to face, about the text/or the upcoming sermon, or 4) In the moment of delivery, preachers

can get feedback from the audience by asking non-rhetorical questions to which hearers may respond aloud. Preachers may also have a dialogue, of sorts, by paying attention to hearers' non-verbal feedback. In either instance, preachers can incorporate this dialogue into the finished product of the sermon by means of improvisation.

The dialogue with the contemporary audience may also occur in the preacher's imagination. For the sake of time and convenience, preachers may need to imagine their audience as the primary way of experiencing a dialogue with them. The effectiveness of this method will be largely dependent both on how well preachers have gotten to know their hearers and how attentive preachers are to the variety of factors that impact the lives of their hearers. Regarding the latter, the preparation for preaching becomes an opportunity for preachers actively to consider the many cultural influences that impact their hearers.³⁰ Preachers utilizing an Organic Homiletics should understand that the dialogues in which they participate with their audience are also dialogues with varying cultures represented in the audience.

It is important to note the integral relationship of discovering context in a sermon to discovering content in a sermon. In this regard, preaching occurs in a rhetorically complex setting. The extent to which preachers give attention to this "content ↔ context" relationship directly impacts the degree to which the sermon will be authentic. Attention to particularity is critical since every rhetorical situation is different and local. Sermon context cannot be ignored in the process of ultimately determining content. Content must be achieved as the result of two dialogues: first, between preachers' deep intuition and reason and the biblical text and, second, in the midst of the voices of text, preacher, contemporary audience, and the audience's particular culture(s). From out of these dialogues, organic preachers most likely will have several pages or screens of sermon content based on their pre- or free-writing and research. It is time to take the next step.

Step Three: Discovery of Form

In this step, preachers consider "how" to preach this sermon. Organic preachers do not need to go somewhere outside to borrow a sermon model and then mold their content into it. Instead, organic preachers can now simply re-read their several pages of content, looking in particular for hints of sermon form that may already have begun to emerge from the process to this point. However, this does not mean it is alright to neglect and reject already existing basic sermon models. As basic music scales are indispensable to be practiced for jazz pianist to improvise, beginning

preachers, unlike already seasoned and experienced preachers, must get acquainted to basic sermon models in order later to have these forms as a part of their repertoire. The more dexterous preachers are in working with basic sermon forms, the more dexterous they will be in creating authentic organic sermon form. Organic sermon form is not anarchical method; rather, it is “creative imitation” or “organic imitation” as Aristotle argues synthetically that “imitation differs from one another,”³¹ and Emerson Marks calls it “Organic Mimesis.”³² The Romantic organicist Coleridge stunningly emphasizes “true imitation of the essential principles” rather than “servile imitation and blind copying of effects.”³³ Preachers should understand that Coleridgean organic form is a synthesis of reason and intuition (or imitation and creation). Even seasoned and experienced preachers need to review the basic sermon forms and learn emerging, new models of sermon form to create their authentic “right” sermon form. This is also stressed by the great Romantic organic preacher, Brooks. Although he was seen as an “atypical” formless preacher, he advised preachers to accept rules of sermon making as “helpful friends and not as arrogant masters.”³⁴

Since preaching is oral communication, it is important for preachers to search for a form that has continuity.³⁵ Here, preachers need to restrain any tendency they may have to imitate. Preachers should trust their own ability to create and discover sermon form. Some preachers may hesitate in plunging into the adventure of discovering a new authentic form from the content that has emerged. When first beginning to utilize Organic Homiletic, preachers may have a latent fear of and allegiance to the authority present in the idea that “there is only one ‘correct’ sermon form template for this sermon and you, the preacher, had better use it.” Such a concern may act to limit preachers’ creative discovery of their own authentic form. Nonetheless, organic preachers need to remember that all they need, at this point, is a simple awareness of some basic possible sermon continuities. For example, Davis provides a beginning list: deductive, inductive, logical, chronological, and dramatic;³⁶ however, preachers need not be limited to just these since the possibilities for continuities of communication are numerous.³⁷

Another possible problem for preachers attempting to embrace Organic Homiletic is that they may have been trained according to the presupposition that sermon form always should be logical—a premise influenced by Hellenistic rhetoric and Aristotelian logic. Organic Homiletic raises the challenge against the assumption that all sermons should be logical. Granted, when a sermon is logical, the audience hears it easily. Nonetheless, even when sermon is illogical, an audience also can hear and experience the content strangely well, perhaps even with awe and freshness. Organic

Homiletic proceeds on the belief that logical order may, at times, be supplemented by chaotic disorder.³⁸ Systematic control of sermon form of Hellenistic rhetoric can (and should) be supplemented by a natural flow of sermon form reminiscent of Hebraic rhetoric. In this respect, one can describe this conflict in the following terms: logic versus rhetoric. Logic always has its inner artificial law of continuity, while rhetoric, though seemingly random, chaotic and disorderly, has its own natural law. Adherence to an understanding and appreciation of organic form makes it possible to produce metamorphosis and synthesis of sermon form from these two extreme poles. Systematic, mechanistic, and artificial sermon form helps preachers to be logical and rational, while unsystematic, organic, and natural sermon form helps preachers to be natural and creative. Dialogic and expository Hebraic sermon form is perceived as formless from the perspective of Hellenists who are committed to a systematic, artificial, and logical form. However, these two initial sermon forms constructed Christian sermon form by synthesis and metamorphosis. Organic sermon form grows and flows from the content and the context organically in the process of its creation.³⁹ If the content that grows out of the discovery process contains multiple topics or ideas, organic preachers may wish to include multiple themes. The goal is to let the form flow and grow. The preacher needs to discover the already present form from the content and develop it. Organic Homiletic requires that the preacher let the form emerge on its own, free from any possible intimidation related to authoritarianism latent in the preacher's previous understanding of the role of logic or traditional models. Preachers need to relax and not feel as if they are breaking rules. If there is a law to be followed, it is organic law—the law of nature that allows the process of discovering sermon form to flow as it naturally chooses to flow. Ultimately, every sermon follows a law of some kind as it comes into being. The law may artificial or natural; Organic Homiletic argues that preachers should opt for the natural and let the form work out by itself.

Although some of the New Homileticians argue that a sermon should flow with movements, not as a chronological passage through a series of points (a perspective consistent with the Old Homiletic), preachers should know that what ultimately matters is that a sermon should have a flow that allows the audience to grasp (or be grasped by) the sermon. Such a form may utilize points or plots or movements. As Davis points out, even the flow sometimes can be mixed and fused, the result of metamorphosis and synthesis. For this reason, a fully developed Organic Homiletic claims that every sermon form should be authentic, even though the final form may resemble other extant models. Sermon form should flow from the content

and grow naturally and organically. An organic sermon must be given the time to grow and must be finally rooted in the particularity of place in order to incubate. Through adherence to this process for discovering form, a particular, creative, and authentic form emerges into the world. It will be a form so authentically in tune with preachers that they will feel as comfortable with it as they do with their own bodies. This level of comfort may significantly impact the delivery of the sermon. Preachers may more naturally deliver a sermon in a form that has come out naturally from the preachers' inner selves. Working with a form that came from within may also enable preachers more easily to memorize the sermon; consequently, they may be freer in the moment of delivery to maximize more fully the vocal variety and expressive body language incumbent in extemporaneous preaching.⁴⁰

Organic sermon form, for this reason, appeals to audiences ethically because preachers are perceived as being honest in their sermon content, sermon metaphor, sermon style, and sermon delivery. Sermon content and form, in Organic Homiletic, flow from the preacher's deep soul honestly, depicting the real world. In this regard, Organic Homiletic employs all three rhetorical means: logos, pathos, and ethos.⁴¹ As Horace and Augustine had functional homiletics that aims to teach, please, and move an audience, Organic Homiletic also has such goals for the audience. Organic Homiletic combines all these goals by combining all three rhetorical means. It anticipates audience will learn by argument, instruction and exposition. It expects the audience to be pleased and moved by imagination and the self-disclosure of the preacher.⁴² Also, it calls the audience members to participate in the preaching by identifying themselves with the preacher. Organic Homiletic, as shown above, is a Homiletic that stresses ethos by self-disclosing (truth through personality) honestly to audience and helping the audience to self-discover its own truth. Organic Homiletic also utilizes indirect communication such as inductive, narrative and dialogic forms that makes preachers midwives while, at the same time, directing communication through deductive, argumentative, and expository methods by synthesizing these two opposite methods. Given this, Organic Homiletic helps preachers to self-disclose and self-discover truth and method, not neglecting and rejecting "old truths and old methods." As Young, Becker and Pike argue, this is an integral synthesis in which "we must be discoverers of new truths as well as preservers and transmitters of the old."⁴³ As content and form are inseparable, then this can be applied to methods and forms. Coleridge also emphasizes this synthesis of accidental aspect of creation and artificiality of imitation⁴⁴ while Schaper and Lord argue contrary emphases of organic

form.⁴⁵ Thus, Organic Homiletic actually interconnects all the parts of the classical rhetorical canon: invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery. Arrangement, or form, is related to invention first, and then style, memory and finally delivery. Arrangement or form is the crucial stage for the sermon preparation process. The process of discovering form from within is the most important contribution of Organic Homiletic.

Conclusion

Organic Homiletic is not another method for preaching, but an understanding of and appreciation for the power and synergy that leads to the creation of authentic preaching. Organic Homiletic embraces all other methods for preaching not as imitative models leading to a “product,” but as potential organic fruits that may grow out of a “process.” Organic Homiletic requires that preachers enter into a process of growth that occurs in time and place. Traditional homiletic pedagogy presented preachers with sermon models for preachers to practice and imitate, and the process of invention, the task of determining what to preach, was, in effect, turned over to other seminary academies. Organic Homiletic challenges the traditional homiletic pedagogy that only teaches “product” for imitation, not “process” for creation.⁴⁶ Organic Homiletic asserts the importance of an initial process of discovery of content in which the preacher’s self converses with the biblical text.

Equal emphasis is placed on the next step in the process, the discovery of context in which preachers perform a second dialogue with their contemporary audience. In this process, preachers attend to the rhetorical situation of preaching that affects sermon design. Organic Homiletic emphasizes utilization of intuition as well as reason. Free-writing using intuition is the most important technique utilized by Organic Homiletic. Organic preachers need not fear any critique (internally or externally) while they are producing what to preach. It is an ‘open-ended process, the goal of which is to discover as much as they can.

In the third and final step, organic preachers employ a critical mind to organize and revise the sermon content, relating it to the sermon’s context, as a means for discovering an already inherent form within the sermon content they have created. In seeking out the form, organic preachers value natural flow and organic law, though it may seem neither logical nor orderly. Sometimes chaos, disorder and randomness also work for organic preachers, if they are natural and organic to the sermon content. Human life is sometimes random, chaotic, and disorderly, and people accept these

phenomena as natural. Therefore, Organic Homiletic that cherishes natural and organic flow does not reject illogical continuity, yet organic preachers should find some logical continuity and movement, whether it is deductive, inductive, expository, and narrative. Organic preachers develop their own authentic voice and method of preaching, while not slavishly sticking to a method with which they are familiar.⁴⁷ Organic preachers treasure a pluralistic sermon form, particularly one that is creatively authentic and grows out of a concern for local cultural concerns. Organic preachers engage in dialogue with a diverse text and a diverse audience in order to create a sermon that is appropriately diverse and authentic for a changing time and place. Organic Homiletic challenges preachers and homileticians alike, who have been controlled and suffocated under the strain of authoritarian form,⁴⁸ to participate in the self-discovery of an authentic voice and expression. Those who accept the challenge will be rewarded with colorful, tasteful, and healthful sermons as the fruit of their labor—the arduous labor of preparing to preach.

NOTES

- 1 Derrida, Jacques, and Bennington, Geoffrey. *Jacques Derrida*, trans., Geoffrey Bennington (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1993). This book utilizes a binary dialogic structure in which Derrida writes his autobiography with Bennington. The upper portion is written by Geoffrey Bennington, using the name of *Derridabase*, while the lower portion is written by Jacques Derrida himself, under the name of *Circumfession*. A similar structure is employed in this chapter as a way of modeling how one can consciously seek to pursue an authentic voice and expression. In raising a private voice to propose an Organic Homiletics, it is good for that voice to maintain the standards of academic rigor by entering into with dialogues with other scholarly voices. For this reason, the footnotes in this chapter are, in some instances, lengthy.
- 2 The concept of preaching “Without Authority” has echoes of the Romantic revolt against the control of authority of content and form. Fred Craddock’s *As One without Authority* suggests that audience should receive a message indirectly by means of hearers making their own decision. In *Preaching*, he re-applies this Romantic revolt of preaching to sermon form, by suggesting the preacher should select from plural sermon forms to create a sermon form, rather than imitating a given sermon form and thereby submitting to its authority. In a sense, Craddock is also a Romantic homiletician when he opposes the authority of norm and form in preaching. Contemporary, Romantic expressive composition theorists [See Peter Elbow’s *Writing without Teachers* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973) and *Writing with Power* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981)] show the same Romantic revolt against authority of outer norms and form in composition. Every writer should compose without authority; form should be discovered inside rather than imposed from outside. In this sense, Organic Homiletics is a Rhetoric of Romanticism, and aligns itself with Contemporary Romanticism such as Craddock and Elbow. In *Writing without Teachers*, Elbow represents the radical and unbridled Romanticism of Wordsworth, but later, in *Writing with Power*, Elbow turns to the moderate restrained Romanticism of Coleridge. Creativity and critical thinking, or intuition and reason, are harmonized (pp.8–11 “A Two-step Writing Process” in *Writing with Power*). Elbow gives insight to preacher when he writes, “But you don’t have to give in to this dilemma of creativity versus critical thinking and submit to the dominance of one muscle and lose the benefits of the other. If you separate the writing process into two stages, you can exploit these opposing muscles one at a time: first be loose and accepting as you do fast early writing; then be critically tough-minded as you revise what you have produced. What you’ll discover is that these two skills used alternately don’t undermine each other at all, they enhance each other”(p.9). Applied to preaching, the quickest process of sermon composition is comprised of these two steps: create what to preach freely, and be critical about how to preach. Preachers can employ this approach by using two separate sheets of paper when creating a sermon; one sheet is used to create what to preach, and the other is used to note for how to

preach with continuity or movement. The first sheet of paper can be used for free-writing or brainstorming without worry or fear, and the second sheet can be used to introduce some type of organization. Maybe this all can be done in the time frame of an hour.

- 3 This suggestion for using reason assumes the preacher should stress the importance of right use of reason, as Luther did. Luther distinguishes three kinds of reason: 1) natural reason, 2) arrogant reason, and 3) regenerate reason. For Luther, natural reason is the inventor and mentor of all the arts, medicines, laws, and of whatever wisdom, power, virtue, and glory men possess in this life. Luther supports the use of logic in debate and the use of common sense and wisdom in creating an orderly, caring, just, and ennobling society. Luther does not rule out the utility of reason in the religious realm. As well, Luther thinks reason is vital for pointing out logical weaknesses in destructive reasoning. Luther's only opposition to reason is the use of arrogant reason. For Luther, regenerate reason needs to be appropriated in the Christian ministry for faith. See Park, Richard H. *Language and Truth: Dialogue in the New Homiletics*, unpublished MA Thesis, Graduate Theological Union, 2003) pp.99–102. Some of New Homileticians tend to have antipathy to reason while they revolt against Rationalistic preaching, but, according to Luther, reason can be a powerful tool for sermons. Sermon form utilizing argument (whether deductive or inductive), therefore, can be powerful tool for organization.
- 4 See Bizzell, Patricia and Herzberg, Bruce ed. *The Rhetorical Tradition: Reading from Classical Times to the Present*, second edition (Bedford: ST. Martin's, 2001), "The Sophistic Movement," pp.22–25.
- 5 For a discussion of "flow," see Csikszentmihalyi, Mihaly. *Creativity: Flow and the Psychology of Discovery and Invention* (New York: Harper Perennial, 1996), and by the same author, *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience* (New York: Harper Perennial, 1991).
- 6 Coleridge's Shakespearean criticism, p.224
- 7 For a further discussion of the serious danger of intellectual poverty of society, social inertia, see Clark, Jere. "On Facing the Crisis of Intellectual Poverty," *The Journal of Creative Behavior* 3:4 (1969), p. 260.
- 8 Ancient rhetorical canon has five parts: 1) invention or discovery, 2) arrangement or disposition or organization 3) elocution or style, 4) memory or memorizing speeches 5) delivery. See Corbett, Edwards P.J. *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), "The Five Canons of Rhetoric," pp.22–28. Organic Homiletics attempts to interconnect these five canons, especially invention and arrangement.
- 9 Roy Deferrari discovered Augustine's sermon "bears too many striking marks of spontaneity and naturalness" (p.101). Deferrari found out that "the great minds of the patristic floruit (fourth and fifth centuries) usually preached extempore, or if not extempore in the strictest sense, after some meditation on the subject" (p.104). Extemporaneous sermon has a long history in the preaching. (See Roy J. Deferrari, "St. Augustine's Method of Composing and Delivering Sermons," *American Journal of Philology* 43:2 (1922). In addition, Edwards, O.C. also discloses that Luther preached extemporaneously ("History of Preaching" p.205). Joseph M. Webb's *Preaching with-*

out Notes is a study of extemporaneous preaching (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2001). This extemporaneous preaching in relation to using intuition will be a topic for further development.

- 10 Hebraic preaching may be called a homily (*homilia*), while Hellenistic preaching is referred to as sermon (*sermo*). The most thorough study of this homily appears in Robert P. Waznak's *An Introduction to the Homily* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1998), "From Sermon to Homily" (pp.1–30). Waznak attempts to retrieve and refine the ancient sermon form (homily) and characterizes homily as 1) biblical, 2) liturgical (doxological, anamnestic, epikletic, eschatological, and ecclesial), 3) kerygmatic, and 4) conversational, and 5) prophetic. Waznak traces this of homily primarily from Origen. New Homiletician, Charles L Rice, also relates homily to a liturgical setting. See Charles L. Rice, *The Embodied Word: Preaching as Art and Liturgy*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991). This liturgical, expository and conversational homily is also found in the early Middle Age's *Homiliaries*. With Chrysostom, this homily splits from liturgy, not using pericope but *lectio continua*. Natural flow, conversation, and verse by verse exposition are the main character of a homily, while a sermon is more systematic, persuasive, and argumentative. Today, there is confusion regarding these two names for preaching. It seems that homily has natural flow or law, while sermon has artificial, mechanic flow and law. Organic preachers should discover from their content and context what type of flow is most appropriate—a naturally progressive continuity or somewhat systematic and logical continuity.
- 11 Allen, Ronald J. ed. *Patterns of Preaching: A Sermon Sampler* (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 1998). Allen collects 19 sermon models from traditional to contemporary and 15 according to subjects and theology: 1) Puritan Plain Style, 2) Sermon as Journey to Celebration, 3) Sermons That Make Points, 4) Preaching Verse by Verse, 5) Thesis-Antithesis-Synthesis, 6) From Problem through Gospel Assurance to Celebration, 7) Bipolar Preaching, 8) Sermon as Theological Quadrilateral, 9) Simple Inductive Preaching, 10) The Form of the Text Shapes the Form of the Sermon, 11) Four Pages of the Preacher, 12) Sermon as Plot and Moves, 13) Preaching from Oops to Yeah, 14) Moving from First Naïveté through Critical Reflection to Second Naïveté, 15) Sermon as Movement of Images, 16) Sermon Drawing from the Arts, 17) Sermon Developed as an Author Develops a Novel, 18) Sermon as Portrayal of a Biblical Character, and 19) Sermon as Jigsaw Puzzle (pp.7–138). Fred Craddock also enumerates 12 sermon models: 1) What is it? What is it worth? How does one get it? 2) Explore, explain, apply, 3) The problem, the solution, 4) What it is not, what it is, 5) Either/or, 6) Both/and, 7) Promise, fulfillment, 8) Ambiguity, clarity, 9) Major premise, minor premise, conclusion, 10) Not this, nor this, nor this, but this, 11) The flashback (from present to past to present) and 12) From the lesser, to the greater (*Preaching*, pp.176–7). Eugene Lowry, after proposing narrative sermon form (*The Homiletical Plot*, 1980), further proposes four options of narrative (story) sermon: 1) Running the Story, 2) Delaying the Story, 3) Suspending the Story, and 4) Alternating Story (*How to Preach a Parable: Designs for Narrative Sermons*, 1989, pp.38–40). David Buttrick provides three modes of sermon form: 1) Mode of Immediacy, 2) Reflective Mode, and 3) Mode of Praxis (*Homiletic: Moves and Structures*, 1987). Long also suggests 11 sermon models: 1) If this...then this...and thus this, 2) This is true...in this way...and also in this way...and

in this other way too, 3) This is the problem...this is the response of the gospel...these are the implications, 4) This is the promise of the gospel...here is how we may live out that promise, 5) This is the historical situation in the text...these are the meanings for us now, 6) Not this...or this...or this...or this...but this, 7) Here is a prevailing view...but here is the claim of the gospel, 8) This...but what about this?...well, then this...yes, but what about this?...and so on, 9) Here is a story (a single story, Story/reflection, Part of a story/reflection/rest of the story, Issue/story), 10) Here is a letter, and 11) This?...or that?...both this and that (*The Witness of Preaching*, pp.126–130). David J. Schlafer proposes 3 basic strategies for shaping sermons: 1) Image, 2) Narrative, and 3) Argument (“Where Does the Preacher Stand?” *Homiletic* 19:1, 1994). From the Old Homiletics line, Haddon W. Robinson, certainly influenced by Henry Davis, provides at least six sermon shapes as 1) an idea to be explained, 2) a proposition to be proved, 3) a principle to be applied, 4) a subject to be completed, 5) a story to be told, and 6) other forms (deductive/inductive/inductive-deductive) (*Biblical Preaching: The Development and Delivery of Expository Messages*, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980, pp.116–127). Also, James W. Cox offers seven structural options: 1) explaining (text/doctrine), 2) affirming, 3) reasoning, 4) applying, 5) questing, 6) storytelling, 7) combining (*Preaching: A Comprehensive Approach to the Design and Delivery of Sermons*, New York: Harper San Francisco, 1985, pp.150–172). Donald L. Hamilton introduces eight homiletical techniques for organization: 1) Keyword method, 2) Analytical method, 3) Textual methods, 4) Problem-solving patterns, 5) The Comparative method, 6) The Syllogistic method, 7) Inductive Patterns, and 8) The Narrative Approach (*Homiletical Handbook*, Nashville: Broadman Press, 1992, pp.39–117). John A. Broadus suggested three sermon models: 1) Subject-sermons, 2) Text-sermons, and 3) Expository sermons, while noting various arrangements of arguments: 1) Argument from Testimony, 2) Argument from Induction, 3) Argument from Analog, and 4) Argument from Deduction (*On the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons*, 1870). Halford E. Luccock points out ten types of sermon outline: 1) Ladder sermon, 2) Jewel sermon, 3) Classification sermon, 4) Skyrocket sermon, 5) Twin sermon, 6) Roman candle sermon, 7) Analogy sermon, 8) Surprise-package sermon, 9) Chase Technique, and 10) Rebuttal sermon (*In the Minister’s Workshop*, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1944, pp.134–147). William E. Sangster classifies five structural types of sermon: 1) Exposition, 2) Argument 3) Faceting, 4) Categorizing, and 5) Analogy (*The Craft of Sermon Construction*, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1951, pp.62–102). As indicated above, there are considerable variables regarding a multiplicity of sermon forms. It would be nearly impossible for all preachers to be familiar with all these forms before composing a sermon. All these sermon models are potentially the fruits of Organic Homiletics. It is fine to be acquainted with all these models, but borrowing them as normative models would be awkward, impractical, and prohibitive for pastor-preachers.

- 12 Edwards P.J. Corbett introduces “discovery of argument” in *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student* (1965). In the section on “topics,” according to Corbett, there is logical argument, and there is rhetorical argument. Among three rhetorical appeals, logical appeal is distinguished from emotional and ethical appeal. Lucy L. Hogan and Robert Reid, in *Connecting with the Congregation: Rhetoric and the Art of Preaching* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999), discuss the previous generation’s overemphasis on *logos*,

while the New Homiletics emphasizes *pathos* to create an affective experience for listeners (p.42). In addition, according to Hogan and Reid, post-liberal and post-Christendom approaches place greater emphasis on *ethos* in an effort to help listeners rediscover and affirm the character of their true identity as a community of faith (ibid). Organic Homiletics as an heir of Romanticism emphasizes *pathos* and *ethos*, as well as *logos*. Using intuition, Organic Homiletics appeals to hearers by means of both *pathos* and *ethos*, seeking to create a deep life experience and an honest sharing of truth.

- 13 The triangle of preacher, text, and audience is emphasized by various homileticians. Don M. Wardlaw questions linear the model in favor of a dynamic, multi-dimensional model. Preachers encounter two cultural, social worlds when the converse with both the past audience of text and the contemporary audience. Two horizons are interfaced in a sermon. ("Preaching as the Interface of Two Social Worlds: The Congregation as Corporate Agent in the Act of Preaching," in Arthur Van Seters, ed., *Preaching as a Social Act: Theology and Practice*, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1988, pp.55–93). J. Grant Howard also discusses this triangle in *Creativity in Preaching* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1987). The triangle is at work, "creatively recreating the life setting of the text," "creatively relating to the life setting of the congregation," and "creatively using the life setting of the preacher" (pp.31–76). Attention to this triangle creates a metamorphosis and synthesis resulting in the potential for unlimited pluralities of sermon form. Karl Barth, in *Homiletics* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1966), states, regarding this triangle, "Preaching is exposition, not exegesis. It follows the text but moves on from it to the preacher's own heart and to the congregation" (p.81).
- 14 See Don M. Wardlaw, ed., *Preaching Biblically* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1983). This collection of articles by several homileticians examines interplay and encounter between various biblical text and preacher, which makes particular and authentic sermon. Also Thomas G. Long's *Preaching and the Literary Forms of the Bible* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985) also notes the literary form of the biblical text that affects sermon forms diversely and authentically. However, Organic Homiletics embraces and transcends this approach, because Organic Homiletics has triangle variables including text. Text is one of those possible variables, not dominating other factors. Literary form of the text may affect the sermon form, but there are more strong factors such as preacher, culture, goal, and audience. Sermon form grows in the process of double dialogues.
- 15 Lucy Rose maintains that in the nonhierarchical dialogue, "where power, leadership, and authority are shared, conversational preaching describes the whole of preaching as an ethos that surrounds the pulpit, traditionally a place of power. This nonhierarchical ethos perhaps leads those who are ordained to resist monopolizing the pulpit and to re-envision their role as ensuring that preaching occurs. This ethos perhaps leads the community of faith regularly to invite others, particularly laity, to preach" (*Sharing the Word*, p.123).
- 16 Note that intuition is used here rather than emotion. Emotion is more akin to music and transient feeling. Intuition, in this instance, has a deeper meaning. It refers to the inner soul where the unconscious and mystery reside together and work together to produce creativity and authenticity. Alla Boarth-Campbell penetrates the lack of intuition of

western culture, "Since our scientifically oriented culture has provided educational development of intellectuality, what seems to be needed, for Western persons at least, is a means for developing the receptive, intuitive mode of experience" (*The Word's Body: An Incarnational Aesthetic of Interpretation*, p.95). See Irmscher, William F. *Teaching Expository Writing* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979), "Acknowledging Intuition," pp.31–47, regarding the relation between intuition and composition.

- 17 *Lectio divina* is "a very ancient art, practiced at one time by all Christians." It is, "a slow, contemplative praying of the Scriptures which enables the Bible, the Word of God, to become a means of union with God. This ancient practice has been kept alive in the Christian monastic tradition and is one of the precious treasures of Benedictine monastics and oblates. Together with the Liturgy and daily manual labor, time set aside in a special way for *lectio divina* enables us to discover in our daily life an underlying spiritual rhythm. Within this rhythm we discover an increasing ability to offer more of ourselves and our relationships to the Father, and to accept the embrace that God is continuously extending to us in the person of his Son Jesus Christ." Quoted and summarized from <http://www.valyermo.com/ld-art.html>: See also Park, Richard H. "Creativity and Homiletics," unpublished paper, GTU, 2005.) for a further discussion of *lectio divina* in relation to preparing a sermon. Park makes the following connections: 1) *Lectio*: Reading/Listening; 2) *Meditatio*: Meditation; 3) *Oratio*: Prayer; 4) *Contemplatio*: Contemplation (p. 23).
- 18 See Hilkert, Mary Catherine. *Naming Grace: Preaching and the Sacramental Imagination* (New York: Continuum, 1997). Hilkert suggests analogical imagination that emphasizes the presence of the God who is self-communicating love, opposing dialectical imagination (p.15). For Hilkert, analogical imagination is sacramental imagination that depicts narratives of human experience (p.94). Because of that, preachers are more akin to the poet than the teacher (p.128). Therefore, preaching is the art of naming the grace discovered in the experience of the community of faith, both past and present (p.142). Likewise, Romantic expressive composition theorist, Donald C. Stewart, states, "good analogies, like good meditations, depend upon minds with rich storehouses of individual perceptions" (p.128). For Stewart, the analogy "develops its own momentum and individuality because of the specific nature of each person's perceptions and capabilities for analogical thinking. The resolution to the analogy can also be something like the resolution to the meditation...And because it is so dependent upon the particular perceptions of each person and the links he establishes between them, the good analogy, like the good meditation, can be written in nothing but an authentic voice" (p.128). *The Authentic Voice: A Prewriting Approach to Student Writing* (Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers, 1972). Hilkert and Stewart speak the same thing from different disciplines. Intuition can mine resources for preachers, not only through meditation, but also from real life experiences that may reside in stories and images. Stewart writes, in "Conquering the World of Abstractions" (chapter 4), that abstraction, generalization, and dialectical imagination should be supplemented by concrete, particular, and analogical imagination for perfection. Similarly, utilizing intuition is a key factor in Organic Homiletics.
- 19 See Jones, Kirk Byron. *The Jazz of Preaching: How to Preach with Great Freedom and Joy* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2004).

- 20 Organic unity and organic form both speak about the unity of content and form. Art form grows from art content. They are inseparable. Cf., Orsini, G.N.G. "Organicism," *Dictionary of History of Ideas* (1973–4), pp.422–427.
- 21 Strikingly, Augustine also defines Homiletics as discovering both content and form; he does not view them separately. Augustine simultaneously emphasizes two homiletic tasks as "the process of discovering what we need to learn (*modus inveniendi*) and the process of presenting what we have learnt (*modus proferendi*). See *De Doctrina Christiana*, IV. I. 1.
- 22 Pre- or Free- writing technique are persuasively recommended by Contemporary Romantic, expressive composition theorists. Free-writing technique is an inventional tool that uses intuition. Peter Elbow, in *Writing without Teachers* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973) dedicates the first chapter to "Free-writing Exercise" (pp.3–15). In *Writing with Power* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), Elbow also deals with free-writing and meditation technique for composition (pp.13–19). Donald C. Stewart, in *The Authentic Voice: A Pre-writing Approach to Student Writing* (Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers, 1972), "Chapter 3: The Journal: Birthplace of an Authentic Voice" and "Chapter 5: The Art of Divine Meditation." discusses "writing freely" (pp.15–26). , Ken Macrorie, in *Telling Writing* 3rd edition, (Rochelle Park: Hayden Book Company Inc., 1980), also suggests the use of "pre-writing" (pp.78–91). Irmscher, William F., in *Teaching Expository Writing* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979) also argues for the use of "pre-writing." Pre- or free- writing is an important technique for Organic preachers as well. Without fear of critique, preachers need to write nonstop 10–20 minutes as a part of the dialogue between text and audience before referring to commentaries. Craddock suggests free-writing under the title of, "scribbling" (*Preaching*, p.193); Lowry calls it "scraps of notes" (*The Homiletical Plot*, p.5). In addition, women preachers in *Birthing the Sermon* almost all practices free-writing and meditation of *Lectio Divina*, referring to the process as "jotting down notes" (p.17) "scribbling notes" (p.123) or "jot lots of notes at random" (p.139).
- 23 Craddock critiques that "only a single form has dominated preaching for a long time." (*Preaching*, p.170) Against the authoritarian dominance of "deductive, argumentative, expository" sermon form, Craddock proposes "variety of forms" (ibid, p.172), and one of the multiple options is his "inductive" sermon.
- 24 Donald Stewart, in *The Authentic Voice*, points out the merits of "cumulative" free-writing. "The cumulative sentence has one other important virtue directly related to the objectives of this text. The cumulative sentence is the opposite of the periodic sentence. It does not represent the idea as conceived, pondered over, reshaped, packaged, and delivered cold. It is dynamic rather than static, representing the mind thinking" (pp.75–6). Stewart also discusses using a notebook for free-writing, some preferring the large pads of unlined sketching paper for greater freedom and experiments with print-space (p.79). He also suggests using different color pens for effect (p.80). Stewart teaches that "pre-writing concerns itself most of all with inception, concept-formation, and paradigms for organizing and ordering the concepts" (p.5). Peter Elbow, in *Writing without Teachers*, teaches how to free-write by saying, "the easiest thing is just to put down whatever is in your mind... the only requirement is that you never stop" (p.3). Even if the writer produces garbage, Elbow advises to keep writing for 10 to 20 minutes nonstop. "If you

abandon it, you'll likely never have a voice and never be heard" (p.7). Elbow recommends that writers do free-writing in a diary or ten minutes a day without regard for whether it is any good or how it might be critiqued (p.9). Organic preachers should follow this advice. Every day they should practice free-writing as a part of the dialogue that constitutes sermon creation.

- 25 See footnote 14 regarding *Lectio Divina*. Donald Stewart, *The Authentic Voice*, introduces the ancient "Art of Divine Meditation," suggesting participants observe three steps: 1) Composition of Place, 2) Internal Colloquy, and 3) Resolution to the Meditation (pp.104–118). The Composition of Place is a constructing of many trains of thought before asking questions and seeking resolutions. After setting several places to meditate, an internal colloquy starts with a set of questions which connects the composition of place to a particular aspect of the writer's personal experience (p.109). Stewart states, "You can begin to see at this point that the meditation has a geometrical shape; it is something like a cone. The composition of place is the point of the cone, a place of departure. Then the scope of the meditation rapidly widens, like the sides of the cone, as the mediator begins to reflect and to ask questions of himself. The resolution of a meditation is a narrowing of focus again" (p.112). Stewart gives this final advice: "Do not try to force associations and questions. If you do, you will be in the same bind a student is in when someone is yelling at him to THINK! Just compose your sense of place and let your mind operate naturally. The questions and resolutions will follow naturally" (p.118).
- 26 For preaching ministry, as well as in daily devotional preparation, a day-by-day, step-by-step process is more productive and creative. God created the world in seven days, not in one. Daily spirituality throughout the week appears to be a secret for creativity for Christian ministry, including preaching.
- 27 Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Lectures on Homiletics*, in Clyde E. Fant, ed. and trans. *Worldly Preaching* (New York: Crossroad, 1991), p.120. Note: some research on adult learning has revealed that certain individuals do not do their peak learning in the morning. See Gross, Ronald. *Peak Learning: How to Create Your Lifelong Education Program for Personal Enlightenment and Professional Success* (New York, Pearson Custom Publishing, 2003). Scheduling adjustments should be made in such cases. The goal is utilize one's most focused and effective time for the work of sermon creation.
- 28 Among the books and articles that address the incubation stage in the creative process, Poincare is deemed, by other posterior psychologists, as one of the seminal thinkers regarding incubation process necessary for the work of creativity. Brown, Robert T. "Creativity: What are we to Measure?" in *Handbook of Creativity*, edit by John A. Glover, Royce R. Ronning, and Cecil R. Reynolds (New York: Plenum Press, 1989) notes, "Poincare...proposed an influential theory on the generation of creative ideas: the 'appearance of sudden illumination is a manifest sign of long, unconscious prior work'"(5). "Poincare further suggested that initial intense prior conscious work on the problem is necessary to 'unhook' relevant ideas from fixed positions so that they are free to join during the unconscious process" (Ibid). "Incubation is the term used for unconscious generation of potential solutions. For Wallas (1926), incubation was more structured and guided than for Poincare, and preparation, which included the individual's previous education, was a general orientation toward problem solving as well as

the consideration of the problem at hand”(Ibid). See also Wallas, Graham. “*The Art of Thought, excerpts*” in *Creativity: Selected Readings*. Wallas separates the four stages of the creative process, which became a foundation for later creative process study. “1) *Preparation*, the stage during which the problem was ‘investigated...in all directions;’ the second is the stage during which he was not consciously thinking about the problem, which I shall call 2) *Incubation*; the third, consisting of the appearance of the ‘happy idea’ together with the psychological events which immediately preceded and accompanied that appearance, I shall call 3) *Illumination*. And I shall add a fourth stage, of 4) *Verification*,.... In the daily stream of thought, these four different stages constantly overlap each other as we explore different problems”(pp. 91–92). Wallace continues, “Yet, even when success in thought means the creation of something felt to be beautiful and true rather than the solution of a prescribed problem, the four stages of preparation, incubation, illumination and the verification of the final result can generally be distinguished from each other” (p. 92). “The incubation stage covers two different things, of which the first is the negative fact that during incubation we do not voluntarily or consciously think on a particular problem, and the second is the positive fact that a series of unconscious and involuntary (or fore-conscious and fore-voluntary) mental events may take place during that period” (p. 94). “We can often get more result in the same time by beginning several problems in succession and voluntarily leaving them unfinished while we turn to others, than by finishing our work on each problem at one sitting” (p. 94). Interestingly for preachers and homileticians, Wallas introduces a preacher who uses “incubation.” “A well-known academic psychologist, for instance, who was also a preacher, told me that he found by experience that his Sunday sermon was much better if he posed the problem on Monday, than if he did so later in the week, although he might give the same number of hours of conscious work to it in each case. It seems to be a tradition among practicing barrister to put off any consideration of each brief to the latest possible moment before they have to deal with it, and to forget the whole matter as rapidly as possible after dealing with it. This fact may help to explain a certain want of depth which has often been noticed in the typical lawyer-statesman, and which may be due to this conscious thought not being sufficiently extended and enriched by subconscious thought” (p. 94). “Helmholtz and Pincare both speak of the appearance of a new idea as instantaneous and unexpected.... On the other hand, the final ‘flash,’ or ‘click,’ is the culmination of a successful train of association, which may have lasted for an appreciable time, and which has probably been preceded by a series of tentative and unsuccessful trains. The series of unsuccessful trains of association may last for periods varying from a few seconds to several hours. H. Poincare, who describes the tentative and unsuccessful trains as being, in his case, almost entirely unconscious, believed that they occupied a considerable proportion of the whole incubation stage” (p. 96). In addition, Alla Bozarth-Campbell introduces a different name for the incubation and illumination stages: “plateau period.” The period is “the period of unconscious activity, the transcendent function in action on a subliminal (and seemingly chaotic) level....Through the transcendent function the interpreter can experience the revelation of what was present but heretofore unknown, an active mystery now ready to be incarnated in an art form: performance” (*The Word’s Body*, p.97). See

- also Park, Richard H. "Creativity and Homiletics," unpublished paper, (Berkeley: GTU, 2005).
- 29 Edwards Corbett explicates the rhetorical "topics" in *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*, 3rd edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990). This can be invention of topics but at the same time arrangement, or major flow: "The Common Topics: 1) Definition (Genus, Division), 2) Comparison (Similarity, Difference, Degree), 3) Relationship (Cause and Effect, Antecedent and Consequence, Contraries, Contradictions), 4) Circumstance (Possible and Impossible, Past Fact and Future Fact), and 5) Testimony (Authority, Testimonial, Statistics, Maxims, Law, Precedents-Examples). " (pp.97–132) "The Special Topics: 1) Deliberative (the good, the unworthy, the advantageous, the disadvantageous), 2) Judicial (justice-right, injustice-wrong), and 3) Ceremonial (virtue-the noble, vice-the base)." (pp.133–143)
- 30 James R. Nieman and Thomas G. Rogers, in *Preaching to Every Pew: Cross-Cultural Strategies* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), note how culture and the context of preaching affect the creation of effective sermon content and form. Nieman and Rogers analyze the cultural context of preaching through the cultural frames of 1) ethnicity, 2) class, 3) displacement, and 4) beliefs. They further suggest that preachers strategize their sermons by utilizing forms appropriate to the context. Nieman and Rogers echo Romantic organic homileticians, when they speak of, "Knowing yourself," (p.140) and "Accepting difference" (p.141). Growth in cultural self-awareness is liberating. Romantic organic preachers seek their own authentic voice from interaction with context of audience. Free-writing and meditation are all about listening to real voices in a real world that is definitely different from the preacher's own.
- 31 Aristotle. *On Poetics*, p.3
- 32 Marks, Emerson R. *Coleridge on the Language of Verse*, p.60.
- 33 Raysor, Thomas M. Ed. *Coleridge's Shakespearean Criticism*, p.223.
- 34 Brooks, Phillip. *Lectures on Preaching*, p.114.
- 35 Henry Davis advises preachers to compose "audible design" for "defenseless listener" (*Design for Preaching*, p.169). "The proper design of a sermon is continuity in time. It is an audible, not a visible, continuity" (Ibid). According to Davis, as in listening to music or a play, an audience receives a series of thoughts and impressions. There is progress. (p.168). For Davis, sermon introductions and conclusions "must be parts of that continuity which is the whole design of the sermon. They are so intimately related to the idea and its development that it is impossible to treat them as if they had a separate existence apart from the whole design of the sermon. Sermons are not all of like design, and the introduction and conclusion cannot be planned until the main design is grasped" (pp.170–1). This is a difference between an organic and a mechanistic sermon. In mechanistic sermon, each part is separate from the whole, but in organic unity every part is connected with the whole. In imitational and mechanical Homiletics, parts are separated from the whole, and form is separated from content. Karl Barth also emphasizes this organic unity of form and content. He writes, "Form and content, then, are not to be separated in preaching. The right form is part of the right content" (*Homiletics*, p.120). In this respect, the charge that Barth rejects sermon introductions can be resolved by Barth's natural and organic movement of sermon form. For Barth, introductions and conclusions of Hellenistic mechanical sermons, not homilies, are unnecessary,

from a perspective of organic unity; there should be no separate parts. Davis and Barth agree that introductions and conclusions need to be a part of the whole body rather than functioning as separate parts.

- 36 Davis, *Design for Preaching*, pp.171–182. In addition, Davis illumines, “Good thinking moves in both directions. It usually begins with particulars and goes to generals, the process of induction. But good thought, especially when being communicated, never remains general for long. After it has generalized, it moves back again to particulars” (p.247). “There it was said that all major movements of the mind are in one of these two directions: from a general to particular and from particulars to a general” (p.243). For Davis’ Organic Homiletics, the general and the particular are the major poles.
- 37 In addition to the those for organizational strategies mentioned previously in this chapter, Maxine C. Hairston, in *Successful Writing* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1998), suggests nine “common patterns of organization..” 1) Reasoning from Evidence, 2) Assertion and Support, 3) Definition, 4) Cause and Effect, 4) Circumstantial Arguments, 5) Comparison, 6) Analogies, 7) *A Fortiori* Reasoning, 8) Narration, and 9) Process (pp.54–64). Also, Hairston adds “Combining Methods,” something that sounds a lot like organic metamorphosis and synthesis. This arrangement method comes from the classical topics, and for this reason content and form, as well as invention and arrangement, are inseparable. From the content or topic, arrangement flows naturally and organically. Peter Elbow, in *The Writer’s Craft: Idea to Expression* (Evanston: McDougal, Littell & Company, 1992), explicates eight types of organization: 1) Main Idea and Supporting Details, 2) Chronological Order, 3) Spatial Order, 4) Organization by Degree, 5) Comparison and Contrast Order, 6) Cause and Effect Order, 7) Classification, and 8) Combining types. Henry Davis’s method for creating an organic sermon is first to discover a subject or topic and then to expand the thought organically (*Design*, Chapter 5 and 6). Davis compares how the organic growth of a fully developed plant is inherent in the seed to how the arrangement and continuity of a fully developed sermon is inherent in a thought or topic. What Organic preachers need to do is to expand the seed of a main idea or topic in which organizing principles are inherent (Chapter 9). Organic Forms for Davis are simply fruits of that discovery of form and an expanding of the thought. Although Davis does suggest specific organic forms: 1) a subject discussed, 2) a thesis supported, 3) a message illumined, 4) a question propounded, and 5) a story told, Ronald Allen reminds preachers that the fruits of an organic sermon are limitless due to the metamorphosis and synthesis involved in the process.
- 38 Peter Elbow argues, “Insisting on control, having a plan or outline, and always sticking to it is a prophylactic against organic growth, development, change. But it is also a prophylactic against the experience of chaos and disorientation which are very frightening” (*Writing without Teachers*, p.35). Elbow sounds like a Post-modern prophet railing against the Enlightenment’s control of reason. “The developmental model, on the other hand, preaches, in a sense, lack of control: don’t worry about knowing what you mean or what you intend ahead of time; you don’t need plan or an outline, let things get out of hand, let things wander and digress. Though this approach makes for initial panic, my overall experience with it is increased control. Not that I always know what I am doing, not that I don’t feel lost, baffled, and frustrated. But the overall process is one that doesn’t leave me so helpless. I can get something written when I want to. There

isn't such a sense of mystery, of randomness" (pp.32–33). In *Writing without Teachers*, Elbow opposes the system of control and certainty asserted by Western Rationalism, in favor of appreciation of the probability, randomness and uncertainty of Romantic, Post-modernism. However, in *Writing with Power*, Elbow turns to a more balanced Coleridgean Romanticism that does not exclude reason. Elbow turns out to be "both highly intuitive and highly organized," (p.10) as someone who embraces both "creativity and critical thinking" (p.8).

- 39 Elbow, in *Writing with Power*, explicates three composition processes: 1) Direct writing process, 2) Open-ended writing process, and 3) Loop writing process. Free-writing is the most important invention technique. It provides the quickest and deepest improvement of the process not the product (p.48). Elbow warns against a dangerous method of composition: trying to write something right the first time. He argues that it is an approach that only a few people can use efficiently and creatively as their normal procedure (Ibid). *The direct writing process* is the simplest and most practical way of getting words on paper when writers are writing something in a hurry or when the writer knows she or he will have no trouble finding material. The process is very simple. The write simple divides available time in half; the first half is used for fast writing without worrying about organization, language, correctness, or precision, and the second half is used for revising (p.26). In sum, this is quick free-writing and quick revising. *The open-ended writing process* is at the opposite extreme from the direct writing process. This process invites maximum chaos, and disorientation. The open-ended writing process goes on and on till the potential piece of writing is fully cooked and grown (p.50). This open-ended writing process takes writers on a voyage outside of themselves and maximizes growth in self and new thinking on paper, but writers pay the price in time, energy, and uncertainty (p.59). This process can even allow writers to ignore or even forget exactly what their topic is (p.60). *The looping writing process*, on the contrary, is a way to get the best of both worlds; it delivers both control and creativity (p.59). This process is a voyage home, and writers bend their efforts back into the gravitational field of the writers' original topic as writers select, organize, and revise parts of what the writers produced during the voyage out (p.60). Organic preachers can utilize all three of these writing processes. When the time is short and immediate, organic preachers can use the direct writing process. However, in the routine of working on preaching daily each week, organic preachers should the open-ended writing process as much as possible. This is the most optimal free-writing process for discovering sermon content. Afterwards, organic preachers should use the looping writing process, for organization and revision of content toward audible sermon design and delivery. Elbow suggests *13 tips of procedures for the voyage out*, i.e., free-writing, and for loop writing (pp. 61–73): 1) *First thoughts*: Just put down as fast as you can all the thoughts and feelings you happen to have about the topic. You will discover much more material than you expected. And not just feelings and memories either: there are probably solid facts and ideas you forgot you had, 2) *Prejudices*: Writing down your prejudices also helps you generate new ideas and insights, 3) *Instant Version*: It would be a miracle to turn out a final version of any extensive writing task in half an hour. But it's worthwhile pretending to pull off this miracle. Simply deny the need for research, thinking, planning and turn out a kind of sketch of your final piece—an instant projected version,

4) *Dialogues*: If you discover that instead of having one clear prejudice you have two or three conflicting feelings, you are in a perfect position to write a dialogue. Give each of the feelings a voice and start them talking to each other, 5) *Narrative Thinking*: If your topic is confusing to you—if for example you find your mind shifting from on thought to another or from one point of view to another without any sense of which thought or point of view makes more sense—then simply write the *story of your thinking*, 6) *Stories*: The best way to write a letter of recommendation or a job analysis or an evaluation of a person or project is to start by letting stories and incidents come to mind and jotting them down very briefly, 7) *Scenes*: Stop the flow of time and take still photographs. Focus on individual moments, 8) *Portraits*: Think about your topic and see what people come to mind. Give thumbnail portraits of them. 9) *Vary the audience*: Write about your topic to someone very different from the real audience of your paper, 10) *Vary the writer*: Write as though you were someone whose view on the topic is very different from your own, 11) *Vary the time*: Write as though you were living in the past or the future, 12) *Error*: Write down things that are almost true or trying to be true; things that you are tempted to think or that other think but you know are false, and 13) *Lies*: Write down quickly all the odd or crazy things you can come up with.

Elbow continues to say, “Reasoning itself is deductive. It only tells you more about what you already know. But writing stories, scenes, and portraits is a very inductive process and will lead you to new insights and new points of view you couldn’t reach by reasoning alone. The important thing is to try out all these devices. You will learn which ones work best for you in various circumstances. And you will probably develop variations and brand new devices that are particularly suited to your needs” (p.75). Organic preachers may wish to try this suggestion for invention while free-writing. From out of the dialogue of the biblical text and congregation, organic preachers free-write whatever comes to them. However, unlike pagans, Christian organic preachers should pray for inspiration from the Spirit as well as inspiration from their own intuition.

- 40 See Deferrari, Roy J. “St. Augustine’s Method of Composing and Delivering Sermons,” *American Journal of Philology* 43:2 (1922) Roy J. Deferrari discusses Augustine’s delivery of sermon as being extempore, “There are several sermons, however, in which Augustine tells his congregation quite frankly that he has been inspired with the subject of his present sermon while listening to the reading of the Gospel, and must accordingly improvise” (p.118). “Augustine often did speak entirely extempore” (ibid). “In private and in public, at home and in the church, Augustine taught and preached the word of salvation both by his finished books and by extemporaneous sermons” (p.116). “In a letter to his bosom friend Alypius, Bishop of Tagaster, Augustine gives another instance of his speaking extempore, or with but slight previous meditation on the subject.” (p.117). Like Augustine, organic preachers do not fear to preach extemporaneously. Organic preachers, even in the moment of delivery, are open to leaving space for intuition to intervene.
- 41 See Park, Richard H. *Language and Truth: Dialogue in the New Homiletics*, unpublished MA thesis, (Berkeley: Graduate Theological Union, 2003). Park maintains that Augustine, Luther, and Newman all emphasize religious persuasion concerning *pathos* and *ethos*, yet they do not reject the proper role of *logos*, in that it is preceded by faith.

- They all warn against the overemphasis of *logos* or the improper use of *logos*, as preachers seek to balance the three rhetorical means (p.69).
- 42 See, Meyers, Robin R. *With Ears to Hear: Preaching As Self-Persuasion* (Cleveland: The Pilgrim Press, 1993), especially, "The Sermon as an Irresistible Intruder," pp.107–110. Robert Reid penetrates a similar position of my proposal of "Organic Homiletic" to Meyers' "self persuasion." "Meyers believes that the most significant thing that happens in good preaching is that the preacher must find her or his way to a way of expressing gospel conviction that the sermon should show evidence of this internal conversation as self-persuasion." According to Reid, Meyers inserts his notion of "self-persuasion" into the idea of current conversational homiletics (Robert S. Reid, unpublished letter to Richard H. Park, (September 2, 2005).
- 43 Young, Becker, Pike, *Rhetoric: Discovery and Change*, p.9.
- 44 Coleridge, "Poesy or Art," Coleridge's *Miscellaneous Criticism*, p.204. Like Schelling, for Coleridge, art is a combining medium of nature and man (intuition and reason, or, accidental creativity and artificial imitation).
- 45 See "the brief history of form" of this study (chapter II).
- 46 See Park, Richard H. "Create Casserole! Revisiting New Homiletics with Kierkegaard and Peter Elbow on Sermon Composition," unpublished paper, (Berkeley: Graduate Theological Union, 2005): *Organic Homiletics suggests a new homiletical pedagogy*: 1) Do not be satisfied to teach one or more methods of homiletics. 2) Participate with seminarians in the process of sermon composition. 3) Teach them various models as function for sermon composition. 4) Do not teach them product but process. 5) Make them make their authentic voice. 6) Encourage not to be oppressed under authority of content and form. 7) Train them to free-write. 8) Let them use dialectic invention and indirect function. 9) Teach them to be a midwife and respect the audience to decide for themselves. 10) Have them understand the creative art process. *Suggestions for organic preachers for sermon preparation*: 1) Liberate yourself from only one method. 2) Do free-writing to find your voice. 3) Consider all rhetorical situations. 4) Collect what is free-written. 5) Think order and rhetorical strategy. 6) Remember indirect communication. 7) Design sermon for the audiences' self-examination. 8) Let it grow from the process and content. 9) Be a midwife in form to respect the audience. 10) Seek means to edify the audience.
- 47 In order to be creative and authentic, writers and preacher need to boldly and courageously overcome fear and resistance. Elbow, in *Writing with Power*, states, "To write is to overcome a certain resistance: you are trying to wrestle a steer to the ground, to wrestle a snake into a bottle, to overcome a demon that sits in your head. To succeed in writing or making sense is to overpower that steer, that snake, that demon" (p.18).
- 48 Stewart, *The Authentic Voice*, pp.2–3. He distinguishes "authorial voice vs. authentic voice."

CHAPTER 6

Conclusion

Significance of the Study

Cognitive psychologist Jere W. Clark bemoans the “intellectual poverty” of our society. He argues that it is the result of moving from an “open-ended, dynamic base of adaptability and synthesis,” to a “narrow, mechanical and static base of specialization and fragmentation” that has led to “conformity, rigidity, over-specialization, and mediocrity.”¹ He notes how “social inertia” serves to create resistance to innovation and changes in people’s routines. He writes,

Innovations by their very nature involve change. Not only are there changes in people’s routines and jobs, but also changes in the status quo. Hence, there is typically resistance to major innovations, no matter how essential they may be. For that reason, social inertia will have to be included as one of the facts of life in updating our educational system.²

As Clark laments this situation for society in general, a case could be made that those looking specifically at preachers might well join Clark in his lament. This study has noted how, in the history of preaching, there has been a significant tendency for preachers to rely on organizational models and content from others. The potential for preachers to utilize authentic and imaginative flair lessens to the extent that preachers simply conform to external influences. The authenticity, imagination, and creativity inherent in Organic Homiletic may go a long way in addressing this mounting problem for preachers. It is critical that every preacher have her or his own unique and authentic voice and expression, distinctively different from other preachers, in terms of sermon content and form. The preaching field needs to mirror that of art where brilliant expressionists, such as Mozart, Tchaikovsky, Tolstoy, Hemingway, Picasso, Van Gogh, and many other unknown organic artists, all demonstrate their own unique style and *modus operandi*. Mechanical imitation (or copying) kills the free spirit of expression. Organic Homiletic, as presented in this study, can be a catalyst for part of the solution to this serious crisis facing preaching.

As noted in chapter two, Samuel T. Coleridge is a Romantic, organic, and synthetic prophet. He has roots in a radical Romanticism that opposes

Rationalism and advocates the use of emotion. However, Coleridge moves beyond an unbridled Romanticism, constructing an organicistic approach which transcends Romanticism into a balanced, synthetic Romanticism. Coleridge may be rightly labeled an organic Romanticist. Coleridge offers a balanced, rather than a separated, approach. This is a crucial point for rhetoricians and homiletics who rely on human rhetorical means in their work of persuasion. Both rhetoricians and homiletics must decide which of the rhetorical means of appeal (*logos*, *pathos*, or *ethos*) they will employ. It is a question of importance: "Which rhetorical appeal(s) should be used?" This is a long standing question in the history of rhetoric and homiletics, and there has been a rather persistent disagreement, over time, as to how this question should be answered.³ Organic Homiletic asserts that the future of Contemporary homiletics should be synthetic in that it balances each of these three rhetorical means, as Coleridge proposes in his synthetic Romantic organicism.

Another reason for Coleridge's synthesis of reason and intuition (or emotion) is his emphasis on the rediscovery of inventiveness and creativeness for artists and composers. Reason controls, but intuition liberates! Reason unifies, but intuition diversifies! Reason imitates, but intuition creates! Coleridge does not reject reason in his organicism; rather, he embraces both reason and intuition for the creation of imagination. Unlike unbridled Romantics, such as Wordsworth, Coleridge appropriates both of these rhetorical tools. For example, some argue that an authentic voice and expression flow from intuition or inner feeling pointing to Shakespeare's brilliant and magnificent use of intuition for his creative and imaginative form and content. However, Schlegel and Coleridge disagree with that claim, maintaining that Shakespeare uses not only intuition but also reason in his invention. Thus, Coleridge offers a recipe for imagination: reconcile seeming opposites. For Coleridge, authenticity, imagination and creativity come, not only from intuition, but also from reasoning. How can preachers become and remain authentic, imaginative and creative in the week-by-week, burdensome task of preparing to preach? Coleridge's answer is that preachers should employ reason and intuition together.

Moreover, neither Coleridge's organic theory nor Organic Homiletic neglect *ethos*. This third rhetorical means of appeal is not merely a moralistic appeal arguing that preachers should be perfect in their moralistic goodness and sacrifice. Such an understanding would be legalistic and in severe opposition to the quintessential understanding of grace. If this was what *ethos* was understood to imply, then it would be impossible for preachers to achieve their goal in this broken world. What then is *ethos*? Organic

Homiletic understands *ethos* as the means for showing the true character of preachers, the true character of the audience, and a true experience of the world. Appropriating intuition, preachers penetrate the true voice and true experience of the world that connects honestly to the audience. Audiences applaud preachers, not for their authoritarian and heavily legalistic sermons, but for their honest disclosure of true and real experiences of the world where preachers and laity suffer together in a broken creation. Also, by utilizing a dialectical invention of opposites, preachers present a true representation of a real experience; sermons ring true and real when they are linked to the inherent truth and realism of approaching life pluralistically, rather than from a single perspective or point of view. Consequently, Coleridge can be viewed as a balanced, synthetic, Romantic rhetorician who comes to influence the development of a balanced, Romantic, synthetic homiletic.

Coleridge's organic form is the most significant contribution in the creation of an Organic Homiletic. As shown in chapters one and two, the organic concept, as it relates to form, has a history that precedes Coleridge. Building on those initial ideas, Coleridge opposes mimesis theory for imaginative and authentic creation. Art and literary form should not be allowed to become obstacles for creativity and authenticity. When artists imitate, the power of authentic creativity is weakened. Neoclassical theory of imitation opposes Coleridge's organic form view. Nonetheless, Coleridge insists that form grows from a process that acknowledges both content and context. Organic Homiletic argues that homileticians need to embrace this aspect of the scholarship of art and aesthetics in terms of the matter of sermon form. The weekly creating of sermon is a creative art. To produce one of more artistic works each week is an overwhelming task for any artist; consequently, preachers face intense creative pressure in that they must regularly, and in a relatively short period of time, create new work. Part of the dilemma lies in the tension between the demand for quality and quantity. Sometimes, artists get blocked; they "hit a wall" that kills inspiration and motivation for new creation. There has been much debate in the history of preaching, from Plato to the present, regarding how best to resolve this tension.

For Plato, form of this world is only a copy of that transcendent world, or form in this world should copy form from that world because this world is inferior. However, theologians advocating the free will and the positive potential of human beings oppose Plato's view and the negative approach to anthropology that it influenced. Examples include Calvin and early Barth. This anthropological theology has to do with Organic Homiletic in that

Organic Homiletic insists that every human being, given the reality of the *Imago Dei*, has tremendous potential for creativity. Bozra-Campbell writes,

The creative writer's idea is juxtaposed with God the Creator as creative Source, the Energy or Activity is placed with God the Savior as Creative Expression, and the Creative Power is aligned with the Holy Spirit, proceeding from the Idea and Energy together and flowing back to the writer to make her or him, as it were, the audience of her or his own work.⁴

The reality of the incarnated Christ and the resurrected Christ is present and inherent within us and gives us the creative power of the Father and the Spirit.⁵ Thus, every common preacher, as anointed by the Creator God and the Spirit inherent in Christ, can create his or her own authentic voice and a sermon form by means of the creative power of the Spirit. Our salvation is put in jeopardy by corruption of the first Adam, but the second Adam and the Counselor come and reside within us. We have the freedom to produce authentic and creative work as we manage the world God created. Coleridge's theory of organic unity of content and form relates to this discussion in that he argues that form grows out of content. It does not proceed out of nothing. In the same way, creation by the spirit is not always creation from nothing, *ex nihilo*.⁶ Whether organic form comes *ex nihilo* or is already inherent and collected in the content, organic form grows (or is created) naturally and organically; it is not given from outside. This Romantic revolt concerning form influenced Henry Grady Davis and the greatest Romantic organic preacher, Phillip Brooks.

Chapter three focused on Henry Grady Davis, the first homiletician to construct a homiletic concerned with organic theory. As such, Davis became a prophet of Contemporary homiletics. Davis influences both the New Homiletics (which currently influences mainline churches) and the Old Homiletics (which continues to guide conservative and evangelical churches). Davis's influence replaced that of John Broadus who swayed preachers for around 70 years. For over 25 years, Davis's *Design for Preaching* set the tone for Northern American Homiletics. Davis' organic approach concretely influenced Haddon W. Robinson's expository approach in *Biblical Preaching* (1980), which became a legendary homiletic textbook for the evangelical line.⁷

Chapter four offered a practical and systematic review of how Davis impacts the birth of the New Homiletics. From seeds provided by Davis, diverse garden of New Homiletic methods blossomed. However, Robinson of the Old Homiletic and the New Homileticians developed their sermon form theories individually and separately, not synthetically like Davis. Davis

treated all possible continuities of sermon form whether deductive, inductive, logical, chronological or dramatic, yet, after Davis, organic synthetic homiletic becomes confusingly differentiated because of differing emphases on *logos*, *pathos* and *ethos*.

It appears that Davis was influenced by Romanticism through several channels. Davis adores Robert Frost (1874–1963), a great American romantic poet.⁸ Davis shows the similarity of thought to Phillip Brooks (1835–1893) who lived in the era of Romanticism. Also, Davis shows proof of his study and reading of contemporary rhetoric and composition theory—a theory where imitation and expression theory were at odds. In addition, Davis is influenced by Contemporary preacher Harry Emerson Fosdick (1878–1969) and his problem-solving preaching. Davis shows his own propensity toward interconnectedness by constructing a homiletical approach by means of organic synthesis, organic form, organic unity, organic process, and organic law. Like Coleridge, Davis synthesizes reason and intuition. For Davis, as for Coleridge, content is inseparable from form; furthermore, form grows as part of a process following natural and organic law. Davis is acknowledged for having constructed a bridge between Romantic organic theory of literature/art and Romantic organic preaching. However, one can argue that Davis does not fully develop organic form in that he suggests only five organic sermon forms and five organizing continuities of logic.⁹ In contrast, Organic Homiletic, a more fully developed system dealing with organic form, yields limitless options.

Chapter four traced the roots of organic form and its development in the history of preaching. The Hebraic rhetoric of natural flow and the Hellenistic rhetoric of systematic law both served to influence the production of diverse sermon forms over time. *Homilia* and *sermo* are the different names for Hebraic and Hellenistic sermon form, respectively. The first is dialogical and liturgical in character; the second centers on a monologue that is more forensic and argumentative in tone. These two major streams of thought flow through every age, and, by means of metamorphosis and synthesis of sermon form, new forms come into being. Other names are sometimes given to the streams, such as expository form and topical form, but, regardless of nomenclature, the synthesis and creation of new hybrids continues. For example, textual form is a synthesis of homily and sermon, and evangelical sermon form is the result of the marriage between Romantic emotion and forensic argument. Most recently, in the New Homiletics, the creation of new forms has been prolific. However, this study has noted how each of the New Homileticians seems to emphasize *logos*, *pathos*, or *ethos*, and this blocks the full potential of a completely natural and organic flow of sermon form.

Sermon form is a living organism. It grows from within itself—naturally and organically. Any attempt at control by authority from outside hinders the process. Like art, preaching is creative work. In the creative process, artists and preachers express their own authentic and organic voice. The process also produces both content and form.

Chapter five introduced a proposal for an Organic Homiletic. Such a homiletic is needed in order to free and liberate preachers to be more fully creative in their weekly task of preparing sermons. Organic Homiletic is centered in process, synthesis, dialogue, intuition and discovery. Organic Homiletic asserts that sermons grow, over time, beginning with the initial stage of inventing what to preach. Organic Homiletic synthesizes reason and intuition for discovery, organization, and delivery. Organic Homiletic performs double dialogues with both the text and the contemporary audience, as preachers listen deeply to their inner selves and their inner feelings. To this end, a free-writing technique, borrowed from contemporary expressive composition theory, is utilized. By means of free-writing and meditation, Organic Homiletic acknowledges the importance of the unconscious and intuition; at the same time it employs a classical rhetorical invention technique by asking questions and using dialectics for imagination. Thus, Organic Homiletic is a process of discovery: discovery of content and context leads to the discovery of organic sermon form which is already inherent in the content. This discovery is creative, authentic, and organic, allowing preachers to produce sermons that are different, unique, and refreshing.

While Organic Homiletic does not suggest a new model for sermons, it does suggest discovering and developing sermon form that is inherent in content. One may critique Organic Homiletic as being “parasitic,” since it synthesizes and metamorphosizes existing sermon forms. However, it is not parasitic to the extent that Organic Homiletic emphasizes the creation of an authentic form that grows from the content. The process could be considered parasitic, to the extent that not all the resulting forms in Organic Homiletic are created *ex nihilo*; organic preachers may end with a form that is similar to forms that already exist. Still, a form can be similar to an extant form and still be “new,” as a new creation from an organic process. Organic Homiletic frees preachers from being overly concerned about form; instead, they can focus fully on invention and discovery of content. They can begin by using intuition and reason, and then, utilizing Elbow’s “looping writing process,” they can organize and revise their free-writing materials looking for audible continuity for their audience. The 21st century can be viewed as a time when a variety of vendors in the homiletics market place tempt preachers to

purchase the sermon forms they have to offer, but Organic Homiletic encourages preachers to discover the abundance of sermon form options available in their own garden. The treasure is in one's own back yard, not on an imagined treasure island far away—in the land of resources from others!

Heuristic Implications

Organic Homiletic grows out of an attempt to fully appropriate the work of Coleridge and Davis and to engage in interdisciplinary dialogue with the fields of rhetoric, psychology, philosophy, literature, art and aesthetics, and communication theory. Wilson asks, "Is homiletics academic?"¹⁰ Wilson deplores homiletic textbooks that do not have academic rigor that comes from entering into a dialogue with homiletic scholars, for the sake of exchanging critiques and having reciprocal discussion. This study asks, "How can homiletics become a science?" Traditionally, homiletics has been taught by the great preachers who had great skills. The assumption was: if they can preach well, they can teach well. Consequently, unlike other disciplines, homiletics has tended to remain an unscientific and uncritical discipline. At worst, homiletics can be seen as a mere skill. Every teacher of preaching offers her or his own random techniques—the teaching of preaching is not systematized. Depending on which seminary they attend, seminarians learn totally different homiletic models and approaches. Such a view is biased to the extent that Organic Homiletic shows that sermon form can be so unpredictable that no one can know from which direction sermon form for a particular sermon will be developed.

Currently, homiletic pedagogy is severely divided between mainline New Homiletics and the Old Homiletics, between use of narrative and exposition; unfortunately, this is not a healthy and desirable state of affairs for the ministry of proclaiming the Good News and the Word to all people. Homiletics should be holistically systematized utilizing all available rhetorical appeals; although some homileticians may still state their own preferences to student preachers, the teachers should allow their students to discover their own preference. Until this happens, seminaries will deserve the charge of teaching biased homiletic method(s). Such teaching does not constitute education; it is training. Preachers trained in this way cannot properly apply their preaching to the diverse rhetorical situations they will encounter.

Since they are trained as imitators, when such preachers encounter a strange context, they will not know how to adjust, change, and create the best

form that will fit that particular context. Preachers should be “educated” so that they may know how to be authentic, imaginative, and creative. They should be educated to pursue new creations as a part of their ministry—especially preaching.¹¹ When homiletics becomes systematized by holistic principles; when it enters into dialogue with other disciplines, and when it constructs a critically systematized science, then it will be possible to educate preachers holistically.¹² Along the way, Organic Homiletic seeks a friend in Contemporary, expressive composition theory. Just as Augustine advises preachers to borrow “gold from Egypt,”¹³ homiletics will do well to borrow from expressive composition theorists. Therefore, one heuristic possibility for Organic Homiletic lies in the way it may serve as a stepping stone for further development of an educated, scientific approach to preaching.

Organic Homiletic emphasizes listening to voices: voices from self, voices from others, and voices from God. Acknowledging the importance of using intuition, Organic Homiletic seeks to establish a three way dialogue among the particular context of the preaching moment, the audience, and the texts. While listening to the many voices in this dialogue, organic preachers inevitably have an opportunity to hear the small, largely unheard voice of the marginalized. This voice whispers to the preacher through the dialogue with the audience. Post-modern deconstructionist Michel Foucault describes this voice as a “forbidden” voice.

For Foucault, the traditionally marginalized, forbidden voice has been segregated as “madness” and consequently silenced by the majority of society.¹⁴ Foucault contends that Western Hellenistic philosophy tends to assume that there are certain qualities that an individual may acquire that will permit him or her to live differently, better, or more happily than others. This assumption leads to another assumption: namely, that discourse from the master is most important. Within this mindset, the most important voice in any conversation is that of the master. What the master says or explains gives disciples a universal code for their life.¹⁵

Organic Homiletic challenges this assumption; for the organic preacher, the most important voice is that which is authentic, true and real. Authoritarian and authorial voices may assume and/or pretend to be the most authentic voices, but, as Lucy Rose urges, preachers should listen to marginal voices: the voices of women, the poor, the disenfranchised, and the silenced.¹⁶ The master voice in discourse, as the voice of power, oppresses and silences weak voices. Organic Homiletic urges preachers to listen to and incorporate all voices—even those of the weak. Organic Homiletic is Homiletic of Dialogue and Listening. Buttrick warns against the danger of

preachers giving up “naming God in the world” if they do not listen without prejudice to the biblical world and the church.¹⁷ In *Homiletic*, Buttrick, like Foucault, analyzes the cultural master’s voice. He writes, “Remember, Christian discussions of an issue will always include human hermeneutics, cultural attitudes, perspectives drawn from different “-ologies,” and the like.”¹⁸

In regard to attending to the voices that are sometimes silenced, Turner and Hudson explore strategies for finding women’s voices in preaching. For Turner and Hudson, voice is distinctive self, authentic self, authoritative expression, resistant self and relational self. They write, “The powerless were not allowed to speak in the presence of the powerful.”¹⁹ Turner’s and Hudson’s work echoes a Romantic concept of resistance to authority and submitting to strong, outer, traditional voices. Smith also asserts the importance of recovering the silenced voices in preaching. Smith contends that voices are lost in preaching due to powerful discrimination associated with handicappism, ageism, sexism, heterosexism, white racism, and classism. She proposes a homiletic of weeping, confession and resistance against radical evil oppression.²⁰

Gonzales and Gonzales address the silenced, captive voices of the poor in society and the church. They illustrate several reasons why listening to the oppressed voice is difficult: a perspective of *Sola scriptura* limits a full listening from contexts outside the Bible; a prejudiced translation of the canon betrays particular oppressed members of the audience, and using certain lectionaries and certain commentaries prejudices preachers because of the pericopes which the lectionaries select and to which the commentaries refer.²¹ Preachers sometimes do not listen to the oppressed and the poor because of their compromising deafness. For this reason Hilkert stresses the importance of social location for lifting every voice in the audience. In lifting these voices, it is important, for Hilkert, to name sin as well as grace. She encourages giving voice to the voiceless so that many diverse church members may hear the voices of each other.²²

McClure, appropriating Levinas’ ethical philosophy of the interhuman, explicates this same concern epistemologically. He writes, “I know nothing in my self except that I am a sign to another, and that other is already obliterated, erased, in my knowing.”²³ According to McClure, the truth which organic preachers preach cannot be completed until this dialogue is completed. To fully embrace Organic Homiletics, it is necessary for preachers to adopt a humble and caring attitude of listening to every voice. Not only is it imperative for preachers to challenge themselves to listen for

voices within their audience, but preachers should also listen to their own cultural voices by which sermon content and form will be decided.²⁴

Nieman and Rogers propose basing a preaching strategy (including both content and form) on the audience's culture. According to them, decisions regarding sermon form should be influenced by the culture of the audience. This is especially true in relation to ethnicity.²⁵ Since selecting or creating authentic sermon form should be varied according to ethnic culture, Richard Lischer helps African American preachers to find their own authentic voice and expression through preaching of Martin Luther King, Jr.²⁶ In addition, African American Homiletician Henry H. Mitchell discovers his own ethnic and authentic voice and expression in *Celebration and Experience in Preaching*, and much earlier, in *The Recovery of Preaching*.²⁷ In a desire to create authentic preaching, in regard to cultural ethnicity, Korean homileticians have also attempted to construct Asian and Korean authentic voice and expression of preaching.²⁸

In this regard, Organic Homiletic is a Homiletic of Voice that produces authentic voice and expression for the culturally different ethnic groups. Organic Homiletic produces plurality of sermon form by listening and attending to the ethnic voice of culture. Those homileticians eager to develop a cultural pluralism in preaching are helped by cultural studies of university rhetoric departments.²⁹ Therefore, Americans should find an American way of preaching; Mexicans should find a Mexican way; Germans should find a German way; Asians should find an Asian way, and Koreans should find a Korean way to bring an authentic voice and expression to preaching!

Organic preachers attend to listening to emerging, previously silenced voices and different sounding voices. By synthesizing intuition and reason, Organic Homiletic becomes a "Synthetic Homiletic." By incorporating these voices, Organic Homiletic can become an "Authentic Homiletic." Therefore, another heuristic possibility for Organic Homiletic lies in the way it may serve as a stepping stone for even further development of a "Homiletic of Voice."

NOTES

- 1 Clark, Jere W. "On Facing the Crisis of Intellectual Poverty," *The Journal of Creative Behavior* 3:4 (1969), p.260. For a further discussion of discussion of preachers' authenticity and creativity, see Park, Richard. "Creativity and Homiletics," unpublished paper, (Berkeley, 2005).
- 2 Ibid, 269.
- 3 These three rhetorical appeals have been dialectically developed in the history of rhetoric and homiletics. The healthiest possibility for homiletics will be a balance among the New Homiletics movement's focus on *pathos*, the Old Homiletics' focus on *logos*, and Post-modernism's ethical rhetorical focus on *ethos*. See Park, Richard. "Language and Truth: Dialogues in the New Homiletics," unpublished thesis, (Berkeley: GTU, 2003).
- 4 Bozra-Campbell, Alla. *The Word's Body*, p.12.
- 5 Bozra-Campbell here addresses the serious issue of imitation and creation of the West and the East. She states, "In the West Christ is the object of love; in Russia Christ is the loving subject within. The way to God is not through imitation, but through the reality of the Incarnation and the divine presence within...What is of significance here in the description of the Russian attitude toward Christ is its implication for creativity. In the creative encounter with Christ the Russian Christian meets Christa as the subject and lovingly receives God into her or his own self, into the depths of the heart" (Ibid, p.73). Christ is within us, who had been incarnate as the greatest expression of the creativity of the Creator God the Father. As redeemed sinners, resurrected with Christ by baptism and the Eucharist, we are united to the power of the creativity and authenticity in preaching and other areas, such as spirituality.
- 6 Perkins, D.N. "The Possibility of Invention," in Robert J. Sternberg ed., *The Nature of Creativity: Contemporary Psychological Perspectives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988). Perkins discusses the *ex nihilo* problem: "Human invention never produces something entirely out of nothing." (p. 363) Perkins analyzes Coleridge's invention of Kubla Khan in this perspective, claiming that "that novel combination at least is *ex nihilo*."
- 7 Robinson, Haddon W. *Biblical Preaching: The Development and Delivery of Expository Messages* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980), pp.115-134.
- 8 See Henry Grady Davis, "Nature, Love, and Robert Frost," in Philip J. Hefner, *The Scope of Grace: Essays on Nature and Grace in honor of Joseph Sittler* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), pp.41-64.
- 9 Davis, *Design for Preaching*. The five organic sermon forms are 1) A subject discussed, 2) A thesis supported, 3) A message illumined, 4) A question propounded, and 5) A story told. The five organic continuities are 1) Deductive, 2) Inductive, 3) Logical, 4) Chronological, and 5) Dramatic. (See chapter 9 and 10).
- 10 Wilson, Paul Scott. "Is Homiletic Academic?" *Homiletic* 13:1 (1998), p.3.

- 11 Joseph Sittler points out the distinction between education and training. "You can train dogs to jump, and you can train people to report what is going on in chemistry and transmit that information. Education means training the mind to unfold to the multiple facets of human existence with some appreciation, eagerness and joy. It is, in essence, the opposite of being dull. We've got plenty of trained, dull people on our faculties, but not many educated people." ("Education as Furniture and Propellant," *Christian Century* 105:4, 1988, p.104) Phillip Brooks also addresses this problem, "The really educated man will be always distinctly himself and yet never precisely the same that he was at any other moment. His personality will be trained both in the persistency of its central stock and in its susceptibility and responsiveness to manifold impressions...but an uneducated man will be either monotonously and doggedly the same, or else full of fickle alteration. The defects of our education are seen in the way in which it sometimes produces the narrow and obstinate specialist, sometimes the vague and feeble amateur in many works, but not often the strong man who has at once clear individuality and wide range of sympathy and action" (*Lectures on Preaching*, p.115).
- 12 See Park, Richard H. "Cicero and Augustine: A Comparative Study of Relation between Cicero and Augustine in Rhetoric," unpublished paper. (Berkley: University of California, Berkeley, 2001). Park argues that homiletics needs to become a more systematic, scientific, teachable liberal art. Postmodern homileticians need to find roots that can build up a rootless art. Park contends that thoroughly examining Augustine's homiletic may be a beneficial first step for Contemporary homileticians.
- 13 Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, II. XL. 60. See also Hesselgrave, David J. "'Gold from Egypt': The Contribution of Rhetoric to Cross-Cultural Communication," *Missiology: An International Review* 4 (1976) p.89.
- 14 Foucault, Michel. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*, ed. Colin Gordon, trans. Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham, Kate Soper, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972). p.184–5.
- 15 Michel Foucault, *Religion and Culture*, ed. Jeremy R. Carrette, (New York: Routledge, 1999), pp.163–4.
- 16 Rose, Lucy A. *Sharing the Word*, p.97.
- 17 Buttrick, *A Captive Voice: The Liberation of Preaching* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994), p.3.
- 18 Buttrick, *Homiletic*, p. 429.
- 19 Hudson, Mary Lin, and Turner, Mary Donovan, *Saved from Silence: Finding Women's Voice in Preaching* (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 1999), p. 7–17.
- 20 Smith, Christian M. *Preaching as Weeping, Confession, and Resistance: Radical Responses to Radical Evil* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), pp.3–6.
- 21 Gonzales, Justo L. and Gonzales, Catherine G. *The Liberating Pulpit* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994), pp.30–46.
- 22 Hilkert, *Naming Grace*, pp. 175–181.
- 23 McClure, John S. *Other-Wise Preaching: A Postmodern Ethic for Homiletics* (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2001), pp.119–123.
- 24 Nieman and Rogers, *Preaching to Every Pew*, "Insights and a Final Voice," pp.139–157.
- 25 *Ibid.*, pp.22–54.

- 26 Richard Lischer, *The Preacher King: Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Word that Moved America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).
- 27 Henry H. Mitchell, *Celebration and Experience in Preaching* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1990) and *The Recovery of Preaching* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1977).
- 28 Jung Young Lee, *Korean Preaching: An Interpretation* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), Chang Bok Chung, *Preaching for Preachers: A Study of Preaching with Particular Reference to the Korean Cultural Context* (Seoul: Worship & Preaching Academy, 1999), Sung Kuh Chung, *Korean Church and Reformed Faith: Focusing on the Historical Study of Preaching in the Korean Church* (Seoul: Time Printing, 1996), and Eunjoo Mary Kim, *Preaching the Presence of God: A Homiletic from an Asian American Perspective* (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1999).
- 29 D. Ray Heisey, ed., *Chinese Perspectives in Rhetoric and Communication* (Stamford: Ablex Pub., 2000), Xing Lu, *Rhetoric in Ancient China, Fifth to Third Century B.C.E.: A Comparison with Classical Greek Rhetoric* (Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1998), and George A. Kennedy, *Comparative Rhetoric: An Historical and Cross-Cultural Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Works on Coleridge

- Arthur, Paul W. L. "From Politics to Pleasure: Coleridge and Romantic Imperialism." *SPAN: Journal of the South Pacific Association for Commonwealth Literature and Language Studies*. 45 (1997): 73–87.
- Barth, J. Robert. *The Symbolic Imagination: Coleridge and the Romantic Tradition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- . "Mortal Beauty: Ignatius Loyola, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, and the Role of Imagination in Religious Experience." *Christianity and Literature*. 50:1 (2000): 69–78.
- . "The Biographia Literaria as Conversation Poem: The Poetry of Coleridge's Prose." *Coleridge Bulletin: The Journal of the Friends of Coleridge*. 16 (2000): 1–4.
- . *Coleridge and Christian Doctrine*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1987.
- Beer, John. "Coleridge and Wordsworth: The Vital and the Organic." *Reading Coleridge: Approaches and Applications*. Crawford, Walter B. ed. Ithaca: Cornell University Press (1979): 160–190.
- Benziger, James. "Organic Unity: Leibniz to Coleridge." *PMLA* 66:2 (1951): 24–48.
- Buell, Lawrence. "The Question of Form in Coleridge's Biographia Literaria." *E.L.H.* 46 (1979): 399–417.
- Coleridge, Samuel T. *Coleridge: un tableau synoptique de la vie et des uvres de Coleridge et des evenements artistiques, litteraires et historiques de son époque*. Paris: P. Seghers, 1963.
- . edited by Richards, I. A., *Coleridge*. Viking Adult, 1961.
- . *Biographia Literaria. The Major Works*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . *Lectures on Shakespeare. The Major Works*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . *Aids To Reflection. The Major Works*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . *Coleridge's Shakespearean Criticism*. Raysor, Thomas Middleton, ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930.
- . *Coleridge's Miscellaneous Criticism*. Raysor, Thomas Middleton, ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936.
- . *The Political Thought of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*. London: J. Cape, 1938.
- Degrois, Denise. "S. T. Coleridge et la 'Fixite'" *Etudes Anglaises: Grande-Bretagne, Etats-Unis*. 45:4 (1992): 416–23.
- Eiseley, Loren. "Darwin, Coleridge, and the Theory of Unconscious Creation." *Daedalus: Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*. 94 (1965): 588–602.
- Enscoe, Gerald E. *Eros and the Romantics, Sexual Love as a Theme in Coleridge, Shelley and Keats*. Paris: Mouton, 1967.
- Fogle, Richard Harter. *The Idea of Coleridge's Criticism*. Berkeley: University of California

- Press, 1962.
- Fulford, Tim. "Coleridge, Darwin, Linnaeus: The Sexual Politics of Botany." *Wordsworth Circle* 28:3 (1997): 124–130.
- Gallant, Christine, ed. *Coleridge's Theory of Imagination Today*. New York: AMS Press, 1989.
- Gokak, Vinayak Krishna. "On Coleridge's Aesthetics." *Journal of Comparative Literature and Aesthetics*. 1:1 (1978): 65–71.
- Hanford, James Holly. "Coleridge as a Philologist." *Modern Philology: A Journal Devoted to Research in Medieval and Modern Literature*. 16:12 (1919): 615–636.
- Hedley, Douglas. "Was Coleridge a Romantic?" *The Wordsworth Circle* 22:1 (1991): 71–75.
- Holmes, Richard. *Coleridge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- . *Coleridge: Darker Reflections, 1804–1834*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1999.
- . *Coleridge: Early Visions*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1989.
- Joplin, David. "'Past the Headlands': The Significance of the 'Growth of Mind' for the Thought and Work of S. T. Coleridge." *Journal of Evolutionary Psychology*. 19:1–2 (1998): 21–30.
- Klein, Jurgen. "Samuel Taylor Coleridge's Theorie der Imagination in seiner Biographia Literaria: Coleridge zwischen Empirismus und Idealismus." *Romantik. Alexander, Vera* (ed. and introduction).
- Kneale, J. Douglas. "Coleridge and Epideictic." *Relocating Praise: Literary Modalities and Rhetorical Contexts*. den Otter, Alice G. (ed. and intro.). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' (2000): 33–49.
- Kooy, Michael John. "Romanticism and Coleridge's Idea of History." *Journal of the History of Ideas*. 60:4(1999): 717–735.
- Magnuson, Paul. "Teaching the Coleridge-Wordsworth Dialogue." *Approaches to Teaching Coleridge's Poetry and Prose*. Richard E. Matlak, ed. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, (1991): 76–82.
- Marks, Emerson R. *Coleridge on the Language of Verse*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.
- McFarland, Thomas P. "Coleridge, the Stoics, and the Epicureans." *Hellas: A Journal of Poetry and the Humanities*. 7:2 (1996): 195–212.
- . "A Coleridgean Criticism of the Work of M. H. Abrams." *High Romantic Argument: Essays for M. H. Abrams*. Lipking, Lawrence (ed. & introd.); Parrish, Stephen M. (pref.); Ende, Stephen A. (bibliog.). Ithaca: Cornell University Press, (1981): 106–127.
- . "The Symbiosis of Coleridge and Wordsworth." *Studies in Romanticism* 11 (1972): 263–303.
- McKenzie, Gordon. *Organic Unity in Coleridge*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1939.
- Miall, David S. "Coleridge on Emotion: Experience into Theory." *The Wordsworth Circles* 22:1 (1991): 35–39.
- Milnes, Tim. "Eclipsing Art: Method and Metaphysics in Coleridge's Biographia Literaria." *Journal of the History of Ideas*. 60:1 (1999): 125–47.
- Modiano, Raimonda. *Coleridge and the Concept of Nature*. Tallahassee: Florida State

- University Press, 1985.
- Newlyn, Lucy, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Coleridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Ortemann, Marie-Jeanne. "L'Errance nécessaire, comme indice d'une impasse philosophique: Sa représentation dans le corpus coleridgien" *L'Errance. Lecerclé, J.-J.* Paris: Univ. de Paris X. (1991): 187–205.
- Ortemann, Marie-Jeanne. "'Romantic Chasm': Le Statut de l'objet dans l'écriture poétique coleridgienne." *Q/W/E/R/T/Y: Arts, Littératures & Civilisations du Monde Anglophone*. 2 (1992): 61–69.
- Parrish, Stephen Maxfield. "The Wordsworth-Coleridge Controversy." *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*. 73:4 (1958): 367–374.
- Prickett, Stephen. *Coleridge and Wordsworth: The Poetry of Growth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- . *Romanticism and Religion: The Tradition of Coleridge and Wordsworth in the Victorian Church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- . "Coleridge, Schlegel and Schleiermacher: England, Germany (and Australia) in 1798." 1798: *The Year of the Lyrical Ballads*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1998.
- Raine, Kathleen. *Coleridge*. Colchester: The British Council and the National Council, 1953.
- Richards, I. A. *Coleridge on Imagination*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1965.
- Sewell, Elizabeth. "Bacon, Vico, Coleridge, and the Poetic Method." *Giambattista Vico: An International Symposium*. Tagliacozzo, Giorgio(ed.); White, Hayden V.(ed.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, (1969): 125–136.
- Sewell, Elizabeth. "Coleridge on Revolution." *Studies in Romanticism*. 11 (1972): 342–59.
- Shaffer, E. S. "The Hermeneutic Community: Coleridge and Schleiermacher." *The Coleridge Connection: Essays for Thomas McFarland*, Gravit, Richard ed. and intro., Basingstoke: Macmillan, (1990): 200–229.
- Veeder, Rex. "Coleridge's Philosophy of Composition: An Overview of a Romantic Rhetorician." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*. 23:2 (1993): 20–29.
- Wendling, Ronald C. "Coleridge's Critical Sympathy with Plato." *Coleridge Bulletin: The Journal of the Friends of Coleridge*. 16 (2000): 115–122.
- Whitehill, Joseph. "Samuel Taylor Coleridge: Prisoner and Prophet of System." *American Scholar*. 37 (1968): 145–158.
- Wojcik, Manfred. "Coleridge: Symbol, Organic Unity, and Modern Aesthetic Subjectivism." *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik*. 18 (1970): 355–390.
- Wordsworth, Jonathan. "'The Infinite I AM': Coleridge and the Ascent of Being." *Coleridge's Imagination: Essays in Memory of Pete Laver*. Gravit, Richard (ed.); Newlyn, Lucy (ed.); Roe, Nicholas (ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (1985): 22–52.
- Wylie, Ian. *Young Coleridge and the Philosophers of Nature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- Yaeger, Patricia S. "Coleridge, Derrida, and the Anguish of Writing." *Substance: A Review of Theory and Literary Criticism*. 12:2 (1983): 89–102.

Works on Romanticism and Organicism

- Abrams, M. H. *Natural Supernaturalism: Tradition and Revolution in Romantic Literature*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1973.
- . *The Milk of Paradise: The Effect of Opium Visions on the Works of DeQuincey, Crabbe, Francis Thompson, and Coleridge*. New York: Octagon Books, 1971.
- . *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953.
- . "Coleridge and the Romantic Vision of the World." *Coleridge's Variety: Bicentenary Studies*. John Beer ed. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, (1974): 101–133.
- Bahm, Archie J. "Organic Unity and Emergence." *The Journal of Philosophy* 44 (1947): 241–244.
- . "Organicism: The Philosophy of Interdependence." *International Philosophical Quarterly* 7 (1967): 251–284.
- Berlin, Isaiah. *The Roots of Romanticism*, edited by Henry Hardy. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- Brisman, Leslie. "Coleridge and the Supernatural." *Studies in Romanticism*. 21:2 (1982): 123–159.
- Curran, Stuart. "Romanticism as Movement." *Review*. 4 (1982): 135–157.
- Eaves, Morris. "Romantic Expressive Theory and Blake's Idea of the Audience." *PMLA* 95 (1980): 784–801.
- Ellison, Julie. "Rousseau in the Text of Coleridge: The Ghost-Dance of History" *Studies in Romanticism*. 28 :3 (1989): 417–436.
- Galison, Peter. "Objectivity Is Romantic." *ACLS Occasional Paper*. 47 (1999): 15–43.
- Godfrey, B. R. "Imagination and Truth: Some Romantic Contradictions." *English Studies: A Journal of English Language and Literature*. 44 (1963): 254–267.
- Hamm, Victor M. "The Problem of Form in Nature and the Arts." *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 13 (1954): 175–184.
- Haney, David P. "Aesthetics and Ethics in Gadamer, Levinas, and Romanticism: Problems of Phronesis and Techne." *PMLA: Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*. 114:1 (1999): 32–45.
- Jasper, David, ed. *The Interpretation of Belief: Coleridge, Schleiermacher and Romanticism*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd., 1986.
- La Driere, James Craig. "Form." *The Dictionary of World Literature*. J.T. Shipley ed. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1943.
- Lord, Catherine. "Organic Unity Reconsidered." *Journal of Aesthetic and Art Criticism* (1964): 263–268.
- Manuel, Frank E. "From Equality to Organicism." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 17 (1956): 54–69.
- Morgan, David. "German Character and Artistic Form: The Cultural Politics of German Art Theory, 1773–1814." *European Romantic Review* 6:2 (1996): 183–212.
- O'Brien, Orsini, G.N.G. "Coleridge and Schlegel Reconsidered." *Comparative Literature* 16:2 (1964): 97–118.

- . "The Organic Concepts in Aesthetics." *Comparative Literature* 21:1 (1969): 1–30.
- . "Organicism." *The Dictionary of the History of Ideas*. Philip P. Wiener, ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973–74.
- . "The Ancient Roots of a Modern Idea." *Organic Form: The Life of an Idea*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, (1972): 7–24.
- Kathleen. "Romanticism and Rhetoric: A Question of Audience." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*. 30:2 (2000): 77–91.
- Peckham, Morse. "Toward a Theory of Romanticism." *PMLA* 66:2 (1951): 5–23.
- Phillips, D.C. "Organicism in the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 31 (1970): 413–432.
- Primeau, Ronald. "On the Discrimination of Hulmes: Toward a Theory of the 'Anti-romantic' Romanticism of Modern Poetry." *Journal of Modern Literature* 3 (1974): 1104–1122.
- Punter, David. "1789: The Sex of Revolution." *Criticism: A Quarterly for Literature and the Arts*. 24:3 (1982): 201–217.
- Riedel, Wolfgang. *Die Arbeit der Dichter: Vergleichende Studien zur dichterischen Subjektivität in der englischen Romantik und Moderne*. Frankfurt: Lang, 1979.
- Ritterbush, Philip C. "Organic Form: Aesthetics and Objectivity in the Study of Form in the Life Sciences." *Organic Form: The Life of an Idea*. Rousseau, G.S. London: Routledge & K. Paul, (1972): 25–59.
- Rousseau, G.S. ed. *Organic Form: The Life of an Idea*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972.
- Sayre, Robert. "The Young Coleridge: Romantic Utopianism and the French Revolution." *Studies in Romanticism*. 28:3 (1989): 397–415.
- Schaper, Eva. "Significant Form." *British Journal of Aesthetics* 1 (1960): 33–43.
- Schlegel, Augustus William. *A Course of Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature*. Trans. by John Black. London: Henry G. Bohn, York Street, Covent Garden, 1846.
- Steinmann, Martin, Jr. "Coleridge, T. S. Eliot, and Organicism." *Modern Language Notes*. 71:5 (1956): 339–340.
- Stempel, Daniel. "Coleridge and Organic Form: The English Tradition." *Studies in Romanticism* 6 (1966): 89–97.
- Vallins, David. *Coleridge and the Psychology of Romanticism: Feeling and Thought*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.
- Watson, J. R. "The Romantics." *Critical Quarterly*. 21:1 (1979): 3–15.
- Wellek, René. *A History of Modern Criticism: 1750–1950*, vol.2 The Romantic Age. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955.
- . *A History of Modern Criticism: 1750–1950*, vol.1 The Later Eighteenth Century. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955.
- . "Henry James's Literary Theory and Criticism." *American Literature* 30 (1958): 293–321.
- Wilkinson, Elizabeth M and L.A. Willoughby. "Goethe's Conception of Form." *Goethe Poet and Thinker*, New York: Barnes & Noble Inc. (1962): 167–184.

Works on Rhetoric

- Aristotle. *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*, trans. George A. Kennedy. New York: Oxford, 1991.
- Augustine. *De Doctrina Christiana*, R.P.H. Green (trans.) Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Bitzer, Lloyd F. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Contemporary Rhetorical Reader: A Reader*. Ed. John Louis Lucaites, Celeste Michelle Condit, and Sally Caudill. New York: The Guilford Press (1999): 217–225.
- Bizzell, Patricia and Herzberg, Bruce, ed. *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*, second edition. Bedford: St. Martin's, 2001.
- Booth, Wayne C. "The Meeting of Minds." *College Composition and Communication* 23 (1972): 242–250.
- . "The Revival of Rhetoric." *PMLA* 80:2 (1965): 8–12.
- Clark, M.L. *Rhetoric at Rome: A Historical Survey*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Cole, Thomas. *The Origins of Rhetoric in Ancient Greece*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991.
- Corbett, Edward P.J. "The Theory and Practice of Imitation in Classical Rhetoric." *College Composition and Communication* 22 (1971): 243–250.
- . *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student* 3rd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Golden, Jame L. and Corbett, Edwards P.J. *The Rhetoric of Blair, Campbell, and Whately*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1990.
- Herrick, James A. *The History and Theory of Rhetoric*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2001.
- Kennedy, George A. *Classical Rhetoric and its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*, Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1980.
- Polka, Brayton. "Aesthetic and Religion: Kierkegaard and the Offence of Indirect Communication." *Kierkegaard on Art and Communication*. Cambridge: St. Martin's Press (1992): 23–54.
- Smith, Craig R. *Rhetoric & Human Consciousness: A History*. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press, Inc, 2003.
- Talmor, Sascha. *The Rhetoric of Criticism: From Hobbes to Coleridge*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1984.
- Wilder, Amos N. *Early Christian Rhetoric: The Language of the Gospel*. London: SCM Press, 1964.
- Young, Richard E., Alton L. Becker, and Kenneth L. Pike. *Rhetoric: Discovery and Change*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1970.

Works on Davis

- Davis, Henry Grady. *Design for Preaching*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1958.
- . "Preaching in the Fall." *Lutheran Quarterly* 7 (1955): 240–248.

- . *The Gift of Conversion*. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1958.
- . *Why We Worship*. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1961.
- . "Nature, Love and Robert Frost." *Scope of Grace*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, (1964): 41–63.
- and Vööbus, Arthur. *The Gospels in Study and Preaching: Trinity Sunday to the ninth Sunday after Trinity*. (Homiletical Studies) Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.

Works on Contemporary Composition Theory

- Allott, Miriam. "Form versus Substance in Henry James." *Review of English Literature* 3 (1962).
- Amoros, Jose Antonio Alvarez. "Henry James's "Organic Form" and Classical Rhetoric." *Comparative Literature* 46:1 (1994): 40–64.
- Berlin, James A. "Rhetoric and Ideology in the Writing Class." *College English* 50:5 (1988): 477–494.
- . *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900–1985*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1987.
- . "The Rhetoric of Romanticism: The Case for Coleridge." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 10 (1980): 62–74.
- . "Contemporary Composition: The Major Pedagogical Theories." *College English* 44:8 (1982): 765–777.
- Berthoff, Ann E. "From Problem-solving to a Theory of Imagination." *College English* 33 (1971–2): 636–649.
- . "The Problem of Problem Solving." *College Composition and Communication* 22 (1971): 237–242.
- . "Problem-solving, Composing, and Liberal Education." *College English* 33 (1971–2): 628–635.
- Blanchard, Margaret. "Composition, Literature, and Interior Power." *College Composition and Communication* 15 (1964): 20–23.
- Connors, Robert J. "The Rise and Fall of the Modes of Discourse." *College Composition and Communication* 32 (1981): 444–455.
- Cooper, Charles R. and Lee Odell, ed. *Research on Composing: Point of Departure*. National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), 1978.
- Elbow, Peter. "Embracing Contraries in the Teaching Process." *College English* 45 (1983): 327–339.
- . "Shall We Teach or Give Credit? A Model for Higher Education." *Soundings: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 54 (1971): 237–252.
- . "Teaching Thinking by Teaching Writing." *Change* 15 (1983): 37–40.
- . "A Method for Teaching Writing." *College English* 30:2 (1968): 115–125.
- . "Forward: About Personal Expressive Academic Writing." *Pre-Text: Journal of Rhetorical Theory* 11 (1990): 7–20.
- . "Foreword." *The Psychology of Writing: The Affective Experience*. New York:

- Greenwood Press (1989): xiii–xvii.
- . “Closing My Eyes as I Speak: An Argument for Ignoring Audience.” *College English* 49 (1987): 50–69.
- . Sherian Blau and Don Killgallon. *The Writer’s Craft: Idea to Expression*. Evanston: McDougal, Little & Company, 1992.
- . Pat Belanoff, and Sheryl I. Fontaine ed. *Nothing Begins with N: New investigations of Freewriting*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1991.
- . *Writing with Power: Techniques for Mastering the Writing Process*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- . *Writing without Teachers*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Faigley, Lester. “Competing Theories of Process: A Critique and a Proposal.” *College English* 48:6 (1986): 527–542.
- Fishman, Stephen M. and Lucille Parkinson McCarthy. “Is Expressivism Dead? Reconsidering its Romantic Roots and its Relation to Social Constructionism.” *College English* 54 (1992): 647–661.
- Emig, Janet A. “The Uses of the Unconscious in Composing.” *College Composition and Communication* 15 (1964): 6–11.
- Foss, Sonja K. and Foss, Karen A. *Inviting Transformation: Presentational Speaking for a Changing World*. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press, Inc, 2003.
- Fulkerson, Richard. “Composition Theory in the Eighties: Axiological Consensus and Paradigmatic Diversity.” *College Composition and Communication* 41:4 (1990): 409–429.
- Graves, Richard L, ed. *Writing, Teaching, Learning (Rhetoric and Composition)*. Portsmouth: Boyton/Cook Publishers, 1999.
- Hairston, Maxine C. *Successful Writing* 4th edition. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1981.
- Irmischer, William F. *Teaching Expository Writing*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979.
- House, Elizabeth B. and House, Wiluam J. “Problem-Solving: The Debates in Composition and Psychology.” *JAC* 7 (1987).
- Killingsworth, M. Jimmie. “Product and Process, Literacy and Orality: An Essay on Composition and Culture.” *College Composition and Communication* 44 (1993): 26–39.
- Larson, Richard L. “Problem-solving, Composing, and Liberal Education.” *College English* 33 (1971–2): 628–635.
- Lauer, Janice M., Gene Montague, Andrea Lunsford, and Janet Emig. *Four Worlds of Writing* 3rd edition. New York: HarperCollins Publishers Inc., 1991.
- Macrorie, Ken. “To be Read.” *English Journal* 57 (1968): 686–692.
- . *Telling Writing* 3rd edition. Rochelle Park: Hayden Book Company Inc., 1980.
- Monroe, Alan H. *Principles of Speech*, 4th edition Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1958.
- Murray, Donald M. “Finding Your Own Voice: Teaching Composition in an Age of Dissent.” *College Composition and Communication* 20 (1960): 118–123.
- . “The Interior View: One Writer’s Philosophy of Composition.” *College Composition and Communication* 21 (1971): 21–26.

- . “Writing and Teaching for Surprise.” *College English* 46 (1984): 145–151.
- Neman, Beth S. *Teaching Students to Write*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Newton, K.M. *Twentieth-Century Literary Theory: A Reader*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1988.
- Quiller-Couch, Sir Arthur. *On the Art of Writing*. New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1916.
- Read, Herbert. *The True Voice of Feeling: Studies in English Romantic Poetry*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1953.
- Rogers, Jr. Paul C. “Alexander Bain and the Rise of the Organic Paragraph.” *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 51 (1965): 399–408.
- Stewart, Donald C. *The Authentic Voice: A Pre-Writing Approach to Student Writing*. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers, 1972.

Works on Homiletics

- Allen, Ronald J. “New Directions in Homiletics.” *Journal for Preachers* 16:3 (1993): 20–26.
- . *Patterns of Preaching: A Sermon Sampler*. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 1998.
- and Bartholomew, Gilbert L. *Preaching Verse by Verse*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2000.
- . “Preaching and Postmodernism.” *Interpretation* 55:1 (2001): 34–48.
- Barth, Karl. *Homiletics*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991.
- . *The Word of God and the Word of Man*, trans. Douglas Horton. Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1978.
- Bartlett, David L. “Story and History: Narratives and Claims.” *Interpretation* 45:3 (1991): 229–240.
- Bennett, B. J. *The Development of A Story-Form Homiletic, 1958 to 1985: Retelling the Story of God in Community*. Unpublished Ph.D Dissertation. New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1988.
- Blackwood, James R. *The Soul of Frederick W. Robertson, The Brighton Preaching*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1947.
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Worldly Preaching: Lectures on Homiletics*. Clyde E. Fant (trans. and edit.). New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1991.
- Brilioth, Yngve. *A Brief History of Preaching*. Trans. Karl E. Mattson. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1965.
- Broadus, John A. *On the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1944.
- Brooks, Phillips. *Lectures on Preaching: The Joy of Preaching*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publication, 1989.
- Browne, R.E.C. *The Ministry of the Word*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1958.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *Finally Comes the Poet*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.
- Bullock, Jeffrey Francis. *Preaching with a Cupped Ear: Hans-Georg Gadamer’s Philosophical Hermeneutics as Postmodern Wor(l)d*. New York: Peter Lang, 1999.

- . “Preaching in a Postmodern Wor(l)d: Gadamer’s Philosophical Hermeneutics as Homiletical Conversation.” *AAR/SBL*, 1997.
- Buttrick, David. *Homiletic: Moves and Structures*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- . *A Captive Voice: The Liberation of Preaching*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994.
- Carroll, Thomas K. *Preaching the Word: Message of the Father of the Church*. Wilmington: Michael Glazier Inc., 1984.
- Childers, Jana. *Performing the Word*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998.
- . ed. *Birthing the Sermon: Women Preachers on the Creative Process*. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2001.
- . ed. *Purposes of Preaching*. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2004.
- Chrysostom, St. John. *On the Priesthood*. Crestwood: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2002.
- Clader, Linda L. *Voicing The Vision: Imagination and Prophetic Preaching*. Harrisburg: Morehouse Publishing, 2003.
- Clark, Charles Allen. *Lectures on Homiletics*. Seoul: The Christian Literature Society, 1990.
- Craddock, Fred B. *Preaching*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1985.
- . *As One without Authority*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1979.
- . *Overhearing the Gospel*. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2002.
- Davis, Horton. *Varieties of English Preaching 1900–1960*. Bloomsbury: SCM Press LTD, 1963.
- Dieter, Otto A. “ARBOR PICTA: The Medieval Tree of Preaching.” *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 51:2 (1965): 123–144.
- Edwards, O.C. Jr. *Elements of Homiletic*. New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1982.
- Eslinger, Richard L. *A New Hearing: Living Options in Homiletic Method*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1987.
- . *The Web of Preaching*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002.
- Forsyth, P.T. *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind*. London: Paternoster Press, 1907.
- Garvie, Alfred Ernest. *The Christian Preacher*. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1937.
- Gonzales, Justo L. & Catherine G. Gonzalez. *The Liberating Pulpit*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994.
- Greenhaw, David M. and Allen, Ronald J., ed. *Preaching in the Context of Worship*. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2000.
- Hamilton, Donald L. *Homiletical Handbook*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1992.
- Hilkert, Mary C. *Naming Grace: Preaching and Sacramental Imagination*. New York: Continuum, 1997.
- Hogan, Lucy Lind & Robert Reid. *Connecting with the Congregation: Rhetoric and the Art of Preaching*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999.
- . “Homiletos: The Never-Ending Holy Conversation.” *Homiletic* 21:2 (1996): 1–10.
- . “Rethinking Persuasion: Developing an Incarnational Theology of Preaching.” *Homiletic* 24:2 (1999): 1–12.
- Holland, DeWitte T. *The Preaching Tradition: A Brief History*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1980.

- Jensen, Richard A. *Telling the Story: Variety and Imagination in Preaching*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1980.
- . *Thinking in Story*. Lima: C.S.S. Publishing Co., 1993.
- Karl Rahner. S.J., ed. *The Renewal of Preaching*. New York: Paulist Press, 1968.
- Kerr, Hugh Thomson. *Preaching in the Early Church: The Moor Lectures*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1942.
- Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon*, 7th edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.
- Lischer, Richard. "The Limit of Story." *Interpretation* 38 (1984): 26–38.
- . "Preaching and the Rhetoric of Promise." *Word & World*, 8:1 (1988): 66–79.
- . *Theories of Preaching: Selected Readings in the Homiletical Tradition*. Durham: The Labyrinth Press, 1987.
- Long, Thomas G. *Preaching and the Literary Forms of the Bible*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.
- . *The Witness of Preaching*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1989.
- Lowry, Eugene L. *The Homiletical Plot: The Sermon as Narrative Art Form*. Atlanta: John Know Press, 1980.
- . *How to Preach a Parable*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1989.
- . *The Sermon: Dancing the Edge of Mystery*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997.
- McClure, John S. *The Roundtable Pulpit*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995.
- . *Other-wise Preaching: A Postmodern Ethic for Homiletics*. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2001.
- Meuser, Fred W. *Luther the Preacher*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1983.
- Meyers, Robin R. *With Ears to Hear: Preaching as Self-Persuasion*. Cleveland: The Pilgrim Press, 1993.
- Mitchell, Henry H. *The Recovery of Preaching*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1977.
- . *Celebration & Experience in Preaching*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1990.
- O'Day, Gail R. and Thomas G. Long, ed. *Listening to the Word: Studies in honor of Fred B. Craddock*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1993.
- Ong, Walter J. *Orality and Literacy*. London: Routledge, 1982.
- Park, Richard H. "Cicero and Augustine: A Comparative Study of Relation between Cicero and Augustine in Rhetoric," Ph.D. seminar paper, Classical Rhetorical Theory, University of California, Berkeley, Fall, 2001.
- . "Simplicity as the Common Denominator: A Study of Preaching Style in the Multi-Cultural Preaching." Ph.D. seminar paper, Preaching across Culture, Berkeley: Graduate Theological Union, Fall 2002.
- . *Language and Truth: Dialogue in the New Homiletic*. MA thesis. Berkeley: Graduate Theological Union, Spring 2003.
- . "The Problem of Allegory in Origen." Ph.D. seminar paper, History of Christian Preaching, Graduate Theological Union, Fall 2003.
- . "Create Casserole! Revisiting New Homiletic with Kierkegaard and Peter Elbow on Sermon Composition." Ph.D. comprehensive exam paper. Berkeley: Graduate Theological Union, Spring 2005.

- . “Feminist Invitational Rhetoric and Theology of Preaching.” Ph.D. comprehensive exam Paper. Berkeley: Graduate Theological Union, Spring 2005.
- Parker, T.H.L. *Calvin’s Preaching*. Louisville: Westminster/John Know Press, 1992.
- Pattison, C. Harwood. *History of Christian Preaching*. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1909.
- Pfeiffer, Robert H. *History of New Testament Times*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1949.
- Pieterse, H.J.C. “Sermon Forms.” *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 36:1 (1981):10–17.
- Postman, Neil. *Amusing Ourselves to Death*. New York: Penguin Books, 1986.
- Preminger, Alex, ed. “Form.” *Encyclopedia of Poetry & Poetics*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, (1965): 286–287.
- Randolph, David, James. *The Renewal of Preaching in the 21st Century*. Babylon: Hanging Gardens Press, 1998.
- Reid, Robert Stephen, Bullock Jeffrey, and Fleer David. “Preaching as the Creation of an Experience: The Not-So-Rational Revolution of the New Homiletic.” *The Journal of Communication and Religion* 18:1 (1995): 1–9.
- . “Postmodernism and the Function of the New Homiletic in Post-Christendom Congregations.” *Homiletic* 20:2 (1995): 1–13.
- . “The Four Voices of Preaching.” Presented in the Academy of Homiletic conference (2003):147–158.
- . “Letters to Richard H. Park.” March 7, 2005, March 8, 2005, and March 9, 2005.
- , Jeffrey Bullock and David Fleer. “Preaching as the Creation of an Experience: The Not-So-Rational Revolution of the New Homiletic.” *The Journal of Communication and Religion* 18:1 (1995): 1–9.
- . *The Four Voices of Preaching*. Brazos Press, forthcoming book.
- Reno, R.R. “The Great Delayer.” *A Monthly Journal of Religion and Public Life*. 145 (2004): 63–69.
- Robinson, Wayne Bradley, ed. *Journeys toward Narrative Preaching*. New York: The Pilgrim Press, 1990.
- Robinson, Haddon W. *Biblical Preaching: The Development and Delivery of Expository Messages*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980.
- Rogers, Thomas G. “Privilege in Preaching: Using “Privileged Narration” for Telling Stories in Sermon.” *Dialog* 34 (1995): 173–179.
- . *Rhetorical Resources for Narrative Preaching: the Use of Wayne C. Booth’s Types of Narrative as A Method for Exploring Rhetorical Resources Utilized by Richard A. Jensen in Preaching Narrative Sermons*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Berkeley: Graduate Theological Union, 1995.
- and Nieman, James R. *Preaching to Every Pew: Cross-Cultural Strategies*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- and Souza, Mauro B. “Preaching Cross-Culturally to Spanish-Speaking U.S. Hispanic Americans.” *Homiletic* 28:1 (2003):1–10.
- Rose, Lucy Atkinson. *Sharing the Word: Preaching in the Roundtable Church*. Louisville: Westminster John Know Press, 1997.

- . “Conversational Preaching: A Proposal.” *Journal for Preachers* 19:1 (1995): 26–30.
- Sanders, James A. *God Has a Story Too: Sermons in Context*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Schlafer, David J. “Where Does the Preacher Stand? Image, Narrative, and Argument as Basic Strategies for Shaping Sermons.” *Homiletic* 19:1 (1994): 1–5.
- . *Surviving the Sermon*. Cambridge: Cowley Publications, 1992.
- Schlueter, Carol J. “Feminist Homiletics: Strategies for Empowerment.” *Women’s Visions*. Geneva: WCC Publications (1995): 138–151.
- Seters, Arthur Van, ed. *Preaching as a Social Act: Theology and Practice*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1988.
- Shepherd, William H. Jr. “A Second Look at Inductive Preaching.” *Christian Century* 107 (1990): 19–26.
- Shipley, J.T., ed. “Form,” *The Dictionary of World Literature*. New York: The Philosophical Library, (1943): 250–253.
- Sittler, Joseph. *The Ecology of Faith*. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1961.
- . *The Anguish of Preaching*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.
- . “Education as Furniture and Propellant.” *Christian Century* 105:4 (1988): 102–104.
- Sleeth, Ronald E. “Design for Preaching: A Review.” *Religion in Life* 28 (1958–59): 155–156.
- Smith, Christine M. *Preaching as Weeping, Confession, and Resistance*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992.
- Stephen Crites. “The Narrative Quality of Experience”, *Journal of American Academy of Religion*, 1971.
- Thompson, Ernest Trice. *Changing Emphasis in American Preaching: The Stone Lectures for 1943*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1943.
- Thulin, Richard L. *The “I” of the Sermon*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.
- Troeger, Thomas H. *Imagining a Sermon*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1990.
- Turner, Mary Donova, and Mary Lin. Hudson. *Saved From Silence: Finding Women’s Voice in Preaching*. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 1999.
- Wallace, James A. *Imaginal Preaching: An Archetypal Perspective*. New York: Paulist Press, 1995.
- Wardlaw, Don M., ed. *Preaching Biblically*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1983.
- Waznak, Robert P. *An Introduction to the Homily*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1998.
- Willimon, William H. “Preaching: Entertainment or Exposition?” *Christian Century* 107:7 (1990): 204–206.
- and Lischer, Richard, ed. *Concise Encyclopedia of Preaching*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995.
- Wilson, Paul Scott. “Coherence in Biographia Literaria: God, Self, and Coleridge’s ‘Seminal Principle.’” *Philological Quarterly*. 72:4 (1993): 451–469.
- . *Imagination of the Heart*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1988.
- . *A Concise History of Preaching*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1992.
- . *The Practice of Preaching*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995.

- . “Is Homiletics Academic?” *Homiletic* 13:1 (1998): 1–4.
- . *The Four Pages of the Sermon: A Guide to Biblical Preaching*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999.
- Young, Robert D. *Religious Imagination: God’s Gift to Prophets and Preachers*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1979.

Works on Creativity

- Achtemeier, Elizabeth. *Creative Preaching: Finding the Words*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1981.
- Bozarth-Campbell, Alla. *The Word’s Body: An Incarnational Aesthetic of Interpretation*. Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 1979.
- Clark, Jere W. “On Facing the Crisis of Intellectual Poverty.” *The Journal of Creative Behavior* 3:4 (1969): 260–270.
- Csikszentmihalyi, Mihaly. *Creativity: Flow and the Psychology of Discovery and Invention*. New York: Harper Perennial, 1996.
- . *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience*. New York: Harper Perennial, 1991.
- Gardner, Howard. *Art, Mind & Brain: A Cognitive Approach to Creativity*. New York: Basic Books Inc., Publishers, 1982.
- Howard, J. Grant. *Creativity in Preaching*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1987.
- Lloyd-Jones, Richard. “Romantic Revels- I Am Not You.” *College Composition and Communication* 23 (1972): 251–257.
- May, Rollo. *The Courage to Create*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1975.
- McElvain, Marcia L. “The Creative Process: The Relationship of the Musical and Literary Composer.” *College Composition and Communication* 19 (1968): 128–132.
- Park, Richard H. “Creativity and Homiletics: Save Preachers from Boredom!” Ph.D seminar paper, Performance Study, Berkeley: Graduate Theological Union, Spring 2005.
- Perkins, D.N. “The Possibility of Invention,” in *The Nature of Creativity: Contemporary Psychological Perspectives*, ed. Robert J. Sternberg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988): 362–385.
- Pumphrey, Jean. “Teaching English Composition as a Creative Art.” *College English* 34 (1973): 666–673.
- Read, Herbert. *The True Voice of Feeling: Studies in English Romantic Poetry*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1953.
- Stewart, Donald C. *The Authentic Voice: A Pre-Writing Approach to Student Writing*. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers, 1972.
- Vernon, P.E., ed. *Creativity*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1970.
- Wallas, G. “The Art of Thought.” Excerpts from G. Wallas, *The Art of Thought*, Jonathan Cape, 1926, pp.79–96, *Creativity: Selected Readings*. Ed. P.E.Vernon. Baltimore: Penguin Press, 1970.

INDEX

A

Abrams, M.H., 5, 34; abrams analyzes, 18; *Ars Poetica*, 22; Cambridge Platonists, 24; Coleridge, 17; in Coleridge, 36; Organic growth, 35; process philosophy, 18; researcher and critic, 34
Aesthetics, 6, 56
Aristotle, 22, 51, 67, 78; a view of art, 21; in book, 21; *Poetics*, 21; two possible forms, 21; view of form, 21
Augustine, 22, 35, 67, 82, 96, 97, 99, 124, 129, 155, 179, 190
Authentic Homiletic, 181

B

Biographia Literaria, 27
Bonhoeffer, Dietrich, 80, 151, 193
Bozarth-Campbell, Alla, 96, 198
Broadus, John, 85, 100, 105, 106, 112, 175, 193
Brooks, Phillips, 3, 94, 107, 116, 130, 153, 175, 193
Buttrick, David, 3, 6, 71, 115; in homiletic, 180; new homiletics, 94; pheonomiological, 118

C

Calvin, 62
Chrysostom, 95, 99, 124, 129, 194
Contentualism, 16
Conversational Preaching, 123, 124
Craddock, Fred, 112
Craddock, Fred, 2, 123, 142; congenial, 114; in molding a sermon, 113; neoclassical imitation theory, 113; new homiletic, 94; two additional factors, 113

D

De Doctrina Christiana, 22, 56, 91, 131, 183
Descartes, 59, 78, 135
Design for Preaching, 2, 3, 4, 8, 67, 69, 71, 83, 85, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93; as functional sermon form, 5; Davis, 112; in the bibliography, 69; ormanitic organic development, 86; sleeth, 71
Dialogue, 6, 142, 144, 146

E

Elbow, Peter, 58, 65; in the teaching process, 58, 65; writing without teachers, 138
Erasmus, 103, 104, 129
Expressivism, 27, 48, 68; romantic, 52

F

Form, 3, 9, 22, 23, 73, 113, 185; A Brief History of Form, 20; Discovery of Form, 152; Sermon Form from Antiquity go ghe Present, 5
Formalism: mimeticism, 48
Fosdick, Harry, 5, 67, 70, 78, 85, 124, 176

G

Gonzales, Justo, 7, 180, 194

H

Hilkert, Mary, 180, 194
Homilia, 97, 99, 129, 176

I

imagination, 10, 12, 38, 74, 76, 81, 86, 90, 126, 173; Coleridge emphasizes, 37;

creativity, 173; developed, 21; Henry Newman, 106; preacher, 152; preaching, 3; Richards, 13; romantic, 106
 Imago Dei, 6, 175
 Inner form, 18, 23, 25, 53
 intuition, 4, 5, 8, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 80, 81, 91, 177; a part of, 148; as well as, 156; Davis, 87; Homiletic of, 144; rational order, 83; romantic theorists, 96; synthesizing, 181

K

Kant, 17, 24, 28; in, 24; influence, 24

L

La Driere, 188
 Lectio Divina, 6, 147, 150
 Lischer, Richard, 181, 195
 Long, Thomas, 3, 6, 120, 195
 Lowry, Eugene, 3, 6, 71, 94, 118, 142, 195
 Luther, 96, 103

M

McClure, John, 123, 180, 195
 McKenzie, Gordon, 44, 45, 186
 Mechanism, 18, 77; organicism, 20
 Metamorphosis, 5, 94, 154, 176; in England, 104; in Luther, 103; organic, 94, 97, 99; process, 100; Ronald Allen, 128
Mimesis, 21, 174
 Mitchell, Henry, 181, 195

N

Narrative form, 124
 Neoclassicism, 10, 96
 New Homiletic, 2, 3, 4, 6, 71, 84, 87, 89, 111; in north america, 142; to campbell, 106

O

Organic form, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 44, 70, 73, 76, 79, 85, 86, 87; Davis, 77; principles, 4; the issue, 3
 Organic Homiletic, 2, 5, 67, 68, 70, 75, 76, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87, 177; a definition, 144, 145, 146, 147, 156; a proposal, 6, 142; a systematic, 5; Davis, 73, 85; influence, 6; Romantic, 116; the goal, 150; the need, 143
 Organic Law, 5, 67, 82, 87
 Organic Mimesis, 22, 153
 Organic Process, 5, 67, 79, 87
 Organic sermon, 75, 83, 85, 117, 122, 146, 149, 155, 176, 177
 Organic Unity, 5, 9, 15, 26, 41, 43, 67, 77, 185
 Organicism, 9, 15, 19, 20, 145, 188
 Orsini, G.N.G, 4, 15, 24, 34, 41

P

Park, Richard, 56, 195
 Philosophy of Interdependence, 90, 188
 Pieterse, D.C., 102, 107, 125
 Plato, 11, 21, 67, 78, 120
 product and process, 75

R

Rationalism, 10, 105, 106, 173; preaching, 106
 Read, Herbert, 4, 34, 37, 39, 198
 Reason, 10, 126, 143, 173; in preaching, 147; the age of, 105; with intuition, 147
 Reid, Robert, 68, 70, 194, 196
 Rogers, Thomas, 7, 181, 196
 Romanticism, 3, 5, 12, 143, 145, 188; a biological revolution, 10; against Rationalism, 10; the Age of Feeling, 105
 Rose, Lucy, 3, 6, 94, 112, 122, 196

S

Sangster, W.E., 85

Schaper, Eva, 26, 155, 189
 Schlafer, David, 119, 197
 Schlegel, A.W., 96, 108, 109, 173, 189
 Schleiermacher, 12, 68, 96, 187
Sermo, 5, 97, 99, 129, 176
 sermon form, 2, 3, 4, 6, 67, 72, 74, 76, 81,
 85, 86; as *homilia*, 97; for Davis, 73,
 76; modern-age, 105; organic
 homiletic, 76; Phillips Brooks, 107
 Shakespeare, 3, 4, 5, 8
 Significant form, 25, 26
 Significant Form, 189
 Sittler, Joseph, 85, 108, 197
 Symbol, 11, 13, 41; three, 51
 Synthetic Homiletic, 181

T

Turner, Mary, 7, 180, 197

W

Wallas, G., 79, 80, 120, 198
 Waznak, Robert, 96, 124, 197
 Wellek, René, 5, 34, 36, 189
 Whitehead, 18, 60
 Wilson, Paul, 3, 6, 14, 94, 98, 126, 197
 Wordsworth, 2, 4, 5, 31, 68, 69, 82, 83, 87,
 88, 185, 186; Coleridge, 30; friend, 52