

CONNECTEDNESS WITH GOD REAWAKENING CONSCIOUSNESS IN CONTEMPORARY CHRISTIANITY AND RELIGIOSITY IN THE LIGHT OF SCHLEIERMACHER'S *SPEECHES*

Hadrianus Tedjoworo

| Department of Philosophy,
Parahyangan Catholic University,
Bandung, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Reading Schleiermacher's *Speeches* might give rise to different experience of religion. It appears that the more important issue today is not the identity (being), but the communality and sociality, for communality is a 'space' where one's being is able to move in its 'becoming'. The importance of experience is now considered much more than before. In this article the emphasis on one's experience and its connectedness with that of others is refreshed and further

elaborated. Schleiermacher's ideas question the traditional patterns of (Christian) communities, which to some extent have implanted uniformity, dogmatism and oppressions, as being responsible for the emergence of indifferentism today. Community, as Schleiermacher has pleaded in the *Speeches*, must be fluid and broadly inclusive. The immediate self-consciousness is depicted in the moment of 'listening'—the world might have been blinded by appearances and made deaf by the voices, but there remains the process of listening. Maybe a time for a 'listening' religion? A 'listening' religious community?

Keywords:

•religion •fragmentation •virtuality •indifferentism •power
•rational Christianity •institutional representation •fascination
•'true' religion •appearances to experiences •intuition •feeling
•continuous reciprocity •fluid and inclusive community

Introduction

Religiosity is perhaps in its most challenged shape in nowadays situation. What brings about the challenges is, as we know, first and foremost the postmodern condition. Contemporary society is characterised by the complexity of matters which is hidden in the simplicity brought about by technology. To some extent, the simplicity offered by technology to humankind cannot eliminate the complexity of human matters. Rather than opening the problems publicly, simplification is concealing matters to the deepest of human mind. In other words, what appears in front of us in our daily life is not simply what it *is*. We are increasingly engaged in complex interpretations in order not to misunderstand what we perceive and experience.

This article was inspired by the reading of Schleiermacher's (1768-1834) *On Religion: Speeches to its Cultured Despisers*, originally published as *Über die Religion. Reden an die Gebildeten unter ihren Verächtern* (1799), which has unexpectedly reawakened the issue of *conscience* and *feeling*. We know of

course that *Speeches* was intended by the author to confront the 19th century salon society of Berlin—aristocrats, artists, Jewish women, and young clergymen—which was deeply affected and infected by the Enlightenment. Of course, we must be aware that simply stretching the significance of this work to our present situation will not do justice to the work itself and the author himself. However, by not taking the chance to elaborate the ideas contained in the work, we will probably miss some instrumental ideas as well as possible solutions for the contemporary religious problems. From the same point of view, one may say that too easy analogy of religion with Christianity can give the impression that we justify Christianity as the only religion. But it need not be our intention, since one way among many others to investigate the presumed crisis in Christianity is by dwelling into its religiosity, its being *as* a religion.

We will see immediately how parts of the present situation in the society to large extent reflect the situation encountered by Schleiermacher at the time, and how Schleiermacher criticisms in a way may give rise to possible solutions for our enigma today.

In Search of 'True' Religion in a Complex World

The word 'complex' itself has brought a notion of how complicated our current world has become. The purpose of this elaboration is not merely to aggravate its complexity and complication, but rather, to appreciate them in order to find some alternatives to live them out. We are attempting in this process to acclimatize ourselves—that is to say, to survive amidst the tensions—to the conflicts contained in this world so that we may appropriate the most significant changes in religious experiences amid the developing society. It appears that the conflicts have been caused by some particular shifts both in the tendency of the society itself and in people's way of thinking and behaving.

One significant shift that has shaken our society is *fragmentation*. This notion, which is chiefly brought about by postmodernism, describes any kind of separation and disintegration among people in our present society. Ironically, this separation happens at the same time with the rapid growing of communication technology. While people are communicating easier to each other, they are also allured to add more borders around themselves, manifested by the increasing of sophisticated security systems. Thus, by enhancing and doubling security systems, they accidentally produce

alienations to other people. Therefore, the increasing of communication technology does not mean that communication has become more personal than before. Instead, it turns virtual everyday. Technology, though making every effort to promote its personal style, is still producing virtuality rather than any other else. This perhaps can explain how technology to some extent is still disputable when one speaks about religion and religious experience. Technology, whether we realise it or not, is yet a representation of rationality.

Should we say that fragmentation is in one way or another caused by the splendour of rationality? Should we also say that it is because of any kind of rationalisation in many contexts? It appears that fragmentation has been another aspect that each time colours an age of rationalisation. When rationalisation rules, consequently, classification becomes epidemic. When classification is implemented, comes separation and division. In order to define identities, one feels obliged to classify as precisely as he or she can. Moreover, in that way, he is incidentally propagating fragmentation. Up to this point, we will go on forthwith with the situation encountered by Schleiermacher and what seems reappears in our own society.

Schleiermacher states that Christianity itself is not free from being fragmented and from the temptation to present itself as a collection of fragmentations. This was already clear in the tendency of rational Christianity of his time. He warns us towards “the poorly stitched together fragments of metaphysics and morals that are called rational Christianity.” With this, he also reminds us that Christianity should not be the proponent of fragmentation collecting metaphysics and morals to conceal its significance. Instead, it should be significant from itself.

Indifferentism and the Problem of 'Power' in Christianity

The Enlightenment's quest for a rational religion was too ineffectual for many of the cultured elite. It was to this disaffected crowd that Schleiermacher offered his apology (*first speech*). These people were endowed with both education and leisure to create a rich, creative life on earth. They had many interests, ranging from the arts and sciences to ethical issues, so they laboriously pursued authorities from these many fields. He says, “You have succeeded in making your earthly lives so rich and many-sided that you no longer need the eternal, and after having created a universe for yourselves, you are spared from thinking of that which created you.” People

were interested in everything but religion. That is what Schleiermacher complained. He argued that a person could not be fully human without also being religious. Therefore, whatever universe they were trying to create would be void if religion is excluded.

The situation today is not so different with that experienced by Schleiermacher and his contemporaries. Religion, if not through fundamentalism, becomes to some extent merely a kind of institution that barely attracts people. Even for those who are not hesitant to declare their religion are disposed to be in contact with the representatives of their religion only in matters of births, marriages, and deaths. This fact could be a little bit relieving, since there still remain the basic celebrations of human life connected with religion. But we should ask whether these are the only way to live out religion. Or, to put it in other words, we may ask, is religion still *something* outside of its institutional representation?

There is an increasing deliberateness to restraint religion to simply institution and this has consequently promoted *indifferentism* in religious life as well as towards any institutionalised religion. By 'institutionalised religion', here we do not mean that religion needs not to be institutionalised. It means that religion is *not* first of all institution. Indifferentism itself is nowadays mirrored clearly in the period between one and another stage of life mentioned above—birth, marriage, death. As long as a person is not at one of the three stages, he or she remains indifference, as if no one or no institution will be asked for any confirmation on what he or she thinks and does. This, in a way, has produced what we mention above as the problem of 'power.' It should be noted that 'power' in connection with religion, and especially with Christianity, has to do not simply with the power of the church to impose a rule to the believers. I would rather describe this 'power' in terms of 'appeal' and 'fascination.' Metaphorically, the church as an image is not glaring as well as not fascinating enough for its present believers. The possible cause of this might be the seal 'institutional', which is frequently attributed to the church, either by the believers themselves or by its leaders. It is because of this crisis of 'power' that indifferentism at the same time is arising.

Schleiermacher is of the opinion that religion is not mainly a matter of rational based decision or something out of hope and fear. It is far deeply rooted in human existence, as he explains it as “the inner, irresistible necessity of [our] nature.” Furthermore, he describes it as a “divine calling” born out of humility, that is, an ability to hear the Deity who is

continuously revealing itself by roaring within human hearts. Whenever there is indifferentism towards any false characteristic that is attached to religion, it is the time when religion is not a 'true' religion anymore. The 'true' religion remains in the bosom of human being and it is not something to be spoken of.

When applied to our situation, this conception is indeed a criticism for Christianity as well as for other religions. Christianity is imperilled by any kind of attitude limiting its competence to ceremonial activities, and accordingly, fails to retain its fascinating quality. Must we say that today's lack of religious appeal also shows a lack of God's power? But God is not the one bounded by any deficiency. Or perhaps there is a lack of church's or theology's adeptness to present the mystery and to bring people back to their 'true' religion, to the existential religion? Christianity is not simply a question of explaining and systematising, even those applied to the Scripture—" Thus, they seek knowledge; their wisdom is only directed toward a lamentable empiricism, and thus religion can be nothing else for them than a dead letter, a holy article in the constitution in which nothing is *real*."

Thus, derived from what Schleiermacher has proposed on religion, Christianity is facing such indifferentism and experiencing a lack of 'power' to appeal people because there is a misunderstanding and a lack of knowledge of the essence of Christianity itself. Even 'hope', as well as 'fear,' as one of the motivations in Christianity, is criticised by Schleiermacher. For, Christianity should have primarily been an existential stance *from within*, not because of one's hope or fear, but because it is the energy, the élan, for a religious person to *exist*. Instead of willing to learn, we should let ourselves to be taught by that inner spirit, to be moved by the *feeling* to intuit the infinite.

Does it give a basis for the emergence of a religious turn to the heart today? What Schleiermacher criticised in his society seems to have appeared in our recent situation. When Christianity has been too rational or too institutionalised, people are appealed to go within, to search for Christianity which promotes and cares for the heart of its believers. On the one hand, people are tired of systematising and theologising. On the other hand, they long for the experiences in which they will be fascinated and converted again. We cannot simply accuse this tendency as something immature, since being fascinated is a very human position if not an existential one. In other words, Christianity is challenged to reawaken its

“child capacity to experience joy” *each* time. This challenge has been put upon religion by Schleiermacher (*third speech*). Schleiermacher has never intended to create a new religion. Instead, he continues to encourage every individual to recover religious vitality through the discovery of the religious feeling, to be sensitive to the religiosity of each experience.

Speeches: An Alternative for a Fragmented World?

Besides the fact that the world has been fragmented, we could recognise that there is now a shift 'from appearances to experiences'. This change is in one way or another caused by the confusion presumed to appear because of the multiplicity of images in recent process of communication. People feel it increasingly difficult to distinguish which image is trustworthy and which is not, which information is true and which is not. One may be involved very much in the speed activity of this communication, but one question remains the same: which one is true? It seems that the more information we get, the more careful consideration we need. Therefore, the importance of experience is now considered much more than before. The emphasis on one's experience and its connectedness with that of others is refreshed and further elaborated. Small communities or circles of experiences are then established everywhere to retain this connectedness.

This tendency, however, is not something new if seen in the light of Schleiermacher's *Speeches*. Schleiermacher describes that there is a mysterious moment in our life where intuition (*Anschauung*, sometimes translated as 'perspectivity') and feeling (*Gefühl*), as the essence of Religion, are originally one and unseparated, and not yet interfered by metaphysics and morals. At the same time, he criticises those who only have memory and imitation, but no religion. They have known the formulas and the creeds, but produced no intuition. Their feelings are only mimetically reproduced as caricatures, and they never feel the need to recognise the mysterious moment when religion was born in their being. On the contrary, if we want to be truly religious, we have to find among all the holy men in whom humanity is immediately revealed, one who could be our mediator. Only if we find the mediator everything will appear to us differently, illumined by the reflection of that new light. He states further, that at the time, religion will return to us with sharpened meaning, and we will discover the countless dispositions intuited in others' characters, that is, in the *moments* (of humanity) *when we are able to think, feel and act in*

everyone's way.

The latter is somewhat surprising, since Schleiermacher has long ago predicted the importance of the experience *with* the other; not simply to experience the other, but moreover to experience *in* other's way. Schleiermacher is proposing that religious experience, being intensified by the finding of the mediator, should open one's mind and to enable one to think, feel, and act in everyone's way. Experience, in other words, should be communicated so that everyone within the circle is able to experience in other's way. Without this communication, experience remains something personal. At this point, we can realise that Schleiermacher's position cannot be judged as personalism, since experience in his view is always a *social* and *communal* experience, always an-*other* experience. When in this way one has let religion to work back inwardly and discover there the infinite, then he or she no longer needs a mediator for some institution of humanity—he or she him/herself can be a mediator for many. The state when one needs a mediator is only a 'passing condition,' inasmuch as everyone should “see with his own eyes and should himself make a contribution to the treasures of religion; otherwise he deserves no place in its kingdom and also receives none.”

But this scheme is not a lackadaisical one in Schleiermacher. It appreciates humanity in its complexity as well as plurality. That is why Schleiermacher goes further in stating that one must intuit humanity not only in its being but also in its *becoming*. It means that to live up the complexity and plurality, one must get used first to the state of becoming. Or, to put it differently, the more important issue is *not* the identity (being), but the communality and sociality, since communality is a *space* where one's being is able to *move* in its becoming. Schleiermacher states firmly that religion by its very nature is social. Human persons are always in 'continuous reciprocity' expressing and communicating 'all that is in him.' He feels an irresistible passion to share what he has experienced. The point is only about “becoming conscious of the relation of our particular events to our shared nature.” Though emphasising feeling in each individual, Schleiermacher, as Richard R. Niebuhr puts it, “no longer seeks the source of religion primarily in individual piety, nor suggests that piety is merely immature without social cultivation; now he recognises the original role of community in the molding of religious feeling and intuition.” Here we find what we can bring out further in our present time concerning Christian communities and the communication of religious experiences.

Christian communities in a fragmented world should be first of all a *space* for everyone to have a chance to *become* what he or she is intending to be, since all this is in order to be faithful to humanity. Instead of simply stating its own restrictions, a community should (1) *promote other communities* and (2) *keep the connectedness* with each other. A community should realise that it cannot be the only legitimate community to adopt any set of principles. Otherwise, it will underestimate the other and produce alienations. And when there is alienation, there is no more connectedness. One considerable condition for this is not to be lured—in Schleiermacher's word—to “repress everything else that nevertheless arises in the same way from the same operation of the mind.” But the communication of religion—the feeling and intuition—is to be sought not in books or common conversation but in all the effort and artistry of language. It is described as when a person steps forth before the others to present his intuition, and “the community follows his inspired speech in holy silence.” Accordingly, communities cannot merely be communities with moral exclusivity, as if there is no other community with the same principles. If the appearing communities are framed to emphasis on morals, dogmas, and institutional principles, they will contrariwise promote rampant fragmentation. Community, as Schleiermacher has pleaded in the *Speeches*, must be fluid and broadly inclusive.

The actuality of Schleiermacher's *Speeches* as an alternative for the community life in postmodern society can be expressed in Maureen Junker-Kenny's, an Irish theologian, terms as differentiation (*differenüering*), un-dogmatisation (*ontdogmatisering*), individualisation (*individualisering*), pluralisation (*pluralisering*) and un-institutionalisation (*ont-institutionalising*). These ideas question the traditional patterns of (Christian) communities, which to some extent have implanted uniformity, dogmatism and oppressions, as being responsible for the emergence of indifferentism today. Differentiation will call for a critical attitude towards any tendency towards uniformity instead of universality; un-dogmatisation will stipulate a mature position in experiencing religion and Christianity as a life-giving community; individualisation—not individualism—and pluralisation will generate a sense of respect and a spirit to fight oppressions; and un-institutionalisation will nurture liberating atmosphere in every community.

But so far we have not mentioned yet what kind of approach considered as appropriate to enhance this connectedness of communities in the light

of Schleiermacher's *Speeches*. Yet, it seems not clear for individuals as well as communities themselves to create a space in order to encourage connectedness. We will focus on this in the following details.

A 'Conscious' Approach

Schleiermacher propagates the resurgence of consciousness and feeling. What he means by feeling is both the immediate consciousness of the world transcendent to the self, and the original response of the self to the world. Feeling is immediate self-consciousness in which knowing and doing contrast. Feeling qualifies consciousness as immediate apprehension of the correlation between self and the world. On the other hand, consciousness excludes feelings which are not conscious.

This immediate self-consciousness, for our purpose, is described as the moment of *listening*—the world might have been blinded by appearances and made deaf by the voices, but there remains the process of listening. In our postmodern context, appearances may dazzle us from being certain, from being sure that we are on the right way. Therefore, everyone must be involved with the listening process, the listening consciousness. One may refer back to the Old Testament religious experiences, when the prophets were engulfed in the process of listening to the uttered words of God. The immediate self-consciousness remains in a way 'passive'—cf. *second speech*—since it has nothing to do with attaching meaning or metaphysics to itself. It is itself the meaning and the meaningful.

Nonetheless, our society is also delineated as a society of the spectacles where images play an important role, not only in defining one's opinion, but also in confusing one's ability to hold a right standing due to the stupefying figures. However, the world with its overwhelming images need not be something frightening or confusing if the communities and their members are aware to give space for the moments of *listening*. Listening is not a matter of mere silence. Listening is a conscious approach of the feeling *with-in* conflicts and contrasts of knowing and doing in this world. Hence, instead of a withdrawal, listening is an in-dwelling. In the light of Schleiermacher, the state of listening is phrased as a person whose senses are open to the universe, because “such a person is far from every conflict and contrast and elevated above every endeavour; he is permeated by the influences of the universe and has become one with it.”

For Christianity and Christian communities, the revival of

consciousness in an already and always fragmented world means referring to Christ as the unique one in his strength and his constancy of God-consciousness and as the one who stands at the origin of the Christian community. This view points to a consciousness not merely to talk about God but to be an *ever connected self* with a personal God. This conscious approach gives no room to play around with words and concepts—though for Schleiermacher scientific knowledge, which is not religion, is permitted, even welcomed, to investigate religion—but always stimulates every individual in the communities to create a space for the God of the 'true' religion in this world. For Christians, this special communication from God is mediated exclusively through Christ, the Redeemer. Hence, here Christ's position as a special mediator is not taken away; instead, it is reaffirmed as the one who is constantly *connected with God*, i. e. the one with God-consciousness.

Probably this God-consciousness can adequately be described with Rudolf Otto's term in his attempt to depict Schleiermacher's feeling, the *sensus numinis*. God-consciousness is 'the sense of the numinous' by which power one could grasp the presence of the numinous in every religious experience. Thus, for Christians within communities, the referring to Christ as a person ever connected with God gives rise to the global feeling, the feeling of God and of history, and the sense of responsible for the world, since God is responsible for the world (the infinite is intuited in the finite). Eventually to coexist with this God of history and to realise this original fact of Christianity mean for us the revelation of God as the sound affection in every person and moment.

Let us note that being connected with God seems cannot be too easy identified with talking about everything in connection with God. It is not that connectedness. It is rather being in 'utter dependence,' to use Robert R. Williams' term. But let us take into account that this utter dependence is not a one-sided relation as has been erroneously understood as Schleiermacher's standpoint, for the feeling of utter dependence is a 'receptivity-determination,' something which is pre-given and co-existent. From this point, we will go further in applying this 'being connected with God' approach with what we have stated above as the moments of listening. Moments of listening are not times when we hear many things in powerlessness. The moments are rather those in which we could express our utter dependence with the infinite. We dwell in the world and moved by God intuited in our immediate self-consciousness. It is through this fashion

that we need not be confused anymore by the stupefying figures and voices in our world. For, if the moments of listening are necessary, then the coexistence with this other and the others will be sufficient. This headway ought not to be seen as a strategy, inasmuch as the feeling will not manipulate any connectedness other than the one to God.

Conclusion: The Liberating 'Religion'

It might be argued that the above rendition of the *Speeches* goes so far than what Schleiermacher intends to say. As mentioned in the beginning, we do not want to miss the possible solutions for our situation. Nevertheless, Schleiermacher's standpoint that the 'true' religion is inalienable in human heart is a chance to pursue the liberating character of religion. This applies to every religion as well as Christianity. The challenge for *cross-religions* is of great importance in recent theological discussions, especially amid the flourishing fragmentation and the increasing need of communities enforcing communicated religious experiences. With Schleiermacher, we are reminded that in religions, we are to discover religion. Not attempting to each time reawaken the "child's capacity to experience joy" may result in a rapid and immense loss of fascination. And if this really happens, Christianity might cease to be a liberating religion. If not from Christianity, and notably from its communities, where should the liberation come from? Of course this is not a task solely for Christian communities, but their having Christ as the one constantly connected with God should have challenged them more. The desire to be a religious Christian should lead no one into any kind of incarceration. Everyone is asked to "view all things to seek every trace of the divine, the true, and the eternal, even in what appears to us to be vulgar and base, and to worship even the most distant trace." Schleiermacher, as Rudolf Otto has described him, plays the role of catalyst for the renewal of Christianity. But the catalytic process in him must have taken place because the transcendent has discovered the sensitive heart. In our society, the transcendent is seeking the sensitive hearts in the communities. Christian communities, in postmodern society, are invited to open a power-free space in the middle of social balances of power, that is, to open up the liberating 'religion'. Lastly, this article is not so much a hamming up of Schleiermacher's *Speeches* as a footnote of its ideas to regain the élan of unrelenting relatedness with God.

Endnotes:

- ¹ Schleiermacher, Friedrich, *On Religion: Speeches to Its Cultured Despisers*, ed. Richard Crouter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); hereafter quoted as *Speeches*.
- ² Zygmunt Bauman describes how in the global chaos intensified by the communication technology it is not just survival that is at stake, but the way we live and the way we think about our living; Zygmunt Bauman, *The Individualized Society* (Malden and Oxford: Polity and Blackwell, 2001) 37-38.
- ³ Schleiermacher, *Speeches*, p. 12.
- ⁴ *Speeches*, p. 3-4.
- ⁵ This condition, in Schleiermacher's contemporary, is alluded to in the "Fifth Speech" (*Speeches*, p. 113) as that among the "rigid systematizers" or "superficial indifferentists."
- ⁶ *Speeches*, p. 5. "Religion was the maternal womb in whose holy darkness my young life was nourished and prepared for the world still closed to it. In it my spirit breathed before it had discovered the world of external objects, experience, and scholarship;" p. 8.
- ⁷ "Religion must indeed be something integral that could have arisen in the human heart, something thinkable from which a concept can be formulated about which one can speak and argue" (Second Speech, *Speeches*, p. 21)
- ⁸ *Speeches*, p. 9; emphasis mine.
- ⁹ Cf. Schleiermacher's viewpoint on 'miracle' (*Second speech*). For him, everything, every event, even the most natural and usual, is a miracle. The more religious we would be, the more we would see miracles everywhere; *Speeches*, p. 49.
- ¹⁰ Cf. Robert F. Streetman, "Romanticism and the *Sensus Numinis* in Schleiermacher," in David Jasper (ed.), *The Interpretation of Belief: Coleridge, Schleiermacher and Romanticism*, Hampshire and London: Macmillan Press, 1986, p. 112-133. Schleiermacher in the "Fourth Speech" explains the ability to see the divine in all things as 'true' priesthood. It implies serving the divine in all activities; (*Speeches*, p. 91). But he rejects a rigid distinction between priest and laity, since it is merely a "distinction of situation and functions" (*Speeches*, p. 75-76)
- ¹¹ "Religion's essence is neither thinking nor acting, but intuition and feeling" (Second speech, *Speeches*, p. 22).
- ¹² *Speeches*, p. 22.
- ¹³ His allusion to Christology; *Speeches*, p. 41.
- ¹⁴ Ad Willems emphasises that the believers' experiences is a starting-point not only of a new kind of piety, but furthermore of a new kind of theology that fix with the great discoveries of the Enlightenment; Ad Willems, "De Actualiteit van Schleiermacher's 'Reden' uit 1799: Over vroege Romantiek en Postmoderniteit," in *Tijdschrift voor Theologie* 40 (2000), p. 349.
- ¹⁵ *Speeches*, p. 42.
- ¹⁶ *Speeches*, p. 50.
- ¹⁷ *Speeches*, p. 41. Cf also in the "Fifth Speech" on the "more intimate intuition of [our] being and becoming;" p. 95.
- ¹⁸ *Speeches*, p. 73ff.

- ¹⁹ Richard R. Niebuhr, *Schleiermacher on Christ and Religion: A New Introduction*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1964, p. 35.
- ²⁰ Richard R. Niebuhr observes that in Schleiermacher "God is the *space* of human experience but never a conceptual element in it. With Anselm, Schleiermacher believes that God informs the mind, as that than which no greater can be thought. With Kant, he believes that God cannot appear in any concept or judgment. With Spinoza, he believes that a conatus towards God inspires every effort of intellect and will to grasp the part in the whole;" Richard R. Niebuhr, "Schleiermacher and the Names of God: A Consideration of Schleiermacher in Relation to Our Theisms," in *Schleiermacher as Contemporary*, ed. Robert W. Funk, New York: Herder and Herder, 1970, p. 180; our emphasis.
- ²¹ *Speeches*, p. 44.
- ²² *Speeches*, p. 75.
- ²³ On this fragmentation in community life today, see Ad Willems, *art. cit.*, p. 350-351.
- ²⁴ Streetman, *art. cit.*, p. 123.
- ²⁵ Quoted by Ad Willems, *art. cit.*, p. 344.
- ²⁶ Robert R. Williams, *Schleiermacher the Theologian: The Construction of the Doctrine of God*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978, p. 25-26.
- ²⁷ Note that 'images' are not simply those represented by pictures or sculptures. Images are mental ideas and images kept in our mind, and which determine our way of life, our way of behaving, and our making of decisions.
- ²⁸ *Speeches*, p. 95.
- ²⁹ Cf. Robert R. Williams when quoting Schleiermacher that there are always two points in combination, that is, (a) there is no general God-consciousness without a relation to Christ, and (b) no relation to Christ without a relation to the general God-consciousness;" Robert R. Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 104. Schleiermacher asserts that the uniqueness in Jesus lies in his consciousness of his religiousness and of his office as mediator (*Speeches*, p. 120). However, Jesus never claimed to be the sole mediator (p. 121).
- ³⁰ Bradford E. Hinze, *Narrating History, Developing Doctrine: Friedrich Schleiermacher and Johann Sebastian Drey*, Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1993, p. 220.
- ³¹ In fact we cannot comment on this approach in the light of Schleiermacher without any awareness of religious plurality. Schleiermacher accentuates in *Speeches* the view that each religion is a distinct expression of the one religion; cf. Richard Crouter in his "Introduction" of *Speeches*, p. xxxv.
- ³² Robert R. Williams, *loc. cit.*
- ³³ Robert F. Streetman, *art. cit.*, p. 104-105.
- ³⁴ Cf. the exposition of this in Bradford E. Hinze, *op. cit.*, p. 26-27.
- ³⁵ This term of utter dependence or 'absolute dependence,' however, derived from Schleiermacher's later work *The Christian Faith (Der christliche Glaube, 1821-22)*.
- ³⁶ Robert R. Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 36-37.
- ³⁷ In the *second speech* Schleiermacher introduces the highest and most original element in human being, that is, *imagination*, which has always created the world in human. It is through this basic element that human is capable of intuiting God *in* the world; *Speeches*, p. 53.
- ³⁸ *Speeches*, p. 96.

³⁹ *Speeches*, p. 99.

⁴⁰ Robert F. Streetman, *art. cit.*, p. 105-106.

⁴¹ Ad Willems, *art. cit.*, p. 356.

Bibliography

- Schleiermacher, Friedrich. *On Religion: Speeches to Its Cultured Despisers*. Richard Crouter (trans. & ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Hinze, Bradford E. *Narrating History, Developing Doctrine: Friedrich Schleiermacher and Johann Sebastian Drey*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Niebuhr, Richard R. "Schleiermacher and the Names of God: A Consideration of Schleiermacher in Relation to Our Theisms," in Funk, Robert W. (ed.), *Schleiermacher as Contemporary*, New York: Herder and Herder, 1970, 176-205.
- Niebuhr, Richard R. *Schleiermacher on Christ and Religion: A New Introduction*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1964.
- Streetman, Robert F. "Romanticism and the *Sensus Numinis* in Schleiermacher," in Jasper, David (ed.), *The Interpretation of Belief: Coleridge, Schleiermacher and Romanticism*. Hampshire and London: Macmillan Press, 1986, 104-125.
- Willems, Ad. "De Actualiteit van Schleiermacher's 'Reden' uit 1799: Over vroege Romantiek en Postmoderniteit," in *Tijdschrift voor Theologie* 40 (2000), 341-357.
- Williams, Robert R. *Schleiermacher the Theologian: The Construction of the Doctrine of God*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978.