

tion from the wound begins to spread into the surrounding areas of their life. Uncovering the wound allows it to receive fresh air and healing ointment so that the individual can begin to heal and find the way to freedom and newness of life.

Out of compassion for others, a follower of Jesus Christ enters into the suffering and the hope of all human persons with Christ. Moravians today, along with the entire body of Christ, the Church, have the opportunity and the responsibility to recognize the significance of this particular theological tradition within our faith and our world. The presence of the wounded Savior in the suffering around us calls us to “bring good news to the poor, proclaim release to the captive and recovery of sight to the blind, to let the oppressed go free and to proclaim the year of the Lord’s favor.”⁸

Tracy Pryor is the pastor of Morning Star Moravian Church in Peoria, Arizona. She is also the author of a study guide for An Ecumenical Theology of the Heart.

-
- ¹ Monika Hellwig, Jesus: The Compassion of God (MN: The Liturgical Press, 1983), 121.
 - ² Diogenes Allen, Traces of God In A Frequently Hostile World (MA: Cowley Pub., 1981), 13.
 - ³ Henri Nouwen, The Wounded Healer (NY: Image Books Doubleday, 1972), 77.
 - ⁴ Ibid, 72.
 - ⁵ Ibid, 178.
 - ⁶ Hellwig, 121.
 - ⁷ Nouwen, 95-96.
 - ⁸ Luke 4: 18-19, NRSV

The Author Responds

After reading the responses to my article several times, it indeed became a pleasure to read them, though I must admit they were not what I was originally expecting. Some articles in *The Hinge* have sparked lively debate. This one did not.

So after I took off my unused intellectual boxing gloves, I began to appreciate the divergent thoughts of the respondents and attempted to play the weaver. I looked for common threads and ways to tie some far-ranging concerns together. Both Tracy and Keith remind us that Zinzendorf’s theology is a part of a

much larger set of Christian theological and devotional interests. Art reminds us that the discussion of “wounds” within the blood and wounds theology of Zinzendorf is but a part of a larger set of complex and controversial issues in his overall theology.

In all three respondents I read the challenge to keep theology relevant and to recognize the danger of thinking that theology is or even can be irrelevant. Though I know all of the respondents can be quite rational, I read in their responses a common interest in the non-rational. The same could be said of Zinzendorf. All the works translated into English to which Art refers, including the forthcoming translations of Zinzendorf’s sermons from Pennsylvania, demonstrate that Zinzendorf was also capable of being quite rational. But it is his interest in the non-rational that makes him challenging and/or confusing, yet unquestionably compelling. The non-rational speaks to Art’s devotional interests. The non-rational gives us the space to be the wounded healers, especially to the youth culture that Tracy mentions. The non-rational addresses Keith’s Eucharistic interests.

Like Keith I have an interest in the Eucharistic life of the Moravian Church. I was surprised to learn in my church history classes how important the Eucharist has been to many theologians and reformers. Many scholars see a Eucharistic revival as a key component to the Wesleys and Methodism. Aquinas’s Eucharistic vision led him to call all his written works “straw.” Calvin argued that Communion should be celebrated on at least weekly basis, and he was

disappointed when his Reformed associates decided for monthly or quarterly celebrations of the Lord’s Supper. As Moravians it would benefit us to remember that the lovefeast service that we cherish grew out of an especially moving celebration of the Lord’s Supper, celebrated on August 13, 1727.

Maybe a Eucharistic renewal in the Moravian Church would provide the meeting ground for the interests expressed by the respondents. It is the tradition in which we best encounter the non-rational. Maybe if Moravian ministers celebrated the Lord’s Supper together a little more often, forcing ourselves to shake hands with each other twice and remembering that we are guests at the same table, we would better be able to address together the issues that face our church. The same might be true in our congregations.

Reading the responses has helped me clarify why I wrote this article in the first place. Though my article is historically driven, my concern is to show that we cannot reduce Zinzendorf’s interest in the wounds of Jesus to an aberration or even an unfortunate but irrelevant development. My primary concern is to show that Zinzendorf’s interest in the wounds was an important development in his christology, emphasizing Christ’s humanity and that his loving relationship to humanity is most fully expressed in his suffering with and for it. If we will cherish this emphasis we will be better able to minister to those who are suffering.

Reading the responses has also reminded me of how many questions I have left to pursue. How ironic that Hus, the reformer, was excommunicated and handed over to be executed by the ruling of the reforming Council of Constance. How important it is to remember that Zinzendorf, the ecumenist, has so much in common pre-Reformation mystics and the post-modern youth culture. How important that we continue to uncover and wrestle with the beliefs of our spiritual forebear so his thoughts can inform how we address the spiritual needs and questions of our day.

In closing I should note my own resonance with Art's comment, "I see him

(Jesus) in his suffering which more than his resurrection makes him God to me." While I have no problems with the victorious resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ, theologically, I have founded greater significance in his willingness to die on the chance that I might live with him. As I grow older, I find that many supposed victories or successes have become less meaningful. Now I find greater significance in finding meaning in the hurts and disappointments and experiencing the grace and the power for ministry that Christ somehow gives through them.

Letters to the Editor

Dear Editor:

I read your Fall 2000 issue with great interest. My pastor gave me a copy and said he thought I would be interested and particularly agree with Dr. Harvey's response. Perhaps the fact that I was also from a Calvinist background was pastor's main reason but also because I had discussed the Moravian motto with him. I had stated much the same idea as to the "essential" nature of the Bible as Dr. Harvey. I am new to the Moravian Church, joining the local congregation after retiring and moving here to the Pocono mountain area of Pennsylvania five years ago.

Before joining, I had discussed with the pastor the Church's teachings and made sure that the Bible was held as the only source and rule for doctrine, faith and practice. I had asked if there was a forum to discuss these matters and was told "no." I am delighted to find *The Hinge* and intend to subscribe.

I had thought to write and simply add a strong Amen to Dr. Harvey's article. After some considerable thought, I feel that one subject needs to be addressed which has bearing on the matter of "head" and "heart" and how they relate to the final part of the motto: "in all things, love." When pastor read I Corinthians 13 as our Epistle, I realized that without the Holy Scripture we