

October 2015

The Kabod Volume 2, Issue 1

Brenda Ayres
Liberty University, bayres@liberty.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/kabod>

Recommended Citations

MLA:

Ayres, Brenda "The Kabod Volume 2, Issue 1," *The Kabod* 2. 1 (2015) Article 10.
Liberty University Digital Commons. Web. [xx Month xxxx].

APA:

Ayres, Brenda (2015) "The Kabod Volume 2, Issue 1" *The Kabod* 2(1 (2015)), Article 10. Retrieved from
<http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/kabod/vol2/iss1/10>

Turabian:

Ayres, Brenda "The Kabod Volume 2, Issue 1" *The Kabod* 2 , no. 1 2015 (2015) Accessed [Month x, xxxx]. [Liberty University Digital Commons](http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/kabod/vol2/iss1/10).

The Kabod

OFFICAL JOURNAL OF
THE HONORS PROGRAM

Fall 2015

Volume 2, Issue 1

Liberty
University

Table of Contents

3

Aaron Young

A Father's Words

4

Victoria Ramos

**Introduction to
Prosthetic Limbs**

10

Jacob Gordon

**The Current State of the
Insanity Defense in Virginia**

15

Laura E. Mumme

**Diabetic Ketoacidosis:
Pathophysiology and
Treatment**

21

Kelly Kramer

**Genre-Savvy Sonnets:
Shakespeare's Subversion of
Problematic Conventions of
Courtly Love**

24

Rickie S. Scott

**Covenant, Kingship, Grace,
Sacrifice, and Prophetism in
the Old Testament**

38

Dominique Lopiccolo

**The Man behind the
Music: Beethoven's
Critical Early Years**

43

John P. Heaphy

Classical Liberalism

48

William Hopchak

**The Spirit of '98: A
Defense of Civil or
States' Rights?**

A Father's Words

by Aaron Young

Carry yourself with honor, my son,
and your spirit be sure to feed;
That there is honor my son. A Father's Words
by Aaron Young

Earn the respect of everyone;
never abandon your creed.
Carry yourself with honor, my son.

To do what should be done,
though it make you bleed,
That there is honor, my son.

Constantly follow the Holy One
just as He decreed.
Carry yourself with honor, my son.

To gather your loved ones
and show them this need,
That there is honor, my son.

Seek first for Wisdom,
Before every deed,
To carry yourself with honor, my son,
for that there is honor, my son.

Introduction to Prosthetic Limbs

by Victoria Ramos

Introduction to Prosthetic Limbs

Many people incur an illness or experience an accident that results in the loss of a limb. They may also have been born with a congenital condition in which one or more of their limbs are missing. Fortunately, there are artificial limbs that enable those people to still do things such as run, walk, reach, and grip. These apparatuses are known as prosthetics.

Causes of Amputation

There are many reasons why a person may lose a limb. In the United States, the most common cause of amputation is diabetes. Additionally, every year, at least 15,000 people lose feet or legs due to land mines in past war zones. The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan also contribute the vast amount of people who have lost limbs; soldiers, as well as civilians, have lost legs and feet due to the war. Finally, congenital conditions, diseases, industrial accidents, and car accidents are among the other causes of lost limbs.

History and Development of Prostheses

The first written record of an artificial leg was made by the Greek historian Herodotus; this record was a documented

story of a prisoner who escaped by amputating his foot. The prisoner found and used a wooden limb to assist him in walking. In a later discovery, researchers found a prosthetic device in Egypt which was used to replace a big toe; this prosthesis was made out of leather and carved wood. Researchers believe that it is approximately 3000 years old. An artificial leg, made of wood and copper, was found in Italy in 1858, and it is believed to be from around 300 B.C. (Bryant, 2014).

In the primitive era of prosthetic limbs, wooden or iron rods were attached to the stump of the leg. Straps were usually used to keep the rod in place. During the Middle Ages, peg legs and hook arms were available for amputees to use. During the age of the Renaissance, prosthetic device construction improved, and prostheses were beginning to be made out of materials such as iron, copper, steel, and wood (Demello, 2009). Ambroise Paré, a surgeon who lived in France during the sixteenth century, was dedicated to treating injured soldiers who had lost limbs in battle (Bryant, 2014). Paré also created new methods of amputation. Instead of cauterizing arteries, which was the common practice at the time, he suggested tying

off the arteries. Additionally, he developed the first mechanical hand, as well as the first artificial leg with locking knees. At this time in history, materials such as leather were being used in the construction of prosthetic limbs in order to make them lighter. During the seventeenth century, a Dutch surgeon by the name of Pieter Verduyn invented the first non-locking, below-knee prosthesis (DeMello, 2009).

Prosthetic limbs have greatly improved since the time of Paré and Verduyn. In 1800 a man named James Potts constructed an artificial leg that was made out of wood and included artificial tendons that were made from cat guts. This prosthesis and its artificial tendons permitted movement of the foot. In 1812, an artificial arm, which was attached to the opposite shoulder by means of straps, allowed the wearer to move the artificial appendage with his shoulder movements (Demello, 2009). In 1863, the rubber hand was invented; it was significantly more realistic than the models preceding it (Bryant, 2014). Prosthetic limb technology improved during the Civil War because of the number of soldiers who had lost appendages. The creation of anesthesia in the 1840s allowed for amputation surgeries to last longer. This increased the rate of survival for patients. Also during this decade, James Syme created a method for amputation. Instead of amputating at the thigh, amputation was done at the ankle, thereby allowing more people to keep their legs. In 1898, an artificial arm was created by an Italian named Vanghetti. This arm could be controlled via movements of the muscles (DeMello, 2009). Once again, prosthetic technology began to increase after World War I and World War II due to the increase in amputees. A special sock, which

improved comfort and stability, was invented for above-knee prosthesis. In the years that followed, better materials were made to construct prosthetics. Carbon fiber was a stronger and more lightweight material. Also, silicone was used to produce realistic-looking skin (Bryant, 2014).

The first hook that could open and close and that was operated by flexing muscles in the opposite shoulder was invented in 1909 by D. W. Dorrance. After World War II, the Artificial Limb Program began to do research regarding prosthetic limbs and to develop prostheses. The Veterans Administration offered grants to private corporations to make new prostheses. As a result, the older wooden and leather models were replaced by new prostheses. New methods for attachment and fitting were also developed (DeMello, 2009).

Materials for Prostheses

In the 1900s, prostheses started to look and feel more realistic because they were beginning to be made from materials such as plastic, silicone, and PVC. This allowed them to be stronger and lighter. Today, most prostheses are made out of plastic that encases the interior structure, and they are attached by straps and sock. This sock cushions and protects the stump. If the socket is not fixed by straps, it is fixed via suction to the stump. Most prosthetic feet are made with wood; however, they now consist of also foam and plastic (DeMello, 2009).

The most commonly used materials in current prosthetic devices are leather, metal, wood, thermoplastic and thermosetting materials, foamed plastics, and viscoelastic polymers. Five characteristics are considered when deciding what materials to use to construct a prosthesis:

strength, stiffness, durability, density, and corrosion resistance. Strength, which is determined by the amount of weight that the material can withstand, is important in lower appendage prostheses. Stiffness is the amount of bending that is allowed when the material is loaded. For example, a stiffer material is desired for a rigid prosthetic frame, but a more flexible material is desired for a flexible transfemoral prosthetic socket. Durability, or fatigue resistance, is determined by its ability to withstand repeated loading and unloading. Density, the weight per unit of volume, is important because it is a determinant of energy cost while a person is wearing the prosthesis. If a material is susceptible to corrosion, it is vulnerable to be damaged by chemicals. Prosthetic limbs are often made from materials that preserve heat, thereby creating the problem of perspiration. This is why it is better to make prostheses out of materials which are resistant to moisture; prostheses that are made of materials that are resistant to moisture are more readily cleaned than porous substances (Lusardi, et al., 2013).

Further Developments

Although it was not available for public use until the 1960s, the first biomechanical prosthesis, which used myoelectricity, was created in the 1940s. The product continued to be tested and perfected before being sold. Prostheses such as these are connected to the body in a manner that permits electrical impulses to go from the muscles into the prosthesis, causing movement in the prosthesis. Additionally, the nerves in the appendage are surgically adapted to direct movement in a

muscle that has been attached with biosensors. Biosensors sense movement that occurs in a muscle and convey it to a controller that is located in the prosthesis. A flexed muscle, therefore, causes the prosthetic to move (DeMello, 2009).

There is now a new way to attach prostheses to the body; a titanium bolt is screwed into the bone of the stump. The bolt gets attached to an abutment, or support, that is then attached to the prosthesis. This method reduces pain for the patient since it reduces the pressure on the stump; following this practice also permits greater control of the prosthesis by muscles. Once a doctor prescribes a prosthesis to a patient, a prosthetist then custom-fits an artificial limb for the patient. It is much more difficult for people who have lost their leg above the knee to walk and do other activities, as opposed to those who have only lost a foot or the lower leg (Demello, 2009). Therefore, physical therapy is then necessary for the patient to be taught how to utilize the prosthetic limb. It usually takes a numbers of weeks for a patient to acquire the skills needed to walk, drive, and do other daily activities (DeMello, 2009).

Athletes who are missing legs now have access to special apparatuses that can help them run. Known as Cheetah blades, these devices are made out of carbon fiber and formed like sickles. They do not imitate the look or feel of real lower limbs; rather, they are made to permit running. Much controversy has risen over this technology as to whether or not it gives disabled athletes an advantage over other "normal" athletes. They are also

unaffordable for many people (DeMello, 2009).

Types of Prostheses

A transtibial prosthesis replaces the lower leg and foot; a transfemoral prosthesis replaces the entire leg and foot. A transradial prosthesis replaces a missing lower arm and hand; a transhumeral prosthesis replaces the entire arm and hand. There are specific needs that lower limb and upper limb prostheses need to meet. Although prosthetic legs and feet may be less complicated since they do not need to grip and handle objects such as upper limb prostheses, they do, however, need to sustain the weight of the body and provide for locomotion (Demello, 2009).

There are four basic levels of prosthetic feet: K1, K2, K3, and K4. Persons at the K1 level possess limited functionality; they have the potential to use a prosthesis on level surfaces. Persons at the K2 level have the capacity to walk around at home and in the community at a slow speed. If a patient is able to participate in all daily activities and to walk at a varying tempo, they are classified with K3 feet. K4 feet are for serious athletes and weekend runners (Lusardi, et al., 2013).

Transtibial prostheses are composed of a socket design, shin-socket interface, suspension strategy, and additional modular components, such as, feet, shock absorbers, torque absorbers, and dynamic pylons. Patellar tendon-bearing socket and total surface-bearing socket are two socket designs. Hard sockets, socks and sheaths, soft inserts, flexible inner sockets, expandable wall sockets, and gel liners are interface materials. Waist belts, joints and corsets, cuff straps, supracondylar suspensions, supracondylar/

suprapatellar sockets, sleeves, suction, locking liners, semirigid locking liners, and elevated vacuum are suspension techniques (Lusardi, et al., 2013).

There are four main socket designs for transfemoral prostheses: quadrilateral, ischialramal containment (IRC), Marlo Anatomical Socket (MAS), and subischial (elevated vacuum) socket. There are also many transfemoral suspension systems: traditional pull-in suction suspension, roll-on suspension liners, shuttle lock systems, lanyard system, cushion liner with air expulsion valve, elevated vacuum, Silesian belt suspension, total elastic suspension belt, and pelvic belt and hip joint. There is also a variety of prosthetic knee units: single-axis, polycentric, manual locking, hydraulic, and pneumatic knee units (Lusardi, et al., 2013).

Lusardi, Jorge, and Nielson explain the wonder of microprocessor technology for knee units:

Microprocessor knees are typically equipped with sensors that monitor the knee position during swing; they are also equipped with pressure sensors detecting and evaluating ground related forces during stance. Sensor technology is capable of measuring angles, moments, and pressures at the rate of 50 times per second. Customized adjustments are commonly made to microprocessor knees using a laptop or handheld computer. Unique software algorithms determine the phase of gait, then immediately adjust the knee functions to compensate during both the stance and swing phases of gait. Most knee mechanisms provide a stumble recovery feature that limits unintentional bending of the knee that sometimes occurs when walking on uneven terrain. (2013, p. 665)

Conventional (body-powered) systems consist of any prosthesis that uses a control cable system to translate volitional muscle force and shoulder or arm movement in order to operate a prosthetic elbow (Lusardi, et al., 2013, p. 800). Externally powered systems consist of an electric power cell that provides electrical current to prosthetic components (Lusardi, et al., 2013, p.805). Hybrid prostheses that combine conventional and externally powered systems may be the best solution for some individuals (Lusardi, et al., 2013, p. 809).

Prosthetic Limb Construction

The process of construction a prosthesis consists of six steps:

- 1) *Taking accurate measurements of the limb*
 - 2) *Making a negative impression (cast)*
 - 3) *Creating a three-dimensional positive model of the limb or body segment*
 - 4) *Modifying the positive model to incorporate the desired controls*
 - 5) *Fabricating the prosthetic socket around the positive model*
 - 6) *Fitting of the device to the patient.*
- (Lusardi, et al., 2013, p. 152)

It is important that a prosthesis be properly constructed, for the following factors affect energy expenditure:

- 1) *weight of the prosthesis,*
- 2) *quality of the socket fit,*
- 3) *accuracy of alignment of the prosthesis,*
and
- 4) *functional characteristics of the prosthetic components (Lusardi, et al., 2013, p. 653).*

Rehabilitation

The level of rehabilitation success after amputation is influenced by factors such as age, health, cognitive status, sequence of the onset of the disability, concurrent diseases, and the level of the amputation. The preprosthetic phase consists of managing the part of the limb that remains, and this includes tasks such as caring for the wound, controlling edema, shaping, desensitizing, and increasing joint and muscle flexibility. Besides strengthening the extremities for use of the prosthesis, it is also extremely important to strengthen the trunk, or core. Physical therapists are responsible for deciding whether a patient is ready for prosthetic fitting, coordinating prosthetic training, and consulting with prosthetists if issues with alignment result (Lusardi, et al., 2013).

When a person undergoes an amputation, many people are included in the rehabilitation process. Individuals that are part of this health care team involve people such as physicians, nurses, prosthetists, orthotists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, dietitians, vocational rehabilitation counselors, and caregivers. One of the main topics that this team should be concerned with is patient education. By providing information about the health condition, treatment, management, and prognosis, the patient can become an active participant in the rehabilitation process, rather than passively receiving care (Lusardi, Jorge, & Neilsen, 2013).

Conclusion

Every year, prosthetic technology improves. For example, next generation prosthetic knees feature motors which dynamically raise and excite the patient's muscles in order to participate in activities such as walking up stairs and ramps. "Artificial intelligence" qualities allow systems to predict and direct movement (Lusardi, et al., 2013). Researchers are also working on prosthetic limbs that can be operated by the brain.

Although it is a difficult and long process to recover from losing a limb, with advances in technology and improving physical therapy methods, individuals are now able to once again participate more fully in the everyday activities of life. ■

References

Bryant, J. (2014). Medical inventions. St. Catharines: Crabtree Publishing Company.

Demello, M. (2009). Feet and footwear: A cultural Encyclopedia. Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Press.

Lusardi, M. M., Jorge, M., & Nielsen, C. C. (2013). Orthotics & prosthetics in rehabilitation. St. Louis, MO: Saunders.

The Current State of the Insanity Defense in Virginia

by Jacob Gordon

The Current State of the Insanity Defense in Virginia

Commonly misunderstood as a mystical path to circumvent the consequences of the criminal justice system and escape punishment, the insanity defense is a controversial topic that is often debated. This erroneous idea, encouraged and propagated by popular media and television, has led many to believe that the insanity plea is a loophole in the American legal system that enables the defendant to seemingly evade all potential consequences of their actions. This perception is not an accurate summation of the insanity defense, and does not effectively represent the intricacies of pleading insanity. There is a great deal of documented research that clearly demonstrates the actualities of pleading not guilty by reason of insanity that are untainted by the spin of the media or popular culture. By examining a portion of this research, the truth behind the insanity defense can be separated from fiction.

British Common Law

In order to discuss the condition of the insanity defense in Virginia, it is vital to first understand the broader state of the insanity defense in America. Like many other criminal and civil laws, American laws regarding the insanity defense originate from British

Common Law. The most significant case involving the insanity defense is from the case of Daniel M’Naghten in 1843. A simple man living in Glasgow, M’Naghten believed that several groups were conspiring to harm him. Taking matters into his own hands, he set out to assassinate the Prime Minister of England, killing the Queen’s secretary in the process. When arrested and brought to trial, M’Naghten’s team of lawyers attempted to prove that the defendant was insane at the time of the offense and thus should not be held responsible for his actions. By using a plethora of witnesses and a complicated, lengthy medical brief, they were able to successfully convince the court that M’Naghten should be acquitted based upon his plea of insanity. After the trial, M’Naghten was sent to a mental institution where he later passed away.

M’Naghten’s trial was a landmark case, and set the precedent for not only English common law, but also for early American law. Ultimately, the “trial developed into a battle between medical knowledge and ancient legal authority” (Gerber, 1984, p. 22). After numerous witnesses deemed M’Naghten insane, the courts found M’Naghten “not guilty, on the ground of insanity,” further stating that “the whole of the medical evidence is on one side, and that there is no part of it which leaves any doubt in the mind” (Gerber,

p. 22). Using this case as a foundation, the M’Naghten test established a process by which American courts could determine whether or not a person was truly insane at the time at which they committed the crime. This rule states:

Defendants are not legally responsible for their acts if at the time they were laboring under such a defect of reason, from disease of the mind, as not to know the nature and quality of the act he was doing, or, if he did know it that he did not know that what he was doing was wrong. (Gardner & Anderson, p. 114)

In an attempt to break away from the M’Naghten test, an additional test known as “irresistible impulse” was established. This test is used when the defendant knows what they have done and may even know that their actions were wrong, but they were “irresistibly driven to a criminal act by an overpowering impulse resulting from a mental condition” (1984, Gerber, p. 38). This test is most commonly used in conjunction with the M’Naghten test, and has received a great deal of criticism by legal professionals for its apparent lack of clarification. Gerber argues that because the test is so poorly defined, the “irresistible-impulse standard thus becomes an arbitrary juggling of definitions rather than an assessment of real behavior” (p. 39).

Problems with the Insanity Plea

Based upon legal precedents and established tests, the insanity defense has served as a credible and legitimate defense for many years in the American criminal justice system. In nearly all states, when defendants are found not guilty by reason of insanity, they are sent not to a prison, but to a mental institution and sometimes

even released. For the accused individual who is looking for a path that leads to freedom and avoids a prison sentence, this option may initially appear attractive. However, there are many stipulations and conditions that are entailed when a defendant enters a plea of insanity.

One frequently overlooked component of the insanity defense is the fact that by pleading not guilty by reason of insanity, the defendant is required to admit that they committed the crime. The defendant must first confess they perpetrated the act of which they were charged, then attempt to prove their mental condition during the commission of the crime. This presents a dangerous dilemma for any defendant wishing to pursue an insanity plea. As stated by the Virginia State Crime Commission: “A verdict of not guilty by reason of insanity results, in part, from proof that the defendant did in fact commit the criminal offense alleged” (2002, p. 9). Therefore, if the insanity plea should prove ultimately unsuccessful, the defendant has already established their guilt in their attempt to prove their innocence.

Another challenge of successfully using the insanity defense is the burden of proof that is required by the defense. When operating under the M’Naghten rule (as Virginia and many other states do, “every man is presumed to be sane and to possess a sufficient degree of reason to be responsible for his crimes, until the contrary be proved to the jury’s satisfaction” (2012, Gardner & Anderson, p.114). This standard assumption made of every criminal defendant ensures that the defense must be diligent in presenting sufficient evidence to establish a lack of reason in

the defendant, therefore removing them of their criminal culpability for committing the crime.

Once defendants have plead not guilty by reason of insanity and convinced a jury that they should not be held responsible for their actions because of their mental state, they are not immediately released back into society. In Virginia, the acquitted party must pass a psychological evaluation by "one psychiatrist and one clinical psychologist," and if either one of them is not thoroughly convinced that the acquittee should be released, "the court shall extend the evaluation period to permit the hospital in which the acquittee is confined and the appropriate community services board or behavioral health authority to jointly prepare a conditional release or discharge plan" (Virginia State Code). These evaluations are rigorous and thorough, and usually require unanimous agreement before the acquittee is released from a hospital.

These three challenges make it very difficult for defendants to be acquitted by reason of insanity and then to return to their normal lives. Out of the thousands of criminal cases that enter the Virginia court system every year, only a small percentage of those cases are taken to trial. Out of the relatively small number of cases that are heard in a courtroom, a very small percentage of the defendants will choose to plead not guilty by reason of insanity. There are even fewer that have been acquitted of their crimes and allowed to return to civilian life. According to the Rivier College Online Academic Journal, the insanity defense "is used in only about 1% of all cases with a success rate of approximately 25%" (2006, p. 9). Because of the manifold legal

barriers and incredibly low success rate involved in using the insanity defense, any attempt to prove the insanity of a criminal defendant, whether legitimate or otherwise, is highly unlikely to led to the acquittal of that defendant unless their insanity of the crime can be sufficiently proven to the rigorous standards that are adhered to in legal traditions.

Present State of the Insanity Defense in Virginia

Currently, Virginia courts use "a combination of the M'Naghten and the irresistible impulse insanity tests," requiring the defendant to prove that they "did not understand the nature, character, and consequences of the act, or was unable to distinguish right from wrong, or was driven by an irresistible impulse to commit the act" (Roanoke Criminal Attorneys). By combining two well-established legal precedents, it is highly improbable that a defendant can successfully use the insanity plea. While not impossible, it is an extreme rarity in the Virginia criminal justice system. Dr. Jeffrey Fracher, a retired forensic psychologist that has "evaluated thousands of sex offenders during his 42 years working in Charlottesville" stated, "it is rare to see an insanity plea hold up in Virginia" (2014, Thomas). While unlikely, there have been a few cases in Virginia in which the defendant has plead not guilty by reason of insanity.

Lauren Bobbitt v. Commonwealth

In a highly publicized Virginia case, Lauren Bobbitt was charged with malicious wounding after she assaulted her husband with a kitchen knife while he was asleep, causing him serious bodily harm. After allegations that the couple's "four-year-long marriage had been a

'reign of terror'" for Bobbitt, and that she "had been repeatedly raped and abused by her husband," a jury found Bobbitt not guilty by reason of insanity (1994, Ross). This highly controversial case was highly public and raised awareness regarding the insanity defense in Virginia. While certainly not the only case involving the use of the insanity defense, this case provides a succinct view of how the Virginia criminal justice system responds to the use of the insanity defense.

Future of the Insanity Defense

The future of the insanity defense in Virginia courts is likely to be determined in an ongoing case involving the abduction of Hannah Graham. Jesse Matthews is the defendant in the case, facing charges of attempted murder and rape. The defendant's attorney has petitioned the court to evaluate Matthews' mental state. This strongly implies that if the results are indicative of any kind of significant mental handicap, there is a strong possibility of the defendant pleading not guilty by reason of insanity (2014, Thomas). The judge in the case denied Matthews' motion for expert funding, presumably for mental professionals to serve as expert witnesses, and ultimately Matthews plead guilty in an Alford plea and was found guilty of all charges against him (Bryan & French, 2015). The developments of this highly publicized case and its outcome demonstrate the difficulty in applying the insanity defense in Virginia and will undoubtedly impact the current state of the insanity defense in Virginia.

Conclusion

From the pivotal M'Naghten case, the insanity defense became established in American law. Though it is widely debated and highly controversial, the insanity defense has been used in America for many years. It is a complicated and intricate topic, one that the public has many misconceptions about.

Those wishing to prove their insanity in a court of law have to overcome the rigorous burden of proof, thorough psychological evaluations, and mandatory confessions that are inherent in the insanity defense. These conditions make it nearly impossible to be found not guilty by reason of insanity for anyone that is not truly suffering from a severe mental condition. The Virginia criminal justice system has done an excellent job of establishing clear guidelines concerning the insanity defense, and has set a case law precedent for rightfully deciding how to appropriately conduct a trial in which the defendant pleads not guilty by reason of insanity. This efficient and accurate approach, based off of foundational British common law and American legal tradition, will continue to serve as Virginia's guide for the insanity defense for many years to come.

References

Bryan, A. & French, L. (August 20, 2015). Judge denies majority of Jesse Matthews' defense motions. Retrieved from <http://wtvr.com/2015/08/20/judge-denies-majority-of-jessematthews-defense-motions/>

Criminal Defenses in Virginia—Copenhaver, Ellett & Derrico. (2014). Retrieved from <http://www.roanokecriminalattorney.com/hiring-your-defense/criminal-defenses-invirginia/>

Gardner, T. & Anderson, T. (2012). Criminal law. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Gerber, R. (1984). The insanity defense. Port Washington, N.Y: Associated Faculty Press.

Rolf, C. (2006). From M'naghten to Yates—transformation of the insanity defense in the United States—is it still viable? Rivier College Online Academic Journal, 2(1). Retrieved from <https://www.rivier.edu/journal/ROAJ-2006-Spring/J41-ROLF.pdf>

Ross, M. (1994, January 21). Bobbitt case goes to jury; prosecutors concede abuse justice: the commonwealth says maiming was 'an explicit act of revenge.' Los Angeles Times. Retrieved from http://articles.latimes.com/1994-01-21/news/mn-13911_1_lorena-bobbitt

Thomas, L. (2014, November 6). Could there be an insanity plea in the Jesse Matthews case? Newsplex.com. Retrieved from <http://www.newsplex.com/home/headlines/ Could-There-Be-an-Insanity-Plea-in-the-Jesse-Matthew-Case-281841981.html>

Virginia Code Section § 19.2-182.2. Virginia Crime Commission, (2002, May). Not guilty by reason of insanity. Richmond, VA. Retrieved from [http://leg2.state.va.us/dls/h&sdocs.nsf/By+Year/RD312004/\\$file/RD31.PDF](http://leg2.state.va.us/dls/h&sdocs.nsf/By+Year/RD312004/$file/RD31.PDF)

Diabetic Ketoacidosis: Pathophysiology and Treatment

by *Laura E. Mumme*

Diabetic Ketoacidosis: Pathophysiology and Treatment

Diabetic ketoacidosis (DKA), also known as diabetic acidosis or diabetic coma, is a severe complication of diabetes mellitus (DM; Michel, 2011). More commonly seen in patients with type 1 diabetes (T1D), DKA results when lipid breakdown generates a surplus of acidic ketone bodies (Guyen, Matfin, & Kuenzi, 2009). According to Dods (2013), DKA can be defined as a condition with “blood glucose greater than 250 mg/dL, blood bicarbonate less than 15 mEq/L, pH less than 7.35, ketonemia, and increased anion gap” (p. 266). The pathophysiology of DKA in patients with T1D will first be addressed, followed by a discussion of proper emergency treatment for this life-threatening condition.

The three main abnormalities of DKA patients include hyperglycemia, ketosis, and metabolic acidosis (Guyen et al., 2009). An episode of DKA is precipitated by insulin deficiency with hyperglycemia. Insulin deficiency may develop in a patient following illness or infection, an insufficient insulin dose, ignorance of the condition of T1D, neglect of the medication regimen, and defective self-health maintenance (Michel, 2011). When insulin fails to provide

adequate glucose, the cells tap into the fat stores for fuel (Petit & Adamee, 2011). It is the acidic products of fat metabolism that account for the acidosis. Normally, pancreatic beta cells release a bolus of insulin in response to rising blood glucose levels; however, in T1D the beta cells are destroyed through autoimmune process and the result is an absolute insulin deficiency (Michel, 2011). Without insulin secretion, hyperglycemia persists, and the cells starve for energy.

The energy-hungry cells stimulate adipose tissue lipolysis, releasing free fatty acids into the bloodstream. Increased breakdown of adipose tissue into glycerol and fatty acids is related to the increased availability of tissue lipase, an enzyme that is suppressed by insulin. Low insulin levels also correlate with low lipoprotein lipase activity, which leads to lipolysis. Free fatty acids circulate until they reach the liver and are transported into mitochondria for oxidation by carnitine palmitoyl transferase (CPT1). It is pertinent to note that CPT1 is usually inhibited when insulin levels are normal. Acetyl Coenzyme A (CoA) is an enzyme that responds to the presence of insulin by catalyzing the transformation of acetyl CoA into malonyl CoA. Malonyl CoA is the molecule that inhibits CPT1 and, therefore,

fatty acid oxidation. When CPT1 is unhindered by insulin, it shuttles fatty acids into the hepatic mitochondria where they undergo oxidation and form ketone bodies, namely, beta-hydroxybutyrate, acetoacetate, and acetone (Casteels & Mathieu, 2003; Marieb, 2004).

Ketones can be used as an alternate fuel source by cells lacking mitochondria and by brain cells, but in a state of insulin deficiency ketone utilization by the peripheral tissues is diminished (Harvey, 2010; Casteels & Mathieu, 2003). An overproduction and an underutilization of ketoacids results in ketosis (Casteels & Mathieu, 2003). Bicarbonate ions buffer the increased hydrogen ions by forming water and carbon dioxide; nevertheless, as ketosis progresses bicarbonate cannot keep up, and a metabolic acidosis ensues (Casteels & Mathieu, 2003). In a state of ketosis, beta-hydroxybutyrate and acetoacetate are eliminated by the kidneys along with their counter ions, potassium, and sodium (Dods, 2013). This ketonuria contributes to the acidosis by causing the hydrogen ion concentration to rise (2013).

Besides increased lipolysis, the body responds to the glucose-hungry cells by increasing serum glucose levels even though hypoglycemia is not the problem (Beard, 2011). Hyperglycemia is further exacerbated by the release of counter regulatory hormones (Casteels & Mathieu, 2003). Low insulin levels cause the secretion of hormones that increase hepatic formation of new glucose molecules and hepatic breakdown of stored glycogen into glucose molecules (Koul, 2009). Hormones such as glucagon, catecholamines, cortisol, and growth hormone

are released; they not only increase the blood glucose but also have an antagonistic effect toward insulin (Beard, 2011). Glucagon is a hormone secreted by the alpha cells of the islets of Langerhans that increases proteolysis, transports the resulting amino acids into liver cells, and converts these amino acids into glucose precursors during the process of gluconeogenesis (Guyen et al., 2009). Insulin promotes the active transport of amino acids into the cells and prevents protein breakdown (Guyen et al., 2009). Catecholamines respond to stress by stimulating lipolysis in adipose tissue, decreasing insulin secretion, and increasing hepatic glycogenolysis and gluconeogenesis (Michal, 2012). Corticotropin-releasing hormone is released from the hypothalamus and stimulates the pituitary gland to synthesize and secrete adrenocorticotrophic hormone (ACTH), which induces the adrenal cortex to secrete cortisol into the blood (Michal, 2012). Cortisol acts as an antagonist to insulin by promoting gene transcription of catabolic enzymes in extrahepatic cells (Michal, 2010). Cortisol also stimulates gluconeogenesis in the liver (Michal, 2012). Growth hormone (GH) mobilizes fatty acids to be used as fuel and inhibits glucose uptake by insulin in the peripheral cells (Guyen et al., 2009). With these in place, GH increases protein synthesis and sustains hyperglycemia (Guyen et al., 2009).

Patients with T1D exhibit polyuria and polydipsia. As the blood becomes increasingly overloaded with glucose, the kidneys' reabsorbing threshold is surpassed and glucose is excreted in the urine. Glucose is an osmotically active particle and pulls water out of the filtrate and into the urine.

Polydipsia occurs because hyperglycemia causes fluid shifts in the cells resulting in dehydration. T1D patients may also experience polyphagia because their cells are starving for energy and their body's stores of carbohydrates, fats, and proteins are depleted. Because of this use of the body's stores of fat and protein and the loss of fluid, patients with T1D often experience weight loss. Polyphagia is not present in all T1D patients because of the epigastric pain and vomiting that often accompanies their acidotic state (Koul, 2009; Guven et al., 2009).

The osmotic diuresis that results in the patient's experience of polyuria also has dramatic effects on electrolyte levels. Sodium, potassium, phosphate, and magnesium are lost in the urine which predisposes the DKA patient to dehydration and imbalanced electrolyte levels (Guyen et al., 2009). Ketonemia leads to ketonuria; potassium and sodium are excreted with ketones as their counter ions (Dods, 2013). Despite the loss of potassium in the urine, potassium levels often stay normal due to potassium shifts from the intracellular compartment to the extracellular compartment (Grinslade & Buck, 1999). Circulating hydrogen ions move into the cells in an attempt to correct the acidosis (Casteels & Mathieu, 2003). Within the cells, the hydrogen cations are buffered and potassium cations leave the cell in order to maintain intracellular electrical balance (Casteels & Mathieu, 2003). Extracellular potassium may also be increased by proteolysis (Grinslade & Buck, 1999). Although the serum levels of potassium appear normal or even high, the total body potassium level is depleted in DKA patients (Casteels & Mathieu, 2003).

A patient with DKA may take rapid, deep breaths called Kussmaul respirations in an attempt to blow off carbon dioxide to normalize the blood pH. According to Natrass (2002), "Spontaneous decarboxylation of acetoacetate allows excretion of acetone through the lungs" (p.52), giving the breath a fruity odor. Tachycardia and hypotension may also manifest due to decreased blood volume, which will be further depleted by vomiting (Guyen et al., 2009; Koul, 2009).

Proper treatment of DKA is focused on restoring blood volume, enhancing tissue perfusion, correcting hyperglycemia and acidosis, and normalizing electrolyte levels (Guyen, 2009). Due to the emergent and life-threatening nature of DKA, the patient must be treated promptly. Intravenous (IV) access should be initiated to administer fluid and electrolyte replacement. Fluid replacement is necessary for expanding the blood volume so that the tissues can be perfused and receive insulin (Koul, 2009). Restored blood volume also diminishes the release of counter regulatory hormones especially catecholamines and cortisol (Casteels & Mathieu, 2003). When serum sodium is low, a solution of 0.9% NaCl should be infused at a rate of one liter per hour or at a rate that achieves a restored urine output of 30-60 mL/hr. and a stabilized blood pressure (Michel, 2011; Koul, 2009). If the sodium level is within or above the normal limits, 0.45% NaCl is used (Koul, 2009).

If fluid replacement dilutes the serum sodium concentration, cerebral edema may ensue especially in pediatric patients. DKA patients are often dehydrated before treatment because of the high concentration of osmotically

active substances, such as glucose, in the extracellular fluid. According to Koul (2009), "Persistent glucose-induced hypertonicity is implicated in causing neural cells to produce osmotically active idiogenic molecules" (p. 140). Neural cells accumulate these molecules during dehydration to protect the brain from becoming too volume depleted. When IV fluids resolve the high serum osmolality, the brain cells draw water out of the extracellular fluid resulting in cerebral swelling. Monitoring for the manifestations of Cushing's triad is useful for assessing increased intracranial pressure, and unequal pupil dilation may indicate herniation. Neurological assessments are key to identifying cerebral edema, and rapid intervention involves the administration of mannitol and an alteration of the IV fluid rate. If mannitol is not available, a hypertonic solution of three percent saline may be administered with careful observance of hypernatremia, hyperosmolality, and central pontine myelinolysis (Koul, 2009).

Because of the detrimental effects of cerebral edema, fluid replacement therapy should progress slowly. Since insulin draws potassium and glucose into the intracellular compartment, potassium levels should be ascertained before the administration of insulin to prevent hypokalemia. If the patient's potassium level is low before fluid administration then potassium should be given along with fluid replacement. The potassium level should be restored to 3.5 to 5.0 mg/dL to prevent cardiac dysrhythmias. Once the blood volume has been replenished and the potassium level is above 3.5 mg/dL, administration of insulin should begin (Michel, 2011). Insulin corrects hyperglycemia and

hyperketonemia; a continuous IV infusion is initiated at a rate of 0.1 units/kg/hr. (Michel, 2011). The potassium level should be intensely monitored during insulin administration. Potassium should be added to the IV infusion if the level falls below 3.5 mg/dL (Güven et al., 2009). The blood sugar should also be monitored during insulin therapy. If glucose levels reach 250 mg/dL a solution of five percent dextrose is administered to prevent hypoglycemia (Michel, 2011). Insulin should be infused slowly because rapidly lowering serum glucose levels may also precipitate cerebral swelling (Michel, 2011). According to Güven et al. (2009), severe acidosis exerts inhibitory effects on insulin. The patient should be started on a loading dose of regular insulin and then continuously infused with low doses of insulin (Güven et al., 2009).

DKA therapy must be actively guided by the fluid and electrolyte levels that the patient manifests. Koul (2009) encourages having two qualified medical personnel separately calculating fluid management to avoid calculation errors. Emergency supplies such as mannitol and dextrose solution should be readily available (Koul, 2009). Prevention of DKA is achieved through adequate patient teaching on the insulin regimen and early diagnosis of T1D in patients who may be at risk. ■

References

Beard, K. V. (2011). Diabetic ketoacidosis: Early prevention, recognition and early management can improve clinical outcomes. Retrieved from [http://nursing.advanceweb.com/ Continuing-Education/CE-Articles/Diabetic-Ketoacidosis.aspx](http://nursing.advanceweb.com/Continuing-Education/CE-Articles/Diabetic-Ketoacidosis.aspx)

Casteels, K., & Mathieu, C. (2003). Diabetic ketoacidosis. *Reviews in Endocrine & Metabolic Disorders* 4(2), 159-166. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/223172229?accountid=12085>

Dods, R. F. (2013). Understanding diabetes: A biochemical perspective. Retrieved from <http://www.ebib.com>

Grinslade, S., & Buck, E. A. (1999). Diabetic ketoacidosis: Implications for the medical-surgical nurse. *Medsurg Nursing*, 8(1), 37-45. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/230518526?accountid=12085>

Guyen, S., Matfin, G., & Kuenzi, J. A. (2009). Diabetes mellitus and the metabolic syndrome. In C. Porth & G. Matfin (Eds.), *Pathophysiology: concepts of altered health states* (pp. 1047-1077). Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

Harvey, R. A. (2010). Lippincott's illustrated reviews: Biochemistry. Retrieved from <https://www.inkling.com/read/illustrated-reviews-biochemistry-harvey-5th/chapter-16/ketone-bodies-an-alternate-fuel>

Koul, P. B. (2009). Diabetic ketoacidosis: A current appraisal of pathophysiology and management. *Clinical Pediatrics*, 48(2), 135-144. doi:10.1177/0009922808323907

Marieb, E. N. (2004). *Human anatomy & physiology* (6th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Pearson Education.

Michal, G. (2012). *Biochemical pathways: An atlas of biochemistry and molecular biology* (2nd ed.). Retrieved from <https://lucas.liberty.edu/vwebv/holdingsInfo?searchId=834&recCount=10&recPointer=0&bibId=521941>

Michel, B. (2011). Diabetes mellitus. In S. L. Lewis, S. R. Dirksen, M. M. Heitkemper, L. Bucher, & I. M. Camera (Eds.), *Medical-surgical nursing: Assessment and management of clinical problems* (pp. 1218-1254). St. Louis: Mosby.

Natgrass, M. (2002). Diabetic ketoacidosis. *Medicine*, 38(12), 667-670. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mpmed.2010.08.016>

Oster, J. R., & Perez, G. O. (1986). Acid-base disturbances in liver disease. *Journal of Hepatology*, 2(2), 299-306. Retrieved from [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0168-8278\(86\)80089-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0168-8278(86)80089-7)

Petit, W. A., & Adamee, C. (2011). Diabetes mellitus. In *The Encyclopedia of Diabetes*. (2nd ed., pp. 110-124). Ann Arbor, MI: Hermitage Publishing Services.

Porth, C. M., & Litwack, K. (2009). Disorders of acid-base balance. In C. Porth & G. Matfin (Eds.), *Pathophysiology: concepts of altered health states* (pp. 805-825). Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

White, N. H. (2003). Management of diabetic ketoacidosis. *Reviews in Endocrine & Metabolic Disorders*, 4(4), 343-353. Retrieved from <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1023%2FA%3A1027350028584#>

Genre-Savvy Sonnets: Shakespeare's Subversion of Problematic Conventions of Courtly Love

by Kelly Kramer

Genre-Savvy Sonnets

Shakespeare's Subversion of Problematic Conventions of Courtly Love In Shakespeare's 130th sonnet, the speaker points out how his lover does not conform to conventional standards for beauty. He mentions that her eyes are "nothing like the sun," and points out how neither her lips, cheeks, or breasts are the normal color (1). He even mentions that she apparently suffers from halitosis (7-8). All in all, he does not paint a very flattering or appealing picture of his beloved. However, the general tone of this poem is not intentionally offensive; at the end, he admits that he certainly does love her, ugly as she may be. In this sonnet, Shakespeare intentionally subverts the courtly love tradition of the past in order to describe the proper way to love someone.

Shakespeare very intentionally makes use of the traditional language and tropes of courtly love with his language choices. For example, he compares his lover to lofty natural beauty, such as her eyes to "the sun" and her cheeks to "roses" (1, 6). However, instead of writing that his lover's eyes are like the sun, he denies the traditional comparison and later says that there are "no...roses" in her cheeks (6). He uses

the traditional metaphors for physical beauty that derive from the ideals of courtly love, but only in order to make a point about how this lady is not like theirs. Likewise, he makes other conventional comparisons, like her voice to music and her breath to perfume, but only to highlight how his beloved breaks them. Referencing this tradition's highest possible praise, he compares her to a "goddess," but again, this comparison is negative (11). It only emphasizes her humanity. Thus, while Shakespeare is obviously extremely familiar with the poetic traditions of courtly love, he innovatively misuses them.

To begin with, why does the speaker carefully describe her physical beauty, if only to point out that they are inadequate? At first glance, this poem is shocking; no woman would appreciate having her unattractive qualities pointed out and immortalized in a sonnet. It is possible that the speaker is observing that he merely has different tastes in physical beauty than the rest of his culture. For instance, he does not actually say that he finds her breasts unattractive, but only that they are "dun," or tan (3). Perhaps he just prefers his women a little darker than the norms of courtly love poetry, which dictate that a woman should have pale skin and red lips and

cheeks. However, given some other descriptions of her, this claim is hard to support. While it is possible to prefer a woman with darker skin or darker hair, it is hard to imagine one could love a woman specifically because she has bad breath and a harsh voice. Thus, one must conclude that not only is the lady of the poem radically different from traditional beauty conventions, but also that she must be loved for non-physical reasons.

Especially given that the courtly love tradition dictates that the beloved be praised in exalted language for her physical beauty, it is extremely odd that the speaker would focus on the many flaws of his lover. However, the emphasis is not that they are actually repugnant to him, just different from society's expectations. Clearly, given the ending of the poem, "And yet, by heaven, I think my love as rare / as any she belied with false compare," he does genuinely love this woman, and want to praise her (13-14). He does not praise her for some exalted, unrealistic standard of beauty, but chooses to stress that he loves her for, not in spite of, her uniqueness. By doing so, he offers a rather harsh critique of courtly love's conventional insistence that the beloved must be physically beautiful, which the society narrowly defined as fair-haired, whiteskinned, and rosy-cheeked. The purpose of cataloguing all the areas in which she does not conform is not to point out that she is a failure, but rather to point out that he deliberately disregards some of the shallower components of traditional love.

In addition to describing how she does possess the conventional beauty for a lady worthy of courtly love, the speaker also emphasizes her

plain, unadorned humanity. He writes, "I grant I never saw a goddess go / My mistress when she walks treads on the ground" (11-12). Again, from the standpoint of the courtly love tradition, this is almost on the level of an insult. One of the main foundations of this poetic tradition is the cold, disdainful lady who is far above her wooer in terms of beauty, social status, and virtue. He must attempt to become worthy of her, usually by committing some heroic feat. Here, however, the speaker is comfortable with admitting her humanity. She walks on the earth, on his level, not as some divine, unattainable being. These two lines convey that his love for her is not some elaborate, lofty, courtly ritual, but rather a normal human affection for a real person he knows and values for characteristics other than her appearance. The speaker is presenting a counter-cultural way of love, one that does not consider a woman's physical appearance her most important quality.

In the closing couplet of the poem, the speaker blatantly subverts traditional notions of love, calling these lofty descriptions of ladies "belied with false compare," or mis-represented with false, ridiculous comparisons (14). If his lady does not have eyes that shine like the sun, it is not necessarily because she is inferior, but merely because no lady actually does. Unlike other poets, he recognizes and accepts this fact. In fact, this entire poem has been a criticism of the false comparisons created by overzealous poets that, in a desire to praise their ladies, publish lies about them. In one key respect here, the speaker's description of his lady does conform to the expectation of the courtly love tradition: the assertion that his relationship is the best and

greatest love. However, while most poets would proclaim that their love is the greatest because of the fairness of the lady or the devotion of the lover, the speaker argues that his love is the best because it is the most honest, accepting that the both of them are merely human. Their love is the highest because he realizes how ordinary and human is the experience of being in love.

Thus, in this sonnet, Shakespeare aggressively critiques the poetry conventions stemming from the courtly love tradition. He argues that physical appearance, even if unconventional or downright unattractive, is no requirement for true love, specifically by denying all the standards for beauty created by society. The misfortune is not in recognizing one's beloved as merely human, but rather in continuing to romanticize a false picture of her as a goddess,

which will inevitably disappoint. One can only maintain this rosy-colored picture of the lady at a distance, while observing her at court and writing her elaborate poetry. Once you actually have to live with her, one will have to face the reality that she is human, bad breath and all. Unlike other poets in the courtly love tradition, he is not afraid of comparisons between his love and theirs. No matter how much they over-inflate the praise of their beloved, he knows that his love is superior. According to Shakespeare, this is the proper way to love another: actually knowing someone with all of her flaws and oddities, and loving her anyways. In fact, the entire premise of the courtly love tradition is harmful and misleading, teaching people to value the wrong thing in their lovers. It may be good in poetry, but destructive in practice. ■

References

Shakespeare, William. "Sonnet 130." *The Norton Anthology of English Literature: The Major Authors*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. New York: Norton, 2013. Print.

Covenant, Kingship, Grace, Sacrifice, and Prophetism in the Old Testament

by Rickie S. Scott

COVENANT, KINGSHIP, GRACE, SACRIFICE, AND PROPHETISM IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

The Old Testament conveys the expansive and intricate theological history of God's plan for his chosen people prior to the second coming of Jesus Christ. Although the Old Testament presents a vast array of fundamental information and ideas, many people misunderstand or simply gloss over the major themes detailed throughout the text. In order to better comprehend the literature of the Old Testament, one must grasp the themes of covenant, kingship, grace, sacrifice, and prophetism, which embody much of the biblical text. Understand

Covenant

The concept of covenant is one of the most important themes of the Old Testament. The term means "a formal agreement or treaty between two parties in which each assumes some obligation" (Unterman 2011, 158). Common forms of covenant in the Old Testament are a pact of mutuality between two individuals, such as David and Jonathan; a covenant between a husband and wife, or more commonly between political entities, such as Abraham and the

Amorites. However, the term "covenant" was also used to describe agreements between God and his people, the most referenced being the covenant between God and Israel at Sinai (159). Whether the covenant is divine or human, a covenant relationship is not merely a mutual acquaintance, but "a commitment to 'faithfulness,' acted out in a context of abiding friendship" (Craigie 1988, 531). Through divine-human covenants, "God has conveyed to humanity the meaning of human life and salvation" (531). Although in the Old Testament the purpose of the covenant was to convey divine meaning to the Israelites, it also applies to the modern church through the stipulations of the New Covenant.

While humans could not initiate the divine-human covenants with God, they could create covenants among each other. Although covenant is most closely associated with God's promises to his people, there are many examples of covenants found interpersonally in the Old Testament. In fact, "the same basic characteristics of a strictly human covenant are present in a divine covenant" (531). These characteristics include a relationship between two parties and mutual obligations between the covenant partners. To the Old Testament believer, religion meant covenant; they associated the word

with religious responsibilities to God and to others (531). Therefore, covenant relationships between humans contained essential similarities with the divine-human covenants. The religion in the Old Testament is centered on faithfulness to God and adherence to His covenant responsibilities. In turn, God uses his covenants with mankind as an instrument to cause self-revelation. He not only reveals what He is like through the covenants, but also binds Himself to a particular course of action. The Israelites are required to respond with obedience, and while God's covenants are acts of mercy, they are also just, which ensures a certain amount of accountability to the Hebrew people.

The fundamental character of covenants remains the same throughout the Old Testament, but the specific form and nature of the covenants change throughout Israel's history. The Hebrew text of the Old Testament focuses on the initial covenant with Adam, the Noachian Covenant, the Abrahamic Covenant, the Mosaic or Sinaitic Covenant, the Davidic Covenant, and the New Covenant. Most scholars agree that the first covenant begins with Adam, yet in his case "the technical meaning of an agreement with signs and pledges is more conspicuous" (Moss 1989, 162). Although the creation account in Genesis does not specifically state that God made a covenant with Adam, it is clear that the essence of covenant is present in the Genesis account. The description of the fall of mankind in Genesis 3 details the separation of man from God, or the human predicament. Due to the nature of sin, which entered the world when Adam and Eve sinned against God by eating the forbidden fruit, humankind could no longer

intimately relate to its Creator. From that circumstance "emerges a distinctive feature of divine-human covenants; namely, that God alone can initiate the relationship of covenant" (Craigie 1988, 532). The biblical truth of God as initiator of covenants establishes a precedent for all the following covenants.

The next covenant is the Noachian covenant. In fact, the first explicit mention of the term "covenant" is in the flood account, and "refers to the initiative taken by God to bind himself again to human beings" (532). The sinfulness of humankind continues through the time of the flood, whereby God decides to punish the earth and renew His covenant with the sign of a rainbow. It follows that the "climax of the flood narrative is best understood in terms of a recreation – a restoration of the divine order that had been established at creation" (Williamson 2003, 139). The Noachian Covenant was preceded by bloody sacrifice, which was a foreshadowing of Christ's coming. In addition, there is a focus on preserving seed (Genesis 9:9), which conveys its redemptive significance in that woman will deliver and repopulate mankind through childbirth. The testament, moreover, "demonstrates more clearly than any other OT revelation the essential priority of the objective features of the covenant over the subjective" (Payne 2009, 1068). God clearly reveals Himself as a God who judges but also keeps his promises and commitment to his plan.

In the Abrahamic Covenant, God promises Abraham land, progeny, kingship, and blessing. The Lord blesses Abraham and Sarah with a miraculous child, even though Sarah was too

old to conceive. The theme of the "seed" therefore continues throughout Genesis; "his use of key words such as 'seed' (i.e., 'offspring,' 'descendants') and 'blessing' ('making fertile and victorious') reinforces the book's theme that God elected the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob" to bless the earth (Waltke 2007, 306). They act as heirs of the Abrahamic Covenant, which serves as a calling on a nation to form a new nation that carries out God's commands and sovereign plan. The covenant with Abraham "ensured a blessing through their seed to all nations, circumcision being adopted as the token" (Moss 1989, 162). In addition to promising seed, "the Abrahamic Covenant promises that God will...give his seed the land the Canaanites defiled" (Waltke 2007, 306). Although the Israelites had many struggles entering and keeping the Promised Land, God never broke his covenant; God always rescues his plan and keeps his promise.

The ancestral covenants previously mentioned act as "the theological backbone supporting the national covenants and against which they must be understood" (Williamson 2003, 149). The Mosaic Covenant at Sinai in Egypt is a national covenant that is frequently referred to in the Old Testament. Many scholars believe that "the covenant established between God and Israel at Mount Sinai is the focal point of the covenant tradition" (Craigie 1988, 533). After the miraculous exodus from Egypt, God gave Moses and the Hebrew people a covenant while they were at Mount Sinai. Interestingly, the framework of the Mosaic Covenant shares many similarities with suzerain-vassal treaties from the ancient Near East, specifically Hittite

and Assyrian treaties (Unterman 2011, 158). The covenant was also a constitution, but given to Israel "by God, with appointed promise and penalty, duly inscribed on the tables of the covenant, which were deposited in the ark" (Moss 1989, 162). Rather than focusing on a family, the Mosaic Covenant addressed the whole nation with a set of governing rules. The resulting Ten Commandments, as well as other Mosaic legislation, follow the revelation of the covenant and produce new laws that detail how the Hebrews should live and honor God. The legislation contained "both the moral requirements of the testament and the forms of ceremonial obedience that make up the ritual of the tabernacle, which became the testamental sanctuary" (Payne 2009, 1060). Due to the sin nature of humankind, the Israelites had trouble keeping the stipulations of the covenant. Although Retribution Theology, which states that there were consequences for disobedience of equal gravity to the sin committed, is present in the Mosaic covenant, that "does not mean that it is a 'conditional covenant'; in fact, "the punishment that disobedience brings presumes that the relationship between the parties is still intact" (Unterman 2011, 159).

The next major covenant is the Davidic Covenant. The Mosaic Covenant was still active, but the covenant tradition underwent modification during the time of David because an additional element was added: "God entered a covenant with David as king...that was to be an everlasting covenant with David's royal lineage" (Craigie 1988, 535). Many scholars argue that the Davidic Covenant is more unilateral than the Mosaic Covenant because it "speak[s] of what

God offers, but not of what God requires in return" (Unterman 2011, 159). Unterman writes about the similarities of the Davidic Covenant with the promissory royal grants, which were common throughout the ancient Near East. According to the grants, "land was given to loyal servants by the king, and the grant required no further action on behalf of the grantee" (159). Likewise, the Davidic Covenant assures David of a permanent dynasty in which "the Davidic king is depicted metaphorically as the Son of God" (159). The Davidic Covenant is generally known as a Messianic covenant. For several centuries, David's dynasty ruled a united Israel, but after the Babylonians conquered Judah in 586 BC, a descendant of David was no longer ruling; however, "the everlasting nature of the covenant with David was brought out... not in the pages of ancient history but in the expectation of a Messiah who would be born of David's descendants" (Craigie 1988, 535). The New Testament, therefore, extends the Davidic Covenant into the new era and person of Jesus, which leads directly into the New Covenant.

The final major covenant is the New Covenant. The Davidic Covenant was eternal, and the Mosaic Covenant was, in essence, temporal, including conditional clauses "stated in the blessings and curses of Deuteronomy" (Craigie 1988, 535). Due to Israel's continual disobedience of the law, Hebrew prophets often foresaw a dangerous end to the covenant relationship; however, some prophets, such as Hosea and Jeremiah, also saw that the covenant "was rooted in divine love and that therefore even the curse of God could not be final" (535). The concept of the New Covenant is conveyed

through the parable of Hosea and his wife. The prophet Hosea divorces his wife, Gomer, who is unfaithful to him, and God later commands him to remarry Gomer and reconcile. Hosea's marriage story is a parable that reflects Israel's relationship with God: "Israel's sin would inevitably culminate in a divorce from God," (535) but God accepts Israel back into the relationship through the New Covenant. Craigie purports that after the exile from the Promised Land into Babylon, Jeremiah understood that there was a truth beyond his contemporary realities at work (535). In Jeremiah 31:31, he writes of a new covenant that God would bring into effect: "The days are coming, says the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah," which according to Jeremiah 31:33, would be marked by a fundamental act of God within human hearts. In Luke 22:20, during the last supper, Jesus refers to his blood as "the new covenant." The New Covenant is essential to an understanding of the Old and New Testaments. Through the initial, Noachian, Abrahamic, Mosaic, Davidic, and New Covenants, God reveals himself and his plan for his people in the Old Testament.

Kingship

The theme of kingship is very important in the Old Testament. The Hebrew name for "king," melek, is "connected with an Assyrian root meaning 'advise,' 'counsel,' 'rule,' and it seems to have first signified 'the wise man,' the 'counselor,' and then 'the ruler'" (Boyd 1989, 515). In the Old Testament, as the etymology of the name suggests, the Hebrew people knew that God valued counsel and wisdom for his officials. The title 'King' is first attributed to rulers

of the ancient city-states during the time of Abraham (515). The concept of kingship was popularized in the Abrahamic Covenant, and later defined as an office in 1 Samuel. In the Old Testament, kingship could either be "God's gift to Israel and/or a concession to their unbelief" (Waltke 2007, 680). While kings can be a form of "divine election," they can also be extremely displeasing to God (680). For example, Israel's elders tell Samuel, "Appoint a king to lead us, such as all the other nations have" (1 Samuel 8:5). Their request for a king is not necessarily wrong, but "their sin lay in wanting a king like all the nations" (690). Not only does God disapprove of Israel's kings being like the others, He also gives specific instructions for kings in Deuteronomy 17. Deuteronomy 17:15 indicates that the Israelites are to appoint a king that God chooses. Furthermore, Deuteronomy 17:15-18 clearly states:

He must be from among your fellow Israelites. Do not place a foreigner over you...The king, moreover, must not acquire great numbers of horses for himself or make the people return to Egypt...He must not take many wives... He must not accumulate large amounts of silver and gold. When he takes the throne of his kingdom, he is to write for himself on a scroll a copy of this law, taken from that of the Levitical priests.

Through Deuteronomy 17, God reveals that Israel's king must not be a foreigner, a militarist, a materialist, or an internationalist. He recognizes that these qualities lead to destruction, and therefore provides very specific guidelines. The king is instructed to read the law so that "he may learn to revere the Lord his God" (19) and keep the covenant commands. Additionally, the Lord promises that the king and his descendants

will reign a long time over the kingdom in Israel, if the king observes the law and does not consider himself better than his fellow Israelites. The office of kingship was divinely appointed, and God valued humility within that role. Interestingly, the term "shepherd" was often used as a royal term to describe kingship in the Old Testament. One of Pharaoh's common titles was "Good Shepherd," and Moses was also referred to as a shepherd. In fact, "the Lord is my Shepherd," actually means, "Yahweh is my King" (Fowler 2014). While many attribute the term "shepherd" to humility, it is also a symbol of power.

The history of kingship within Israel is complex. Old Testament patriarchs such as Abraham, Joseph, and Moses were divinely appointed leaders; however, the actual office of kingship did not take hold until after the period of the judges. Kingship was promised to Abraham in his covenant, reiterated to Jacob, predicted for the tribe of Judah, personified in Moses, incorporated into Mosaic law in Deuteronomy, passed onto Joshua, nonexistent during Judges, and established in Samuel. God chooses to use kingship as a means to continue his divine plan for humankind. During the time of the Judges, and Israel's occupation of the Promised Land, the Israelites were assembled in tribes and vulnerable to foreign invasion; "in order to preserve the nation from extermination, it became necessary that a closer connection and a more intimate bond of union should exist," calling for the office of a king (Boyd 1989, 515). Many of Israel's 'kings' as a young nation were "little more than local or tribal heroes, carrying on guerilla warfare against their neighbors"

(515). Traditionally, kings in the Old Testament were leaders in war and supreme judges (515). Succession was also an important historical factor. For example, the succession in Judah remained into the house of David, and the father always succeeded the son in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, “unless violence and revolution destroyed the royal house and brought a new adventurer to the throne” (516). The Israelites did mostly observe the office of kingship as a positive position for the nation’s good, and “law and ancient custom were, in the people’s minds, placed before the kingly authority” (516).

The main Hebrew kings were Saul, David, and Solomon. During the reign of David and Solomon, the Israelite kingdom reached its Zenith; however, after the death of Solomon, “the northern ten tribes broke away, refusing to give allegiance to the dynasty of David, and thereafter had their own kings” (Payne 1986, 21). Saul, David, and Solomon were all flawed kings. Saul, though he started out as clearly the divinely appointed king, was shown to be rather superficial, and “when Saul and his sons fell on Mt. Gilboa, it was not long till David the outlaw chief of Judah was invited to fill his place” (Boyd 1989, 516). Saul committed a serious disobedience to the law by using divination to gain information prior to battle in 1 Samuel 28. Although this does not seem like a lofty crime, “Saul neither had nor acquired the theological sophistication to see and perform his role in proper perspective or to function in it successfully” (Hill and Walton 1991, 273). After his initial mistakes, the text says that Yahweh’s Spirit was then replaced by an evil spirit (1 Samuel 16:14). Christians often shed a poor

light on Saul, and then contrast his failures with the appearance of King David, the seemingly perfect leader. Although David was a powerful, smart, and spiritual king, he was also flawed. His fibs cost people their lives (1 Samuel 21); his anger caused him to execute civilians (1 Samuel 27); his lust led him to murder and commit adultery (2 Samuel 11); his pride led to a devastating pestilence upon the land (2 Samuel 24); and yet, “David was loyal to the Lord and recognized when he had committed sin” (Hill and Walton 1991, 274). When David passed the kingship to his son Solomon, “the transition from the system of judges to that of monarchy was complete” (Logan and Clendenen 2003, 986). While Solomon was accredited wisdom, success, and riches, he also possessed serious folly. After ascertaining a firm control on the kingdom, he “turned his attention to taking foreign wives and to building projects” (Logan and Clendenen 2003, 986). Solomon’s lust for power and worship of foreign idols led to his destruction, and ultimately God’s judgment through the loss of the kingdom.

The theme of kingship is intertwined all throughout the Hebrew text. While it takes different forms and connotations, it is clear that God used kingship as a means to continue his divine plan in the Old Testament.

Grace

The theme of grace is prevalent throughout the Old Testament, although many people incorrectly assume it is specific to the New Testament. The contrast people draw between Old Testament law and grace “would have puzzled the ancient Israelite

for whom there was hardly any greater display of God's grace than that demonstrated in his giving of the law" (Hill and Walton 1991, 175). Two Hebrew words are used often in the Old Testament in relation to the idea of grace: *hanan* and *hesed*. The verb *hanan* is "found more than sixty times in the OT" and "denotes kindness or graciousness in action, often expressed as a gift" (Heath 2003, 372). Throughout the Old Testament, the word *hanan* is used to describe God's graciousness to a needy people. The related noun *hen* denotes "favor," and the "emphasis shifts to the disposition of the one who shows favor rather than the experience of the recipient of grace" (372). In many verses, *hen* will be followed by the words "in the eyes of Yahweh," conveying the idea that certain humans can find favor in the eyes of the Lord.

In Exodus 34:6 God tells Moses, "I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will show mercy on whom I will show mercy." Grace and mercy together connote God's kindness and faithfulness to his people. The word that most often substitutes for grace is *hesed* (372). Although the word is found nearly 250 times in the Old Testament, it cannot be translated by a single English word, and most closely translates as a composite of grace, mercy, compassion, and steadfast love; *hesed* is defined as "the disposition of one person toward another that surpasses ordinary kindness and friendship" and "the inclination of the heart to express 'amazing grace' to the one who is loved" (372). Heath continues to describe *hesed* as a term used in covenant, for a committed, familial love that is "deeper than social expectations, duties, shifting emotions or what is deserved or earned by the recipient" (372). God's grace for humankind in the form of *hanan* and *hesed*

is hard to fathom, but it is meant to express God's faithfulness to his divine plan and chosen people, as well as to incite worship.

Themes of grace are stated or implied in almost every narrative of the Old Testament. The grace of God is displayed through God's faithfulness and commitment to his covenant promises by the redemption of mankind through the flood, blessing of Abraham's descendants, deliverance from Egypt, and establishment of his presence and law among the Israelites. The grace of God that is revealed in the Old Testament narratives is "seen in conjunction with God's judgment of sin" (375). Many readers focus on the judgment present in the Old Testament, and miss the grace that God continually extends to the sinful Israel. Seeing as the term connotes "unmerited divine favor," (Weber 2009, 840) judgment and grace actually work together in the Old Testament to bring about God's will.

Generally, the doctrine of grace in the Old Testament "pertains to God's activity rather than to his nature," and is "the dimension of divine activity that enables God to confront human indifference and rebellion with an inexhaustible capacity to forgive and to bless" (Bilezikian 1988, 898). Therefore, grace is not simply a characteristic of a loving God, but it is a means through which God expresses his unmerited forgiveness. In Exodus 34:6, God reveals himself as a God "merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness."

The word mercy is written in conjunction with grace often in the Hebrew text. Through Isaiah 60:10, which states, "For in my wrath I struck you, but in my favor I have had mercy on you,"

God pours his mercy upon the unfaithful Israelites. Joshua 11:20 states: "For it was the Lord's doing to harden their hearts...in order that they should be devoted to destruction and should receive no mercy but be destroyed." These verses convey that "grace brings mercy, and the withholding of it brings judgment" (Millikin 2003, 678). The following list of narratives are examples of God's grace in the Old Testament: God's deliverance of Noah's family during the flood, His rescue of Lot from Sodom and Gomorrah's demise, His gift of divine revelation to Moses, His assurance of divine presence, His selection of Israel for inheritance, His giving of the Promised Land, His choice of David for kingship, His protection of the Israelite people in captivity, and His prophecy of the coming Messiah (678).

An important aspect of grace in the Old Testament is its connection with the Law. God demonstrates more grace by giving the Israelites law, "for [it] provide[s] practical, ethical and spiritual guidance for reclaiming their lives in the Promised Land" (Heath 2003, 374). The Israelites were in captivity for years prior to their deliverance into the Promised Land, and God knew that they needed a set of instructions to guide their actions and attitudes. The book of Leviticus details the change in thinking that occurred after the institution of the Law, whereby the Israelites began to view the world, and everything in it, through the lens of holiness. God graciously gave the gift of the Law so that the Israelites would know how to come into His presence and how to relate to Him. The Law was not able to make them righteous, but in recognition of the attitude

of their hearts, God extended his grace.

Sacrifice

Sacrifice in the Old Testament is conveyed mostly through the system of sacrifices and offerings brought into the tabernacle, and later the temple, of the Lord. Many years passed prior to and during the Hebrews' enslavement in Egypt before Yahweh reestablished his presence among his people. Exodus 40:34 states: "Then the cloud covered the tent of meeting, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle"; in Leviticus 1:1, the Lord "call[s] to Moses and [speaks] to him from the tent of meeting." These verses illustrate the establishment of Yahweh's divine presence in the temple and among the people after their deliverance from Egypt. The resulting Law placed a crucial emphasis on the sacrificial system, which "consisted of the five major kinds of sacrifices and offerings, the basic regulations...and the foundational applications" (Averbeck 2003, 706). The purpose of the sacrificial system was "to provide a means of approaching the Lord in his place of manifest presence in Israel and to maintain that presence by preserving the purity and holiness of the sanctuary" (706). Therefore, sacrifice in the Old Testament denoted an act of worship and purification, as a way to relate to Yahweh.

Burnt offerings existed long before the Mosaic Law, and were used in cultures throughout the ancient Near East. In Genesis 4, Cain and Abel made alters and presented sacrifices to God. Noah presented a burnt offering after the flood in Genesis 8:20, and Abraham and the other Patriarchs built alters throughout Genesis. Moses "ratified the covenant at Sinai by means of burnt and peace offerings offered on a solitary alter constructed there" (706). Furthermore, the presence of a sacrificial system was not

unique to the Israelites. Many other tribes and peoples used sacrifices in an attempt to honor their gods. The “sacrifices and offerings were designed to serve the gods by meeting any physical need that they might have had... Faithfulness to the preparation and presentation of them was an act of devotion” (Langston and Charleston 2003, 1428). Therefore, sacrifice was always a part of ancient history. However, God desired for the Israelites to be set apart, and consequently gave them specific instructions for their sacrifices through the Law.

There were five major types of sacrifices: burnt offerings, grain offerings, peace offerings, sin offerings, and guilt offerings. According to Langston and Charleston, burnt offerings were offered in the morning and evening, as well as on special days. Animals common to these sacrifices were young bulls, lambs, goats, turtledoves, or pigeons, and they had to be perfectly complete (1429). Most often, the animal depended on the wealth and ability of the person making the sacrifice. Leviticus 5:7 declares, “But if he cannot afford a lamb, then he shall bring to the LORD as his compensation for the sin that he has committed two turtledoves or two pigeons, one for a sin offering and the other for a burnt offering.” Leviticus 5:7 stresses the importance of the sacrificial system as an act of obedience and a posture of the heart, rather than simply a religious ritual. When Araunah offered David his threshing floor to make sacrifices on, David refused and said, “I will not offer burnt offerings to the Lord my God that cost me nothing” (2 Samuel 24:24). David knew that the underlying principle of sacrifice was to give up something of value in order to honor and glorify Yahweh.

Grain offerings were from the harvest of the land. These offerings were the only type that did not require bloodshed, and they were “composed of fine flour mixed with oil and frankincense” and were sometimes “cooked into cakes prior to taking it to the priest” (Langston and Charleston 2003, 1430). There is no reason given for the grain offerings in the Old Testament; however, “it may have symbolized the recognition of God’s blessing in the harvest by a society based to a large degree on agriculture” (1430). Therefore, the grain offering was an expression of devotion and thankfulness for Yahweh’s provision.

Peace offerings consisted of the sacrifice of a perfect bull, cow, lamb, or goat, during which time the individual laid a hand on the animal before killing it, and afterwards partook in a “meal of celebration” from certain parts of the meat that were leftover (1430). These peace offerings were in response to unexpected blessings or answers to prayer. They were also welcome as a general sign of thankfulness to Yahweh, and were performed at many religious festivals. Contrary to popular opinion that sacrificial offerings in the Old Testament were impersonal and harsh, the Israelites saw the peace offerings as a way to rejoice in thankfulness to Yahweh and display their adoration.

Sin offerings were “designed to purify the sanctuary from sin that was committed unintentionally, and thereby allow God to continue dwelling with His people” (1430). In a culture that saw the world through the lens of what was holy, it was imperative for them to reconcile themselves after sinning. In other words, “the violator of the law could gain forgiveness

before God, while the unclean person could be brought back into the condition of being ritually clean” (Averbeck 2003, 719). The guilt offering, which was very similar to, and almost overlapped, the sin offering, “was concerned supremely with restitution,” and most often, guilt offerings were performed to cleanse a leper, an adulterer, or one who had broken a vow (719).

While sacrifice was an integral part of the religious law in the Old Testament, it represented Israel’s heart for and devotion to Yahweh. The sacrifices were carried out individually and corporately, conveying their unity as Yahweh’s people. Ultimately, sacrifice “demonstrated that God had provided a way for dealing with sin” and for dwelling among his people (719).

Prophetism

Prophecy is defined as “reception and declaration of a word from the Lord through a direct prompting of the Holy Spirit and the human instrument thereof” (Songer 2003, 1333). According to Songer, there are three key Hebrew terms that are used to describe the prophet: *ro’eh* and *hozeh* mean “seer,” and the most important term, *navi*, usually means “prophet,” which denotes “one who is called to speak” (1333). Kings and priests usually inherited their positions in society, whereas God specifically elected prophets. God used prophets for long or short periods of time throughout the Old Testament, and there is no biblical distinction between the prophetic office and the prophetic gift; while it is tempting to view prophets as titles, such as those of kings, “the work of a prophet is not the fulfilling of an office, but the performance of a function” (MacRae 2009, 994). Although the term prophet may falsely seem to be relative, all true prophets share certain God-given traits and abilities.

In order to be classified as a prophet, the prophets of the Old Testament needed to share several key characteristics, the first being a call from the Lord, for “attempting to prophesy without such a commission was false prophecy” (Songer 2003, 1334). In Jeremiah 14:14, the Lord says: “The prophets are prophesying lies in my name. I did not send them, nor did I command them or speak to them. They are prophesying to you a lying vision, worthless divination, and the deceit of their own minds.” God makes it very clear that prophets must receive word directly from Him, and often they were “allowed to see into the throne room and heavenly court” (1334). However, their word from the Lord usually came in many different ways and forms, such as dreams, visions, or direct communication. Whatever the means by which the word was communicated to them, all prophets spoke the word of God – they were “primarily spokespersons who called His people to obedience by appealing to Israel’s past and future” (1334). For example, through Israel’s past blessings and future judgment, God places emphasis on social justice and mercy for those in need. Prophets did not just speak the Word, they also acted out much of what they communicated. Hosea’s reconciliation with his wife was a parable of God’s restored relationship with Israel. Many prophets performed miracles, or at least saw “a miraculous fulfillment of God’s word” (1334). Prophets were also rather like ministers, in that they were to watch the people, test them, and ensure that they were following the will of God. In Jeremiah 6:27 God claims that he has made his prophet “a tester of metals among my people, that [he] may know and test their ways.” Finally, an especially important role of the prophet was that of an intercessor. In 1 Kings 17:17-24, the prophet Elijah sojourns with a widow, whose son dies during the stay. Elijah prays to the

Lord to save the boy, and is able to present the widow with her resurrected son. She then praises the Lord and exclaims that Elijah is truly a man of God. Elijah was able to successfully intercede on behalf of the woman.

While all of the previously stated qualities are characteristics of prophets, there are also signs of false prophets. The first example of a false prophet in the Old Testament is Baal. Jeremiah 2:8 and 23:13 both speak of people who prophesied by Baal. When Jezebel "introduced Baal worship into Israel, groups of men appeared who were called 'prophets of Baal,'" although there is no biblical evidence to assume that they ever claimed to receive word directly from Baal (MacRae 2009, 1005). 1 Kings 22 reveals an incident that neatly describes the issue of false prophecy within the Old Testament. When Ahab invited Jehoshaphat to attack Ramoth Gilead, he sought the counsel of his men that claimed to be prophets. All of his prophets declared that he would triumph in battle, but Jehoshaphat asked whether there was not one more prophet that could advise him. Ahab reluctantly brought a prophet named Micaiah, who usually prophesied distressing messages. Micaiah revealed that Ahab and his men would be destroyed in battle, and angrily Ahab threw him in prison; yet, just as Micaiah prophesied, Ahab died in battle and the hypocrisy of the false prophets was revealed. However, it is important to note that even true prophets were "fallible and sinful" and in their human capacity "apt to err"; it was only "when directly presenting a message that God chose to give them that their words were free from error" (1006). Due to the confusing nature of prophesy in the Old Testament, Moses recorded certain tests in answer to the Israelites'

question, "How may we know the word that the Lord has not spoken" (Deuteronomy 18:21)? Moses' instructions can be summarized as: a true prophet must speak in the name of the Lord; a true prophet may produce a sign or a wonder; a prediction given by a true prophet may be visibly fulfilled; and the most important test of all – a prophet's word will agree with previous revelations (MacRae 2009, 1006-1007).

Prophets played a major role in Israel's history. The first prophet in the Old Testament is generally considered to be Moses. He was a prophetic prototype, and in Deuteronomy 34:10 Israel looks for a prophet like Moses, claiming, "There has not arisen a prophet since in Israel like Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face." Deborah, the prophetess, assisted the Israelites in securing the Promised Land by predicting victory and the right time to attack, as detailed in Judges. God used Samuel, who transitioned the Israelites into a period of monarchy, and was identified as a "prophet, priest, and judge" (Songer 2003, 1333) to anoint Saul as king and defeat the Philistines in battle. Gad, Nathan, Elijah, and Elisha all advised the kings on God's word. These early prophets "did more than predict the future; their messages called Israel to honor God," and "their prophecies were not general principles but specific words corresponding to Israel's historical context" (1333). The writing prophets arose amongst the political turmoil around 750 BC, when the Assyrians rose to power. Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah all prophesied during this difficult time period. Jeremiah and Ezekiel responded to the threat of the Babylonians with their prophecies, and the

beginning of the Persian Empire brought about prophets such as Obadiah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi (1333). The prophets underwent much persecution and critique, but they were all committed to conveying God's messages for his people and continually ensuring that the Israelites turned back to God's plan.

The Old Testament can be easily misunderstood, and a basic understanding of the themes of covenant, kingship, grace, sacrifice, and prophetism is crucial. Through covenant, Yahweh reveals aspects of his divine nature and relates to his people; through kingship, Yahweh discloses his plan for Israel as a nation; through grace, Yahweh extends unmerited mercy and lovingkindness upon his chosen people; through sacrifice, Yahweh allows the Israelites to be cleansed and sanctified in His presence; and through prophetism, Yahweh aids Israel in understanding His divine calling for their lives. God uses each of these themes as a powerful means of effecting self-revelation throughout the Old Testament and a beautiful promise of the coming Messiah. ■

References

Averbeck, Richard. "Sacrifices and Offerings." In *Dictionary of the Old Testament Pentateuch*, edited by T. D. Alexander and David Baker, 706-732. Madison, WI: InterVarsity, 2003.

Bilezikian, Gilbert. "Grace." *Baker Encyclopedia of the Bible*. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1988. 898-900.

Boyd, W. F. "King, Kingship." In *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by James Hastings, 515-516. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1989.

Craigie, Peter. "Covenant." *BAKER Encyclopedia of the Bible*. Edited by Walter Elwell. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1988. 530-536.

Fowler, Donald. "Kingship in the Old Testament." *Old Testament Life and Literature Symposium*. Liberty University, Lynchburg. Oct. 2014. Lecture.

Heath, E. A. "Grace." In *Dictionary of the Old Testament Pentateuch*, edited by T. D. Alexander and David Baker, 373-375. Madison, WI: InterVarsity, 2003.

Hill, Andrew E., and John H. Walton. In *A Survey of the Old Testament*, 175, 273-274. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1991.

Langston, Scott, and E. Ray Charleston. "Sacrifice and Offering." In *Holman Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, edited by Chad Brand, Charles Draper, and Archie England, 1428-1431. Nashville, TN: Holman Bible, 2003.

Logan, Phil, and E. Ray Clendenen. "King, Kingship." In *Holman Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, edited by Chad Brand, Charles Draper, and Archie England, 986. Nashville, TN: Holman Bible, 2003.

MacRae, A. A. "Prophets and Prophecy." *The Zondervan Encyclopedia of the Bible*. Edited by Merrill Tenney and Moises Silva. Revised ed. Vol. 4. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2009. 992-1026.

Millikin, Jimmy. "Grace." In *Holman Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, edited by Chad Brand, Charles Draper, and Archie England, 678. Nashville, TN: Holman Bible, 2003.

Moss, R. W. "Covenant." In *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by James Hastings, 161-162. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1989.

Payne, D. F. "Kingship." *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Edited by Geoffrey Bromiley. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1986. 21.

Payne, J. B. "Covenant." *The Zondervan Encyclopedia of the Bible*. Edited by Merrill Tenney and Moises Silva. Revised ed. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2009. 1060-1068.

Songer, Harold. "Prophecy, Prophets." In *Holman Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, edited by Chad Brand, Charles Draper, and Archie England, 1333-1336. Nashville, TN: Holman Bible, 2003.

Unterman, Jeremiah. "Covenant." In *Harper Collins Bible Dictionary*, edited by Mark Powell, 158-159. 3rd ed. New York, NY: HarperCollins, 2011.

Waltke, Bruce, and Charles Yu. "The Gift of Kingship." In *An Old Testament Theology*, 680-701. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2007.

Waltke, Bruce, and Charles Yu. "The Gift of the Abrahamic Covenant." In *An Old Testament Theology*. 305-345. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2007.

Waltke, Bruce, and Charles Yu. "The Noahic Covenant." In *An Old Testament Theology*, 284-304. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2007.

Weber, C. P. "Grace." *The Zondervan Encyclopedia of the Bible*. Edited by Merrill Tenney and Moises Silva. Revised ed. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2009. 840-842.

Williamson, P. "Covenant." In *Dictionary of the Old Testament Pentateuch*, edited by T. D. Alexander and David Baker, 139-155. Madison, WI: InterVarsity, 2003.

The Man behind the Music: Beethoven's Critical Early Years *by Dominique Lopiccolo*

Ludwig van Beethoven, music extraordinaire, still baffles the minds of musicians everywhere with his musical prowess. Beethoven's uncanny ability to improvise and to create out of nothing such unique pieces as the Pathétique sonata or the Eroica Symphony presents only a small taste of the musical genius that lies beneath his complex skill. Born into a household of court musicians in Bonn, Germany, Beethoven grew up under an artistic atmosphere from the very first few years of life. However, his familial environment was not a stable one. To begin with, his father and grandfather had a very rocky relationship despite their mutual love for music. His father, Johann van Beethoven, was a tenor for the Elector of Cologne in which his grandfather, Ludwig van Beethoven Sr., was the court's Kapellmeister. The tension between them culminated when Johann proclaimed he would be marrying Ms. Maria Magdalena Kewerich in spite of Ludwig, Sr.'s disapproval. ¹Against his father's wishes, Johann decided to continue with the marriage plans. After one miscarriage, Maria Magdalena gave birth to the soon-to-be-prodigy Ludwig van Beethoven, Jr. The exact date of Beethoven's birth is not known, however, since it was Rhenish tradition to baptize a child within

¹ Ludwig van Beethoven, Sr. had an unfortunate marriage to Maria Josepha Poll whose only surviving child was Johann. Maria was reportedly an alcoholic and had to be placed in a cloister until her death on September 30, 1775. He viewed marriage negatively from then on (Solomon 7-8).

twenty-four hours of the child's birth, Beethoven's birth date is presumably December 16, 1770.²

Johann's father maintained an authoritarian role over him even after his marriage to Maria and the birth of their son Ludwig, Jr. Constantly belittling his son's efforts as both father and husband, Ludwig van Beethoven, Sr. drove their relationship to extremely hostile ends. At the death of Ludwig, Sr., Johann became consumed with drinking. ³Maria had to fulfill the duties of both provider and caretaker for the family in order to compensate for her husband's negligence. For Ludwig, Jr., his mother Maria became his hero and source of inspiration during these dark days for the Beethoven family.

In the midst of his battle with alcoholism, Johann became Ludwig's first music teacher. His methods of music education were unconventional to say the least. It had been recorded that Ludwig could be seen crying at the piano as his father (oftentimes in a drunken stupor) violently beat him when he played the wrong notes or exhibited incorrect posture. Despite his horrid instructional techniques, Johann

² Beethoven formed the preconceived notion that he was actually born two years later than what the baptismal documentation records. This was due in part by his father's intentional falsification of his age in order to place him on equal turf with the young Mozart prodigies. (Solomon 4)

³ Johann's alcoholism was most likely inherited from his mother (Solomon 10).

inadvertently stirred up in Ludwig's impressionable mind a love for improvisation.⁴ A psychiatric study on Beethoven's early years confirms this: "An early rebellion against his father's arbitrariness and unjust strictness laid the foundation for the revolt against every kind of authority..." (Schonberg 112). This study's conclusions explain much of Beethoven's unbridled behavior as an adolescent and young adult. It was this type of rebellion towards authority that led him to produce some of the most powerfully written compositions ever heard in music history.

In addition to his father's instruction, Beethoven received music lessons from talented instrumentalists including court organist Van den Eeden, violinist Franz Ries, and pianist Tobias Pfeiffer (Schauffler 12-14). The combined efforts from these teachers, including those of his father, were insufficient in furthering his intrinsic talent. It was at this critical point in time that Christian Gottlob Neefe entered Ludwig's life. Neefe was exactly the type of instructor Ludwig had desperately needed. His fervor for the classics and composition pushed Beethoven to new heights of musical exploration. Neefe's partiality for Bach led him to teach Beethoven the score *The Well-Tempered Clavichord* (which was still unpublished at the time) (Burk 14-15). Not only was Neefe's musical instruction conducive for Beethoven's development as a musician, but his philosophy too played a significant role. Neefe had adopted many of his philosophical views from his friend and master Johann Adam Hiller. Hiller is one of the unsung pioneers who provoked the transition of the Classical music period to the Romantic period. Hiller's personal preference for the abstract and subjective nature in music indirectly influenced Beethoven's own musical developments, eventually

bridging the gap to a novel era of music (Schauffler 16).

Neefe not only propagated Hiller's philosophy, but he also exposed Beethoven to the musical masterpieces of noted composers like C.P.E. Bach, Mozart, and Haydn. Little did Beethoven know at the time that a couple of these same composers would later become his instructors in Vienna. Another important detail concerning Neefe was that he supplied the fatherly role model Beethoven had lacked from his biological father. Neefe's willingness to cultivate Beethoven's growing mastery during the boy's early years proved later to be integral for his path to extraordinary virtuosity (Kinderman 18).

As Beethoven continued to progress rapidly through his lessons with Neefe and later Kapellmeister and composer Andrea Lucchesi, his talent soared and people noticed. Neefe even went so far as to say that if Beethoven continued to learn and play as well as he had been, then he would surely become a "second Mozart" (Schonberg 112). At the time, Neefe probably would have never guessed just how prophetic this statement would be. Beethoven's next step in his musical career seemed obvious. Where else was there to go but Vienna, the musical center of Europe? So at the ripe young age of sixteen, Beethoven headed off to Vienna, where he received the honor of playing with Mozart. Nothing more than that is really known about Beethoven's first visit to Vienna since his time there was cut short upon hearing from his father that his mother was dying. However, before leaving, Mozart said this in reference to Beethoven's playing, "Keep your eyes on him; someday he will give the world something to talk about" (Kamien 188-89). Like Neefe, Mozart's prophetic words would fulfill themselves in Beethoven's future career as a revolutionary composer and performer.

⁴ "Without meaning to do so Johann taught the boy that printed melodies are sweet but those unprinted are sweeter" (Schauffler 3).

In returning to Bonn to take care of his mother, Beethoven found his home in utter disarray. His father had completely neglected his wife and two sons while Ludwig had been away in Vienna. Ludwig said his last goodbyes to his mother as she underwent the final effects of her tuberculosis. After Mrs. Beethoven's passing on July 17, 1787, Ludwig decided to stay in Bonn (Burk 21). Since his return home, he had quickly acquired two piano students—a brother and sister—from the well-respected von Breuning family. Beethoven quickly grew very close to the von Breunings. After Beethoven's mother passed, Frau von Breuning, mother to his two students, took Beethoven under her wing and provided him the necessary funds to continue to pursue his musical career.⁵

While Beethoven taught the von Breuning children piano, he kept up with his duties as court musician to the Elector of Cologne. At this point in Beethoven's musical career, Franz Joseph Haydn, a rising composer himself, was passing through Bonn en route to London. During his stay, Haydn was exposed to the music of the elector's court (which most likely included some of Beethoven's music). Upon Haydn's return trip back to Vienna, he stopped in Bonn again. During Haydn's second visit, Beethoven took the opportunity to show him one of his own cantatas. Haydn was reportedly so impressed by the boy's skill that he offered to teach Beethoven theory lessons in Vienna (Solomon 42). Prompted on by his friend and patron, Ferdinand von Waldstein, Beethoven left for Vienna to pursue higher education in music composition. It should be noted here that Waldstein, in his letter to Beethoven, became the first person to ever unite the names of the three composers who would later form the "Classical Trinity" of music history. This connection

⁵ Frau von Breuning became a mother figure to Beethoven, and she even succeeded in smoothing away some of the rough edges Beethoven had built up from a childhood of neglect (Burke 28-29).

is revealed in Waldstein's statement to Beethoven in his letter to him: "[Beethoven,] Receive Mozart's spirit from the hands of Haydn" (Schauffler 20-22).

Just as Waldstein had predicted, Beethoven greatly advanced in his musical ability. However, Beethoven was no easy student. His early years of instruction under his maniacal father had festered in him a spirit of rage and stubbornness (Schonberg 113). Haydn's instruction did not necessarily help the issue either. He went back on his promise to teach Beethoven composition and focused instead on subjects such as harmony and counterpoint. After undergoing much mismanagement from Haydn, Beethoven secretly began taking theory lessons from the composer Johann Schenck (Schauffler 26). It was this man who began to hone in on Beethoven's technical skill for composition writing. In January 1794, Haydn left again for London—this time placing Beethoven under the instruction of Johann Georg Albrechtsberger. Unfortunately for Beethoven, Albrechtsberger taught him the same painstaking process of counterpoint that Haydn had so insufficiently taught. Although there was still not much progress on that end, Beethoven was able to learn vocal composition from the Imperial Kapellmeister Antonio Salieri. Salieri helped Beethoven develop his skill for matching music with dramatic, operatic text. With Salieri's guidance, Beethoven was able to write some Italian arias that were later showcased at a few concerts (Burk 45-46).

Through the ups and downs of Beethoven's early instruction in Vienna, he was able to establish a name for himself among the high class Viennese society. His wildly impassioned piano playing diverted largely from the usual light, airy movements of the classical players, but it was this manner of playing that entranced his listeners. It did

not take long before Beethoven's notoriety reached the same heights as that of his instructor Haydn. At this point in Beethoven's career, he wanted to completely break away from the structural conformity of the classical era and move into something new, untried in music history—something revolutionary.⁶

No one could have predicted what would happen to Beethoven next. Right at the pinnacle of his career in Vienna, he started experiencing hearing loss. Naturally, Beethoven did everything he could to save his hearing. He even went so far as to try to cure his condition through galvanism (Schonberg 115). His attempts were futile, and his deafness became inevitable. On October 6, 1802, Beethoven wrote an emotional letter to his brothers relaying his battle with hearing loss. The document, famously known as the Heiligenstadt Testament, reveals a man severely troubled by the future implications of his disease. Although Beethoven admits to suicidal thoughts in this document, he mentions the one thing, which keeps him from acting out on these emotions as evinced by the statement: "I would have ended my life—it was only my art that held me back. Thanks to [virtue] and to my art, I did not end my life by suicide" (Kamien 189 and Solomon 118).

The following years marked Beethoven's most triumphant period yet. Often called the "Heroic Period," Beethoven claimed victory over his depressive state and turned it into his most powerful production of music yet. His *Pathétique* sonata is a singular piece whose introduction conveys the first signs of Beethoven's grief but is soon requited with a rondo-finale, giving the piece its conclusive positivity (Schauffler 52). Not much

⁶ Carl Ludwig Junker even reportedly made the comment: "His style of treating the instrument is so different from that usually heard that it gives one the idea that he has attained that height of excellence on which he now stands by a path of his own discovery" (qtd. in Schonberg 113).

time lapsed before Beethoven produced what would become music history's ultimate turning point in musical style—the *Eroica* Symphony. At its first performance, audience members were astonished by the pure size and monstrosity of the symphony. Reactions were highly varied. Beethoven, however, was not stunted by the largely negative response he received from the public. In fact, he became more determined than ever to create pieces that strayed from the norm of current music culture. From then on, music would never be the same (Schonberg 116).

Beethoven's life as both performer and composer was one of incomparable greatness. While composers like Mozart and Haydn contributed invaluable to the music scene at the time, Beethoven contributed his soul. He not only wrote music for others, he also wrote for himself. He did not fall captive to the aristocratic bonds of society but rather broke the bonds and developed a musical form that would challenge the standard for decades to come. In fact, it was this bold spirit of Beethoven that finally brought forth the birth of Romantic music. This development was largely due to his efforts to convey the strong emotions inside his mind directly onto composition paper. Every time one listens to the slow, paused notes of anguish from his *Apassionata* sonata or the heightened, lively notes of excitement from his Ninth Symphony, one can picture a man behind the music—a man who was not only a musician but a living composition. ■

References

Burk, John N. *The Life and Works of Beethoven*. Toronto: Random House, 1943. Print.

Kamien, Roger. *Music: An Appreciation*. 7th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2011. Print.

Kinderman, William. *Beethoven*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009. Print.

Schauffler, Robert H. *Beethoven: The Man Who Freed Music*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1929. Print.

Schonberg, Harold C. *The Lives of the Great Composers*. New York: Norton, 1997. Print.

Solomon, Maynard. *Beethoven*. New York: Schirmer, 1977. Print.

Classical Liberalism

by John P. Heaphy

Introduction

John Locke is widely considered one of the most important and influential philosophers in history. While he has greatly influenced future thinkers with ideas such as the famous “tabula rasa” (blank slate) perception of the mind, his most important contributions may be those in the area of political philosophy. It is here where he left an indelible mark on Western civilization and the world as a whole.¹ According to Neal Wood, Professor of Political Science at the University of York, “Philosophy for him was not the esoteric prerogative of the ivory-tower thinker but an important instrument for effecting social change.”² Locke did not just ponder about the problems and evils of the world, but made an effort to change them. Perhaps one of Locke’s most famous philosophical works is *The Two Treatises of Government*, which calls for a society based on natural rights and social contract. It is in this work along with others where Locke outlines his paramount political philosophy rooted in classical liberalism. Adopted by our founding fathers, Locke’s classical liberalism, entrenched in Christianity and *laissez-faire* economics, would go on to shape

1 Paul Strathern, *Locke in 90 Minutes* (Chicago, IL: Ivan R. Dee, 1999), 8.

2 Neal Wood, *The Politics of Locke’s Philosophy: A Social Study of “An Essay Concerning Human Understanding”* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1983), 3.

the development of the United States and set itself apart as the most effective form of government.

John Locke

John Locke, son of John and Agnes Locke, was born in Wrington, England, on August 29, 1632.³ His upbringing was rooted in Calvinism, and it is undoubted that his politics and philosophies were derived from his religious beliefs. His father, John Locke senior, was a country lawyer and served as a captain of cavalry for Parliamentary forces during The English Civil War. This war, fought over the idea of divine monarchy, is said to have “brought about the first successful revolution in European history.”⁴ Because of his father’s parliamentary ties, Locke was able to start his studies at Westminster School in London, considered “the finest school in the land at the time.”⁵ Following his initial schooling, Locke enrolled as an undergraduate at Christ Church College in Oxford.⁶ It is here where Locke’s life begins to get particularly interesting. Bored with the monotonous traditionalism of a medieval school, Locke found his love first in rational science, and eventually in the rational philosophy of Descartes.⁷ Locke’s interest

3 R. S. Woolhouse, *Locke: A Biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 5.

4 Strathern, 12.

5 *Ibid.*, 14.

6 *Ibid.*, 17.

7 *Ibid.*, 24.

and passion for philosophy would only ameliorate throughout his studies and eventually past his schooling—and the world would never be the same.

Locke would gain prominent positions at Christ Church College, and then go on to serve Anthony Ashley Cooper, the first Earl of Shaftesbury.⁸ Locke began developing his political theories, and was first able to implement these theories when he helped draft the constitution for the American colony of Carolina.⁹ Locke soon realized that he ought to transcribe all of his theories in coherent form, and thus began writing down his thoughts and philosophies, mostly between the years of 1668 and 1686. In the year 1689, works such as *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, *Two Treatises of Government*, and *A Letter Concerning Toleration* were all drafted and published.¹⁰ Through these works amongst others, Locke would formulate some of the most profound and persuasive theories relating to religion, humanity, and government.

Classical Liberalism

Classical liberalism was the bedrock of John Locke's political theory and countered the patriarchal government of his day. Locke lived in turbulent times, witnessing the inherent contradiction and implicit dangers that resulted from the idea of a "divine right of kings." To Locke, a government derived from the consent of the governed was the better system, as it not only correlated with the laws of nature, but also the nature of God.¹¹ Classical liberalism focused heavily on this idea of social contract as well as natural rights—ideals that stemmed from Christianity.

8 Wood, 24.

9 Strathern, 3.

10 Wood, 25.

11 John Locke, *Two Tracts on Government*, ed. Philip Abrams (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 123.

Locke's political theories begin and end with Christian principles. According to Neal Wood, "Locke was a dedicated Christian who took his faith very seriously and devoted much attention to religious and theological questions."¹² These religious beliefs are the grounds upon which his arguments stand. For example, the Christian principle of the Golden Rule guided his ideology that all men are created equal, a key aspect of his political philosophy. Other facets of Locke's faith that contributed to his theories included: a commitment to reasonableness, moderation, and toleration.¹³

Locke openly speaks out against the fallibility of "divinely appointed monarchs" while infusing his Christian beliefs in in the second treatise of his *Two Treatises of Government*. In this example, Locke describes the authority that Adam did not have, authority over the world, because it was not given by either natural right or positive donation by God. Locke goes on to say "it is impossible that the rulers now on earth should make any benefit, or derive any the least shadow of authority from that, which is held to be the fountain of all power."¹⁴ Locke unequivocally founded his governmental theories upon Christianity.

As mentioned earlier, a key component of Locke's theory is individual rights, which are derived from the natural law (which is from God), not kings or any other form of government.¹⁵ Locke believed that these rights were "plain and intelligible to all rational creatures."¹⁶

12 Wood, 28.

13 Ibid., 28.

14 John Locke, *Two Treatises of Government*, ed. Peter Laslett (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 100.

15 Ed., L. Miller, *Questions That Matter: An Invitation to Philosophy*, 6th ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2009), 443.

16 Miller, 443.

Locke closely followed the teachings of the Roman philosopher Cicero when it came to the protection of natural law and individual rights. Nate Wood in *The Politics of Locke's Philosophy* references Locke's shared belief with Cicero that "each of us has a moral duty to maximize his own interest as long as it does not threaten or harm our neighbor."¹⁷ Locke also was affected by the individualistic ideal of Cicero that held that a private citizen has the role of resisting governments that violate nature by infringing upon natural rights.

Lastly, Locke believed that social contract was the necessary step for men because of his view on the state of nature. Locke believes that the state of nature can only be theoretical because of mankind's selfish nature, the difficulty of arbitrating the differences that would arise, and the lack of authority to enforce it.¹⁸ According to Locke, this led to a conclusion: a society in the form of social contract. According to Ed Miller, a social contract is an agreement between members of a society according to which each forfeits certain rights and privileges in order to preserve others.¹⁹ In Locke's mind, this social contract would comprise of citizens submitting to the government and its laws, in order to secure "fundamental freedoms and rights."²⁰ This contract is necessary to promote order and maintain a theoretical balance between government and constituents—but unfortunately this balance can be compromised.

17 Wood, 30.

18 Miller, 444.

19 *Ibid.*, 444.

20 *Ibid.*

The United States of America

The shining example of the implementation of classical liberalism is the United States of America. The United States' success as a nation and influence abroad provides thousands of reasons as to why classical liberalism is the best form of government. John Locke's political theories had a direct influence on the creation of the United States government and he should be honored as a vital reason for this country's success. According to Ed Miller, "Locke is called the spiritual father of the U.S. Constitution."²¹ Miller also notes that Thomas Jefferson's goal was to have the Declaration of Independence "embody the social and political principles of Locke."²² This is obvious if one simply reads the Declaration of Independence. Key phrases in it, such as "all men created equal," "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," and governments are instituted among men to "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," validate its Christian and Lockean foundation.

The United States took these ideals and became the most successful nation in the history of mankind. It became nation where the Bill of Rights (the first ten amendments of the Constitution) would guide the freedom of its citizens. There were not monarchs unjustly exercising their power, dictators suppressing the people, or an anarchical spirit in the U.S. No, the government ruled with the rights of the people in mind, and the people submitted not blindly, but respectfully to the government that secured their natural and God-given rights.

The United States also implemented Locke's political theories in the realm of economics.

21 *Ibid.*, 448.

22 *Ibid.*, 449

Locke valued the importance of labor and hard work—a trait that described many of the early founders and citizens of the United States.²³ His support of free market capitalism with little government regulation was a key component of the United States' success and set it apart from other nations. Capitalism has proved to be the most natural and successful form of economic theory, supporting the notion that Locke's political theory serves as the best overall form of government observable.

One of the best ways to prove the superiority of classical liberalism is by comparing nations that implement it to those that do not. Look at nations such as the former communist Soviet Union and fascist Germany. These nations controlled nearly all aspects of life and did not place a premium on individual rights, resulting in serious atrocities. One just has to compare the success of nations that implement the communistic ideal of shared wealth versus capitalist nations to see that Locke's theory reigns supreme. Admittedly, the United States' implementation of classical liberalism is far from perfect and has gotten worse. The U.S. government has also taken extreme liberty in stretching the Constitution and often interpreting it as a "living, growing document."²⁴ It is this interpretation along with the decay of morality that has proven detrimental to the integrity of the U.S. Yet all in all, despite its imperfections, the United States of America has served as an arsenal of democracy for over two hundred years and has exemplified the best form of government in classical liberalism.

Conclusion

John Locke is considered the father of classical liberalism, the governmental theory implemented by the founding fathers of the United States of America and that has proven to be the best form of government. This political theory is founded upon Christian principles and places a premium on natural law, individual rights, and social contract. The United States' Bill of Rights, capitalist economics, and execution of social contract are examples of what John Locke had in mind when he created his political theory. While the United States has not been perfect in the implementation of this theory, it still stands as the most successful nation in world history, proving that classical liberalism is the best form of government. ■

²³ Wood, 34.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, slide 11.

References

Hinkson, Craig. Chapter 18. Lecture. Liberty University. PowerPoint, 2014.

Locke, John. *Two Treatises of Government*. Ed. Peter Laslett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Locke, John. *Two Tracts on Government*. Ed. Philip Abrams. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Miller, Ed. L. *Questions that Matter: An Invitation to Philosophy*. 6th Ed. New York: McGrawHill, 2009.

Strathern, Paul. *Locke in 90 Minutes*. Chicago, IL: Ivan R. Dee, 1999.

Wood, Neal. *The Politics of Locke's Philosophy: A Social Study of "An Essay Concerning Human Understanding"*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1983.

Woolhouse, R. S. *Locke: A Biography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

The Spirit of '98: A Defense of Civil or States' Rights? by William Hopchak

The Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions of 1798 and the subsequent Virginia Report of 1800 have created a great deal of controversy since their adoption. Passed in response to the recently enacted Alien and Sedition Acts which collectively extended the naturalization period, gave the president power to expel immigrants, and criminalized criticism of the government, the Resolutions and Report denounced the Acts as unconstitutional. No other states issued concurring statements and there was widespread critique of the arguments espoused therein. However, in the election of 1800, Jefferson was elected thus giving a certain amount of affirmation to the republican doctrines espoused in the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions. Thirty years later John C. Calhoun and other South Carolina nullifiers cited Madison and Jefferson as the sources of their theory and relied heavily on the Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions. Madison however, denounced the nullifiers and argued that neither he, nor Jefferson, nor the resolutions they authored had ever supported such things as the nullifiers argued. Within the last century scholarship has also been divided upon the issue. Some scholars have emphasized the defense of civic rights inherent to Jefferson and Madison's arguments. More recently some scholarship has emphasized the articulation of a compact theory and the constitutional arguments

made in these documents. Such scholarship lends support to the similar interpretations made by nullifiers and draws heavily upon the broader historical context of the documents. The first of these approaches is inferior to the second in removing the defense of certain civil rights from the overall constitutional argument. Despite the ambiguity of a few specific points of the documents' implications and regardless of immediate political intentions, the Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions expressed long held concepts of the nature of the American Union that were validly drawn upon by subsequent States' Rights proponents.

In order to understand the constitutional implications of these documents, the conceptions of political order competing within the young United States must be understood. Donald Livingston, Professor Emeritus at Emory University, identified "two ideal conceptions of legitimate political order," from the early modern era.¹ The first and pre-dominant one he refers to as "Hobbesian" or the "modern unitary state," and the other he calls the "Althusian" or the "modern federated polity." The first model is "composed of egotistically motivated individuals who contract to form a sovereign office to rule for the sake of peace and stability." Though, Livingston refers to the first model as "Hobbesian" after Thomas Hobbs'

¹ Donald W. Livingston, "The very Idea of Secession," Society 35, no. 5 (July 1998), 38

exposition of such a theory in *Leviathan* (1651), he intends the term as a broad label. For example, Livingston includes Locke's political theory under this label as well because, despite the libertarian flavor, Locke propounded the same basic system Hobbs did. For Livingston any system that supposes man began in a state of nature and contracted to create society, government, and sovereignty falls into this broad category. "Hobbesian" serves as a convenient label for consolidated, centralized, unitary systems, not merely the version of it propounded by Hobbes. The second model, named for Johannes Althusius, author of a treatise on political theory entitled *Politica* "root[s] political order... in social bonds and duties." It conceives of sovereignty as a "symbiotic relation among... independent social orders." This system believes society to exist independent of and prior to government. Sovereignty then is vested in the societies that create government.² These two positions are drastically different in both presuppositions and implications. The Hobbesian model consolidates power in a sovereign center, while the Althusian model disperses power throughout the component parts of a polity or system of polities. These two fundamental positions manifested themselves in the disparate constitutional positions that plagued America throughout at least its first century of existence.

A trend setting work in the historiography of the Resolutions from the late 1940s argues that the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions were above all else defenses of civil liberties. While the article provides a good chronology of the events surrounding the resolutions and especially well documents Jefferson and Madison's interaction on the matter, the arguments for a compact theory of union are downplayed. Rather than being perceived as a serious articulation of a

² Ibid., 38.

theory of state sovereignty, they are interpreted as a practical response to the current overreach of the central government: "However interesting these famous Resolutions may be for the constitutional doctrine they contain, they were intended primarily as a defense, practical and spirited, of civil liberties."³ In the authors' opinions this situation is an example of state and central government being used as checks and balances upon each other to protect the civil liberties of individuals. They emphasize that "The Resolutions were measures of 'solemn protest' meant to limit the scope of the illiberal laws and to guard against their serving in the future as precedent for Congressional legislation."⁴ While a common and not entirely incorrect interpretation of the intended function and relation of the state and central government, this misses much of the point.

The introduction to Madison and Jefferson's correspondence at this time also takes this sort of tack. Editor James Morton Smith provides an informative overview of the events surrounding the adoption of the Resolutions of 1798 and even acknowledges the formulation of the compact theory of the union within Jefferson's resolution. However, he accepts that they were primarily defenses of civil liberties: "Both men used states' rights arguments as sticks to beat off what they considered federal violations of individual rights and civil liberties."⁵ That Smith titled the chapter covering the Resolutions "The Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions and American Civil Liberties, 1798-

³ Adrienne Koch and Harry Ammon, "The Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions: An Episode in Jefferson's and Madison's Defense of Civil Liberties," *The William and Marry Quarterly*, Third Series, 5, no. 2 (Apr. 1948), 174.

⁴ Ibid., 174.

⁵ James Morton Smith, "The Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions and American Civil Liberties, 1798-1799," in *The Republic of Letters: The Correspondence between Thomas Jefferson and James Madison 1776-1826*, vol. 2 1790-1804 (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1995), 1072.

1799" is also indicative of the editor's interpretation of the Resolutions as primarily defenses of individual rights rather than primarily defenses of states' rights.

Perhaps the narrow view of the Resolutions as simple defenses of particular violated liberties indicates a failure to understand the long struggle in American politics spanning the colonial and national periods between centralized and decentralized conceptions of political order. Jack Greene has excellently tracked this struggle in the years leading to the American War for Independence. However, this struggle did not end with American independence, and to be thoroughly understood, the Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions must be recognized as episodes in this larger and ongoing struggle.⁶

Some of the first to understand the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions as arguments for decentralized power were the South Carolina Nullifiers. The nullifiers sought to nullify Federal Tariffs they believed unconstitutional, and mechanism by which they undertook this action was a state convention.⁷ In brief, the justification they offered for their theory was that the several states were sovereign political communities that had never surrendered their identity as autonomous communities by joining the union.⁸ Though they drew on historical arguments reaching far into colonial history, the South Carolina Nullifiers including John C. Calhoun, the greatest articulator of nullification and states' rights theory of his day, drew upon the precedent of

the Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions and Report, or as they oft referred to them, "The Spirit of '98."

Chancellor William Harper, a prominent South Carolinian political figure and leader in the Nullification movement, appealed to Madison's Report of 1799 in defense of nullification theory and esteemed Jefferson even higher than Madison. Harper referred to Jefferson as the "master" of "a true and thorough comprehension of the genius and working of our confederate system."⁹ Calhoun believed the source of the constitutional crisis faced in 1832 was "to be found in our departure from the great republican principles of [17]98; [which] practically convert[ed] our confederative system into a great consolidated government, without limitation of powers or constitutional check."¹⁰ The Nullifiers believed that the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions use of terms such as "interposition" and "null and void" were akin to the nullification they proposed.

Madison was repulsed and disturbed however, to see his name brandished as an authoritative propounder of the nullifiers' position. His positions on political issues in the 1790s as a Democratic Republican party leader and especially his statements in the Virginia Resolutions of 1798 seemed to indicate that he was a supporter of the same positions as the Nullifiers. However, Madison is a sort of enigma. Contrasting with some of his incredibly states' rights positions, he was ardently nationalist during the creation and adoption of the Constitution of 1787 and again in the 1830s in response to Nullification doctrine.

⁶ Jack P. Greene, *Peripheries and Center: Constitutional Development in the Extended Politics of the British Empire and the United States, 1607-1788* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1986), 182, 198.

⁷ John C. Calhoun, "Exposition and Protest" in *Union and Liberty: The Political Philosophy of John C. Calhoun*, ed. Ross M. Lence, (Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 1992), 351.

⁸ John C. Calhoun, "Speech Introducing Resolutions Declaratory of the Nature and Power of the Federal Government in the Senate." January 22, 1833, 21.

⁹ William Harper, *The Remedy by State Interposition or Nullification Explained and Advocated: in His Speech at Columbia, S.C. on the Twentieth of September 1830* (Charlestown, SC: The State Rights and Free Trade Association, E.J. Van Brust, 1832), 16. The Online Books Page. Penn State, accessed November 16, 2015, <http://onlinebooks.library.upenn.edu/webbin/book/lookupid?key=ha009580803>.

¹⁰ Calhoun to S[amuel] D. Ingham, Washington, January 13, 1833, *The Papers of John C. Calhoun*, ed. Clyde Wilson, (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1979), 8.

This apparent undulation on Constitutional issues is a dominant theme in Madisonian historiography. Many have found Madison to be at least fundamentally consistent in his stance on these issues, but the historical community has yet to reach consensus on this point.¹¹

It is even harder to judge whether Jefferson would have actually supported such policies because, unlike Madison, he had died before his name was invoked by the nullifiers and thus was unable to weigh in himself. Madison attempted to save his friend from accusations of supporting such policies, but John Quincy Adams did indeed see him as responsible for the nullification doctrine.¹² He explicitly wrote to Edward Everett, "Jefferson was the father of South Carolina Nullification, which points directly to the dissolution of the union."¹³ Not only did Jefferson appear to support strong states' rights doctrines in the Kentucky Resolution, but also late in life he had written letters to Governor Giles of Virginia in which he spoke of secession from the union as a viable option in cases of extreme need. In fairness to Jefferson he also stated within the same letter that "the States should be watchful to note every material usurpation on their rights ... to protest against them as wrongs to which our present submission shall be considered, not as acknowledgments or precedents of right, but as a temporary yielding to the lesser evil, until their

accumulation shall outweigh that of separation."¹⁴ This suggests that perhaps such a protest is what he envisioned the Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions to be. However, this is not certain, especially considering the strong language of those documents. Jefferson's statements in this letter, while leaving no doubt that he thought secession legitimate in extreme circumstances, leave open the possibility that he thought of secession not as a constitutional right, but as an undeniable natural right integrally related to the natural right to rebellion. If the latter was his intention, Jefferson was in essential agreement with Madison on this topic.¹⁵ His talk of enduring usurpation with peaceful protest seems to weaken claims the nullifiers have on him as a supporter of their doctrine and to support the interpretation of the Resolutions and Report as defenses of civil liberties.

Some light can be shed on this controversy by considering the historical context in which the Resolutions and Report were created. Looking at the broader picture of history rather than the immediate political events that prompted the adoption of the Resolutions and Report, demonstrates a continued struggle between Hobbesian and Althusian conceptions of political order. In the decade-long constitutional debate that preceded the War for Independence, England early on articulated a Hobbesian stance in a book authored by a Parliamentary deputy of Minister Grenville, *The Regulations Lately Made Concerning the Colonies and Taxes Imposed upon Them, Considered* (1765). Whateley argued that the Empire was a unitary state and therefor claimed the Parliament of England was able to legitimately represent the colonies.¹⁶

11 For an overview of Madisonian historiography dealing with his consistency and nationalism see, Alan Gibson, "The Madisonian Madison and the Question of Consistency: The Significance and Challenge of Recent Research," *The Review of Politics* 64, no. 2 (Spring 2002): 311. Kevin Gutzman's *James Madison and the Making of America* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2012) is the strongest recent representation of scholarship asserting contradictions in Madison's positions.

12 Drew McCoy, *The Last of the Fathers: James Madison and the Republican Legacy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 143-147.

13 John Quincy Adams to Edward Everett, Charlestown, October 10, 1836, in Ralph L. Ketcham and John Quincy Adams, "Jefferson and Madison and the Doctrines of Interposition and Nullification: A Letter of John Quincy Adams," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 66, no. 2 (Apr. 1958): 182.

14 Jefferson to William Branch Guiles, Monticello, December 26, 1825, in Thomas Jefferson: Writings, ed. Merrill D. Peterson, (New York: The Library of America, 1984), 1,511.

15 Drew McCoy, *The Last of the Fathers*, 136.

16 Thomas Whateley, *The Regulations Lately Made*

In response to such arguments, colonials developed an Althusian argument that was finally expressed, among other places, in Thomas Jefferson's Summary View of the Rights of British America (1774). He argues that the original settlers of the American colonies had acted upon the basic human right to emigration and had established new societies in the wilds of North America separate from England.¹⁷ These societies, presumed Jefferson, were under no obligation to maintain associations with England:

*[but] the emigrants thought proper to adopt that system of laws under which they had hitherto lived in the mother country, and to continue their union with her by submitting themselves to the same common sovereign, who was thereby made the central link connecting the several parts of the empire thus newly multiplied.*¹⁸

Elsewhere in his pamphlet, Jefferson referred to both Parliament and colonial legislatures as "free and independent legislature[s]."¹⁹ He also spoke of "the addition of new states to the British Empire [producing] an addition of new, and sometimes opposite interests;" he saw it as the King's duty to act as a mediator between these interests.²⁰ More significantly the assertion of

separate interests further supports the distinct nature of the multiple polities constituting the British Empire. Building on the concept of multiple communities existing within the British Empire, he asserted that, "from the nature of things, every society must at all times possess within itself the sovereign powers of legislation."²¹ Jefferson concluded by arguing that the King was in fact the servant of the people in whom real sovereignty actually resided and calling upon the King to act as a fair mediator between the different peoples of the empire.²²

The argument articulated by Jefferson in the Summary View is consistent with the Virginia and especially the Kentucky Resolutions in articulating an Althusian conception of union. In his "Fair Draft of the Kentucky Resolution" Jefferson spoke of the states as sovereign, distinct communities. He argued that

*they alone [were] parties to the compact, and solely authorized to judge in the last resort of the powers exercised under it, Congress being not a party, but merely the creature of the compact, and subject, as to its assumptions of power, to the final judgment of those by whom, and for whose use, itself, and it's powers were all created and modified.*²³

It referred to the Constitution as a "federal compact" among the states. It explicitly articulates a fear of "a general and consolidated government, without regard to the special delegations and reservations solemnly agreed to

Concerning the Colonies and Taxes Imposed upon Them, Considered (London, J. Wilkie, 1765), 39-40, 107-109, Revolutionary War and Beyond, accessed November 16, 2015, <http://www.revolutionary-war-and-beyond.com/the-regulations-lately-made-concerning-the-colonies-bythomas-whately.html>.

17 Thomas Jefferson, A Summary View of the Rights of British America (Williamsburg, VA, 1774), 5-7. Google Books, accessed November 16, 2015, <https://books.google.com/books?id=5ntbAAAAQAAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=A+Summary+View+of+the+Rights+of+British+America&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0CCUQ6AEwAGoVChMIh4br-fmVvYQIVhO8mCh1UDwXi#v=onepage&q=A%20Summary%20View%20of%20the%20Rights%20of%20British%20America&f=false>.

18 Ibid., 7.

19 Ibid., 12.

20 Ibid., 16.

21 Ibid., 19.

22 Ibid., 22-23.

23 Thomas Jefferson, "Thomas Jefferson's Draft of the Kentucky Resolutions of 1798" in The Republic of Letters: The Correspondence between Thomas Jefferson and James Madison 1776-1826, vol. 2 1790-1804 (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1995), 1083.

in that compact."²⁴ Such language betrays that Althusian conception of political order Jefferson held in both the 1770s and 1790s. He nowhere spoke of the constitution as being formed by individuals. Rather the organic, pre-existent societies of each state compacted together to create a union "for specified national purposes, and particularly for those specified in the late federal compact."²⁵

Madison expressed a fundamentally identical view of the union. Somewhat more reserved in the application of theory than Jefferson was, Madison thought Jefferson's choice of language at some points of the Kentucky Resolution potentially dangerous and counseled him:

*have you ever considered thoroughly the distinction between the power of the state and that of the Legislature, on questions relating to the federal pact. On the supposition that the former is clearly the ultimate Judge of infractions, it does not follow that the latter is the legitimate organ especially as a Convention was the organ by which the compact was made.*²⁶

Though he was concerned by Jefferson's assertions that a state legislature could authoritatively judge a federal law, he acknowledges implicitly the sovereignty of the people of the state who by convention adopted the constitution and entered the union. Also, in the Virginia Resolution of 1798, Madison used the same sort of language Jefferson did, declaring "the powers of the federal government as resulting from the compact to which the states are parties."²⁷ Also like Jefferson,

²⁴ Ibid., 1082.

²⁵ Ibid., 1082.

²⁶ Ibid., 1085.

²⁷ Virginia Resolution of 1798, Pronouncing the Alien and Sedition Laws to Be Unconstitutional, and Defining the Rights of the States, Virginia House of Delegates, (December 21, 1798).

he was afraid of a shift from a decentralized political order to a centralized one: "the General Assembly doth also express its deep regret, that a spirit has, in sundry instances, been manifested by the federal government to enlarge its powers by forced constructions of the constitutional charter which defines them ... so as to consolidate the states, by degrees, into one sovereignty."²⁸

Recent scholarship by Kevin Gutzman, Professor of History at Western Connecticut University, has recognized this historical context and rejected the long held opinion that the Resolutions were primarily defenses of civil liberties. He traces in immense detail the development of Republican theory in Virginia and that state's political elite's interactions with the constitution of 1787. He argues that the Resolutions were primarily attempts to bring the national government into alignment with what Federalists promised it would be during ratification.²⁹ While historical context demonstrates that the Resolutions were indeed part of a long-term struggle between opposing conceptions of political order, the fact that the Resolutions did indeed deal with civil liberties need not be downplayed. There was a practical side as well as a constitutional side to the states' rights argument. During the struggle between the colonies and Britain, the protection of individual rights and community rights was sought simultaneously. Colonists believed that the only way their rights as individuals could be protected was if their corporate rights remained inviolate.³⁰ Considering that the

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Kevin R. C. Gutzman, "The Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions Reconsidered: "An Appeal to the Real Laws of Our Country," The Journal of Southern History 66, no. 3 (Aug., 2000), 474-476. Also, an even more detailed account of these topics can be found in his book, Virginia's American Revolution. Kevin Gutzman, Virginia's American Revolution (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2007).

³⁰ Robert W. Tucker and David C. Hendrickson, The Fall of the First British Empire: Origins of the War of American Independence (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press,

compact theory of the constitution developed out of the arguments adopted during this pre-revolutionary debated, it seems sensible that there was still an assumption that local community rights had to be protected if individual rights were to remain.

Clearly, the interpretation of the Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions and Virginia Report as mere defenses of civil liberties leaves much to be desired. They were in fact equally defending civil liberties and state sovereignty. Examining them in the context of the historical struggle between Hobbesian and Althusian conceptions of order makes this point clear. Thus, Calhoun and his compatriots were correct to see the “Principles of ‘98” as supportive of their cause, even if Madison and Jefferson’s support of the exact mechanism of nullification is lacking. The fundamental principles expressed in the Resolves and Report, that The United States is composed of several independent, sovereign political societies is identical to the foundation of the nullifiers’ arguments. Thus, as Gutzman has argued, the Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions and Report articulate a Republican theory of union distinct from nationalistic interpretations. ■

1982), 161-163.

References

Primary Sources

Calhoun, John C. *The Papers of John C. Calhoun Vol. 12*. Edited by Clyde N. Wilson. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1979.

Calhoun, John C. *Union and Liberty: The Political Philosophy of John C. Calhoun*. Edited by Ross M. Lence. Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 1992.

Harper, William. *The Remedy by State Interposition or Nullification Explained and Advocated: in His Speech at Columbia, S.C. on the Twentieth of September 1830*. Charlestown, SC: The State Rights and Free Trade Association, Van Brust, 1832. The Online Books Page. Penn State. Accessed November 16, 2015. <http://onlinebooks.library.upenn.edu/webbin/book/lookupid?key=ha009580803>.

Jefferson, Thomas. *A Summary View of the Rights of British America*. Williamsburg, VA: Clementina Rind, 1774. Google Books. Accessed November 16, 2015. <https://books.google.com/books?id=5ntbAAAAQAAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=A+Summary+View+of+the+Rights+of+British+America&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0CCUQ6AEwAGoVChMIh4br-fmVyQIVhO8mCh1UDwXi#v=onepage&q=A%20Summary%20View%20of%20the%20Rights%20of%20British%20America&f=false>.

Jefferson, Thomas. *Thomas Jefferson to William Branch Guiles, December 26, 1825*. In *Thomas Jefferson: Writings*. Edited by Merrill D. Peterson. New York: The Library of America, 1984.

Jefferson, Thomas, and James Madison. *The Republic of Letters: The Correspondence between Thomas Jefferson and James Madison 1776-1826. Vol. 2 1790-1804*. Edited by James Morton Smith. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1995.

Ketcham, Ralph L, and John Quincy Adams, "Jefferson and Madison and the Doctrines of Interposition and Nullification: A Letter of John Quincy Adams." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 66, no. 2 (Apr. 1958): 178-182.

Tucker, Robert W, and David C. Hendrickson, *The Fall of the First British Empire: Origins of the War of American Independence*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982.

Virginia House of Delegates. Virginia Resolution of 1798, Pronouncing the Alien and Sedition Laws to Be Unconstitutional, and Defining the Rights of the States. (December 21, 1798).

Whateley, Thomas. *The Regulations Lately Made Concerning the Colonies and Taxes Imposed upon Them, Considered*. London, J. Wilkie, 1765. *Revolutionary War and Beyond*. Accessed November 16, 2015. <http://www.revolutionary-war-and-beyond.com/theregulations-lately-made-concerning-the-colonies-by-thomas-whately.html>.

References

Secondary Sources

Ellis, Richard E. *The Union at Risk: Jacksonian Democracy, States' Rights and the Nullification Crisis*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Gibson, Alan. "The Madisonian Madison and the Question of Consistency: The Significance and Challenge of Recent Research." *The Review of Politics* 64, no. 2 (Spring, 2002): 311-338.

Greene, Jack P. *Peripheries and Center: Constitutional Development in the Extended Politics of the British Empire and the United States, 1607-1788*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1986.

Gutzman, Kevin R. *James Madison and the Making of America*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2012.

Gutzman, Kevin R. C. "The Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions Reconsidered: An Appeal to the Real Laws of Our Country." *The Journal of Southern History* 66, no. 3 (Aug., 2000): 473-496.

Gutzman, Kevin. *Virginia's American Revolution*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2007. Koch, Adrienne and Harry Ammon. "The Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions: An Episode in Jefferson's and Madison's Defense of Civil Liberties." *The William and Marry Quarterly, Third Series*, 5, no. 2 (Apr. 1948) 145-176.

Livingston, Donald W. "The very Idea of Secession." *Society* 35, no. 5 (July 1998): 38-48.

McCoy, Drew. *The Last of the Fathers: James Madison and the Republican Legacy*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Tucker, Robert W, and David C. Hendrickson, *The Fall of the First British Empire: Origins of the War of American Independence*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982.