

# A Queen Beloved:

## Monarchy & Virtuous, Representative Symbolism

### T. D. Desso

The inherent power of symbolism does not receive enough credit and is not recognized for its weight. Utilitarian and existentialist worldviews, for example, cannot appreciate Scriptures like Rom. 5 and I Cor. 15, which speaks of how “*in Adam all die, so also in Christ all will be made alive*” (I Cor. 15:22, emphases added). Symbolic representation is at the heart of such passages. One will have difficulty connecting with the Christian God of Scripture if he/she cannot grasp that symbols mean something to God. The preferred parabolic method Jesus employed in his teaching was rooted in symbolic communication. The Old Testament employs a great number of typological figures in preparation for only one Anti-type. Adam, Israel, Moses, Joshua, the tabernacle, the temple, David, and the offices of King, Priest, and Prophet make up a plethora of symbols all meant to point to one Reality. The Divine has invested a great deal in symbols. This work seeks to explore the symbolic value of monarchy.

#### **Clarification of the Intended Type of Symbolic Representation**

The concept of symbolic representation has many approaches and is not monopolized by any one discipline, so clarification is needed of this work’s specific use of the term. First, though an object, something inanimate or non-human, can serve as a symbolic representation—that which represents—such as a flag for a nation or a donkey or elephant for political parties, this work shall use the term to refer only to a person. For this reason, at times the term *symbolic representative* shall be employed. Secondly,

though symbolic representation can be used to note the representation of non-human objects and concepts—that which is represented—such as governments, ideas, etc., this work shall employ the term to only describe the representation of people, thus one human symbolically representing one group of people. Thirdly, and perhaps most importantly, this paper shall employ the term to describe one person’s representing the *identity* of people, in other words, people finding their collective identity in one symbolic representative.

In this version of symbolic representation, it is not human identity that is sought in the symbolic representative person but group identity. In the “in Adam/in Christ” paradigm, a person does not abandon identity with Adam in order to *become* human under Christ. Instead of the classification deciding a person’s humanity, it is the deciding factor for the group’s survival, in this case spiritual survival. Under Adam and Christ are people equal in humanity, but under one, “all die” while under the other “all will be made alive.”

Likewise—to transition from a metaphysical framework to the political—we do not identify with any nation with in mind for that identity to initiate, impact, or perfect our humanity, rather to effect our survival. As the United States Declaration of Independence declares, “all men are created equal”—a statement which did not limit its application only to men in any nation or under any one banner—but the establishing of the United States was intended to secure for every man, under its own banner, the right to “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” In this statement, the framers did not assert that only men under their newly founded banner had a right to these basic human dignities but that this new nation would be formed to secure these rights for men under its own banner, not negating the rights of other men to have the same under their respective nations’ banners. In short, we do not look to our nation for our humanity but for our

survival. The identity is for the purpose of preserving something—something of value to the natural, human experience—other than our humanness. A group finding its collective identity in one representative for the sake of preservation is a Hobbesian concept but one that this author embraces, not as the only possible reason for a people collecting themselves under the representation of one, but as the reason in most cases.

Yet, there remains another sense in which we desire protection, not only that of the body but also protection of human dignity. This sort of protection shall receive the most focus in this paper. There is a form of identity symbolic representation that serves the purpose of protecting a group's dignity, and it is very possible that a group of people gladly accept that limited form of representation for that purpose, even if that form of representation offers protection for nothing else.

### The Queen

The world had a great example of this type of identity symbolic representation. In September 2022, the death of her majesty, Queen Elizabeth II of the United Kingdom, focused the eyes of the world on not just a woman or a single country, but I believe on monarchy itself, reminding all nations of its majesty and symbolism. For a modern world that has completely abandoned the idea of government by one, perhaps it is helpful to have stimulating dialogue surrounding that which has been abandoned. In the plethora of media analysis of this seismic event, the word "duty" was most prevalent in describing the queen. Nick Spencer, senior fellow at Theos, wrote, "she modelled a very different kind of leadership from that popular in our day, silence and duty rather than publicity and transparency."<sup>1</sup> Withstanding the great number of times this word was employed to describe her majesty, several

initial questions arise: how should one define the queen's *duty*? What did Queen Elizabeth believe was her duty? Whatever it entailed, did she believe that the same was the duty of any monarch for all cultures and ages or just her duty for her country?

Deciphering with certainty the political theory that the queen embraced is a difficult task since she was not outspoken, for, as noted by Nick Spencer, she modelled "*silence and duty*." Though one would be hard pressed to write much about what the queen meant when referencing her duty, I do believe she left enough clues for one to conclude that her idea of duty at least entailed the concept of being the identity symbolic representative for the people of the United Kingdom. In other words, it seems very clear that she believed her duty, and her means of impacting her society, lay more in her simple presence in her royal capacity opposed to her actions and words.

As I explore the beauties of monarchy—beauties in principle and not in practice—this is an aspect that fascinates me—the influence and intrinsic value in the monarch's simple presence and existence, the value of being a figurehead, a symbol. If, in analysis of her life and reign and contribution to her nation, one concludes that she did not do anything, then that is precisely the point. Her duty was not to *do* but to *be*. As a symbol, it was her duty to remain not only in the sight—physical sight—but the *focus* of the people she represented. This is true for any monarch but exponentially applicable for Queen Elizabeth due to the technological age in which she lived and served. "Her life was lived in a world made by media, which means that not only was hers the longest reign in British history, but possibly the most recorded life in human history, 85 of her 96 years lived under intense media interest."<sup>2</sup> Beyond being seen, her representative symbolism

---

<sup>1</sup> Nick Spencer, "Queen Elizabeth II: Faith and Virtue," Theos Think Tank, September 9, 2022,

<https://www.theosthinktank.co.uk/comment/2022/09/09/queen-elizabeth-ii-faith-and-virtue>.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

entailed much more. A survey of her public addresses are revealing of her approach to monarchy.

She had a sense of her reign being somehow in connection with the unity of her people, and the crown served as a shared quality, a common denominator for the British. Her reign being so long, she had many opportunities to celebrate jubilees, each one prompting a speech. Surveying these speeches, consider the connection she repeatedly draws between her role as monarch and a sense of togetherness among the British people. Also, note that her focus is more on what the crown *is* for their culture opposed to anything the crown *does*.

In June of 2022, as the nation prepared to celebrate her Platinum Jubilee, the queen officially wrote, “Thank you to everyone who has been involved in convening communities, families, neighbours and friends to mark my Platinum Jubilee.”<sup>3</sup> Four days later, in a separate message, she says:

When it comes to how to mark seventy years as your Queen, there is no guidebook to follow. It really is a first. But I have been humbled and deeply touched that so many people have taken to the streets to celebrate my Platinum Jubilee. . . I have been inspired by the kindness, joy and kinship that has been so evident in recent days, and I hope this renewed sense of togetherness will be felt for many years to come.”<sup>4</sup>

We should not give too much attention to the note of people taking “to the streets to celebrate” since it is appropriate for any political leader, in virtually all forms of government, to thank people for their support. However, the “kinship” and “renewed sense of togetherness” that the queen notes should be considered, in context, uniquely

belonging to a monarchical culture. With her observations of these societal moods and sentiments, she is doing more than offering gratitude for her people’s support. In context, this “kinship” and “renewed sense of togetherness” surrounded her being queen for seventy years, and official recognition of her reign is the exigence of such sentiments. Now, should one argue that she is simply utilizing political speech and not making real observations, it is true that there is no way to prove if the citizens of the U. K. really felt those sentiments; nevertheless, such a point is moot. At the very least, this observation—whether true or wishful—reveals what the queen *expected* her reign to do. Her being queen was *supposed* to evoke such sentiments of “kinship” and “togetherness.”

Consider further, in recognition of the 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary of her accession to the throne, the queen expressed what she hoped her jubilee would accomplish. She wrote:

And so as I look forward to continuing to serve you with all my heart, I hope this Jubilee will bring together families and friends, neighbours and communities . . . in order to enjoy the celebrations and to reflect on the positive developments in our day-to-day lives that have so happily coincided with my reign.<sup>5</sup>

Every anniversary marking her accession was a reminder of their heritage, as alluded to in her 2002 Christmas Broadcast. She said, “I felt that the Golden Jubilee was more than just an anniversary. The celebrations were joyous occasions, but they also seemed to evoke something more lasting and profound—a sense of belonging and pride in country, town, or community; a sense of sharing a common

---

<sup>3</sup> Elizabeth II, “A Platinum Jubilee message from The Queen,” The Royal Family, June 1, 2022, <https://www.royal.uk/platinum-jubilee-message-queen>.

<sup>4</sup> Elizabeth II, “A Thank you message from Her Majesty The Queen following the Platinum Jubilee weekend,” The Royal Family, November 17, 2022,

<https://www.royal.uk/thank-you-message-her-majesty-queen%C2%A0following-platinum-jubilee-weekend>.

<sup>5</sup> Elizabeth II, “The Queen's Accession Day message,” The Royal Family, February 5, 2022, <https://www.royal.uk/queens-accession-day-message>.

heritage.”<sup>6</sup>

She recognized, it seemed, that her people did indeed feel a sense of tradition and “fellowship” around herself. For all of them, she was a common denominator, her reign felt more so culturally than legally. In her 2012 Christmas Broadcast, she said:

This past year has been one of great celebration for many. The enthusiasm which greeted the Diamond Jubilee was, of course, especially memorable for me and my family. It was humbling that so many chose to mark the anniversary of a duty which passed to me sixty years ago. People of all ages took the trouble to take part in various ways and in many nations. But perhaps most striking of all was to witness the strength of fellowship and friendship among those who had gathered together on these occasions.<sup>7</sup>

Other of her speeches and official messages reveal the queen’s dependence on these high ideals of fellowship and kinship while other, more archaic aspects of traditional monarchy faded with shifting cultural norms, in result becoming elements of the past on which she could no longer depend. It is obvious that the queen recognized the decreasing desire among people to be ruled, but besides law and order, there were other benefits of togetherness and a sense of tradition and heritage that monarchy offered, and she made necessary adjustments while maintaining those core and more abstract values of monarchy. For example, in March 2022, for her Commonwealth Day speech, she says:

Today, it is rewarding to observe a modern, vibrant and connected Commonwealth that combines a wealth of history and tradition with the great

social, cultural and technological advances of our time. . . We are nourished and sustained by our relationships and, throughout my life, I have enjoyed the privilege of hearing what the relationships built across the great reach and diversity of the Commonwealth have meant to people and communities. Our family of nations continues to be a point of connection, cooperation and friendship. It is a place to come together to pursue common goals and the common good, providing everyone with the opportunity to serve and benefit. In these testing times, it is my hope that you can draw strength and inspiration from what we share, as we work together towards a healthy, sustainable and prosperous future for all. And on this special day for our family—in a year that will include the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting and the Commonwealth Games—I hope we can deepen our resolve to support and serve one another.<sup>8</sup>

That “wealth of history and tradition” that she spoke of, in context, was represented in the monarchy, which they celebrated at that occasion. Also, as she had a pattern of doing, more frequently throughout the progression of her seventy years, she referred to the commonwealth as a “family.” It is important to note here the origins of the Commonwealth Day. With the growing number of territories gaining independence from the old British Empire, resulting in its decline, there needed to be some mechanism of maintaining the tie between Britain and those newly formed governments. After the death of Queen Victoria in 1901, the first “Empire Day” was celebrated the following year

---

<sup>6</sup> Elizabeth II, “Christmas Broadcast 2002,” The Royal Family, November 16, 2015, <https://www.royal.uk/christmas-broadcast-2002>.

<sup>7</sup> Elizabeth II, “Christmas Broadcast 2012,” The Royal Family, November 17, 2015, <https://www.royal.uk/christmas-broadcast-2012>.

<sup>8</sup> Elizabeth II, “The Queen's Commonwealth Day Message 2022,” The Royal Family, March 14, 2022, <https://www.royal.uk/queens-commonwealth-day-message-2022>.

in her honor.<sup>9</sup> Eventually, it developed into what it is today, being “formally established by the 1949 London Declaration, which modernised the community and acknowledged the member states as free and equal. The declaration recognised King George VI as Head of the Commonwealth,” and after his death, Queen Elizabeth II, with consent of member nations, became the second to hold that position.<sup>10</sup> Thus, with such a voluntary relationship that the people of the U. K. along with those of the broader commonwealth had with the monarch, it was advantageous for the queen to begin to refer to the collective whole as a family, and her speeches, especially to these nations once under British dominance, are replete with the theme of family.

She was aware that her famous Christmas Broadcast, shown each year without fail, was intently watched not merely by individuals or citizens, but family units in their homes. In the 2017 broadcast, she says:

My own family often gather round to watch television as they are at this moment, and that is how I imagine you now. Six decades on, the presenter of that broadcast has “evolved” somewhat, as has the technology she described. Back then, who could have imagined that people would one day be following this Christmas message on laptops and mobile phones? But I'm also struck by something that hasn't changed. That, whatever the technology, many of you will be watching or listening to this at home.<sup>11</sup>

Keeping that same theme of the home, she says later in the speech, “In 2018 I will open my home to a different type of family: the leaders of

the fifty-two nations of the Commonwealth, as they gather in the UK for a summit.”<sup>12</sup> She is very intentional about sponsoring a sense that she is more than the face of a nation but of a national—and international—family. In her 2017 Christmas Broadcast, she said, “The Commonwealth has an inspiring way of bringing people together, be it through the Commonwealth Games . . . or through bodies like the Commonwealth Youth Orchestra & Choir: a reminder of how truly vibrant this international family is.”<sup>13</sup>

The Queen's involvement in the Commonwealth was a testament to her adaptability. Bishop Robert Barron credits her with being “the Queen who presided over the peaceful transition from the British Empire to the British Commonwealth.”<sup>14</sup> One may argue that she receives too much credit for “presiding” during this “transition.” With the rise in popularity of democracy during her tenure, how else was she to respond (and still be accepted by her people and without becoming a pariah globally)? However, though her “presiding” is questionable, her calm behavior, in reaction to society's shifts, is certainly to her credit.

A great example of how she reacted to the fall of the old Empire maintained by her not-too-distant ancestors were her comments in her 1997 Christmas Broadcast:

The Prince of Wales represented Britain when the people of Hong Kong marked their return to China—in spectacular fashion. Many of you might have felt a twinge of sadness as we in Britain bade them farewell, but we should be proud of the success of our partnership in Hong Kong and in how peacefully the old

---

<sup>9</sup> National Today, “History of Commonwealth Day,” National Today, 2022, <https://nationaltoday.com/commonwealth-day/>.

<sup>10</sup> Westminster Abbey, “Celebrating the Commonwealth,” Westminster Abbey, 2022, <https://www.westminster-abbey.org/about-the-abbey/history/celebrating-the-commonwealth>.

<sup>11</sup> Elizabeth II, “The Christmas Broadcast 2017,” The Royal Family, December 25, 2017, <https://www.royal.uk/christmas-broadcast-2017>.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Robert Barron, “Queen Elizabeth II: Faithful Disciple,” Word on Fire. September 13, 2022, <https://www.wordonfire.org/articles/barron/elizabeth-ii-faithful-disciple/>.

Empire has been laid to rest. Out of the old Empire sprang the Commonwealth family of nations that we know today, and that, too, has grown and changed over the years. . . . Recent developments at home, which have allowed Scotland and Wales greater say in the way they are governed, should be seen . . . as proof that the kingdom can still enjoy all the benefits of remaining united. Being united—that is, feeling a unity of purpose—is the glue that bonds together the members of a family, a country, a Commonwealth. Without it, the parts are only fragments of a whole; with it, we can be much more than the sum of those fragments.<sup>15</sup>

While she could not maintain complete dominance over lands, she could maintain a sense of unity and a desire among many peoples to at least continue a cultural tie to herself as a symbol. I believe she meant the words uttered later in that speech: “kindness and consideration for others that disarms malice and allows us to get on with one another with respect and affection,”<sup>16</sup> demonstrating her honest confidence in the disarming power of “kindness” and “consideration.” I am convinced of her confidence in this ideal not for the simple fact that she says it, but because of how frequently this theme, the power of such attributes, found its way into her public addresses.

Nick Spencer, in his article, “Queen Elizabeth II: Faith and Virtue,” observes society’s growing distrust of institutions and the political leaders who lead them but how Queen Elizabeth seemed to be immune from that distrust. He writes:

One of the more notable social changes during her long reign was the decay in public trust in institutions. . . . Mass

Observation studies from the 1930s and 40s report a British public every bit as cynical about their political leaders as their great-grandchildren would be 80 years later. . . . But no nation, no common project, can survive, let alone thrive, without institutions and so, in an effort to shore up that trust, we placed ever greater emphasis on transparency, on openness, on accountability. Freedom of Information. Watchdogs. Regulators. The way of assuring probity in public life and trust in institutions was to expose them to constant mutual scrutiny. . . . The more we knew about what was going on inside our leaders or institutions, the more we would have reason to trust them. . . . It hasn’t really worked, which further underlines the paradox of Queen Elizabeth II’s popularity. The best-known woman in the world was also hardly known at all. Over many years, we assembled a partial picture, but she hardly ever gave an interview, rarely voiced a personal opinion.<sup>17</sup>

Writing further on the fact that the Queen was a trusted figure, Spencer noted former Prime Minister Theresa May, who “remarked on how one of the joys of her weekly meetings with the Queen was that she could be sure, unlike pretty much every other meeting she had, that what she said in private would stay private.”<sup>18</sup>

So, the question of this work is one similar to Spencer’s: How did she manage to stay in people’s hearts and on the throne, despite those same people’s distrust of institutions and their growing preference for democratic government? “The Queen herself,” Spencer writes further, “and in her shadow the monarchy, remained popular. . . . Adored. . . . The reason, I suggest, was her commitment to virtue.”<sup>19</sup> I am in agreement with

---

<sup>15</sup> Elizabeth II, “Christmas Broadcast 1997,” The Royal Family, November 16, 2015, <https://www.royal.uk/christmas-broadcast-1997>.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

<sup>17</sup> Spencer, “Faith and Virtue.”

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.

Spencer but with one addition: the British along with people of the Commonwealth respected the symbol of monarchy as long as that symbol demonstrated virtue.

It seems to me she understood that her most fundamental function was just to be a figure for her people, but the greatest threat to monarchy is when the position of the monarch is in question. However, there are qualities that a person can have to make his/her position unquestionable. The Queen, in a 2015 speech identified those qualities herself:

We trust public servants to show integrity, stamina, and selfless duty, as well as essential values such as being fair, keeping one's word, speaking the truth. . . . These unwritten but deep-rooted values . . . are the essence of the British spirit of public service, which is recognised throughout the world, and it is important that they continue to be celebrated and encouraged.<sup>20</sup>

While the Empire continued to decline in her lifetime, it is remarkable that she made no attempts to retrieve that dominance. To be clear, it cannot be an easy experience to witness your own tribe decline in power, but world history, along with current events, teach us the dangers posed to the entire world when one group stops at nothing to regain dominance. Adolf Hitler, for example, initiated World War II in an effort to regain the dignity that Germany lost after the first World War and the Treaty of Versailles. Many experts understanding geopolitics agree that Vladimir Putin is prepared to initiate World War III in an effort to see again the glory of the Soviet Union. Many would also agree that the desire to regain lost dominance is a core motivation for what is called "white rage" in the United States. A sociologist once said that people will fight

harder to regain something they feel they've lost opposed to those who have never had. So, considering the alternative, Queen Elizabeth does deserve a great deal of credit for keeping the peace during a time when the form of governing that had benefitted her ancestry was falling out of favor with the world. She did not try to make Britain great again.

A thought she shared in her 1974 Christmas Broadcast illustrates her approach:

Fortunately over the centuries we have devised a way of sharing this responsibility [for each other in society], a uniquely effective system for bringing progress out of conflict. We have developed Parliamentary Government by which the rights and freedom of the people are maintained. It allows change to take place temperately and without violence. . . . This system, this product of British genius, has been successfully exported to the world wide Commonwealth.<sup>21</sup>

To her credit, after the fall of an Empire, upon which "the sun never set," I imagine the queen took inventory of and assessed what still remained. It seems that she posed, if you will, the question to herself: "After so many losses, what can I—the monarchy—yet hold to?" More than dominance and governing, her position as *sovereign* was one of morality and virtue, and that element is what still remained, if she were able to keep it. Evident by her public addresses, she dedicated her life and reign not to the two elements of dominance and the duties of governing, which were mostly lost, rather the integrity befitting the high office—the symbol—and I propose that she proved more effective with that one element of monarchy than many kings and queens had done with all three. When people,

---

<sup>20</sup> Elizabeth II, "A speech by The Queen at the Home Office, 2015," The Royal Family, November 12, 2022, <https://www.royal.uk/queens-speech-home-office-12-november-2015>.

<sup>21</sup> Elizabeth II, "Christmas Broadcast 1974," The Royal Family, November 10, 2015, <https://www.royal.uk/christmas-broadcast-1974>.

caught up in the wave of democracy, individuality, and independence, no longer wanted her sovereignty, they still wanted her virtuous representation and seemed to be proud to be called Britains because of her.

### **The Rejection of One-Person Sovereignty**

One can argue with minimal refutation that the Queen was genuinely adored at home and abroad, but still remains the looming question: if this notion of monarchial symbolism is so beautiful, then why is monarchy rejected in virtually all modern societies? Even the United Kingdom, where Queen Elizabeth II was so loved, rejects monarchy in practice. So this is a valid question. Monarchy is broadly viewed as obsolete and an overly expensive venture of maintaining a feeling, a shell, of traditional values. The purpose of this work is not to explore too deeply the origins of such rejection, if it be natural or due to centuries of cultural conditioning, (an exploration which would contribute a great deal to this ongoing research). However, this work shall seek specificity of the rejection and consider the theological and philosophical presuppositions that have historically undergirded the rejection.

### **Specifying the Aspects of Monarchy that have been Rejected**

Can monarchy be divided into parts as to see what specific parts were rejected? The rise of democracy was a response to human monarchial abuse, but what if monarchy had not been abused? The impossibility of such a scenario in a fallen world is an irrelevant point since the goal here is to understand a thing conceptually by dividing it.

Exemplifying modern manifestations of that rejection, after the queen's death, there were some who did not mourn the death of one who represented imperialism. However, even those who showed no remorse actually had very little to say about the queen personally, rather the failures and injustices of the Empire that committed those injustices in her family's name. As cruel and

unjust as Great Britain's actions may have been—and certainly they should not be overlooked—those detractors after the queen's death blamed her more for her *association* with those injustices rather than she herself committing them, and for the fact that she benefitted from those past injustices. This is a clear rejection of abuse of power and not the power itself—its existence, nature, purposes, functions, etc. It was the rejection of governmental and political methods, but does that mean monarchy in total was rejected?

This work has already attempted to consider different aspects of monarchy by observing the British crown's loss of practical power but retaining of abstract power, power over cultural identity. The following paradigm further helps to divide monarchy into parts. Society requires the management of at least three things. Most political theories identify and observe only two, which are management of people and resources, but a third should be added, which is the management of identity. The management of people entails their membership in the society, i.e. citizenship, their education and progression as individuals, the nature of their living together, and the protection or defense of their bodies and quality of life. The mechanism utilized to facilitate the management of these things is law. Varying methods of managing people are called forms of government, e.g. monarchy, democracy, oligarchy, etc.

The management of resources involves land and other commodities. The tool used to facilitate this management is currency. Varying methods of managing resources are called economic systems, e.g. capitalism, socialism, etc. Laws are also used here for facilitation purposes. These two can be considered as “practical” powers.

Thirdly is the management of identity, which includes dignity of the people and involves the culture they share. Normally, when we consider the management of society in general,



we attempt to answer the question of who has the power to manage *all* aspects, people and resources—rarely considering identity. Is society controlled by one? That is monarchy. By the people? That is democracy. By a few? That is oligarchy, and so on. However, I propose that this is an oversimplified conflation. It is possible for a society to have a blend, and I propose that in a society with a monarch who serves only as a figurehead, that society has given the management of its identity to one. This is the case with the modern United Kingdom.

**See Diagram**

**(“3 Managing Functions of Government”)**

<b>Functions</b>	Management of People	Mgmt. of Resources	Mgmt. of Identity
<b>Systems</b>	Forms of Government	Economic Systems	No widely established system
<b>Means of Facilitation/Regulation</b>	Laws	Currency, Laws	No widely established means

Obviously, there is a need in political theory to develop this third aspect of government. There does exist the concept called “social identity theory,” but its approach falls more under sociology and not political theory. Australian political scientist, Leonie Huddy, in her 2002 article, “From Social to Political Identity: A Critical Examination of Social Identity Theory,” writes, “Interest in the concept of identity has grown exponentially within both the humanities and social sciences, but the discussion of identity has had less impact than might be expected on the quantitative study of political behavior in general and on political psychology more specifically.” Also, social identity theory mostly limits consideration of social identity as a concept to be observed and studied—as is a common approach in psychology and sociology—and not a method or tool to be utilized the same way political science studies forms of government and

economic systems. In short, there is need for development in this area, and the full rejection of monarchy—a form of government that relies more on symbolism and national identity than other forms—likely suppresses the interest in developing this idea.

Perhaps it is the lack of inquiry about abstract governmental powers, along with other factors, that inhibits our recognition of monarchical aspects that we do find acceptable. Nevertheless, understanding these separate functions helps us to identify exactly what of monarchy has been widely rejected. It has been the practical powers and not the abstract that have been expressly forbidden to only one.

**Presuppositions of the Rejection of Monarchy**

The rejection of monarchy has been based on the presupposition that the business of governing should not be the responsibility of one. Monarchy has historically proven to be advantageous for the one but unfair to the whole because they have no say in their fate. The point of unfairness could be granted, especially considering that among the whole, the desire of their involvement in government is present. However, when proponents of democracy—or detractors of monarchy—argue against monarchy on principles of fairness, one should ask specificity of the type of unfairness. There is the idea of something being in opposition to the *cosmic* sense of balance or justice. This can be defined as unfair. But secondly, there is the idea of something being in opposition to the will or pleasure of humankind. We also call this unfair. It appears to me that democratic ideals rely more on the later, especially considering one of the mantras of democracy: “the will of the people.” The appeal in most democratic theory is to human consciousness and not cosmic balance. Therefore, it seems that, in the pattern of democratic theory, monarchy is unfair not because it is in opposition to the cosmos but because it is in opposition to what the majority of humans desire. One could argue that within early treatises in the democratic

movement, the former concept was present, but if so, it was certainly the later that those proponents explicated.

Nonetheless, withstanding that monarchy is *unfair* to the whole, that still does not address its expediency and efficiency. Early proponents of monarchy, or absolute sovereignty in one, preferred forms of government based on efficiency opposed to human desirability. Both Thomas Hobbes and Carl Schmitt are primary examples. Both of these political theorists pose discomfort to the modern mind, and rightfully so. Thomas Hobbes, whose primary concern was eliminating the threat of civil war, particularly in the context of his 17<sup>th</sup> century England, arrived at absolute monarchy as the solution in his famed *Leviathan*. Because humans, according to Hobbes, need to be protected from themselves, the most reasonable action that any society can take is compose a social contract by which they give all power to one for the safety of all. From such a system, glaring to the modern mind would be the lack of individualism and freedom of human spirit. On the other hand, Carl Schmitt, German political theorist, in his work *Political Theology*, refutes the relatively new ideals of liberal constitutionalism, arguing for man's need of sovereignty in one person. (Besides Schmitt's ideas, his support for the antisemitic German Nazi party, led by Adolf Hitler, poses obvious moral conflict.) The modern mind appreciates constitutionalism, which is the idea that people adhere to a higher moral order, especially presented in a written text, instead of a singular person.

The contributions of both of these men must be used with somewhat of a disclaimer. Nevertheless, their works are still very important to the discipline of political theory and must be considered. They are important to this work particularly because, like them or not, they

highlight the importance that government be efficient.

Hobbes, in *Leviathan*, wrote, "The Greatest of humane Powers, is that which is compounded of the Powers of most men, united by consent, in one person, Naturall, or Civill, that has the use of all their Powers depending on his will; such as is the Power of a Common-wealth."<sup>22</sup> It was noted previously that rejection of monarchy took in consideration of what was *fair* for the whole; ironically, what motivates Hobbes's proposition is his consideration for the whole. Hobbes does not even recognize any benefit that absolute sovereignty brings to the one, instead considering the safety it brings to the whole, but this is because he is thinking in terms of what benefits society most in expediency and not in desire.

Carl Schmitt, in *Political Theology*, contributes immensely to this discussion with his observation of "the exception" in jurisprudence. The exception can be defined as an emergency that threatens the normal order in, and even the existence of, a society and an emergency that is so grave that it requires immediate attention, a drastic response, and demands the suspension of the rules—or laws—that had governed that society. According to Schmitt, the "sovereign" is the person "who decides in a situation of conflict what constitutes the public interest or interest of the state, public safety and order."<sup>23</sup> In other words, should one wonder who is the most powerful person in a society—and in most societies, who that person is is not as clear as many may think—the answer to that question is whomever would be given full authority should an emergency arise that threatens the existence of them all. According to Schmitt that person is the true "sovereign," and the exception is not something that creates sovereignty but identifies it.

I am in no way a Hobbesian, and I certainly

---

<sup>22</sup> Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. C. B. Macpherson (New York: Penguin Classics, 1982), 150.

<sup>23</sup> Carl Schmitt, *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*, trans. George Schwab (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1985), 6.

would not align myself with Schmitt, but I do recognize the need to not only address what humans *want* in a government—which apparently is involvement—but also the efficiency that we *need* in our government. What Hobbes’s and Schmitt’s contemplations reveal is the inescapability of monarchy, even its practical aspects such as the management of resources, people, and of their defense. Even without its abstract and idealistic beauty, government by one is a difficult method to annihilate. This is not to say that the democratic method is not worth defending. In my humble opinion, it is worth our efforts, and I would not want to live—in a fallen world—under any other form of government except democracy. However, I can hold to democracy as the best temporal solution and at the same time defend the fact that monarchy seems to be the default and baseline form of government among human beings. Every other form of government seems to be an attempt to escape that default.

But I want to consider Schmitt and his concept of the exception further because this concept best highlights society’s need for one person to have sovereignty. Since Schmitt sees the exception as a real scenario taking place in time and space, it is something that requires a decision, which in turn requires a human agent. Schmitt, recognizing the rise in and preference for democratic ideals, points out the difficulties with the concept of multiple humans sharing sovereignty or anything non-human possessing sovereignty, such as a written constitution or law itself. Systems with multi-human or non-human sovereigns are untenable political situations in the case of the exception. Schmitt’s concept of the exception is important to this work because the possibility of the exception demonstrates the impossibility of any society in the truest sense rejecting all aspects of one-person sovereignty.

Explaining presence of the exception, Schmitt writes:

The exception, which is not codified in the existing legal order, can at best be characterized as a case of extreme peril, a danger to the existence of the state, or the like. . . . The precise details of an emergency cannot be anticipated, nor can one spell out what may take place in such a case, especially when it is truly a matter of an extreme emergency and of how it is to be eliminated. The precondition as well as the content of jurisdictional competence in such a case must necessarily be unlimited. From the liberal constitutional point of view, there would be no jurisdictional competence at all. The most guidance the constitution can provide is to indicate who can act in such a case. If such action is not subject to controls, if it is not hampered in some way by checks and balances, as is the case in a liberal constitution, then it is clear who the sovereign is. He decides whether there is an extreme emergency as well as what must be done to eliminate it. Although he stands outside the normally valid legal system, he nevertheless belongs to it, for it is he who must decide whether the constitution needs to be suspended in its entirety. All tendencies of modern constitutional development point toward eliminating the sovereign in this sense. . . . But whether the extreme exception can be banished from the world is not a juristic question. Whether one has confidence and hope that it can be eliminated depends on philosophical, especially on philosophical-historical or metaphysical convictions.<sup>24</sup>

Schmitt explores countries’ movements toward constitutional frameworks of government in order to avoid governmental decisions being made by one person. However, in a fallen world the state of “exception” can rise at any time,

---

<sup>24</sup> Schmitt, *Political Theology*, 6-7.

triggering the need for a human decision. Of course, the description of the cosmos being “fallen” is a metaphysical designation, which Schmitt did reference. Further, even practical monarchy is very difficult to escape because even in governments that rely on a text, as do constitutional governments, the text can only be implemented by agents possessing will.

Observing the concept of “the sovereignty of law,” which is a non-human sovereignty, Schmitt quotes Hugo Krabble:

The modern idea of the state, according to Krabble, replaces personal force (of the king, of the authorities) with spiritual power. “We no longer live under the authority of persons, be they natural or artificial (legal) persons, but under the rule of laws, (spiritual) forces. This is the essence of the modern idea of the state. . . . These forces rule in the strictest sense of the word. Precisely because these forces emanate from the spiritual nature of man, they can be obeyed voluntarily.” The basis, the source of the legal order, is “to be found only in men’s feeling or sense of right.”<sup>25</sup>

Krabble, like the founding fathers of the U. S., had a high view of humankind’s moral aptitude. Among political theorists, there seems to be a tendency that confidence in democratic and or constitutional forms of government coincide with confidence in human morality. The presupposition is that the government of one is not necessary because of the moral reliability of the whole, or at least the majority. With a democratic philosophy, the whole is moral enough to govern themselves, and in a constitutional philosophy, the whole is moral enough to submit to a higher moral law, to recognize their own lack of sovereignty and adhere to the “sovereignty of law.” Of course, Hobbes does not place such trust in humans, thus

the need for a sovereign, as an arbitrator. Schmitt identifies the facade of this concept, demonstrating that all societies, whether they realize it or not, in fact have one sovereign whom the exception reveals. According to Schmitt, “The multifarious theories of the concept of sovereignty . . . demand such an objectivity. They agree that all personal elements must be eliminated from the concept of the state.”<sup>26</sup>

Hobbes evidently cannot even imagine political “power” that is not held by humans and relative to other humans:

To have servants, is Power; To have friends, is Power: for they are strengths united. Also Riches joynd with liberality, is Power; because it procureth friends, and servants. . . Reputation of power, is Power; because it draweth with it the adherence of those that need protection. . . Reputation of Prudence in the conduct of Peace or War, is Power; because to prudent men, we commit the government of our selves, more willingly than to others.<sup>27</sup>

Nonetheless, as long as a society can go on without the occurrence of the exception, that society may continue to operate in full rejection of government by one human agent.

The theological aspect of Schmitt’s proposal is a referendum on rationalism and its attempt—in “the development of the nineteenth-century theory of the state”—to eliminate “all theistic and transcendental conceptions” and to form “a new concept of legitimacy.”<sup>28</sup> In an attempt to pinpoint the philosophical origins of the rejection of one-person sovereignty, Schmitt writes:

All significant concepts of the modern theory of the state are secularized theological concepts . . . because of their systematic structure, the recognition of which is necessary for a sociological

---

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 22.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., 29.

<sup>27</sup> Hobbes, *Leviathan*, 150-1.

<sup>28</sup> Schmitt, *Political Theology*, 51.

consideration of these concepts. The exception in jurisprudence is analogous to the miracle in theology. Only by being aware of this analogy can we appreciate the manner in which the philosophical ideas of the state developed in the last centuries. The idea of the modern constitutional state triumphed together with deism, a theology and metaphysics that banished the miracle from the world. This theology and metaphysics rejected not only the transgression of the laws of nature through an exception brought about by direct intervention, as is found in the idea of a miracle, but also the sovereign's direct intervention in a valid legal order. The rationalism of the Enlightenment rejected the exception in every form. Conservative authors of the counter-revolution who were theists could thus attempt to support the personal sovereignty of the monarch ideologically, with the aid of analogies from a theistic theology.<sup>29</sup>

Now, what is there to gain from these considerations? Are they to show the necessity of monarchy? More accurately, they are to show the metaphysical necessity of one-person sovereignty. For practical and symbolic purposes, there is a necessity of one.

### **The King: Identity Symbolic Representation of Christ**

Let us turn again to the general concept of identity symbolic representation. What we gain from Hobbes and Schmitt is the inescapability of—or at least the difficulty of escaping—the singular sovereign person, that it is the default form of government, despite efforts to give sovereignty to multiple humans, texts, or abstract ideals. And what we observe through the reign of Queen Elizabeth II is people's allowance for one virtuous person to have total sovereignty in abstract powers in order to be their identity

symbolic representative. And, concerning theistic political theology, one could argue that the rise of democratic ideals, which emerged with the unorthodox approach of deism—as noted by Schmitt—promoted humanist ideals of self-reliance separate from God. Yet, despite these drawbacks, modern rejection of monarchy can be viewed positively. The argument could also be made, simultaneously, that its proponents were—unwittingly or knowingly—affirming a very Christian orthodox view. They correctly observed that absolute power had been repeatedly held by corrupt persons and arrived at a moral conclusion that corrupt persons should not hold absolute power. They simply did not account for the metaphysical reality that there is One in whom is no corruption and who is the perfect representative of His people.

As stated in Rom. 5 and I Cor. 15, the believer is found “in Christ.” As our spiritual status—that is our position before God—“in Adam” was corporate in nature, so is our nature “in Christ.” The limits of soteriology cannot be the forgiveness of sins of individuals but must also include the constitution of those individuals into one body. As the Queen represented a sense of togetherness for the British, so does Christ for believers. To the redeemed individual, Jesus is Savior, but to the corporate group, he is King. In traditional monarchy—in which one person holds all power practical and abstract—the monarch *is* the state and is the representative of the people's identity. In modern, weakened monarchy, the monarch is a representative of people's concerns, similar to a representative in a republic. Jesus is both. He represents the group's need for salvation, but he also represents our identity because the former would not be possible with our own identity. Our salvation cannot be legitimate without our identifying with and in him, so that being “in Christ” is not simply the acceptance of salvation but the joining in his identity that he provides to the group. Identity, in

---

<sup>29</sup> Schmitt, *Political Theology*, 36-7.

the sense of union, was at the root of Jesus' baptism. He identified with our humanity that we might share in his divine nature.

He is the One Person with sovereignty, and, similar to the political theology of Schmitt, there is an "exception" that reveals his sovereignty. In the government of the cosmos, sin is the exception. It is the unfortunate event that calls for one person to interject himself into the system in order to restore order. That one person had to be divine, but, in order that humans—the responsible agents for sin, who justice demanded make atonement—be able to find representation in that one, he also had to be man. Thus, Jesus was the God-Man born to represent us and be king of those who seek not just forgiveness of sins but new and righteous and restored identity in him.

The King accomplished a great deal, spiritually and practically, during his earthly life, but for the sake of this work and its focus, let us consider the value in the Sovereign's simple presence by focusing on the time of his life when he "did nothing" but be a symbol. If the Savior had come as a fully grown man, he still would have been completely righteous, for his righteousness was not rooted in his age but in his very being. However, the Word came first in silence in a form that symbolizes complete purity: in the form of a baby. During Advent, it is always appropriate to meditate on a very simple, yet profound and pregnant question: In all forms the Sovereign could have come, why an infant? To this question, there may be no definitive answer (that we can comprehend on this side) but all the more reason to meditate on it each year.

### **Meditation 1**

First, a baby does not talk. Jesus came as a silent King with all sovereignty. He did not proclaim himself as King at his entrance, but as an infant he came with no verbal means of asserting his righteousness or right to rule. He allowed Scripture, angels, and men to proclaim these, and his silence asserted his inherent

authority. Not Jesus, but the angel Gabriel told Mary that "the Lord God will *give* him the throne of his father David" (Lk. 1:32), and later, another angel, accompanied by a host, proclaimed him as the Messiah [Lk. 1:11]. Wise men from the east came, asking, "Where is he who has been *born* king of the Jews?" (Mt. 2:2). Matthew is drawing an obvious contrast between Herod the Great, a half-Jewish man who worked hard to *become* king, and Jesus, who was *born* king. This point is drawn out not only in the wise men's question but also in the rest of the pericope wherein Herod the Great goes through great lengths to assert his right to rule versus the infant Jesus who *does nothing*, is only carried by his lowly earthly family, and protected by God. Jesus practiced what I like to call "silent sovereignty."

Scripture undoubtedly draws a connection between silence and virtue. "Lord, set up a guard for my mouth; keep watch at the door of my lips" (Ps. 141:3). "In the multitude of words sin is not lacking, But he who restrains his lips is wise" (Prvb. 10:19). "Even a fool is considered wise when he keeps silent—discerning, when he seals his lips" (Prvb. 17:28). "On the day of judgment people will have to account for every careless word they speak" (Mt. 12:36). "Everyone should be quick to listen, slow to speak, and slow to anger" (Jas. 1:19). "For we all stumble in many ways. If anyone does not stumble in what he says, he is mature, able also to control the whole body" (Jas. 3:2).

Even in the United States, among its three branches of government, is it a coincidence that the branch thought by many to require the service of only the wisest is also the branch expected to be the most silent. Though all three branches are equal, and no branch actually has the "last word" in a legal sense, the judicial branch is treated—at least in recent times—as a quasi-arbiter between the executive and legislative. A societal—not constitutional—expectation upon judges is that they verbalize their opinions the least. This is evident by the shock and news coverage of rare

occasions when judges do voice their opinions. For some strange reason, there is an expectation for this particular part of government to do its work in complete silence.

All four gospel writers to varying degrees portray Jesus as King, but his kingship is not the writers' focus at all points of his earthly life. This portrayal seems to be highlighted at two particular points in his life: his birth and death. Interestingly, it is also these stages, the beginning and end of his life, when he practiced silence. Silence at his birth has been sufficiently noted, but consider his silence during his passion. "He was oppressed and afflicted, yet he did not open his mouth. Like a lamb led to the slaughter and like a sheep silent before her shearers, he did not open his mouth" (Is. 53:7). In this same chapter, Isaiah's particular focus is on Jesus as the Righteous Sufferer, enumerating evidences of his righteousness, his silence being one of them. Beyond evidences, his silence, during his suffering, would also serve as an identifying marker, another "look-for" to help the Jewish people identify their Messiah. This is one reason Jesus' silence is pointed out in the gospels [Mt. 26:63; 27:12, 14; Mk. 14:61; Jn. 19:9]. When the leaders repeatedly demanded that he speak in order to prove that he was king, his silence was actually proof—fulfilled prophecy—that proved his sovereignty. More interestingly, these two times that receive more attention to his kingship are also the two times when Christ is celebrated most in the religious calendar, i.e, Christmas and Easter.

### **Meditation 2**

Secondly, the baby, specifically for the children of Abraham, often serves as a symbol. Throughout the Hebrews' story, there remains a mysterious connection between infants and the deliverance of the LORD. Miraculous conceptions and births occur so often in their history that they become a part of their identity as a people.

One should first consider the pattern that when God prepared to deliver his people, he did so by raising up a male child out of an impossible birth situation. When God desired to birth a nation, he gave a son to a one-hundred-year-old Abraham and a ninety-year-old Sarah, and that son's name was Isaac. From this "promised son" was initiated their identity as a people of promise. When God desired to preserve that family from famine, he gave a son to a barren Rachel, and that son's name was Joseph. When God desired to deliver that people from bondage in Egypt, he preserved the life of Moses, who was "drawn out" of the water, resembling resurrection from the dead since this infant was born under a death decree. Further, God gave a son to a barren—yet praying—woman named Hannah, and that son's name was Samuel. One of the greatest judges—evident by the space that the Judges writer(s) gives to him—was Samson, whose mother was barren. John the Baptist was born to aged parents, Zechariah and Elizabeth. Finally, Jesus, who would "save his people from their sins" (Mt. 1:21), came out of the most impossible birth situation, which was prophesied in Is. 7:14: "the virgin will conceive, have a son, and name him Immanuel."

In the writings of Isaiah, the "child-sign" is developed more explicitly through the prophet's own children. In Isaiah, the child is an instrument God uses to create anticipation among his people as they await fulfillment of a promise. This is the case with Is. 7:14-16; c.f. 8:1-10, 18; 9:6-7; 11:6, 8. This collection of chapters in Isaiah is the prime example of God using a child as a sign.

The infant Jesus was identified as a "sign." According to Lk. 2:34, Simeon, through the Holy Spirit (vv. 25-27), prophesies, "this child is destined to cause the fall and rise of many in Israel and to be a sign [σημεῖον] that will be opposed," which indicates the divisive figure Jesus would be and that the nature of his ministry would leave no room for neutrality. One commentator said it well that "Jesus was a

spiritual divider of society.”<sup>30</sup> “Thus, Jesus’s coming is seen at the outset as a sign of both hope and warning for Israel.”<sup>31</sup>

The picture of impossible, or mysterious, birth becomes an identifying marker of God’s people in the NT. Jesus, in Jn. 3, tells Nicodemus that those who participate in the kingdom—under his kingship and sovereignty—are those who are “born again/from above,” which is identification with Christ, who comes “from God” (v. 2), i.e. “from above.” That this people of the kingdom are wrought miraculously and mysteriously is shown in Nicodemus’s difficulty of comprehending their birth, asking, “How can anyone be born when he is old?” (v. 4). Also, the symbol of baptism, which resembles birth, is a holy sacrament given to the church. (The term “sacrament” to describe baptism is preferred here over “ordinance” because “sacrament” emphasizes that the sign demonstrates a mystery of the gospel since “the word *sacrament* is derived from the Latin term for mystery.”)<sup>32</sup> Jesus, in order to be the representative of this newly formed and peculiar people and to give them a new and righteous identity, participated in both physical birth and baptism.

### Conclusion

Reflecting on how Jesus perfectly represents the righteous identity of Christians, it would not be adequate to stop with just this abstract sovereignty. As the one true King, he is sovereign in all respects. The political theologies of Schmitt and Hobbes have a fundamental notion of government through human agency. Liberal constitutionalism replaces the human with a concept or idea. This paradigm does not fit in the biblical ideal of the King’s eternal government.

(That is not to say that it cannot fit in secular political frameworks. It is not fair to identify other frameworks as temporary—and they are temporary—and then hold those frameworks to the same standards as a framework meant to be eternal.) In the biblical political paradigm, a person, and not an idea, is absolutely necessary.

The government of ancient Israel, which was also temporary, required a human agent (not because God was establishing in Israel a model for all secular governments but because he was establishing a type in anticipation for the eternal reign of Christ). Harold W. Tribble, in his book, *From Adam to Moses*, as he considers the first pages of Exodus, writes, “As the last of the Genesis account was closed with the story of Joseph, so this new period opens with a study of the life of Moses.”<sup>33</sup> As God is establishing a nation, the biblical focus, from the beginning, is not on the nation but on the person whom the nation must obey. The point being: God did not have his people to obey ideas but people. This is made clearer in Dt. 18:15-19:<sup>34</sup>

The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among your own brothers. You must listen to him. This is what you requested from the Lord your God at Horeb on the day of the assembly when you said, ‘Let us not continue to hear the voice of the Lord our God or see this great fire any longer, so that we will not die!’ Then the Lord said to me, ‘They have spoken well. I will raise up for them a prophet like you from among their brothers. I will put my words in his mouth, and he will tell them everything I command him. I will hold accountable whoever does not listen to my words that

---

<sup>30</sup> E. Ray Clendenen & Jeremy Royal Howard, ed. *Holman Illustrated Bible Commentary* (Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 2015), 1089.

<sup>31</sup> Andreas J. Köstenberger, L. Scott Kellum, & Charles L. Quarles, *The Cradle, the Cross, and the Crown: An Introduction to the New Testament* (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2016), 336.

<sup>32</sup> Mark E. Dever, “The Church,” in *A Theology for the Church*, ed. Daniel L. Akin, Bruce Riley Ashford, and Kenneth Keathley (Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 2014), 615.

<sup>33</sup> Harold W. Tribble, *From Adam to Moses* (Nashville: The Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, 1934), 92.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 92.



he speaks in my name.

This passage is quoted in Acts 3:22-26 but with an additional note that it had been fulfilled in Jesus: “God raised up his servant and sent him first to you to bless you by turning each of you from your evil ways” (v. 26). Thus, though the believer’s righteous identity, in an abstract way, is found in Jesus, obedience to him is practical in that he literally turns us from our “evil ways.” This obedience spoken of here is echoed in the Father’s command at Jesus’ transfiguration, “This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well-pleased. Listen to [obey] him!” (Mt. 17:5). Thus, in the biblical paradigm, there will not be obedience to

an abstract idea of justice and righteousness but adherence to a Person.

One good quality about earthly monarchs and monarchies is that they remind us, through their failures, of something unreachable. There is immeasurable value in having a goal that cannot be reached. As long as there is at least one society on earth with a king or queen, we should be reminded that the perfect exists. If, in a world wherein kings have gone out of style, one woman can win the loyalty of her people through integrity and virtue, surely the righteous King of kings should garner our admiration, and we should show our desire for him to represent us as we confess, “Jesus is Lord.”

## Bibliography

Barron, Robert. "Queen Elizabeth II: Faithful Disciple." Word on Fire. September 13, 2022.

<https://www.wordonfire.org/articles/barron/elizabeth-ii-faithful-disciple/>.

Clendenen, E. Ray and Jeremy Royal Howard, ed. *Holman Illustrated Bible Commentary*.

Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 2015.

Dever, Mark E. "The Church." In *A Theology for the Church*, edited by Daniel L. Akin, Bruce

Riley Ashford, and Kenneth Keathley, 603-68. Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 2014.

Elizabeth II. "Christmas Broadcast 1974." The Royal Family. November 10, 2015.

<https://www.royal.uk/christmas-broadcast-1974>.

———. "Christmas Broadcast 1997." The Royal Family. November 16, 2015.

<https://www.royal.uk/christmas-broadcast-1997>.

———. "Christmas Broadcast 2002." The Royal Family. November 16, 2015.

<https://www.royal.uk/christmas-broadcast-2002>.

———. "Christmas Broadcast 2012." The Royal Family. November 17, 2015.

<https://www.royal.uk/christmas-broadcast-2012>.

———. "The Christmas Broadcast 2017." The Royal Family. December 25, 2017.

<https://www.royal.uk/christmas-broadcast-2017>.

———. "A Platinum Jubilee Message from the Queen." The Royal Family. June 1, 2022.

<https://www.royal.uk/platinum-jubilee-message-queen>.

- . “The Queen's Accession Day Message.” The Royal Family. February 5, 2022. <https://www.royal.uk/queens-accession-day-message>.
- . “The Queen's Commonwealth Day Message 2022.” The Royal Family. March 14, 2022. <https://www.royal.uk/queens-commonwealth-day-message-2022>.
- . “A speech by the Queen at the Home Office, 2015.” The Royal Family. November 12, 2015. <https://www.royal.uk/queens-speech-home-office-12-november-2015>.
- . “Thank You Message from Her Majesty the Queen Following the Platinum Jubilee Weekend.” The Royal Family. June 5, 2022. <https://www.royal.uk/thank-you-message-her-majesty-queen%C2%A0following-platinum-jubilee-weekend>.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. Edited by C. B. Macpherson. New York: Penguin Classics, 1982.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J., L. Scott Kellum, & Charles L. Quarles. *The Cradle, the Cross, and the Crown: An Introduction to the New Testament*. Nashville: B&H Academic, 2016.
- National Today. “History of Commonwealth Day.” National Today. 2022. <https://nationaltoday.com/commonwealth-day/>.
- Schmitt, Carl. *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*. Translated by George Schwab. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.
- Spencer, Nick. “Queen Elizabeth II: Faith and Virtue.” Theos Think Tank. September 29, 2022. <https://www.theosthinktank.co.uk/comment/2022/09/09/queen-elizabeth-ii-faith-and-virtue>.
- Westminster Abbey. “Celebrating the Commonwealth.” Westminster Abbey. 2022. <https://www.westminster-abbey.org/about-the-abbey/history/celebrating-the-commonwealth>.