

There would appear to be three distinctions that are necessary to any adequate theological analysis of authority.

First, there is the distinction between *causative* and *normative* authority.

Second, there is the distinction between *executive* (= deontic) and *nonexecutive* (= epistemic, exemplary) authority.

And third, there is the distinction between *de facto* and *de jure* authority.

But what if the first and second distinctions are really only verbally different ways of making the same distinction? In that event, only two distinctions would be necessary to adequately analyzing authority theologically.

July 1996; rev. 19 July 2006