

## Rudolf Voderholzer's Book on Henri de Lubac and Walter J. Ong's Thought

Thomas J. Farrell

Professor Emeritus in Writing Studies

University of Minnesota Duluth

Web: [www.d.umn.edu/~t Farrell](http://www.d.umn.edu/~t Farrell)

Email: [t Farrell@d.umn.edu](mailto:t Farrell@d.umn.edu)

My favorite scholar, the American Jesuit polymath Walter J. Ong (1912-2003; Ph.D. in English, Harvard University, 1955) of Saint Louis University, the Jesuit university in St. Louis, Missouri (USA), attributes the collective American cultural breakdown/breakthrough in the 1960s to the impact of the critical mass of communications media that accentuate sound. He does this most notably in his book *The Presence of the Word: Some Prolegomena for Cultural and Religious History* (Yale University Press, 1967), the expanded version of Ong's 1964 Terry Lectures at Yale's Divinity School. (Broadly speaking, the prestigious Terry Lectures center on religious history.)

Now, the German-born-and-educated Roman Catholic priest and theologian Rudolf Voderholzer's 222-page book *Meet Henri de Lubac*, translated by Michael J. Miller (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2008) is accessible. It is a translation of Voderholzer's 1999 175-page book in German, which in turn is based on his 1998 564-page book in German about de Lubac, whose theological views contributed to the Second Vatican Council. (Voderholzer was made bishop of the diocese of Regensburg in Germany in 2012.)

On January 25, 1959, Pope John XXIII (formerly known as Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli) announced the council. On October 11, 1962, it opened. On December 8, 1965, it closed. In the meantime, Pope John XXIII had died on June 3, 1963, and on June 21, 1963, Pope Paul VI (formerly known as Giovanni Montini) was elected the new pope.

Vatican II was a watershed moment for the Roman Catholic Church. Basically, the church made its peace with other religious traditions, most notably with the Jewish religious tradition.

The key documents approved at Vatican II have been gathered together in the book *Vatican II: The Essential Texts*, edited by Norman Tanner, S.J., with prefatory material by Edward P. Hahnenberg (New York: Image, 2012). Your guess is as good as mine as to how many practicing Catholics ever read the key documents of Vatican II.

For an accessible history of Vatican II, see the American Jesuit church historian John W. O'Malley's book *What Happened at Vatican II* (Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008).

In O'Malley's estimate, "de Lubac's theological vision was reflected in the form and substance of the key document of the council, *Lumen Gentium*" (page 119).

As O'Malley notes, the American Jesuit theologian John Courtney Murray (1904-1967) was influential in the writing of Vatican II's document on religious freedom, *Dignitatis Humanae* (On the Dignity of the Human Person). By all accounts, no other American was as influential at Vatican II as he was.

No doubt the various official changes that Vatican II inaugurated in the church helped enhance the status of American Catholics in the prestige culture in American culture.

My purpose in the present essay is to explore de Lubac's thought as reported by Voderholzer and Ong's thought. Like Murray and certain other Roman Catholic theologians, de Lubac was influential at Vatican II, as I will explain below. In connection with Ong's thought, I should say here that de Lubac's various books involved historical studies, and so his books fall within the broad parameters of cultural and religious history that Ong expressly refers in the subtitle of his 1967 book mentioned above. Not surprisingly, however, de Lubac does not happen to advert to certain prolegomena that Ong refers to in his ambitious 1967 book (and elsewhere).

As far as I know, Ong does not refer to de Lubac in any of his publications. But it is extremely unlikely that Ong did not know de Lubac, because Ong lived in a Jesuit residence in Paris for three years in the early 1950s and de Lubac also lived for a time in Paris in the early 1950s (according to Voderholzer, pages 12 and 71).

Now, Walter Jackson Ong, Jr., was born on November 30, 1912, in Kansas City, Missouri. In September 1935, he entered the Jesuit order (known formally as the Society of Jesus), which was founded by the Spanish mystic St. Ignatius Loyola (1491-1556). As part of Ong's lengthy Jesuit training, he twice made a 30-day retreat in silence, except for daily conferences with the retreat director, following the *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius Loyola. On June 16, 1946, Ong was ordained a priest at St. Mary's College church in Kansas. On February 2, 1953, Father Ong took his final vows in the Society of Jesus in Paris. On August 13, 2003, Father Ong died in a suburban St. Louis hospital.

For a readable history of the early Jesuits, see John W. O'Malley's book *The First Jesuits* (Harvard University Press, 1993).

For a fast-paced and at times vivid history of the American Jesuits, see the American Catholic historian John T. McGreevy's book *American Jesuits and the World: How an Embattled Religious Order Made Modern Catholicism Global* (Princeton University Press, 2016).

Like all Jesuit priests, Ong studied theology as part of his Jesuit training. But he did not teach theology regularly in a department of theology or in a department of religious studies or in a school of divinity, as most professional theologians in the Roman Catholic Church today tend to do. In terms of the broad categorization of conservatives and liberals in the rarified world of Roman Catholic theology today, I'm not sure that Ong would be categorized as a conservative. As far as I know, his thesis about technology is not widely embraced by either conservatives or liberals in the rarified world of Roman Catholic theology today. Nevertheless, Ong was the first Jesuit ever invited to deliver the prestigious Terry Lectures at Yale's Divinity School.

In the preface to the book *Interfaces of the Word: Studies in the Evolution of Consciousness and Culture* (Cornell University Press, 1977), Ong describes his thesis as sweeping and relationist, but not reductionistic, because it does "not maintain that the evolution from primary orality through writing and

print to an electronic culture, which produces secondary orality, causes or explains everything in human culture and consciousness. Rather, the thesis is relationist: major developments [such as modern science, modern capitalism, modern democracy, the Industrial Revolution, and the Romantic Movement], and very likely all major developments, in culture and consciousness are related, often in unexpected intimacy, to the evolution of the word from primary orality to the present state" (pages 9-10).

Now, the title of Ong's 1967 book, mentioned above, refers to the presence of both the lowercase "word" of our ordinary human experience of spoken language and to the capitalized "Word" in the Christian tradition of thought. The capitalized Word in the Christian tradition of thought is based on the prologue of the Gospel According to John. The capitalized Word in the Christian tradition of thought refers to the supposed person known as Jesus Christ, the supposed divine messiah, who is also known as the second person of the supposed divine trinity.

For different accounts of presence, see the following three studies:

(1) the Swiss Catholic theologian Hans Urs von Balthasar's book *Presence and Thought: An Essay on the Religious Philosophy of Gregory of Nyssa*, translated by Mark Sebanc (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1995; orig. French ed., 1998);

(2) the German art historian Hans Belting's book *Likeness and Presence: A History of the Image before the Era of Art*, translated by Edmund Jephcott (University of Chicago Press, 1994; orig. German ed., 1990);

(3) the American Catholic priest and theologian Robert Sokolowski's book *Eucharistic Presence: A Study in the Theology of Disclosure* (Catholic University of America Press, 1994).

In any event, when Ong was researching his Harvard University doctoral dissertation on the French logician and educational reformer and Protestant martyr Peter Ramus (1515-1572), Ong was based for three years in the early 1950s at a Jesuit residence in Paris. At that time, Ong first read the French Jesuit paleontologist and religious thinker Pierre Teilhard de Chardin's writings in manuscript form. In a 1952 review essay in a journal published at Saint Louis University, Ong became one of the first American Catholics to call Teilhard's thought to the attention of his fellow American Catholics. Ong never tired of referring to Teilhard the rest of his life.

Pierre Teilhard de Chardin was born on May 1, 1881, in Sarcenat, France. On March 20, 1899, he entered the Society of Jesus (known informally as the Jesuit order). On August 24, 1911, he was ordained a priest. In 1914, he was drafted into the French army and served as a stretcher-bearer. In 1918, he made his final vows in the Jesuit order. In 1919, he was demobilized. On April 10, 1955, he died in New York City at the age of 74.

Teilhard's most enduring posthumously published works are the following two books:

(1) *The Human Phenomenon*, translated by Sarah Appleton-Weber (Brighton and Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 1999);

(2) *The Divine Milieu*, translated by Sion Cowell (Brighton and Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 2004). The secondary literature about Teilhard's thought is extensive.

Briefly, in theological terminology, Teilhard postulated what may be styled an evolutionary christology (i.e., a christology is a theological theory centering on the supposed person known as Jesus Christ, the supposed divine messiah). Not only Roman Catholic theologians but also Protestant theologians write christological works. Now, if you subscribe to the Christian claim about the incarnation of the Word, it is not a big leap to understanding Teilhard's postulated evolutionary christology.

But in Teilhard's lifetime, he was forbidden to publish his writings postulating an evolutionary christology because of the Roman Catholic Church's critique of Darwinian evolutionary theory as an alternative to the literal interpretation of the two accounts of creation in Genesis. However, after Teilhard died in New York City in 1955, his literary executor arranged to have his writings published in French. His published writings were quickly translated into English and other languages. Teilhard's posthumously published writings about evolutionary christology rocked the Roman Catholic world.

In 1950, Pope Pius XII (formerly known as Eugenio Pacelli) criticized Darwinian evolutionary theory in his encyclical *Humani Generis*. But later popes such as Pope John-Paul II and Pope Benedict XVI and Pope Francis (formerly known as Jorge Bergoglio) have made their peace with the literal interpretation of the two accounts of creation in Genesis by allowing that Darwinian evolutionary theory may not be incompatible with the way in which God's creation evolved. However, in the United States to this day, certain Protestant Evangelicals have continued to see Darwinian evolutionary theory as incompatible with the literal interpretation of the two accounts of creation in Genesis. In short, American Protestant Evangelicals today tend to resist Teilhard's christological interpretation of the two accounts of creation in Genesis in light of the role of the capitalized Word in creation in the prologue of the Gospel According to John.

Now, in the English-speaking world, the French Jesuit theologian Henri de Lubac (1896-1991), who was made a cardinal in 1983 by Pope John-Paul II, was widely known for his books in the 1960s about Teilhard's thought. In the 1960s, de Lubac published the following books about Teilhard's thought:

(1) *The Religion of Teilhard de Chardin*, translated by Rene Hague (New York: Desclee, 1967; orig. French ed., 1962);

(2) *Teilhard de Chardin: The Man and His Meaning*, translated by Rene Hague (New York: Hawthorn Books, 1965; orig. French ed. 1964);

(3) *Teilhard Explained*, translated by Anthony Buono (New York: Paulist Press, 1968; orig. French ed., 1966);

(4) *The Eternal Feminine: A Study on the Poem by Teilhard de Chardin, Followed by Teilhard and the Problems of Today*, translated by Rene Hague (New York: Harper & Row, 1971; orig. French ed., 1968).

De Lubac also contributed notes and commentary to Pierre Teilhard de Chardin and Maurice Blonde's *Correspondence*, translated by William Whitman (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967; orig. French ed., 1965).

In addition, de Lubac contributed a preface to Pierre Teilhard de Chardin's *Letters from Egypt, 1905-1908*, translated by Mary Ilford (New York: Herder and Herder, 1965; orig. French ed., 1965).

Pope Francis, the first Jesuit pope, refers to Teilhard's evolutionary christology in his eco-encyclical. In footnote 53, the pope says, "Against this horizon [of the ultimate destiny of the universe, mentioned in paragraph number 83], we can set the contribution of Fr. Teilhard de Chardin."

Incidentally, in paragraph number 200 of the pope's eco-encyclical, Pope Francis has one sentence that sounds like a gloss on Ong's thought both in his 1967 book, mentioned above: "Cultural limitations in different eras often affected the perception of these ethical and spiritual treasures [of wisdom in religious traditions]." (However, I have no reason to think that Pope Francis is actually familiar with Ong's 1967 book.)

Over his lifetime, de Lubac was a prolific author. Not all of his works have been translated into English, evidently because professional theologians are expected to know French. Because the interpretation of the two accounts of creation in Genesis and the interpretation of the prologue of the Gospel According to John are important in the Christian tradition of thought, I want to single out here de Lubac's massively researched four-volume study titled *Medieval Exegesis: The Four Senses of Scripture*, translated by Mark Sebanc (Vol. 1) and E. M. Macierowski (Vols. 2 and 3; Vol. 4 in progress) (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998, 2000, and 2009; Vol. 4, forthcoming). The four volumes were originally published in French in 1959 (Vols. 1 and 2), 1961, and 1964 – roughly the same time period when de Lubac was publishing the books about Teilhard's thought.

The four senses of scripture that emerged historically in Christian patristic and medieval writers are known as (1) the literal interpretation, (2) the allegorical sense, (3) the moral sense, and (4) the anagogical sense.

The Christian allegorical interpretation of the Song of Songs in the Hebrew Bible is that the supposed Christ is the bridegroom and the church is the bride. This allegorical interpretation strikes me as straightforward enough. However, because the historical Jesus was born to a young Jewish woman named Mary, she is commemorated in the Roman Catholic Church as also being the mother of the church, which in turn is also imagined as the bride of the supposed Christ and as the mystical body of the supposed Christ. Thus the church is imagined as feminine.

In 1966, the prolific de Lubac himself also published an abridged edition of his four-volume study as the book *Scripture in Tradition*, translated by Luke O'Neill (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 2000). (Your guess is as good as mine as to why de Lubac's books about scripture were not published in English in the 1960s.)

During the 1960s, de Lubac also served as an expert theologian at the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) of the Roman Catholic Church.

### **Rudolf Voderholzer's Short Book About Henri de Lubac**

In the rarified world of Roman Catholic theology today, de Lubac would be categorized as a conservative, as would Voderholzer.

As noted above, de Lubac served as an expert theologian at Vatican II. Voderholzer explains that the Latin term *peritus* literally means “someone with experience, ‘expert,’” (page 83).

On a more mundane level, Vatican II ushered in liturgical reform, including switching from Latin to the vernacular languages. In addition, Vatican II abolished the custom of abstaining from meat on Fridays. No doubt all practicing Catholics felt the impact of the liturgical reforms and the abolition of the custom of abstaining from meat on Fridays.

Ong discussed Latin versus the vernacular languages in a number of his publications. However, as far as I know, he published nothing about the switch from Latin to the vernaculars in Vatican II’s liturgical reforms.

In response to Gareth Edwards’ article “Modern English in the Mass” in the Jesuit-sponsored magazine *America*, volume 115, number 23, (October 22, 1966): pages 483-486, Ong published a lengthy letter about his concerns in *America*, volume 115, number 23 (December 3, 1966): pages 745-746.

Subsequently, Ong published a comment on Articles 54-56 of Vatican II’s “Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World” in the 96-page book titled *Men and Nations: Vatican II’s “Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World”: Part II: Problems of Special Urgency: Text and Commentary*, edited by Peter Foote, John Hill, Laurence Kelly, John McCudden, and Theodore Stone (Chicago: Catholic Action Federations, 1968, pages 23 and 25).

According to Voderholzer, both Henri de Lubac and Karol Wojtyla, then Archbishop of Krakow (later Pope John-Paul II), had worked together on the “Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World” (page 20). According to Voderholzer, “Henri de Lubac [also] contributed insights to” the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Lumen Gentium* (Latin, meaning “Light of the Nations” – meaning that the supposed Christ is the “Light of the Nations”).

Now, because Vatican II inaugurated an ecumenical spirit, I should also mention here Ong’s article “T. S. Eliot and Today’s Ecumenism” in the journal *Religion and Literature*, volume 21, number 2 (Summer 1989): pages 1-17, which is reprinted in volume two of Ong’s *Faith and Contexts*, edited by me and Paul A. Soukup (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992, pages 211-226).

Broadly speaking, Ong attuned his thinking to the documents and spirit of Vatican II, as he shows in his article “God’s Known Universe and Christian Faith: Pastoral, Homiletic, and Devotional Reflections” in the now-defunct Jesuit-sponsored journal *Thought: A Review of Culture and Ideas*, volume 66 (September 1991): pages 241-258, which is reprinted in volume one of Ong’s *Faith and Contexts*, edited by me and Paul A. Soukup (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992, pages 219-238).

As far as I know, these are Ong’s only publications related to the documents and spirit of Vatican II. However, I hasten to add that there was no shortage of other people publishing commentaries on Vatican II.

I should also note here that Ong had an abiding interest in the liturgy, as the following four articles attest:

(1) “A Liturgical Movement in the Middle Ages” in the *American Ecclesiastical Review*, volume 114, number 14 (February 1946): pages 104-113; (2) “Wit and Mystery: A Revaluation in Medieval Hymnody” in the journal *Speculum* (journal of the Medieval Academy of America), volume 22, number 8 (July 1947): pages 310-341, which Ong reprinted in his book *The Barbarian Within: And Other Fugitive Essays and Studies* (New York: Macmillan, 1962, pages 88-130);

(3) “Worship at the End of the Age of Literacy: in the journal *Worship* (Collegeville, MN), volume 44, number 8 (October 1969): pages 474-487, which is reprinted, slightly revised, in volume one of Ong’s *Faith and Contexts*, edited by me and Paul A. Soukup (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992, pages 175-188);

(4) “Mass in Ewondo” in the Jesuit-sponsored magazine *America*, volume 131, number 8 (September 28, 1974): pages 148-151, which is reprinted in volume four of Ong’s *Faith and Contexts*, edited by me and Paul A. Soukup (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999, pages 103-110).

Now, following Vatican II and the promulgation of its landmark documents and its changes in the liturgy and customary practices of practicing Catholics, the Roman Catholic Church experienced a sharp drop in the number of ordained priests and an even sharper decline in the number of women in religious orders – declines that the bishops and their theologians at Vatican II did not expect when they voted at Vatican II’s to change the language of the liturgy from Latin to the vernacular and abolish the custom of abstaining from meat on Fridays and approved other changes in orientation in the landmark documents of Vatican II.

Now, we Americans tend to think of the American Revolution of 1776 in positive terms, because it led eventually to the founding of our American experiment in representative democracy and the ratification of the U.S. Constitution and its Bill of Rights. But the French Revolution of 1789 led to the reign of terror. That tragic French history looms large in the collective memory of many college-educated practicing Catholics and Catholic bishops.

Of course, by definition, the American Revolution of 1776 and the French Revolution of 1789 were political revolutions. But Vatican II was not a political revolution. Instead, it was a course correction of the Roman Catholic Church. Perhaps it could be likened to a course correction of a big ocean liner at sea. After all, we speak of the ship of state. And the American Catholic journalist Peter Steinfels, who holds a Ph.D. in history from Columbia University, titles one of his books about American Catholics, *A People Adrift: The Crisis of the Roman Catholic Church in America* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2003).

However, in addition to the declines in numbers in the Roman Catholic Church in the United States and Europe in the years following Vatican II, the years following Vatican II also involved an uptick in the number of Christians in certain other parts of the world, as Philip Jenkins details in his book *The Next Christendom: The Coming of Global Christianity* (Oxford University Press, 2002).

Now, in the first part of Voderholzer’s short book (pages 19-103), which includes a chronology of de Lubac’s life (pages 11-13), Voderholzer sketches de Lubac’s life and work. Briefly, Henri de Lubac was born on February 20, 1896, in Cambrai, in northern France. On October 9, 1913, he entered the Society of Jesus. In World War I, he was drafted into military service, and on November 1, 1917, he sustained a serious head injury, from which he suffered aftereffects for years. On August 22, 1927, he was ordained a priest in Lyons. On February 2, 1931, he made his final vows in the Jesuit order. He served as a

theological expert at Vatican II (1962-1965). On February 2, 1983, he was made a cardinal by Pope John-Paul II. On September 4, 1991, Cardinal de Lubac died in Paris.

In the second part of Voderholzer's book (pages 107-217), he discusses certain themes in de Lubac's theological studies over the years.

Voderholzer's book contains numerous footnotes. But we may wonder if the footnotes have been added by the translator, Michael J. Miller, or possibly by the American Jesuit editor of Ignatius Press, Joseph Fessio, who supplied the foreword (pages 7-9). In his foreword, Fr. Fessio reports that he knew Fr. de Lubac. Ignatius Press has published translations of a number of de Lubac's works. Ignatius Press has also published Hans Urs von Balthasar's short book *The Theology of Henri de Lubac: An Overview*, translated by Joseph Fessio, S.J., Michael M. Waldstein, and Susan Clements (1991). The first part of this short book (pages 23-121) was originally published as von Balthasar's article "The Achievement of Henri de Lubac" in the now-defunct Jesuit-sponsored journal *Thought: A Review of Culture and Ideas*, volume 51 (March 1976): pages 6-49 (translated by Joseph Fessio, S.J.). (When von Balthasar was in the Jesuits, he was one of de Lubac's students.)

In addition to the foreword and the chronology, the book also includes "Suggested Readings" (pages 219-222), but it is not clear who compiled the "Suggested Readings." However, the book does not include an index, which would have been helpful.

Fessio begins his foreword by quoting Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger (later Pope Benedict XVI): "Never . . . have I found anyone with such a comprehensive theological and humanistic education as [Hans Urs] von Balthasar and [Henri] de Lubac, and I cannot even begin to say how much I owe to my encounter with them" (quoted on page 7; brackets mine).

But both Ratzinger and von Balthasar wrote books that would be categorized as works in dogmatic theology, as Fessio notes. By contrast, de Lubac's books would be categorized as historical studies, as Fessio points out. I would point out here that Ong did not write any books that would be categorized as works in dogmatic theology. But Ong's five book-length studies and most of his other publications could be categorized as historical studies.

Overall, I was impressed enough with the precision of Voderholzer's thought and expression in his short book that I would now like to see his 1998 564-page book about de Lubac translated into English in a scholarly edition with an index.

In 1964, the pope established the Secretariat for Non-Christians; in 1965, the Secretariat for Non-believers; and in 1969, the International Theological Commission – appointing de Lubac to each (Voderholze, pages 88). In 1983, Pope John-Paul II made de Lubac a cardinal. The two men had met at Vatican II, when de Lubac had served as an expert theologian.

However, in 1969, the prolific de Lubac published a book sounding the alarm about the alleged self-destruction of the Roman Catholic Church after Vatican II. His alarmist book has not been translated into English. However, de Lubac delivered an abridged version of his book to close out the sesquicentennial celebration at Saint Louis University in the spring semester of 1969, which is published in the Jesuit-sponsored journal *Theology Digest*, volume 17 (1969): pages 312-325.



Now, Ong presented a paper at Saint Louis University's Sesquicentennial Symposium on Theology and the City of Man, October 15-17, 1968. His paper "Communications Media and the State of Theology" was published in a special issue of the journal *Cross Currents*, volume 19, number 4 (Fall 1969): pages 462-480. His paper is reprinted in volume one of Ong's *Faith and Contexts*, edited by me and Paul A. Soukup (1992, pages 154-174), mentioned above.

For a paper of related interest, see Ong's article "Catholic Theology Now" in the *Theology Digest*, volume 23, number 4 (Winter 1975): pages 338-346, which is reprinted in volume three of Ong's *Faith and Contexts*, edited by me and Paul A. Soukup (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995, pages 164-175).

In 1972, de Lubac was among the Roman Catholic theologians who founded the journal *Communio* as a rival for the journal *Concilium* that was founded in 1965 by certain other Roman Catholic theologians. In the rarified world of Roman Catholic theology, the professional theologians who contribute to these two journals tend to be conservatives and liberals respectively. In general, their rivalry centers on interpretations of Vatican II documents. Each of those documents went through multiple drafts before it received a vote of approval from the bishops. As a result, each document contains a wee bit of wiggle room, so to speak. In the rarified world of Roman Catholic theology today, conservative and liberal theologians vigorously advance their competing views.

Ong published his essay "Technology Outside Us and Inside Us" in the journal *Communio*, volume 5, number 2 (Summer 1978): pages 100-121. His essay is reprinted in volume one of Ong's *Faith and Contexts* (1992, pages 189-208), mentioned above.

Now, Pope John-Paul II was also alarmed by the yeastiness in the Roman Catholic Church after Vatican II, and so he cracked down on real and imagined culprits, including the Jesuits. He had Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, who later became Pope Benedict XVI, carry out his various crackdowns. For an account of the crackdowns instigated by those two successive popes, see Matthew Fox's book *The Pope's War: Why Ratzinger's Secret Crusade Has Imperiled the Church and How It Can Be Saved* (New York: Sterling Ethos, 2011).

In addition to being alarmed by post-Vatican II activities in the Roman Catholic Church, Pope John-Paul II and de Lubac agreed that the priesthood should be restricted to males (see Voderholzer, pages 185 and 188). Their preferred interpretation is based on a literal interpretation of scripture. Their preferred interpretation grows out of the centuries-old custom in Western culture of defining masculine and feminine as stereotypically male and stereotypically female respectively.

For example, in 1917 during World War I, young Teilhard wrote "Hymn to the Eternal Feminine," which de Lubac discusses in his book *The Eternal Feminine* (1971; orig. French ed., 1965), mentioned above. Subsequently, de Lubac himself published a book on *The Motherhood of the Church*, translated by Sr. Sergia Englund (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1982; orig. French ed., 1971).

Commenting on Teilhard's 1917 "Hymn to the Eternal Feminine," Voderholzer says, "In parallel with his cosmic christology, Teilhard sketches here a cosmic Mariology, which sees the 'eternal feminine,' the created principle of bodily and spiritual receptivity, culminating in Mary" (page 186). But spiritual receptivity involves a kind of communion in spirit.

Now, in the book *The Duality of Human Existence: An Essay on Psychology and Religion* (Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1966), the Jewish author David Bakan in psychology at the University of Chicago suggests that both males and females have both stereotypically masculine and stereotypically feminine qualities and tendencies. In setting forth his points about masculine agency and feminine communion tendencies, he makes no claim to originality.

But Bakan's understanding of masculine and feminine tendencies in the human condition would open the door for women to be ordained priests in the Roman Catholic Church. However, at the present time, Pope Francis prefers to stick with Pope John-Paul II's ruling of restricting the ordained priesthood to males.

For a critique of the Roman Catholic tradition of the priesthood, see the prolific American Catholic historian Garry Wills' book *Why Priests? A Failed Tradition* (New York: Viking, 2013). (As a young man, Wills was in the Jesuits for a number of years, during which time he studied philosophy at Saint Louis University. After he left the Jesuits, he earned a doctorate in the classics at Yale University.)

Vicki S. Helgeson in psychology at Carnegie Mellon University in Pittsburgh works with Bakan's understanding of the human condition in her own research studies, which she sums up in her 700-page textbook *The Psychology of Gender*, 5th ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2016).

Now, Bakan's understanding of the human condition would also open the door to taking both the masculine and the feminine dimensions of the human psyche seriously – to paraphrase Voderholzer (page 188).

Briefly, Bakan posits two basic tendencies in the human psyche: (1) agency and (2) communion. He sees what he refers to as agency as stereotypically masculine and what he refers to as communion as stereotypically feminine. In theory, a person who developed both the masculine and the feminine tendencies optimally would be psychologically androgynous.

However, many people tend to over-develop masculine agency and under-develop feminine communion – or vice versa. Bakan sees this kind of pattern of over-development and under-development as problematic.

Because Bakan was Jewish, we should note here that the Song of Songs in the Hebrew Bible can be interpreted as the expression of the inner psychodynamics of love between the masculine and the feminine tendencies in the human psyche.

But shouldn't ordained priests in the Roman Catholic Church should be psychologically androgynous persons, instead of being psychologically under-developed in one tendency or the other? Was the historical Jesus psychologically androgynous? The character named Jesus portrayed in the four canonical gospels certainly appears to be. (In saying this, I make no claim here to originality, because I know that certain others have also noted this.)

In the spirit of rivalry with the Homeric epics, the anonymous authors of what eventually became the four canonical gospels (in Greek) also portray the character named Jesus the Christ as a superhero, as the American biblical scholar Dennis R. MacDonald explains in his book *Mythologizing Jesus: From Jewish Teacher to Epic Hero* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015).

By portraying the character named Jesus the Christ as a superhero in the four canonical gospels, the anonymous authors engaged the imaginations of the people who heard or read those gospels.

In the book *Preface to Plato* (Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1963), a work that Ong never tired of referring to, the British-born-and-educated classicist Eric A. Havelock describes the Homeric epics as involving imagistic thinking. No doubt the four canonical gospels also involve imagistic thinking.

In addition to possibly applying Bakan's understanding of the human condition to the ordained priesthood in the Roman Catholic Church, I should also point out here that the sacrament known as the holy eucharist is also known informally as holy communion.

In the Roman Catholic tradition of thought, we also find reference to the communion of saints. Granted, the communion of saints is usually understood to involve deceased Roman Catholics who have been officially canonized saints by the church. Nevertheless, I am here calling attention to the spirit of living practicing Catholics communing with officially recognized deceased saints in the communion of saints. (By definition, practicing Catholics are supposed to be aspiring to be saints here in this earthly life.)

But the pagan Roman poet Virgil is not an officially recognized saint in the Roman Catholic Church. Nevertheless, I would suggest that the medieval Italian Catholic poet Dante activated his own spirit of communing and communed with Virgil. I would also suggest that the medieval Italian Catholic theologian Thomas Aquinas activated his own spirit of communing and communed with the pagan Greek philosopher Aristotle. It appears to me that it is in the realm of the possible that practicing Catholics today could also activate the spirit of communing in their psyches and commune with certain other persons who are not officially recognized as saints by the church, perhaps including non-Catholics and possibly even atheists.

Feminine imagery is manifested in a variety of ways in the Roman Catholic tradition of thought. For example, as mentioned above, de Lubac also published a book titled *The Motherhood of the Church* (1982; orig. French ed., 1971). But if we were to follow Bakan's lead, we would connect the feminine imagery with the communion tendency of the human spirit. But wouldn't this mean that the Roman Catholic Church represents the communion of practicing Catholics who are expected to aspire to be saints?

As mentioned above, Teilhard wrote his "Hymn to the Eternal Feminine" in 1917 during WWI. In it he gives expression to the Roman Catholic veneration of the earthly mother of the historical Jesus, Mary, who is also venerated as the mother of the church (as mentioned, the motherhood of the church also involves feminine imagery for the church). In the Roman Catholic tradition of thought, the veneration of Mary is customarily referred to as Mariology.

The Roman Catholic veneration of Mary prompted Pope Pius XII to officially declare in 1950 that for Roman Catholics, the bodily assumption of Mary at the end of her earthly life into heaven is to be considered to be an article of faith.

The controversy that followed the pope's declaration prompted Ong to publish his article "The Lady and the Issue" in the journal *The Month* (London), volume 192 (December 1951): pages 358-370. His article was reprinted in German and French. Ong himself reprinted it with a lengthy headnote in his book *In the*

*Human Grain: Further Explorations of Contemporary Culture* (New York: Macmillan, 1967, pages 188-202).

For further discussion of the masculine and feminine dimensions of the human psyche, see my essay “Understanding Jung’s Thought,” which is available online at the following URL:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10792/2576>

Ong discusses Jungian thought in the following five books:

(1) *The Barbarian Within: And Other Fugitive Essays and Studies* (1962, pages 46, 143, 249, and 258), mentioned above;

(2) *In the Human Grain: Further Explorations of Contemporary Culture* (1967, pages 87, 101, and 129), mentioned above;

(3) *Rhetoric, Romance, and Technology: Studies in the Interaction of Expression and Culture* (Cornell University Press, 1971, pages 10-12, 18, and 334);

(4) *Fighting for Life: Contest, Sexuality, and Consciousness* (Cornell University Press, 1981, pages 18-19, 25, 92, 100, 111, 115, and 148), the published version of Ong’s 1979 Messenger Lectures at Cornell University;

(5) *Hopkins, the Self, and God* (University of Toronto Press, 1986, pages 28, 39, and 41), the published version of Ong’s 1981 Alexander Lectures at the University of Toronto.

Now, Voderholzer credits de Lubac with “staving off a condemnation of Teilhard de Chardin” (page 85). However, de Lubac is not uncritical of Teilhard’s work.

As Voderholzer explains (pages 89-92), Teilhard’s rejection of the church’s doctrine of original sin was problematic for many church officials. To this day, the Roman Catholic Church still officially teaches the doctrine of original sin, a doctrine based on the interpretation constructed by St. Paul and St. Augustine of the story of Adam and Eve in Genesis. However, in other respects the Roman Catholic Church today is officially reconciled to evolution as the way in which God’s creation took place, but you can still find certain paleo-conservative Catholics such as Patrick J. Buchanan who reject evolution as not consistent with the two accounts of creation in Genesis – a view that certain American Protestant Evangelicals also hold.

As the dates of publication of the six books by de Lubac listed above about Teilhard’s thought indicate, Teilhard’s posthumously published work rocked the Catholic and the non-Catholic world about the same time that Vatican II rocked the Catholic and the non-Catholic world with its changes in official church teaching and practice. Then Pope Paul VI rocked the Catholic world with his 1968 encyclical *Humanae Vitae* re-affirming the church’s objection to artificial contraception.

In the United States in the 1960s, American Catholics and non-Catholics also witnessed the narrow election of the first Roman Catholic president in 1960, followed by his tragic assassination in 1963. In addition, American Catholics and non-Catholics in the 1960s witnessed the black civil rights movement under the leadership of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who was also tragically assassinated in 1968. Then American Catholics and non-Catholics witnessed the Supreme Court’s ruling in *Roe v. Wade*

in 1973, which legalized abortion in the first trimester – thereby giving rise to the anti-abortion zealotry to this day.

But if we Americans collectively experienced a national nervous breakdown in the 1960s, Americans Catholics were also part of this national experience. In addition, they experienced the changes in their church's official teachings and practices instituted by Vatican II, which by 1969 alarmed de Lubac.

In the book *American Heiress: The Wild Saga of the Kidnapping, Crimes and Trial of Patty Hearst* (New York: Doubleday, 2016), the legal journalist Jeffrey Toobin characterizes the United States in the 1960s as experiencing a national nervous breakdown (pages 11-15). No doubt the Vietnam War contributed big league to our collective American national breakdown.

The American humanistic psychologist Jean Houston says that we Americans collectively are experiencing a breakdown that is a breakthrough. No doubt our collective American cultural breakdown/breakthrough continues to reverberate to this day, most notably in the 2016 presidential election.

Our American involvement in the Vietnam War grew out of the anti-communist mania in the country after World War II. After WWII, both Republican and Democratic candidates were stridently anti-communists. But the Republicans tended to see the Democrats as soft on communists. As a result, then-Senator John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts campaigned vigorously on a supposed missile gap with the now-defunct Soviet Union, but the supposed missile gap turned out not to exist. Nevertheless, the supposed missile gap helped him rally voters to support him in the election, which he narrowly won.

In the book *Decade of Nightmares: The End of the Sixties and the Making of Eighties America* (Oxford University Press, 2006), Philip Jenkins, a former Catholic, includes the 1973 Supreme Court ruling in *Roe v. Wade* in his titular decade. Even though he focuses on more than just American Catholics in his book, it would not be unfair to them to say that many of them also subscribed to the anti-60s rhetoric that he describes. For anti-60s conservatives, the 1960s serve as a watershed symbolizing certain trends that they tend not to like, to put it mildly.

In short, our collective American understandable fear and hyper-vigilance about the real threat of communism worldwide after WWII became the staple of the Republican Party. Donald J. Trump, the Republican Party's 2016 presidential candidate, campaigned on fear and hyper-vigilance in the 2016 election, which he narrowly won, thanks to a combined total of 77,000 Trump voters in Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, and Michigan.

For Trump, the Islamic State and its terrorism served as his counterpart to JFK's supposed missile gap.

Of course the Democratic Party's 2016 presidential candidate, former Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton, did NOT support the Islamic State and its terrorism.

In the 2016 election, both the Republican Party and the Democratic Party did NOT support the Islamic State and its terrorism, just as in the 1960 election, both parties were anti-communist.

In the many states where Trump won, white voters tended to be over-represented among the Trump voters, including many white American Catholics and many white Protestant Evangelicals who are also opposed to legalized abortion in the first trimester.

Now, frankly, I was surprised to find that Voderholzer discuss the four senses of scripture as extensively as he does (pages 189-199). He points out that the 1993 *Catechism of the Catholic Church* actually recommends the “fourfold interpretation of scripture (par. 115-120)” (page 189; also see page 198). But most ordained Roman Catholic priests and deacons have not been trained in explicating the four senses of scripture, so they are not likely to preach from the pulpit about the four senses of scripture.

As far as I know, Ong does not explicitly refer to the four senses of scripture in any of his publications. However, He discusses interpretation broadly, but not biblical interpretation specifically, in his article “Hermeneutic Forever: Voice, Text, Digitization, and the ‘I’” in the journal *Oral Tradition*, volume 10, number 1 (March 1995): pages 3-36, which is reprinted in volume four of Ong’s *Faith and Contexts* (1999, pages 183-204), mentioned above.

Now, Voderholzer has a surprising subheading: “Christianity is Not a ‘Religion of the Book’” (page 171). Granted, to spell out the obvious, the canonical scriptures of Christianity are contained in the book known as the Christian Bible. Granted, to spell out the obvious, the Roman Catholic Church issued the 1993 *Catechism of the Catholic Church* and routinely publishes translations of papal encyclicals and official documents of Vatican II. Nevertheless, in the Roman Catholic tradition of thought, “the church’s faith is concerned first and foremost with a personal relationship to [the imagined] Jesus Christ” (Voderholzer, page 171). Simply stated, a person does not need to know how to read the Christian scripture to be baptized a Christian. As Voderholzer notes, the earliest Christian martyrs (i.e., witnesses) died as a result of their faith “without having ever held a New Testament in their hands” (page 172).

Now, after Vatican II, there was an uptick of interest in spirituality among Roman Catholics worldwide, as is attested in the 1,100-page book *The New Dictionary of Catholic Spirituality*, edited by Michael Downey (Collegeville, MN: Michael Glazier Book/ Liturgical Press, 1993).

The American Jesuit spirituality writer James Martin has written an accessible book about Jesuits spirituality, *The Jesuit Guide to (Almost) Everything: A Spirituality for Real Life* (New York: HarperOne, 2010).

After Vatican II, there was also an uptick of interest in Native American spirituality in the United States and Canada, as is attested in Philip Jenkins’ book *Dream Catchers: How Mainstream America Discovered Native Spirituality* (Oxford University Press, 2004).

In the book *The Death and Afterlife of the North American Martyrs* (Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013), Emma Anderson in religious studies at the University of Ottawa recounts Pope John-Paul II’s 1984 visit to the Jesuit-sponsored shrine commemorating the North American martyrs in Midland, Ontario. She quotes him as saying there, “Christ in the members of his body is himself Indian” (page 271). The mystical body of the supposed Christ is the church, and so the supposed Christ is in the members of the church.

I attribute the widespread uptick of interest in spirituality after Vatican II to the deep impact on the human psyche of the critical mass of communications media that accentuate sound that Ong alerted us about in his 1967 book *The Presence of the Word: Some Prolegomena for Cultural and Religious History*, mentioned above.

Now, for de Lubac, according to Voderholzer, “the path from reason to faith is by no means a one-way street. After ‘insight into the faith’ comes ‘insight through the faith.’ The light of faith illuminates reason and make possible an ever-deeper knowledge of the mystery of God and of [humankind]” (page 46; brackets mine).

In St. Thomas Aquinas’ philosophical thought, insight involves the activity of the so-called agent intellect. However, in the Christian tradition of thought going back at least to St. Augustine, insight involves the Teacher (capitalized to refer to inner activity of the supposed Christ).

According to Voderholder, de Lubac works with “the thesis that [humankind] has a living, natural pre-conceptual awareness of God’s presence” (page 77; brackets mine). I have mentioned the experience of God’s presence above. We should note here that the pre-conceptual awareness of God’s presence is a felt experience. However, insight, both “insight into the faith” and “insight through the faith” (page 46), typically involves conceptual constructs.

As Voderholzer notes, the opening words of Vatican II’s Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, *Dei Verbum*, are actually capitalized for emphasis in the text of the document “‘Hearing the WORD OF GOD with reverence and proclaiming it in faith’” (page 168).

As Voderholzer explains, for de Lubac, each human person is “in principle ‘a hearer of the Word,’ as [the German Jesuit theologian] Karl Rahner would later put it” (page 32).

Voderholzer is here referring to Rahner’s book *Hearer of the Word*, translated by Michael Richards (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969; orig. German ed., 1941).

Concerning faith, Voderholzer says, “The Latin verb *credo* (presumably derived from *cor do* = ‘I give my heart’) can be understood in three ways: (1) *Credo Deum esse* = ‘I believe that God exists’; (2) *Credo Deo* = ‘I believe God,’ ‘I entrust myself to him’; a third way is the specifically Christian mode that comes from biblical usage: (3) *Credo in Deum* = ‘I believe in God,’ ‘I believe unto God.’ Behind this last formula is the Hebrew idea of faith as the state of being anchored in God, of being moored securely in God” (pages 177-178).

Now, Ong perceptively describes the general spirit of faith, including but not limited to religious faith, in his essay “Voice as Summons for Belief: Literature, Faith, and the Divided Self” in the now-defunct Jesuit-sponsored journal *Thought: A Review of Culture and Ideas*, volume 33, serial number 128 (Spring 1958): pages 43-61, which is reprinted in the 600-page anthology *An Ong Reader: Challenges for Further Inquiry*, edited by me and Paul A. Soukup (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2002, pages 259-275).

Now, according to Voderholzer, de Lubac holds, as does Thomas Aquinas, that God “sanctifies and deifies human nature” (page 131).

For recent studies of Aquinas’ discussion of deification, see the following three studies:

(1) A. N. Williams’ book *The Ground of Union: Deification in Aquinas and Palamas* (Oxford University Press, 1999);

(2) Bernhard Blankenhorn’s book *The Mystery of Union with God: Dionysian Mysticism in Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas* (Catholic University of America Press, 2015);

(3) Daria Spezzano's book *The Glory of God's Grace: Deification According to St. Thomas Aquinas* (Sapientia Press of Ave Maria University, 2015; distributed by Catholic University of America Press).

M. David Litwa has studied the earlier history of the conceptual construct of deification in the following four books:

(1) *We Are Being Transformed: Deification in Paul's Soteriology* (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2012);

(2) *Becoming Divine: An Introduction to Deification in Western Culture* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books/Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2013);

(3) *Jesus Deus: The Early Christian Depiction of Jesus as a Mediterranean God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014);

(4) *Desiring Divinity: Self-deification in Early Jewish and Christian Mythmaking* (Oxford University Press, 2016).

Oddly enough, the Swiss Protestant psychiatrist and psychological theorist C. G. Jung, M.D., discusses the psycho-spiritual process of deification in his 1,600-page commentary titled *Nietzsche's Zarathustra: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1934-1939 by C. G. Jung*, 2 vols., edited by James L. Jarrett (Princeton University Press, 1988, pages 448, 657, 816, 1526, 1527, 1533, and 1538).

Voderholzer discusses de Lubac's various comments on Nietzsche (pages 147-153 and elsewhere in passing). Among other things, Nietzsche is famous for articulating the idea of the eternal return – an idea that he pre-Christian origins, as Mircea Eliade explains in his book *The Myth of the Eternal Return*, translated by Willard R. Trask (New York: Pantheon Books, 1954; orig. French ed., 1949). Voderholzer quotes de Lubac as exclaiming in response to Nietzsche's doctrine of the eternal return, "'No more circle [i.e., endlessly repeating cycle]!'" (quoted on page 167).

As far as I know, Ong does not specifically target Nietzsche's doctrine of eternal return. However, taking a hint from Eliade, Ong regularly contrasts cyclic thought with linear thought (which he also characterizes as evolutionary).

Ong published a thought-provoking essay about Nietzsche in 1961, which is reprinted in revised form as "Post-Christian or Not" in Ong's 1967 book *In the Human Grain: Further Explorations of Contemporary Culture* (pages 147-164), mentioned above. In the same book, Ong also reprints three essays about evolutionary thought (pages 61-82, 83-98, and 99-126).

For a study of related interest, see the American Indian Donald L. Fixico's book *The American Indian Mind in a Linear World: American Indian Studies and Traditional Knowledge* (New York: Routledge, 2003).

Now, Voderholzer discusses what he refers to as de Lubac's attitude of paradox (pages 135-137). Elsewhere Voderholzer explains, "A *paradoxon* (Greek *para*, 'against,' and *doxa*, 'opinion' or 'expectation'), since the age of classical Greek philosophy, has meant a 'strange,' 'surprising' or 'shocking' statement. The term also appears in the New Testament [in] Luke 5:26" (pages 117-118; brackets mine). So in the Christian tradition of thought, human persons are created in the image and



likeness of God, by God, and ultimately for union with God (in the psycho-spiritual process known as deification).

In the English-speaking world, the prolific British Catholic convert G. K. Chesterton (1874-1936) was widely known for his use of paradox. The young Canadian Catholic literary critic Hugh Kenner (1923-2003) wrote his Master's thesis in English at the University of Toronto under the Canadian Catholic convert Marshall McLuhan (1911-1980) on Chesterton's use of paradox. Kenner's thesis was published as the book *Paradox in Chesterton* (Sheed & Ward, 1947), with an introduction by McLuhan (pages xi-xxii).

McLuhan had earlier published the article "G. K. Chesterton: A Practical Mystic" in the *Dalhousie Review*, volume 15 (1936): pages 455-464. If we interpret McLuhan's words "A Practical Mystic" to mean a mystic in practice, then we should note that all practicing Catholics are supposed to be mystics in practice.

As far as I know, nobody in the English-speaking world today is as widely known for the use of paradox as Chesterton was in his day.

As far as I know, nobody in the rarified world of Roman Catholic theology today is widely known for the use of paradox as de Lubac was. (The rarified world of Roman Catholic theology is inhabited by professional theologians who also serve as the thought police of Roman Catholic orthodoxy. The Vatican has an office dedicated to policing thought crimes. The slings and arrows of outraged Roman Catholics worldwide can be submitted to thought-crime office at the Vatican to investigate.)

However, in the book *Paradoxia Epidemica: The Renaissance Tradition of Paradox* (Princeton University Press, 1966), Rosalie L. Colie shows that the artful use of paradox was once fashionable. Both Ong and McLuhan were Renaissance specialists. Ong's review of Colie's book was published in *Seventeenth-Century News*, volume 25, number 1 (Spring 1967): page 3.

But as far as I know, Ong does not characterize his own use of contrasts as involving the use of paradox.

Now, because Ong has ably discussed the history of formal logic (also known as dialectic) in his 1958 book *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue: From the Art of Discourse to the Art of Reason*, mentioned above, we should note that formal logic requires the use of operationally defined terms, as that we can speak of a certain term as excluding its polar opposite: For example, term A and term not-A. When the rule for polar opposite terms is not strictly followed to produce either/or contrasts, then the delinquent terminology is described as involving the use of equivocal terms.

Strictly speaking, the antithesis of term A and term not-A involves either/or thinking. By contrast, paradox involves using seemingly polar opposite conceptual contrasts to construct to produce a kind of either/or polarity in which the contrasting terms are not necessarily antithetical.

According to Voderholzer, "For de Lubac, this [kind of paradox] is the hall mark of what is specifically 'Catholic,' as distinguished from what is 'Protestant,' [which] . . . often ends up in 'either/or' oppositions" (page 120).

Now in the book *Varieties of Transcendental Experience: A Study in Constructive Postmodernism* (Collegeville, MN: Michael Glazier Book/ Liturgical Press, 2000), the American Jesuit theologian Donald L.

Gelpi gives no evidence of being familiar with Ong's 1958 book about the history of formal logic (or dialectic). Nevertheless, Gelpi also attributes either/or thinking to the American Protestant tradition of thought and both/and thinking to the Catholic tradition of thought. But he attributes this contrast to what he styles the dialectical imagination of the American Protestant tradition of thought versus the analogical imagination of the Catholic tradition of thought (pages 82, 132, 164, 172, 174, 192, 193, 206, 223, 224, 280, 281, and 282).

But what exactly is the paradox that is de Lubac's central concern? The paradox is that God created humankind's spiritual nature in such a way that we tend to reach further than everything else that we find in creation and thereby step toward God (page 136).

The British poet Robert Browning also called attention to this paradox: "A man's reach should exceed his grasp, or what's a heaven for?"

Voderholzer includes a lengthy quotation (pages 136-137) for de Lubac's controversial 1946 book *Surnaturel*, pages 483-484 in the orig. French ed.). In the last sentence in the lengthy quotation, de Lubac says, "Thus the perfectly gratuitous character of the divine gift [of grace] appears as something requested by the creature, both for its own sake and for the sake of God's greatness" (quoted by Voderholzer, page 137; brackets mine).

Even though Voderholzer does not happen to advert to it, de Lubac's wording "for the sake of God's greatness" echoes the widely known Jesuit motto *Ad maiorem Dei gloriam* (Latin, abbreviated as A.M.D.G., meaning "For the greater glory of God).

Now, Ong has written perceptively about the widely known Jesuit motto in his article "'A.M.D.G.': Dedication or Directive?" in the now-defunct Jesuit-sponsored journal *Review for Religious*, volume 11, number 5 (September 15, 1952): pages 257-264, and in his book *Hopkins, the Self, and God* (University of Toronto Press, 1986, pages 78-81 and 87), the published version of Ong's 1981 Alexander Lectures at the University of Toronto.

However, Voderholzer does call attention to Vatican II's claim that "'All men [and women] are in fact called to one and the same destiny, which is divine' (*Gaudium et Spes*, no. 22" (quoted by Voderholzer, page 137; brackets mine; the quotation is from paragraph number 22 of the Vatican II document known as the "Pastoral Constitution of the Church in the Modern World," the Latin title of which means Joy and Hope).

However, if all human persons are called to the same destiny, then then destination is not only union with God in a supposed afterlife, but also union with God in this earthly life.

According to Voderholzer, de Lubac had already acknowledged that all human persons are disposed toward God even before they may receive any specific further endowment of grace (page 137). "As [de Lubac] sees it, two questions in this connection should be strictly separated: [1] the question about the possibility that non-Christians can be saved (which is mainly individual and belongs to the subjective order) and [2] the question about the relation of Christianity to the non-Christian religions, as well as their meaning and importance" (page 138).

But is there another order besides the subjective order in which individual persons may be saved? In theory, the church represents another order besides the subjective order in which individual persons may be saved. The church is referred to as the mystical body of the supposed Christ.

Today practicing Catholics are familiar with the doctrine of the real presence in the sacrament of the holy eucharist that Sokolowski writes about in the book mentioned above. But the church also represents the real presence of the supposed Christ in the world (Voderholzer, pages 180-181).

However, Voderholzer claims that the Roman Catholic Church “has always recognized the possibility of salvation for [individual persons in the subjective order] who through no fault of their own know nothing about Christ and who live according to their conscience – and to that extent one could speak of ‘anonymous Christians’” (page 138). Perhaps the Roman Catholic Church has not officially taught this magisterially. But Dante in his vivid *Inferno* portrays virtuous pagans as being relegated to the Inferno for all eternity, because this was a commonly held medieval Christian view.

In any event, de Lubac considers the human destiny expressed as the longing desire for mystical union with God to be, in the final analysis, a mystery. As Voderholzer explains, “the Tubingen school [of thought] in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries had developed a so-called theology of mystery, which harked back to the biblical and patristic understanding of *mysterium*” (page 115; brackets mine).

As Voderholzer points out, Pope Pius XII issued an encyclical in 1943 titled *Mystica Corporis* “centered on the Pauline image of the church as the [mystical] body of [the supposed] Christ (1Cor. 10-16). The [supposed] Holy Spirit is described as the soul of this [mystical] body” (pages 178-179).

I will return to de Lubac’s understanding of pre- and non-Christian mysticism below.

To this day, Pope Pius XII is a controversial figure, because he did not publicly condemn the Nazis’ genocide against Jews and others. Your guess is as good as mine as to what impact such a condemnation of their genocide might possibly have had, had he publicly issued such a condemnation. But my guess is that such a public condemnation would not have stopped the genocide.

Now, Voderholzer titles his penultimate chapter “Hope instead of Utopia” (pages 200-210). In it he returns to de Lubac’s extremely ambivalent view of Joachim of Fiore (c.1135-1202). Voderholzer had discussed de Lubac’s view of Joachim earlier in his book (pages 98-99).

Because of the anti-communist mania in the United States after WWII, many Americans may not be especially interested in the secular utopia imagined in communist theory. Oddly enough, the secular utopia imagined in communist theory is rooted in Joachim of Fiore’s imaginative interpretation of the supposed divine trinity in the Christian tradition of thought.

In the Christian tradition of thought, it was commonplace to accept St. Paul’s image of the church as the so-called body of the supposed Christ (1Cor. 10:16; see Voderholzer, page 179). In addition, it was commonplace to accept the supposed divine trinity. As Voderholzer explains, “The Holy Spirit [the third divine person in the supposed divine trinity] is described [in the tradition] as the soul of the body [known as the church]” (page 179).

From this imaginative conceptual framework in the Christian tradition of thought, Joachim of Fiore constructed a threefold account of history by naming a certain historical period after each divine person

in the supposed divine trinity. Briefly, Joachim's imagined time or kingdom of the Holy Spirit was later transmuted into the secular utopia imagined in communist theory.

However, apart from communist theory, utopian thinking can be appealing. Oftentimes in the past, Republicans have criticized Democrats to indulging in utopian thinking. However, in the 2016 presidential campaign, the Democratic Party's presidential candidate did not articulate a utopian vision of the future under her administration, if she was elected.

Finally, Voderholzer's last chapter is titled "Mysticism" (pages 211-217). As he explains, mysticism is a recurring theme, or leitmotif, in de Lubac's various writings, as it also is in Voderholzer's book (see pages 77, 131, and 136, discussed above).

As Voderholzer notes, de Lubac in 1974 published an essay in German about mysticism. According to Voderholzer, de Lubac on page 81 of his 1974 essay says, "'The more one looks at the history of spirituality, the more mysticism appears to be, by its very essence, a universal affair. It also develops outside of the positive religions'" (quoted by Voderholzer, page 212).

In Christian mysticism, the driving force is the individual person's encounter with the supposed Christ, who is imagined to be the Second Person of the supposed divine trinity, as noted above. The historical Jesus himself experienced God, so his Christian followers also aspire to experience God.

Now, Ong published the article "World as View and World as Event" in the journal *American Anthropologist*, volume 71, number 4 (August 1969): pages 634-647, which is reprinted in volume three of Ong's *Faith and Contexts* (1995, pages 69-90), mentioned above.

Also see the American anthropologist David M. Smith's 1997 essay "World as Event: Aspects of Chipewyan Ontology" reprinted, slightly revised, in the anthology *Of Ong and Media Ecology: Essays in Communication, Composition, and Literary Studies*, edited by me and Paul A. Soukup (New York: Hampton Press, 2012, pages 117-141).

For all practical purposes, all the authors of the various texts in the New Testament represent the world-as-event sense of life. That is, their thought and expression represent the world-as-event sense of life.

Now, Voderholzer notes repeatedly that de Lubac refers to "the Christ-event" (pages 163, 166-167, and 171). In other words, the supposed Christ is imagined in terms of what Ong describes as the world-as-event sense of life.

In the book *The Spell of the Sensuous: Perception and Language in a More-Than-Human World* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1996), David Abram describes, in effect, what Ong refers to as the world-as-event sense of life, but Abram does not happen to advert explicitly to Ong's 1969 article.

Now, according to Voderholzer, de Lubac claims that "[e]very genuine [Christian] mysticism is, in the final analysis, not active but passive, has something to do with 'suffering,' with the experience of personal encounter of 'being with' another person [with the supposed Christ]" (page 213; brackets mine). Out of this experience of suffering in Christian mysticism, the Christian mystic participates in friendship with the supposed Christ.

I should point out here that the theme of suffering can also be found in Teilhard's writings, as the American Jesuit spirituality writer David L. Fleming shows in his unpublished doctoral dissertation.

As a humorous aside, the Vatican's silencing and other forms of condemning certain Jesuits such as Teilhard and de Lubac may have helped advance the suffering of those Jesuits.

Because de Lubac was a Jesuit, Voderholzer rounds off his chapter on mysticism by quoting the Ignatian prayer *Suscipe* (Latin, meaning receive):

"Take, O Lord, and receive all my liberty, my memory, and my understanding and my entire will, all that I have and possess. You have given all to me, to You, O Lord, I return it. All is Yours; dispose of it according to Your will. Give me Your love and Your grace, for this is enough for me" (quoted by Voderholzer, page 217).

As we have seen above in connection with the psycho-spiritual process of deification, the human longing desire for God can be satisfied only through the psycho-spiritual experience of the presence of God in our personal lives. For this reason, to say "this is enough for me" testifies to the personal experience of the presence of God.

Concerning the spirit expressed in saying "this is enough for me," see Mortimer J. Adler's accessible short book *Desires Right & Wrong: The Ethics of Enough* (Macmillan, 1991).

In any event, Voderholzer says that this prayer "summarizes Ignatian mysticism" (page 217). Even though Voderholzer does not happen to advert explicitly to it, this Ignatian prayer is contained in the *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius Loyola. The *Suscipe* prayer is contained in the standardized numbered paragraph 234.

In conclusion, readers who are interested in spirituality might be surprised, perhaps even pleasantly surprised at times, by Voderholzer's densely packed but deeply informed short book about de Lubac.