

ORTHOPRAXIS AND PNEUMATOLOGY

In his book *Markings* Dag Hammarskjöld describes a major turning point in his life in these words:

I don't know who—or what—put the question, I don't know when it was put. I don't even remember answering. But at some moment I did answer *Yes* to Someone—or Something—and from that hour I was certain that existence is meaningful and that, therefore, my life in self-surrender had a goal.¹

He then goes on to describe the life that ensued from that "Yes" as a "Way" which "leads to a triumph which is a catastrophe, and to a catastrophe which is a triumph." He continues to portray exuberantly what is obviously a life of paradoxical divine empowerment. Hammarskjöld does not explicitly mention either of the themes of this paper, but his description perfectly illustrates their intersection. Orthopraxis is the concrete Way upon which Hammarskjöld embarked; Spirit is the empowerment of that Way. Note that his experience is initially only tacitly religious; gradually it leads him to appropriate for the first time a Christianity which he had professed from his youth.

In this paper I shall first offer some brief considerations on orthopraxis, then I shall move to a more extended consideration of the meaning of the Spirit in the light of the meaning and possibility of orthopraxis.

I

As I understand it, the use of the word "orthopraxy," as an obviously play on the word "orthodoxy" tacitly implies an understanding of the relationship between religion as lived experience and doctrine. The relationship is analogous to that between praxis and theory in modern thought, where praxis as reflective human experience is granted priority over theory. Theory itself indeed is a form of praxis, but it emerges from the broader framework of praxis and exists to serve praxis in dialectical interaction with it. Similarly doctrine is perceived as emerging in moments of authentic, self-transcending human experience, usually coming to expression in tensively symbolic forms which then conatively/transformatively guide future praxis through dialectical interaction. Thus orthopraxis gives rise to orthodoxy which then in turn in a dialectically interactive way guides orthopraxis. Presupposed in this process are tacit norms and criteria of authenticity embedded in action itself, without which the term orthopraxis would be meaningless. It is interesting to observe in an age like ours, so acutely sensitive to the depth and variety of cultural differentiation, efforts to uncover concrete universal structures of human praxis.

I mention here two such approaches in theology today, first by way of illustration, and then to employ them later in the paper. Helmut

¹D. Hammarskjöld, *Markings* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968), p. 205.

Peukert, a German Catholic theologian, employs and adapts as the foundation for a theological method Jürgen Habermas' theory of communicative action.² This theory shows in great elaboration how certain validity claims are made and criteria assumed, however implicitly, whenever a speech action occurs, in whatever cultural context. Note the effort to draw out criteria for authentic praxis from a general structure of praxis.

Although "praxis" is not a category of high currency in Bernard Lonergan's writings, his major concern and contribution to thought has been his attempt to mediate through self-appropriation the universal, invariant, dynamic structure underlying—actually constituting—human praxis, which he calls transcendental method. As is well known, he sorts out four levels of operations which constitute the invariant structure of human praxis and he assigns to each level a rule or an imperative for success to be achieved at that level. These are his transcendental precepts: be attentive, be intelligent, be reasonable, be responsible.³

It is not my intention either to endorse or to expose the details of Lonergan's transcendental method. I simply wish to underline a certain radically autonomous element in his approach, which Lonergan himself does not seem to fully exploit, and thence to draw to sharper definition my understanding of orthopraxis.

At face value, the transcendental precepts appear rather banal. A penetrating appreciation of the precepts comes only with those events of transformative self-appropriation which Lonergan calls conversions. In one place he explicitly defines conversion in terms of the precepts: "It is finding out for oneself and in oneself what it is to be intelligent, to be reasonable, to be responsible . . ." ⁴ If we add "to be attentive," we have three types of conversion: intellectual, moral, and what some interpreters have suggested that he call "psychic" or "affective" conversion.⁵ This connection between the precepts and the conversions as self-appropriation discloses that the transcendental precepts are not heteronomous rules of conduct. On the contrary, they are imperative formulations of the transcendental notions, the unrestricted intendings of meaning, truth, and value which Lonergan uncovers as the underlying dynamic of the transcendental method, constituting the human spirit as spirit, i.e., as unrestrictedly erotic. The praxis of conversion then, as response to the transcendental precepts, is fidelity to self, not in the sense of self-inverted praxis, but rather, as rigorous fidelity to the deepest exigencies of the human spirit as it aspires to be open to experience, to meaning, to truth, to values for their own sake. Such fidelity to self constitutes human authenticity, it is orthopraxis in its most basic sense.

²H. Peukert, *Wissenschaftstheorie—Handlungstheorie—Fundamentale Theologie* (Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1976).

³Cf. B. J. F. Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1972), esp. pp. 3-25.

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 253.

⁵Cf. R. Doran, "Psychic Conversion," *The Thomist* 41 (1977), 200-36; and W. Conn, "Bernard Lonergan's Analysis of Conversion," *Angelicum* 53 (1976), 362-404.

There is an important dimension of orthopraxis from which I have so far prescind. It has to do with the gracious and the unrestricted aspects of orthopraxis both in the conditions for its possibility and in its fulfillment. This, of course, is the religious dimension. Lonergan's treatment of religious conversion appears in my judgment to possess a certain *Deus ex machina* character. I think that it is intuitively on the mark, inspired by Paul's pneumatology, while at the same time striving for applicability as the universal structure of religion. He rightly refuses to identify religious conversion with the other conversions, even taken together. Religious conversion goes beyond them subsuming them, yet frequently it triggers them, and by its nature it unfolds through them.⁶ Let it suffice for now to say that orthopraxis in its fullest sense is life lived in fidelity to the deepest aspirations of the human heart. Those who have intensely experienced such life frequently have described it as a life of empowerment flowing from an event like Hammarskjöld's "Yes." It is to this possibility that the biblical doctrine of the Spirit speaks.

II

In my judgment Philip Wheelwright's notion of a tensive symbol as a stabilized metaphor⁷ provides an excellent tool for grasping the unity and diversity of the religious meaning of Spirit in the Old Testament. A metaphor is no longer viewed as a mere figure of speech but as a linguistic event of disclosure which takes place by means of the opposition or tension that is set up when a familiar meaning is oddly predicated of a new context.⁸ Usually metaphors, as transient events of disclosure, fade in their disclosive power through familiarity;⁹ some, however, for various reasons retain their tensive power.¹⁰ The Hebrew word *ruah*, initially wind and breath and then by metaphorical extension, life, human interiority, mood, inner attitude, etc., became a stabilized metaphor throughout Old Testament history by being predicated of certain experiences of divine power. It came to represent divinity itself in its outreach, in its immanence to human experience. The symbol "Spirit of God" in manifold ways represented the tangible power and presence within human experience of transcendent deity.

The ongoing tensivity of *ruah YHWH* is evident in the way the Hebrew word, always holding together the basic connotations of wind and breath, is able in a religious experiential context to play on any of the other extended meanings of *ruah*, like "life"¹¹ or "human spirit." In such situations the symbol can be highly evocative.

⁶Cf. Lonergan, *op. cit.*, pp. 237-44.

⁷See P. Wheelwright, "From Metaphor to Symbol," in *Metaphor and Reality* (Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1975), pp. 92-110.

⁸Cf. P. Wheelwright, "Metaphoric Tension," in *The Burning Fountain* (Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1972), pp. 102-23; and also P. Ricoeur, *The Rule of Metaphor* (Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1977).

⁹For an interesting description of the role which faded metaphor plays in the development of language see S. Langer, *Philosophy in a New Key* (New York: A Mentor Book, 1951), pp. 124ff.

¹⁰Cf. Wheelwright, *Metaphor and Reality*, pp. 98ff.

¹¹See esp. Psalm 104:27-30. Note the interplay between "their breath" and "your

The most ancient biblical references to the divine *ruah* are found in the Pentateuchal traditions and appear in two distinct contexts, which were later connected in the Deuteronomist history. The Book of Judges offers numerous instances of the *ruah* of God "rushing upon" individuals and transiently providing them with extraordinary power to lead the people (e.g., Jgs 3:10; 11:29; 6:34; 7:2; 13:25, etc.). Similarly, we have several references to the bands of ecstatic prophets upon whom the *ruah* of God "rushed" and who were caught up into states of religious fervor. Samuel and Saul are presented as consorting with such prophets, whose prophetic fits resemble the descriptions of mantic inspiration in ancient Greece (e.g., 1 Sam 9:26-10:13; 19:20). The Deuteronomist history, recognizing the ambiguity of this form of prophecy (e.g., 1 Sam 10:11-12), nevertheless generally accepts it as a vehicle of divine communication. In both of these types of divine empowerment—the ecstatic-prophetic and that of charismatic leadership—the *ruah* is a dynamic, transient power like a blast of wind or breath which "rushes" upon the recipient from without. The Deuteronomist draws together the prophetic Spirit and the Spirit of leadership as Samuel anoints David (1 Sam 16:13) thus imparting the *ruah* of God, legitimating David's kingly leadership role and providing for the first time, at least by implication, a stabilized presence of the *ruah* but in a much less dynamic form.

Ironically, the richest Old Testament pneumatology develops gradually among the classic writing prophets of Israel, most of whom notoriously eschew "spirit" inspiration, sometimes vehemently, in favor of another metaphor of divine immanent action, the "word of God."¹² The context for the emergence of the richer pneumatology is the eschatological turn in the great prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Second Isaiah.

Isaiah sets the stage by extending the metaphoric range of *ruah* to express elements of high ethical refinement with his introduction of the Spirit of *mishpat*—meaning variously judgment, the power to discern justly, and the state of justice.¹³ The metaphoric development of this pneumatology is interesting to observe in Isaiah. Initially it is the "blast (*ruah*) of searing judgment" (Is 4:4);¹⁴ then it is a power of discernment immanent in a human person yet identified with God himself: "On that day the Lord of hosts will be . . . a spirit of justice to him who sits in judgment" (Is 28:5-6). Finally, it is "the spirit from on high poured out"

ruah," and also the chiasmic arrangement with *panim* (face). Cf. G Montague, *The Holy Spirit: Growth of a Biblical Tradition* (New York: Paulist, 1976), pp. 71f.

¹²This rejection of spirit inspiration is most extreme in Jeremiah who in reaction to the false prophets with their dreams, "lying visions and foolish divinations" (14:11) turns the *ruah* metaphor around and says: "The prophets have become wind (*ruah*), the word is not in them" (5:13).

¹³Cf. W. Gesenius, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*, 17th ed. (Berlin: Springer, 1962), pp. 472-73. Cf. also pp. 674-75 for *sedeq*—meaning "rightness," righteousness, justice—a word used in these contexts often interchangeably and in parallel with *mishpat*.

¹⁴This free NAB translation aptly renders the literal Hebrew phrase: "with the spirit (*ruah*) of judgment (*mishpat*) and with the spirit (*ruah*) of fire." Cf. Montague, *op. cit.*, pp. 37ff.

establishing the eschatological state of justice when "Right will dwell in the desert and justice abide in the orchard. Justice will bring about peace; right will produce calm and security . . ." (Is 32:15-17). The quintessential form of Isaiah's utopic vision for Israel is his portrayal of the ideal messianic king:

The spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him:
 a spirit of wisdom and understanding,
 A spirit of counsel and of strength,
 a spirit of knowledge and of fear of the Lord . . . (Is 11:2-3)

This list simply presents ideal characteristics of the messianic king. The governing metaphor of the vision is still *mishpat/sedeq* with all of its polyvalence, as the ensuing verses show clearly:

But he shall judge the poor with justice,
 and decide aright for the land's afflicted.
 He shall strike the ruthless with the rod of his mouth,
 and with the breath (*ruah*) of his lips he shall slay the wicked.
 Justice shall be the band around his waist . . .
 Then the wolf shall be the guest of the lamb . . . (Is 11:4-6)

More than a century later with the Kingdom of Judah in its last throes, Jeremiah, identifying himself with Israel's agony as it faced its limits as a nation, proclaimed his incomparable eschatological prophecy of a new covenant:

I will place my law within them, and write it upon their hearts; I will be their God, and they shall be my people. No longer will they have to teach their friends and kinsmen how to know the Lord. All, from least to greatest, shall know me, says the Lord . . . (Jer 31:33-34).

No longer is the utopic vision one of an ideal messianic king ruling his people in a situation of perfect justice, but it is a vision of a whole people with new hearts spontaneously living under God in perfect justice and peace. For reasons that we have seen, Jeremiah avoids the pneumatological symbolism in expressing this new peak of utopic vision.

It is Ezekiel who seizes the metaphoric possibilities of *ruah* in representing what is essentially the same vision and in this way even moves beyond Jeremiah in expressing what we might call the divine immanence:

I will give you a new heart and place a new spirit within you, taking from your bodies your stony hearts and giving you natural hearts. I will put my spirit within you and make you live by my statutes (Ez 36:26-27).

Note the metaphoric interplay between the "new spirit" (= the new human heart) and "my spirit" (= *ruah YHWH*). Are these spirits identical? Yes, with the identity of tensive metaphor. It is an identity of which Ricoeur would say, if it were expressed with the copula "is," it also

would entail an "is not."¹⁵ This identity is not simply a figure of speech but an oblique, disclosive affirmation of a profound experiential reality. The same metaphor will appear again in the magnificent psalm of repentance Ps 51:12-13: "A clean heart create for me, O God, and a steadfast spirit renew within me. Cast me not out from your presence, and your holy spirit take not from me." The classic example of the metaphoric possibilities of *ruah* is found in Ezekiel's vision of the dry bones, wherein *ruah* appears about ten times meaning variously wind, the life-breath lacking in the dead bones, the Spirit of prophecy leading Ezekiel, and the *ruah* of God as the wind and breath enabling and constituting the new resurrected life of the restored Israel (Ez 37:1-14).

Finally, Second Isaiah in his songs of the Suffering Servant provides us with the ideal portrait of a person possessing the new heart of Jeremiah and Ezekiel.¹⁶ The Servant is a paradigm of total self-surrender to the power of God's love, a person utterly attuned to and compliant with the unlimited power of God, and in vicarious solidarity with his fellow human beings. Fittingly, he is introduced with the words: "Here is my servant whom I uphold, my chosen one with whom I am pleased, upon whom I have put my spirit . . ." (Is 42:1).¹⁷ We shall call this Spirit the Spirit of orthopraxis and note that in the prophets it is still represented as essentially future. After the exile, with the rising influence of the Priestly theology, the eschatological, orthopractic Spirit entered a period of dormancy in the Scriptures. The Spirit of God became almost exclusively identified with the Spirit of prophecy which itself had become identified with the paradigmatic past primarily, and in a vague way with the final future.¹⁸

An important breakthrough for Old Testament pneumatology took place in the context of the Wisdom literature. It can easily be shown that Wisdom, like Spirit, became a stabilized metaphor of immanent divine activity. I am referring primarily, but not exclusively, to the so-called "hypostatic" Wisdom usually represented with feminine imagery in the beautiful poems of Job 28, Proverbs 8, Sirach 24, and the Book of Wisdom. In the earliest strata of the sapiential literature, wisdom was a concrete, practical, experiential knowledge, often expressed in proverbial form, not always religious or ethical in nature, and typically associated with people of advanced years and long experience. This knowledge was universally available, transcending national and religious boundaries. Gradually in Israel wisdom became more exclusively as-

¹⁵Cf. P. Ricoeur, *op. cit.*, pp. 247-56. It is noteworthy that in this section Ricoeur is laying the foundation for his discussion of metaphorical truth, i.e., the referential relationship of the metaphorical statement to reality.

¹⁶I follow here G. von Rad's thesis that the Servant is not Second Isaiah himself—although his own experience is expressed in the Servant—nor Israel as a people, but rather an ideal future prophet "like Moses" yet to come. Cf. von Rad, *The Message of the Prophets* (London: SCM, 1968), pp. 218-28.

¹⁷It is interesting that the ensuing verses of this song ascribe to the Spirit the function of *mishpat*. The word appears three times in the four verses.

¹⁸Two rich post-exilic texts which preserve the eschatological dimension of the Spirit and combine it with the image of a whole community of prophets are Is 59:21 and Joel 3:1-5.

sociated with knowledge of ultimate questions of an ethical and religious nature, a knowledge which came only to those who sought it and, even then, as a *gift* of God.¹⁹ It is important to observe that this divinely revealed wisdom usually retained the existential, experiential, and even the universally available character of the earlier wisdom, but now "fear of the Lord" replaced long experience as its precondition. G. von Rad shows that this later wisdom is a knowledge born of religiously disposed experience; in a word it is orthopractic.²⁰ In Job 28 wisdom is not yet personified; it is poetically presented as the ultimate meaning of reality for which every heart craves as the most precious possible possession, but it is hidden and unattainable. In Proverbs 8 and Sirach 24 Wisdom is personified in feminine imagery as this same ultimate meaning in creation revealing herself. Unfortunately, von Rad in an otherwise magnificent exposition of these poems feels compelled to choose between wisdom as an attribute of God or as an attribute of creation, and he chooses the latter.²¹ Interpreted, however, in terms of the tensive symbolic possibility of wisdom, Wisdom would clearly represent divinity itself immanently active in the universe, grounding its meaning and experienced first in the unrestricted aspiration of every human heart for meaning (e.g., Job 28) and then in religiously disclosive experience.²²

The pneumatological breakthrough to which I referred takes place in the Book of Wisdom when the Spirit of God is identified with Wisdom. In a bold step the author takes the divine *pneuma* even with some of its important Stoic connotations and applies it to the divine Wisdom. In the first chapter he speaks of Wisdom as a spirit who sees the innermost heart, and he concludes: "The spirit of the Lord indeed fills the whole world and *that which holds all things together* knows every word that is said" (1:7). It would seem that he deliberately associates *pneuma* with *sophia* precisely in order to apply to *sophia* some of the rich immanentist connotation of the Stoic *pneuma*. In one such context he says that wisdom with her spirit "pervades and penetrates all things" (7:24) and that "She displays her strength from one end of the earth to the other, ordering all things for good" (8:1). In the same context, apparently to qualify his Stoic language, he employs twenty-one adjectives such as: subtle, pure, incisive, unsullied, benevolent, loving, etc. (7:22-23). Like the Stoic *pneuma*, then, the Spirit and Wisdom of God are fully imma-

¹⁹ Von Rad cites a passage from Job which perfectly typifies this translation:

I am young in years, but you are aged . . .

I said to myself, "Let age speak, let many years speak wisdom."

But it is the spirit in man, the divine breath which makes him understand.

It is not always the old who are wise, nor the aged who understand what is right.

So I said to myself, "Listen to me,

I too will tell what I know" (Job 36:6-10).

see G. von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel* (Nashville: Abington, 1972), p. 55.

²⁰ See his chapter "Knowledge and the Fear of God," *ibid.* pp. 53-73.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 156.

²² The divine status of Wisdom is most clearly expressed in Wisd 7:15-30.

nent to the world, but they are not limited by the world. They are the immanence of a transcendent God. As far as I know, this is the clearest protocol in the Old Testament for a truly cosmic immanence of the Spirit.²³ It is an immanence in the etymological sense of the word "immanence," certainly the most *comprehensive* immanent activity of the Spirit. The immanent activity of the Spirit with which this paper is primarily concerned—i.e., the eschatological, orthopractic—is, as I hope to show, the most *intense* form of divine immanence, sublating yet presupposing the other forms.

It is well known that the apocalyptic literature tended to populate the world and the heavens of the intertestamental period with intermediary creatures—angelology and demonology flourished in this period.²⁴ The symbols of divine immanence which we have been discussing were not unaffected by this phenomenon. They were often represented with a higher degree of autonomy vis-à-vis God. Scholars are in increasing agreement, however, that this does not imply distinct, literal hypostatic existence for the realities which these symbols represented. Erik Sjöberg can say of this period:

In the Rabbinic writings the Spirit is often spoken of in personal categories. There are instances of the Spirit speaking, crying, admonishing, sorrowing, weeping, rejoicing, comforting, etc. Indeed, the Spirit can even be said to speak to God.²⁵

Sjöberg then goes on to insist that the Spirit in this literature is not a distinct heavenly being, but a representation, sometimes personified, other times not, of divine activity in human existence. It is interesting that even in the period of such a high degree of autonomous representa-

²³P. Skehan sees the identification of Wisdom with *ruah* as already suggested in Sirach: "In Sir 24:3, 'From the mouth of the Most High I came forth, and mistlike covered the earth,' there is no mistaking that wisdom is a *ruah elohim*, to be identified with the *ruah* in Gen 1:2." Cf. "Structures in Poems on Wisdom: Proverbs 8 and Sirach 24," *CBQ* 41 (1979), 371.

²⁴D. S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964), pp. 235-62.

²⁵E. Sjöberg, "Ruah in Palestinian Judaism," *TDNT* 6, p. 387. Marie Isaacs extends the argument against intermediary agents—i.e., intermediary between the creaturely and the fully divine—in Jewish theology to include even Philo. She argues that *pneuma*, *sophia*, and *logos* retain their divine symbolic character in Philo and generally in Hellenistic Judaism. See her *The Concept of Spirit* (London: Heythrop College, 1976), pp. 52-64. The "spirit of light" or "of truth" in the "Community Rule" of Qumran might appear initially to conflict with this generalization. M. A. Chevallier argues that the "spirit of light" like the "spirit of darkness" is angelic and hence creaturely. Chevallier suggests that the ambiguity between the divine *ruah*—i.e., the Spirit of Holiness—and the spirit of light in the Qumran literature is deliberate and religiously evocative in a manner similar to our description of tensive metaphor. See his *Souffle de Dieu I* (Paris: Editions Beauchesne, 1978), pp. 51-57 and 64. See also G. Kretschmar who insists that "... even for apocalyptic there is, strictly speaking, no intermediate form of being between Creator and creature," in his "The Councils of the Ancient Church," *The Councils of the Church*, ed. by H. J. Margull (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966), p. 34. Kretschmar does acknowledge that "Jewish mysticism occasionally found it possible to speak of angelic beings that bear the divine name and are venerated, but this is *not* true of the christology of the Church..." (*ibid.*, p. 34, n. 53).

tion the symbols of divine immanence retained the fluidity to range back again to what scholars used to call "mere" metaphor and even to interplay with one another. What then is distinctive about the Christian understanding of these symbols, and specifically the Spirit? Is it a higher degree of personification? It is difficult in this respect to surpass the degree of personification in the Rabbinic sources which Sjöberg cites. Is it the breakthrough from a symbolic understanding of the Spirit to a literally personal one? This would be a tragedy if it left behind it the tensively metaphoric evocation of divine immanence. My contention is that the Christian tradition at its best intensifies the metaphoric tensivity by applying these symbols in a focal way to the life, teaching, destiny and person of a concrete human being. An adequate demonstration of this contention would, of course, take us into a full Christological discussion, which neither time nor my competence would now allow. Let me instead move rapidly by way of illustration to New Testament pneumatology and ultimately to its peak in Paul.

III

We can safely make the following generalizations about the Spirit in the New Testament tradition. (1) The Spirit was not a prominent theme in the preaching of Jesus, although a case can be made that Jesus had limited recourse to this imagery in his preaching.²⁶ (2) The sending of the Spirit is always seen as a function of the Resurrection, suggesting that, not only was the Spirit related theologically to the risen Lord, but that historically the doctrine of the Spirit emerged in the context of the Easter experience. (3) The risen Christ, and in reflection back, the earthly Jesus, is the *exclusive locus* of the Spirit. Indeed, the Spirit of God is the Spirit of Christ (e.g., Rom 8:9; 1 Cor 15:45; 2 Cor 3:17; Lk 12:12 together with Lk 21:15). (4) Qualifying but not diminishing the force of the previous point, the Christian community by reason of its unique relationship to the risen Christ is the locus of the Spirit's activity in the world.²⁷ (5) The Spirit in the New Testament is predominantly the Spirit of prophecy of Judaism but in the period of eschatological fulfillment. This is true even—and especially—of Luke-Acts wherein pneumatological imagery abounds yet does not move decisively beyond the Spirit of Judaism. Luke almost exclusively relates the Spirit to activity of a broadly prophetic type.²⁸ In applying the prophecy of Joel (3:1-5) to the Christian community, Luke in effect declares the Church to be a community of prophets (Acts 2:16-21).

²⁶Cf. my "Towards a Theology of the Holy Spirit, I," *The Heythrop Journal* 17 (1976), 11-13.

²⁷G. Montague illustrates this point sharply in reference to Luke-Acts by showing that the Spirit imagery in Acts always refers to the inward experience of the community. The centrifugal unfolding of the Church's life as concretized for example in the gifts of tongues and prophecy are attributed to the Spirit, whereas the centripetal movement, concretized in healings, exorcisms, and other signs, are attributed to the "name" of Jesus or the "power" of God, etc. See Montague, *op. cit.*, p. 290.

²⁸Cf. Dobbin, *art. cit.*, pp. 13-14.

Paul's pneumatology, while sharing each of these general characteristics, presses beyond them for their deeper implications. In short, it is Paul's pneumatology which retrieves and captures the full radical implications of the utopic vision of the prophets and even moves beyond them. The genuinely Pauline letters retain the essential futurity of the final Age and with the prophets refuses to identify fully the final Age with any finite state of affairs and thus to dilute or diminish its grandeur. Where Paul does move decisively forward is in his doctrine of the *arrabōn*. The Spirit of the final Age has been given to us as a deposit, a first installment. Conveniently, the classic text on the *arrabōn*, 2 Cor 1:22, explicitly calls the *arrabōn* "the Spirit in our hearts"—one of many Pauline allusions to Ezekiel and Jeremiah.

Paul's pneumatology, as his Christology, clearly emanated and lived from his conversion experience. Paul himself never elaborates on this experience but his brief references to it—direct and indirect—suggest that it was an overwhelming experience of numinous empowering presence which Paul himself describes as the presence of Christ as "life-giving spirit" (1 Cor 15:45). Lacking the time here to reflect on Paul's interesting metaphoric interplay between Christ and Spirit, we can safely say this: his conversion experience certainly entailed a vivid grasp by Paul of the power released by Jesus' self-surrender on the cross.²⁹ Perhaps this was initially mediated to him through the freedom and serenity on the faces of the Christians he persecuted, we have no way of knowing this. His own conversion was undoubtedly an imitation of Jesus' self-surrender, one in which he tangibly felt the empowerment of divine presence that he was to ascribe to the Spirit. But Leander Keck argues convincingly that for Paul, the pharisaic Jew, imitation alone could never have accounted for his experience.³⁰ The divine power with which Paul felt himself filled was perceived by Paul as the divine response to the total self-surrender of Jesus to the Reign of his Father, a self-surrender which unfolded in the life of Jesus and was epitomized in his death. Thus for Paul, Christ crucified and empowerment with the Spirit of Christ went inseparably together, and together they meant for him the freedom of the final Age.

Freedom (*eleutheria*) is the constant theme of Paul's pneumatology.³¹ It is especially evident in Romans 8 where it receives its most expansive treatment. What are we free from? The types of enslavement listed by Paul might be summed up as: law, sin, death and "the powers of this world" (mythically representing all other suppressors of true freedom).³² What are we free for? Love and freedom (*agape* and *eleutheria*). Interestingly Galatians 5:1 says: "It was for freedom that Christ freed us." I view *agape* and *eleutheria* as essentially heuristic

²⁹The centrality and prevalence of the theme of the cross and "Christ crucified" in Paul's writing point overwhelmingly in this direction.

³⁰Cf. L. Keck, "The Son Who Creates Freedom," *Concilium* 93 (New York: Herder and Herder, 1974), pp. 73ff.

³¹Cf. P. Hodgson, *New Birth of Freedom* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), pp. 253-59; 187-206.

³²*Ibid.*, p. 256.

terms in Paul. They refer to "what takes place when one opts to live in accordance with the promptings of the Spirit," or equivalently, "what takes place when one opts to follow Jesus in his way of self-surrender to his Father and in the service of his fellow human beings." These alternative formulations referred to one reality for Paul. Nothing was more obvious to him in the light of his experience than that to follow Christ crucified was identical with living according to the Spirit. He soon learned, however, that for lesser mortals than himself it was not always obvious to know concretely just what following Jesus entailed, nor was genuine pneumatic activity easy to discern. Thus Paul set these principles up as criteria for each other (e.g., 1 Cor 12:3). As we shall see, the circularity opened up here leads to a very important tacit self-correcting principle in the life of the Church.

The freedom which Paul proclaims from the Law, although more elementary and basic than the fullness of freedom to which it leads, brings out most clearly the radical nature of Paul's pneumatology. When Paul announced that we were no longer under the Law (e.g., in Gal 3), the Law he referred to was not simply Jewish ceremonial law, nor any particularities of Jewish observance, but the very Decalogue itself (e.g., Rom 7:7-11). For a pharisaic Jew this was an incredibly strong utterance. Although the topic generally was raised in Paul's letters in reference to Judaizing practices in the new Christian communities, its import for Paul far transcended this setting. If I might borrow an apt term from Immanuel Kant,³³ Paul is declaring the end to heteronomous morality, where heteronomy means the imposition of moral law from without. This includes even the heteronomy of a divine Lawgiver. The Law, the codified will of God engraved upon tablets of stone was good in that it temporarily served as a pedagogue (Gal 3:24), but failing to provide the power to facilitate its own observance the Law complicated matters by heightening the sense of guilt and alienation. The human heart converted to Christ, i.e., flooded with the Spirit of Christ, possesses both the power and the discerning eye of *agape*. This new Law, inscribed in the heart, so transcends the Decalogue that now the Christian observes the fifth Commandment, for example, no longer because God commanded us not to kill but ideally because he or she so intrinsically cherishes the value of human life that its destruction is unthinkable.

Paul was certainly aware of the loftiness of this ideal. With Jeremiah and Ezekiel he still would have agreed that it belonged essentially to the final Age. Likewise, he was made keenly aware of the dangers inherent in its present proclamation, both through the observance of its breakdown and through the warnings against licentiousness which greeted his proclamation. In spite of this, he was convinced that this radical freedom in the Spirit is the *arrabōn*, the first installment of the things to come.

I used the word "heteronomy" to describe the *Torah* morality which Paul rejected. Although most authors appear reluctant to describe

³³ I. Kant, *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1959), esp. p. 51.

Paul's freedom-in-the-Spirit as "autonomy," I do so with the understanding that the *autos* can suggest the same sense of divine immanence which the tensively metaphoric interplay between human spirit and divine spirit disclosed in the prophets. Recall in this connection Carl Jung's archetypal Self and its origin in the Hindu tradition. If I might borrow and slightly adapt an expression of Paul Tillich's, we are dealing here with "theonomous autonomy." For Paul, the Holy Spirit is the symbol *par excellence* of theonomous autonomy.

"Autonomy" often carries the connotation of exaggerated individualism. A final notion associated with Paul's pneumatology should significantly qualify that. Paul's use and metaphoric extension of the word *sōma* provides compactly a personal and social developmental matrix for the working of the orthopractic Spirit. As is well known, Paul's use of the Greek word *sōma* is basically Semitic, referring to the whole personality in its concreteness. The word took on particular theological importance for Paul in his dealings with the so-called pneumatics in Corinth, whose spirituality was "short-circuited," in the sense that it seems to have by-passed the rigors of personal growth and individuation. Paul, in arguing to convince them of the importance of bodily resurrection (1 Cor 15:35-58), was not concerned with proving that tombs would be emptied on the day of resurrection, but rather he was insisting upon an ineffable future destiny for radically transformed human persons. It is clear in Paul's writing that this transformed *sōma pneumatikon*, though future, is already proleptically being formed as we "are being transformed from glory to glory into his very image by the Lord who is the Spirit" (2 Cor 3:18).

Paul's further metaphorical extension of *sōma* to the Church as the body of Christ both presumes and expresses that the gift of the Spirit is primarily a shared experience. Almost all of Paul's references to experiences of the Spirit are in the plural. J. A. T. Robinson has observed that the body of Christ metaphor suggests less the idea of a collectivity than the idea of solidarity.³⁴ In the genuine letters of Paul, Christ is not so much the head of the body as in Ephesians but rather he *is* the body. The Spirit as the power of Christ's love is the dynamic bond which establishes the *koinonia* (2 Cor 13:14; Phil 2:1) that is Christ's body. Every member possesses and thus contributes some *charisma* and no member manifests all the *charismata*. So the astonishing power of discernment which Paul attributed to the converted Christian presupposed an attunement with the shared experience of a Church striving to be "united in mind and judgment" (1 Cor 1:10).

After Paul this radical vision begins to fade, at least in its pneumatological form. This can be easily demonstrated even in the deutero-Pauline literature. Edward Schweizer accounts for the virtual absence of pneumatological imagery in Colossians as a shift from pneumatological to Christological symbolism.³⁵ He provides several

³⁴J. A. T. Robinson, *The Body* (London: SCM, 1952), pp. 49ff.; also p. 78.

³⁵E. Schweizer, "Christus und Geist im Kolosserbrief," in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament*, ed. by B. Lindars and S. Smalley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), pp. 297-313.

illustrations wherein the author of this letter replaces typically Pauline statements about the working of the Spirit with other images. Allow me to cite one example: Gal 5:25 reads "Since we live by the Spirit, let us follow the Spirit's lead." In Col 2:6 we read "As you have received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk in him." As we have seen, Paul himself could have uttered either of these exhortations, but a consistent pattern of this sort leads Schweizer to conclude that a significant decline of interest in the Spirit has occurred. He suggests that "... this change arises from the Colossians situation, in which it seems that rash talking about the Spirit has led to certain dangers, so that a corrective to enthusiastic false faith has become necessary. Orthodoxy is more easily maintained with regard to a clearly defined doctrine about Christ, than with regard to the Spirit."³⁶ We might see this shift in terms of the important circularity to which I referred earlier, i.e., between following Jesus and living according to the promptings of the Spirit, which ideally are the same. For what were probably good pastoral reasons Colossians shifted emphasis to the image of Jesus. Note in this connection the heavy application of the symbol "Wisdom" to Jesus in the hymn which opens Colossians: "He is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creatures..." (Col 1:15).

Similarly, John, whose Gospel begins with a Logos/Sophia hymn, stresses knowing Jesus, God's very Word, as the essence of salvation. Of course, in John this knowing or abiding in Jesus is highly orthopractic—it is clearly a knowledge born of love. John makes ample use of pneumatological language to express this experience, retaining and even supplementing Paul's imagery. John thus holds together the revelatory significance of Jesus and the present experience of the Spirit. His own unique doctrine of the Paraclete was apparently devised precisely for this purpose. As Raymond Brown has shown,³⁷ the Paraclete is the Holy Spirit in the particular function of making present for us now the revelatory aspects of Jesus' earthly life. Thus, the Holy Spirit as the "other" Paraclete replaces in superabundance the earthly presence of the first Paraclete whose bodily presence was limited to a particular place and time. Virtually all of the activities attributed to the Paraclete have already been attributed by John to Jesus. Brown summarizes the Paraclete doctrine succinctly: "The Paraclete is the presence of Jesus when Jesus is absent."³⁸ This doctrine in John is clearly "economic." In my view, the parallel relatedness of the Paraclete to the person of Jesus at once accounts, at least partially, for its high degree of personification and suggests that the Paraclete continues to function as a tensive symbol in John as the Spirit of Christ did in Paul.

What was the fate of the orthopractic Spirit? After Paul, outside of the Johannine community, it faded. There are scant references to the Spirit in the pastoral epistles. Even the Apocalypse of John returns to

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 313.

³⁷ R. Brown, "The Paraclete," *The Gospel According to John, XIII-XXI* (The Anchor Bible; New York: Doubleday, 1970), pp. 1135-44.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 1141.

the consistent use of the Spirit of prophecy,³⁹ which in keeping with Luke-Acts seems to have been more typical of the early Church. The references to the Spirit in the mainline theological literature of the second century are notoriously sparse and where present they are often confused. The Spirit symbol, of course, continued to live in connection with the baptismal liturgy but without significant theological elaboration.⁴⁰

There was another, more subtle way in which the orthopractic Spirit continued to live in the Church. It was implicit in the never abandoned belief that charismatic prophecy belonged in the Church, and with prophecy the correlative charism, discernment of spirits. Even as the Church reacted to the abuses of charismatic Montanism, the rightful role of charismatic prophecy in the Church was never denied but affirmed, at least in principle.⁴¹ Georg Kretschmar, in an insightful essay on the origins of councils in the early Church, shows how the "circular relation of prophecy and the discerning of spirits"⁴² was a major, although usually tacit, dynamic factor in bringing councils about. Underlying this dialectical principle which took many subtle forms in the life of the Church was the basic conviction that "... it is the same Spirit who speaks through the prophet and who bestows on the congregation testing him the gift of recognizing legitimate prophecy."⁴³ This circularity is not unrelated to the circularity to which we referred above in the context of Paul's theology. Prophecy always has to meet two criteria: fidelity to the apostolic tradition about Jesus and resonance with the discerning spiritual heart of the community. With crucial issues the ecumenicity of that community became crucial itself.

Two related factors in the late second century will give rise to a renewed theological interest in the Spirit: the wide visibility of the Spirit associated with the Montanist movement and the ensuing formation of the New Testament canon. Irenaeus is the first major theologian to reflect this new situation, and of him G. Kretschmar can say: "... the first biblical theologian of the ancient Church was the first theologian who consciously placed the Holy Spirit in a truly Christian system."⁴⁴

³⁹See F. F. Bruce, "The Spirit in the Apocalypse," in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament*, pp. 333-44.

⁴⁰Cf. A. Benoit, *Le baptême chrétien au second siècle* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1953), pp. 224-30. Benoit points out the remarkable lack of influence of Pauline pneumatology and baptismal theology during the second century. Another useful and more recent study of second century pneumatology centering on Irenaeus and showing the relationship of the Spirit to baptismal faith is H.-J. Jaschke, *Der Heilige Geist im Bekenntnis der Kirche: Eine Studie zur Pneumatologie des Irenäus von Lyon im Ausgang vom altchristlichen Glaubensbekenntnis* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1976).

⁴¹In an interesting article, J. L. Ash shows that as the office of prophet vanished in the early second century the monarchical bishop in many cases became the locus of charismatic prophecy. Ash cites several instances of bishops using a prophetic form of discourse and argues that, even as the frequency and spontaneity of prophecy decreased, the charism of prophecy continued to be venerated as though it were still present. See his "The Decline of Ecstatic Prophecy in the Early Church," *Theological Studies* 37 (1976), 227-52.

⁴²G. Kretschmar, "The Councils of the Ancient Church," p. 23.

⁴³*Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁴⁴G. Kretschmar, "Le développement de la doctrine du Saint-Esprit du Nouveau Testament à Nicée," *Verbum Caro*, no. 88 (Taizé: Presses de Taizé, 1962), p. 34.

The third century, however, is a new context for pneumatology, a context heavily stamped with the imprint of the second century *logos* Christology. I think that it is fair to say with G. Lampe that "... it was essentially the developed personification of Logos/Wisdom in terms of the preexistent Christ/Son which determined the course which the theology of the Spirit had to follow."⁴⁵ Each step in the development of pneumatology was taken almost as a corollary by way of parallel argumentation in the wake of Christology. This happened even though the Fathers were consciously aware that the "generation" of the Son was quite different from the "procession" of the Spirit, although they could never quite put their finger on the precise meaning of that distinction. The high degree of hypostatization associated with the pre-existent Son was carried over to the Spirit, but it is interesting that although the Spirit was highly personified, it was never to my knowledge represented in patristic thought in terms of an I-Thou relationship with the Father or the Son, except when it speaks to the Father from the depths of a human heart (e.g., Rom 8:26; Gal 4:6). The Fathers used the word *hypostasis* in a truly heuristic way.⁴⁶

To get to the point incisively and connect these brief Trinitarian reflections with my more extended exploration of the tensive biblical language, I shall make an assertion to which I am convinced the historical evidence points. Its ultimate verification would presuppose extensive historical research beyond the scope of this paper and of my competence. The point is that in the New Testament the *Logos/Sophia* imagery and, for that matter, also the more apocalyptically stamped imagery (e.g., Son of Man), retain their tensive symbolic character in representing Jesus as pre-existent and in such a way that they never prescind from, but rather always refer to, Jesus in his concrete humanity.⁴⁷ Poetically, of course, the human lineaments of Jesus can be read back to the "time in the beginning," but the basic referent of the symbolism is Jesus in his humanity. Jesus remains the subject about whom the symbol is predicated. He *is* the Wisdom of God; he is to use a colloquial expression, "what it's all about." As the Apologists preached

⁴⁵G. W. H. Lampe, *God as Spirit* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977), p. 224.

⁴⁶See J. Pelican, *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition, 100-600* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1971), esp. p. 223.

⁴⁷This case can be made more readily for the "pre-existence" Christologies of Paul and Hebrews than for the high Johannine Christology which, as R. Brown indicates, "crosses the bridge from the hymn genre with its Wisdom model (the prologue) to the Gospel genre which describes the words and deeds of Jesus." See his *The Community of the Beloved Disciple* (New York: Paulist, 1979), p. 46. How reflectively symbolic was John's use of the pre-existence imagery throughout his Gospel? J. A. T. Robinson, *The Human Face of God* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1973), pp. 169-79, situates this question within the broader context of a shift which took place in the literature of later Judaism "from the more functional and historical way of thinking (I add: tensively symbolic) characteristic of the prophets and early apocalyptic to the more mythological (I add: in an allegorizing use of myth) and speculative thought-forms of later apocalyptic, mysticism, and philosophy" (p. 149). Robinson argues plausibly that the Fourth Gospel belongs on the early side of this divide. For my earlier very brief discussion of this movement toward allegorization in later Jewish and early Christian literature in the context of P. Ricoeur's notion of "gnosis" see "Towards a Theology of the Holy Spirit, II," *The Heythrop Journal* 17 (1976), 129-32.

the same gospel into the middle-Platonic context of the second century a shift took place. It is true that their language took a more sharply conceptual turn, but it would be over-simplified to view this merely as a shift from the symbolic to the literal. They knew that they too were bending language. Although their theology was still primarily economic, they began the movement of emphasis back first to the protological issue and thence to the inner life of God. One patristic scholar illustrates this point when in commenting on their *logos* doctrines he says: "The Apologists, apart from Justin Martyr and Theophilus, took little notice of the historical manifestation of the Logos."⁴⁸ My intention is not to debunk but to relativize this form of *logos* Christology. It was the invaluable bridge to powerful new conceptual tools for expressing the universal possibilities of the gospel.⁴⁹ Nor do I care to dismantle the Trinitarian orthodoxy which was based upon the *logos* Christology, as G. Lampe would like to do.⁵⁰ I am convinced that the present task of Catholic Christology, pneumatology, and Trinitarian theology is to give heuristic priority to the originating language of the tradition while fully respecting the limited intentions of the conciliar traditions in their normativity.

One conclusion which I hope is obvious from this exploration into the biblical history of Spirit, and incidentally of *Logos/Sophia*, is that these symbols by their very nature refer to modes of divine immanence in creation. If these symbols do speak to us of the divine Mystery in Itself, they do so via our participation in the immanence which they represent. What we "know" of the divine Mystery in Itself through this participation belongs to the realm of Wittgenstein's things that "make themselves manifest" but "cannot be said."⁵¹ The participation itself which gives birth to this knowledge is orthopraxis.

IV

We return finally to the situation of contemporary praxis. Modernity's discovery of human autonomy, in spite of its ambiguity, is of

⁴⁸L. W. Barnard, "God, the Logos, the Spirit and the Trinity in the Theology of Athenagoras," *Studia Theologica* 24 (1970), p. 86, n. 1. D. C. Trakatellis, *The Pre-existence of Christ in Justin Martyr* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976), shows that already in Justin, although his affirmations of pre-existence are never isolated from the incarnation, a decisive shift is taking place: "... an important change is already traceable: the pre-existence terminology, which in the New Testament texts appears mostly within hymnic-creedal formulations, is encountered in Justin as a main component in large segments of theological deliberations" (p. 17). G. Kretschmar provides a concise description of this shift, showing clearly the role played by the protological concern in his "The Councils of the Ancient Church," esp. pp. 34ff.

⁴⁹It is interesting in this connection that Karl Rahner recently speaks of the "second mode of divine subsistence" as God's "ability to express himself in history" ("der geschichtlichen Aussagbarkeit Gottes"), *Foundations of Christian Faith* (New York: Seabury, 1978), p. 304. Italics are Rahner's. Similarly see p. 215: "... the incomprehensible abyss whom we call Father, really has a Logos, that is, really has the possibility of offering (*Zusagbarkeit*) his own very self to us in history..."

⁵⁰E.g., G. W. H. Lampe, *op. cit.*, pp. 226-28.

⁵¹L. Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* (New York: The Humanities Press, 1961), pp. 149-51.

enormous importance for the contemporary interpretation of the Christian Gospel. W. Pannenberg likes to see this discovery as epitomized by nineteenth century atheism, which he identifies with the names of Feuerbach and Freud.⁵² This atheism did not simply deny God's existence but conceived God as antithetical to the truly human. In effect, it proclaimed that the very idea of a heteronomous God is inconceivable to one who appreciates the human aspiration to be free. Ironically, the heteronomous God which they rejected was the God of Abraham and Jesus, as they perceived him. Of course, the irony of this message has gotten through to contemporary Christian theologians. Freedom is not an aspect of the Christian gospel but its core. Nowhere is this more evident in theology today than in the "praxis" model theologies. Nowhere is it more evident in the tradition than in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, especially at its peak expression in Paul.

I close this paper with a few apposite considerations on the correlation between the pneumatological symbolism and the general reflections on praxis with which we began.

(1) Praxis theologies generally affirm with Paul the importance of the essential futurity of the utopic Reign of Freedom, at least insofar as they refuse to identify the Reign with any actualized state of affairs. Likewise, with Paul, they proclaim the transformative possibilities of the Reign for contemporary personal and social life—the latter far more explicitly than Paul. The possibilities of pneumatological symbolism for transformative praxis can easily be shown, as I hope to illustrate in a moment, but here I would like to re-introduce the Spirit of cosmic divine immanence which we met in the Book of Wisdom. Human transformative, or self-transcending praxis in all of its genuine openness to the future and in the grandeur of the possibility of its freedom is part of a broader natural process from which it derives its energy. The very *eros* of the human heart, which provides the imaginative creative power of utopic dreams, draws on natural wellsprings. The Spirit of God which "fills all things" (Wisd 1:7) is immanent to the whole creative process dynamically luring it to the ultimate state of, and most intensive form of, divine immanence in total agapic freedom. Perhaps this is what Paul is referring to when he says mysteriously: "Yes, we know that all creation groans and is in agony until now. Not only that, but we ourselves, although we have the Spirit as first-fruits, groan inwardly while we await the redemption of our bodies" (Rom 8:22-23). Edward Schweizer nicely qualifies the biblical opposition between flesh and spirit—and hence between the two Ages—without diminishing its dialectical power with the incisive observation that in the Scriptures the Spirit "only stands over against flesh in cases where men rely on the flesh alone, instead of on God."⁵³

⁵²Cf. W. Pannenberg, "Speaking about God in the Face of Atheistic Criticism," *The Idea of God and Human Freedom* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1973), pp. 99-115; see also his "Types of Atheism and Their Theological Significance," *Basic Questions in Theology 2* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), pp. 184-200.

⁵³E. Schweizer, "What is the Holy Spirit? A Study in Biblical Theology," *Concilium* 128 (New York: Seabury, 1979), p. ix.

(2) Another consideration has to do with the *koinonia* of the Holy Spirit and orthopraxis. The radical freedom which Paul proclaimed could never be achieved by an isolated individual. Membership in the body of Christ was a *sine qua non* for true freedom in the Spirit. Each member brings to the body his or her distinctive *charismata* and shares in the interactive charismatic activity of the whole body. In 1 Cor 1:10 Paul expresses an important prerequisite for the success of this process: that the Corinthian church, which instantiates the body of Christ in this case, constantly be striving to "be united in mind and judgment." Such solidarity in consciousness was not a monolithic conformism. This is evident in Paul's unabashedly bold proclamation of the individual Christian's freedom and in the sometimes dialectical interplay between *charismata* which Paul encourages—e.g., between prophecy and discernment.

This solidarity with a living Christian *koinonia* of the Spirit extends the individual's scope of experience, field of cognitive vision, capacity to make judgments and to discern values. It is a perfect illustration of the possible extension of Lonergan's transcendental precepts to the corporate sphere. The Church, if it is to be the matrix wherein the freedom of its members is realized, must itself *a fortiori* live in fidelity to the transcendental precepts. The Church itself must be attentive, i.e., open to the data of experience. It must be relentless in its pursuit of meaning with all of the creative imagination that the pursuit of meaning entails. It must be critical, and the truly critical spirit begins with the capacity for wholesome self-criticism. As numerous authors in recent years have insisted, this involves a sensitivity to, and extirpation of, ideological trends within the Church itself.⁵⁴ Finally, the Church must be responsible. It must truly cherish the pursuit of value for its own sake. It must realize that even the values enshrined in the gospel message itself were originally mediated to our world through the radical theonomous autonomy of Jesus. This gospel would be grossly distorted were it to become the principle of a new heteronomy. The risks involved for the Church in applying the transcendental precepts to itself are risks the Church cannot afford not to take. When the Church does risk itself in this way what occurs is Christian orthopraxis.

This vision of the Church "in the power of the Holy Spirit" is, of course, not at all incompatible with institutional structures, authority, teaching office, tradition, etc., in the Church. It does, however, demand that all of the Church's structures thoroughly embody and foster the freedom which it is the very mission of the Church to proclaim.

The focus on orthopraxis and its role in the understanding and teaching of Christian faith brings with it to center stage the old elusive doctrine of the *sensus fidelium*. This doctrine is as formidable a challenge to the performance of theologians as it is to the exercise of papal or episcopal teaching office. Johann Metz argues passionately that theol-

⁵⁴ See esp. G. Baum, "Critical Theology," *Religion and Alienation* (New York: Paulist, 1975), pp. 193-226.

ogy play a majestic role with regard to the people, not simply to enlighten or educate them but for the sake of its own orthodoxy.⁵⁵

The corporate application of Lonergan's transcendental precepts is one tool that I have found useful in appreciating the relationship between *koinonia* of the Spirit and orthopraxis. A second tool is suggested by Helmut Peukert, along with other "praxis" theologians. This has to do with the extent or breadth of solidarity. We have already seen the extension of this solidarity to the whole Christian world when we alluded briefly to that subtle orthopractic pneumatology which underlay the origin of ecumenical councils. Kretschmar suggests that the ecumenicity of these early councils was not determined primarily by delegate representation but by subsequent acceptance throughout the Christian world.⁵⁶ What we had in effect was an exercise of discernment by the whole Christian world. Peukert using his adaptation of Habermas' theory of communicative action urges us to extend this solidarity beyond the Christian world to an ideal universal solidarity. He argues that the very structure of human communications presupposes the ideal situation of a full mutual recognition of dialogue partners as free autonomous subjects. In his words: "... as the utmost conceivable, as the limit idea, which is implicit in communicative action itself, we have the unbounded universal community of communication, which is realized in the historical action of freedom in solidarity."⁵⁷ In his attempt to mediate the *a priori* structure tacit in human praxis, Peukert, like Lonergan, perceives what he calls a normative core: the postulate to act without bias, or coercion, or deceit or domination of the other in any form.⁵⁸ This postulate adds to Lonergan's transcendental precepts, at least by way of explicitation, an intrinsically social dimension. The postulate would apply to the solidarity within the Christian body itself and also to the universal solidarity to which the Christian body is called. A concrete actualization of this universal solidarity to which Peukert and others urgently call the Church is that of solidarity with the oppressed, and even with the forgotten oppressed of past history. For Peukert, orthopraxis would be inconceivable without universal solidarity. In fact, orthopraxis *is* life in universal solidarity empowered, as he says, by the resurrection of Jesus,⁵⁹ which empowerment of course is the Spirit of Jesus. We might add that such universal solidarity defines the true sense of the Church's "catholicity."

I close with a final question: How realistic for the present age is this vision of the Church Catholic living in full fidelity to the transcendental precepts and, in the language of communicative action, living in true universal solidarity? This is, it is true, a utopic vision; it is the Reign of God. One way to destroy a utopic vision is to safely deposit the vision in

⁵⁵ J. B. Metz, *Faith in History and Society* (New York: Seabury, 1980), p. 148.

⁵⁶ G. Kretschmar, "The Councils of the Ancient Church," pp. 77-81.

⁵⁷ H. Peukert, *op. cit.*, p. 283

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 260: "Der normative Kern kommunikativen Handelns, also die Postulate, unvoreingenommen, ohne Zwang und täuschungsfrei zu handeln, richtet sich in seiner Normativität gegen verdinglichende Herrschaft, Täuschung und Selbsttäuschung."

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 302.

a final future rendering it harmless. When the Church proclaims now that "Jesus Christ is Lord," either it commits itself now to the total self-surrender that the utopic vision entails or it ceases to live up to its call. When the Church professes in the creed "We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints," it affirms its confidence that Christian orthopraxis in all of its liberating power is possible now.

EDMUND J. DOBBIN, O.S.A.
Washington Theological Union