



Princeton Theological Review

Vol. 19, No. 1

Featuring essays by
Sarah Bixler
Matthew Kuhner
David B. Smith

Princeton Theological Review

Vol. 19, No. 1 | Spring 2016

Prolegomena	3
CHRIS WAKS	
The Violent Shadow	5
<i>Considering John Howard Yoder's Sexual Misconduct from a Jungian Psychological Perspective</i>	
SARAH BIXLER	
Catholic Ecclesiology and Hans Urs von Balthasar	21
<i>The Unity-in-Difference of the Marian and Petrine Principles of the Church</i>	
MATTHEW KUHNER	
The Deceitful Savior and the Emasculated King	39
<i>Heterosexist Violence in Judges 3:12–30</i>	
DAVID B. SMITH	
Book Reviews	51
About the <i>Princeton Theological Review</i>	59

Prolegomena

CHRIS WAKS

Executive Editor, Princeton Theological Review

“Peace is a deeper reality than violence,” writes Stanley Hauerwas in his memoir *Hannah’s Child*, “but it takes some getting used to.”¹ If peace does in fact take some getting used to, it is because of the countless acts of violence we hear about today. We hear about wars happening in neighboring parts of the world, and many feel warred upon in their own homes. Yet, violence does not always come on such a grand scale. As Christians we must also wrestle with the violence of the biblical text. Divine wrath, Israel’s conquests, and the Crucifixion are things that Christians must wrestle with.

This issue of the *Princeton Theological Review* continues on its trajectory of offering a resource that intersects the practical and the theoretical, the Church and the academy. Scholars were challenged to think how their discipline speaks towards issues of violence for the Church proper. While one issue cannot, and does not, cover every facet of violence in this issue, these essays can serve as a contribution to the conversation imaginative look at what it means for the Church to think about and speak about violence.

Sarah Bixler, M.Div. Senior at Princeton Theological Seminary, asks how the peace tradition, and other nonviolent traditions, can think about the violence inherent in human nature. In particular, she applies concepts from Carl Jung and Ann Belford Ulanov to think about the sexual violence committed by Mennonite Theologian John Howard Yoder. Bixler argues that Christians who commit themselves to nonviolence must acknowledge the unconscious violence that lives within themselves.

Matthew Kuhner, Ph.D. candidate in Systematic Theology at Ava Maria University, explores the main principles of the Marian character of the Church. Drawing on recent Catholic ecclesial and theological scholarship, Kuhner gives an account of the relationship between the Marian and Petrine dimensions of the Church. Using Hans Urs Von Balthasar, he shows how a Marian ecclesiology completes the Petrine dimension of ecclesiology.²

David B. Smith, M.Div. Middler at Princeton Theological Seminary, looks at the complex narrative of Judges 3:12–30. Utilizing queer and feminist scholarship, Smith addresses the subject of male-on-male sexual violence, a subject largely ignored in most

¹ Stanley Hauerwas, *Hannah’s Child* (Grand Rapids: W.B Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2010), 231.

² Matthew Kuhner’s essay was accepted in a previous iteration of the *Princeton Theological Review*, but the essay was never published due to the prior disbanding of the journal. Upon much deliberation and a blind rereading of the essay, we were satisfied with the excellence of the essay and pleased to include it in this issue.

biblical scholarship. This text has been considered a “text of terror” by many LGBTQ people. Smith’s hermeneutic of suspicion attempts to give an honest reading of the text.

The *Princeton Theological Review* accepted one additional essay that was to be included in this volume. However, due to some unfortunate circumstances it could not be included in the publication. Additionally, we were unable to find a suitable replacement essay within the deadline for publication. Even so, the three essays published herein constitute a robust reflection of various ways in which the Church is called to interpret and address violence. Moreover, we hope that these essays challenge you to think critically about issues of violence that are not directly engaged by this publication. The topic of violence is a difficult one to discuss. It fills our memories with pain, loss, fear, and despair. Yet, amidst the darkness of violence shines the light of Christ, our hope in the darkness. May God allow us, as the community of readers, to be a light in the darkness that is violence.

*April 9, 2016
Princeton, NJ*

The Violent Shadow

Considering John Howard Yoder's Sexual Misconduct from a Jungian Psychological Perspective

SARAH BIXLER

Princeton Theological Seminary¹

INTRODUCTION: NONVIOLENCE AND VIOLENCE

The peace church tradition subscribes to a theology of nonviolence based on the life, death, and teachings of Jesus Christ. Carl Gustav Jung's concept of the shadow provides a psychological framework for an analysis of the effects of this theology. Even when nonviolent action serves as the goal, violence remains a very real part of the human experience. When nonviolence is theologically promoted, what happens to the violence inherent in human nature? Jung, interpreted with the help of Ann Belford Ulanov, who translates his material into the Christian context, investigates the effects of repressed violence in the shadow. As a result of engaging Jung's psychology, this paper asserts that pacifists must acknowledge the unconscious violence that lives within them in order to prevent its externalization. The acts of sexual violence against women enacted by prominent Mennonite theologian and ethicist John Howard Yoder will provide a case study for this assertion. Conscious engagement of the shadow, moving toward its integration into the personality, offers hope for maintaining a theological commitment to nonviolence without acting out in violent ways as a result of repression.

THE SHADOW AND ITS EFFECTS

The persona subpersonality and its complement, the shadow, are essential concepts in Jung's depth psychology. Jung coined the term "persona" for the face one displays to the exterior social world, constructed as an adaptation to objects outside of oneself.² The personal shadow, the primary focus of this paper, consists of the aspects of oneself considered inferior or unacceptable, which the ego rejects and represses. Denying these

¹ Sarah Ann Bixler will complete her Master of Divinity in May 2016 and continue at Princeton Theological Seminary for doctoral study in practical theology. A lifelong member of Mennonite Church USA, she has served its institutions through roles in secondary and higher education, youth ministry, church planting, and middle judicatory administration.

² Carl Gustav Jung, "Definitions," *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, vol. 6, ed. Sir Herbert Read, Michael Fordham and Gerhard Adler, trans. Rev. R. F. C. Hull (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971), 465.

undesirable aspects, however, does not eliminate them from the personality; they accumulate into “an inferior, primitive sub-personality that functions autonomously and often destructively as long as the conscious ego refuses to confront it.”³ The shadow’s contents gather unconscious momentum, building strength to break free from repression.

The shadow’s emotional nature leads it to wield considerable power over the individual. Mennonite psychologist David Augsburger explains that negative feelings, repressed in the shadow, “do not lose their emotional charge simply because they are on hold within the shadow, and when something connects with them, they spark to the surface.”⁴ A person may encounter an emotional trigger in a perhaps inconsequential characteristic of another’s personality, and because it resonates with the unconscious shadow, the person perceives it in an emotionally exaggerated fashion because it so deeply offends the ego.

This repressed content will find release, often through projection, whereby individuals perceive in others that which they have repressed.⁵ Jung explains, “The effect of projection is to isolate the subject from his environment. . . . Projections change the world into the replica of one’s own unknown face.”⁶ While others easily recognize the projections of another’s shadow, these require difficult and intentional work to see for oneself. Jung writes, “No one can become conscious of the shadow without considerable moral effort. . . . It involves recognizing the dark aspects of the personality as present and real. This act is the essential condition for any kind of self-knowledge, and it therefore, as a rule, meets with considerable resistance.”⁷ Because the ego has worked so hard to repress these contents, they are not easily made conscious.

Jung identifies *coniunctio oppositorum*, the conjunction of opposites, as a way to transform shadow contents. This process, also called individuation, requires acceptance of both the good and bad aspects of one’s being. Ann Ulanov describes the outcomes of individuation in terms of social ethics, whereby individuals’ self-work affects their treatment of others. Individuation forges “a wholeness where every part of us and of our world gets a seat at the table, engendering compassion for marginal and rejected aspects of ourselves and our communities. This attentive compassion to all of our soul life begets respect and justice toward our neighbor.”⁸ With this understanding of the shadow, whose contents undergo repression and projection, we now turn to a specific trait repressed by the shadow—violence.

³ Thayer A. Greene, “Persona and Shadow: A Jungian View of Human Duality,” *Carl Jung and Christian Spirituality*, ed. Robert L. Moore (New York: Paulist Press, 1988), 173.

⁴ David W. Augsburger, *Hate-Work: Working through the Pain and Pleasures of Hate* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004), 98.

⁵ Ann Belford Ulanov, *Picturing God* (Cambridge, MA: Cowley Publications, 1986), 138.

⁶ Carl Gustav Jung, *The Portable Jung*, ed. Joseph Campbell, trans. R. F. C. Hull (New York: The Viking Press, 1971), 146.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 145.

⁸ Ann Belford Ulanov, *Madness and Creativity* (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2013), 4.

VIOLENCE REPRESSED, VIOLENCE PROJECTED, VIOLENCE DONE

In drawing connections between violence and the shadow, this paper theologically locates violence within the realm of evil, outside of God's being. Jung would not make this move, because he resists categorizing behaviors as intrinsically good or evil,⁹ and considers evil and violence part of God's nature.¹⁰ Ulanov, however, breaks from Jung by refuting the idea of evil as a part of God. She suggests that when God suffered in the person of Jesus Christ, God stopped the logic of evil.¹¹ Similarly, Mennonite theologian J. Denny Weaver considers God to be intrinsically nonviolent and fully good: "If God is truly revealed in the nonviolent Christ, then God should not be described as a God who sanctions and employs violence."¹² God suffered violence on the cross without succumbing to evil's logic of retribution.

Locating violence outside of God-revealed-in-Christ is significant when connected to Jung's conception of the shadow. For church traditions that believe Jesus calls his followers to complete nonviolence, the church naturally relegates violence to the shadow. Shadow contents develop from familial and cultural codes that define the acceptable and the unacceptable, the good and the bad.¹³ When the church defines violence as bad, evil, and contrary to God's character revealed in Christ, it may inadvertently create a violent shadow complex in its members. While this may often happen, nonviolent theology does not have to result in a violent shadow complex. This alternate possibility will be explored in the concluding section of this paper.

Jungian psychology illuminates the reality that if we do not face the violence that plagues us, we externalize our undesirable traits into our neighbor and try to eradicate them there.¹⁴ Augsburgers observe that believers' "crusades against 'evil'" are often "a crusade to attack the contours and criticism of their own shadows."¹⁵ For those who uphold a theology of nonviolence, this projection-driven urge to harm may manifest itself in acts of violence that are not physically damaging yet immensely destructive to individuals and the community.

In "After the Catastrophe," Jung elaborates on the problem of locating violence in the other. His 1945 essay analyzes the collective guilt and disdain for the Germans following World War II. The logic of projection argues, "Now we know for certain where all unrighteousness was to be found, whereas we ourselves were securely entrenched in the opposite camp. . . . Even the call for mass executions no longer offended the ears of the righteous. . . . And all the time the esteemed public had not the faintest idea how

⁹ Carl Gustav Jung, "Christ, A Symbol of the Self," *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, vol. 9:2, ed. Gerhard Adler and R. F. C Hull (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969), 53.

¹⁰ Carl Gustav Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, rev. ed. (New York: Vintage Books, 1989), 92.

¹¹ Alvin Dueck and Ann Belford Ulanov, *The Living God and Our Living Psyche* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008), 62.

¹² J. Denny Weaver, *The Nonviolent God* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2013), 5.

¹³ Ann Belford Ulanov, *The Unshuttered Heart: Opening Aliveness/Deadness in the Self* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2007), 139.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 18.

¹⁵ Augsburgers, *Hate-Work*, 99.

closely they themselves were living to evil.”¹⁶ Elsewhere, Jung observes that the presence of a dictator, perceived on the side of evil, facilitates finger-pointing away from ourselves to the shadow.¹⁷ For pacifists, Jung’s example of the demonization of a dictator might be equated with someone labeled as a “violent person.”

John Howard Yoder perpetuates this image of a violent person when he addresses a common question posed to pacifists, “What would you do if a criminal, say, pulled a gun and threatened to kill your wife?”¹⁸ Yoder hypothetically envisions violence as something done to him as a pacifist, not something he would do to another. He assumes the dichotomy of attacker vs. victim-defender, never recognizing the dark side of the common humanity they share. His approach begins with the front cover teaser leading into the title of his book: “If a violent person threatened to harm your loved one. . . . *What Would You Do?*” This statement locates violence outside of Yoder’s personal realm; he fails to consider first his own responsibility for evil before assessing the violent other.¹⁹

As we enter the case study of Yoder, a term begs defining: violence. In their essay “Defining Violence and Nonviolence,” Stassen and Westmoreland-White state that “violence is destruction to a victim by means that overpower the victim’s consent,” dignity, and human rights.²⁰ John Howard Yoder articulates a strikingly similar definition of violence:

As soon as either verbal abuse or bodily coercion moves beyond that border line of loving enhancement of the dignity of persons, we are being violent. . . . I believe it is a Christian imperative always to respect the dignity of every person: I must never willingly or knowingly violate that dignity.²¹

Based on these definitions, victims of John Howard Yoder’s experiments in sexual ethics experienced violence. Ted Grimsrud, Yoder’s former student and Mennonite professor of theology and peace studies, concludes that regardless of differing reports of Yoder’s physical violence, “he was indeed psychologically violent, over and over.”²²

YODER’S ACTS OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

John Howard Yoder (1927–1997) was a well-known Mennonite theologian and ethicist who articulated Christian nonviolent theology. He served as a professor at

¹⁶ Carl Gustav Jung, “After the Catastrophe,” *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, vol. 10, ed. Gerhard Adler and R. F. C. Hull (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1970), 199.

¹⁷ Carl Gustav Jung, *The Undiscovered Self*, trans. R. F. C. Hull (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1958), 82.

¹⁸ John Howard Yoder, *What Would You Do? A Serious Answer to a Standard Question*, expanded edition (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1992), 11.

¹⁹ Ulanov, *The Unshuttered Heart*, 138.

²⁰ Glen H. Stassen and Michael L. Westmoreland-White, “Defining Violence and Nonviolence,” *Teaching Peace: Nonviolence and the Liberal Arts*, ed. J. Denny Weaver and Gerald Biesecker-Mast (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003), 18 and 20.

²¹ John Howard Yoder, “Fuller Definition of ‘Violence’” (Highgate, London: London Mennonite Centre, 1973), 3, quoted in Paul Martens and David Cramer, “By What Criteria Does a ‘Grand, Noble Experiment’ Fail? What the Case of John Howard Yoder Reveals about the Mennonite Church,” *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* 89, no. 1 (2015), 174.

²² Ted Grimsrud, “Reflections from a Chagrined ‘Yoderian’ in Face of His Sexual Violence,” *John Howard Yoder: Radical Theologian*, ed. J. Denny Weaver (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2014), 343.

Anabaptist Mennonite Biblical Seminary (formerly Goshen College Seminary of Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminaries, AMBS) and the University of Notre Dame. *Christianity Today* designates his *Politics of Jesus*, published in 1972, as the fifth most influential religious book of the twentieth century.²³ Throughout his life Yoder retained friendship and support beyond the Mennonite community from Stanley Hauerwas, Jim McClendon, and Glen Stassen.²⁴

The Elkhart Truth, the newspaper of Yoder's Indiana hometown, reported on June 29, 1992, the suspension of Yoder's ministerial credentials. This was the first public report of allegations against Yoder that had resided in institutional secrecy in the Mennonite church for two decades. In 1991–2, Indiana-Michigan Mennonite Conference investigated the testimonies of eight women. "Allegations included improper hugging, use of sexual innuendo or overt sexual language, sexual harassment, kissing or attempts to kiss women, nudity and violent sexual behavior."²⁵ Other testimonies describe "acts of verbal intimidation, physical aggression, indecent exposure, and other types of physical, emotional, intellectual, and spiritual manipulation and violence."²⁶ At the time, Yoder was no longer teaching at AMBS, having yielded to forced resignation in 1984 as allegations mounted and multiple investigative processes had already occurred.

Historian Rachel Waltner Goossen reports that a conservative estimate of 50, and perhaps more than 100, women in Indiana and worldwide were the recipients of John Howard Yoder's abuse or harassment.²⁷ In a 1975 memo entitled "What is 'Adultery of the Heart?'" Yoder advocates for "healthy non-erotic friendship, brotherliness or working together between two persons of the two sexes."²⁸ Yoder invited "sisters" into an experiment in sexual ethics, exploring "'nonsexual' ways that Christians could touch one another short of intercourse."²⁹ One victim explained Yoder's rationale: "As long as intercourse is not involved, it is not abusive or inappropriate behavior. A sexual relationship between believers is okay even if you're married to someone else, as long as you don't have intercourse."³⁰ Yoder's memo concludes:

'Familial protection' can extend as far as the faith. . . . Instead of the vicious circle in which taboos and anxiety dramatize and provoke erotic excitement, these relations can be dedramatized, calmed by familiarity. Often, in the relaxed relations thus made possible, there will be no call for fraternal familiarity to be expressed physically. But in cases of deeper sharing, especially if some particular trauma has been caused by taboos about the body, some corporal

²³ "Books of the Century," *Christianity Today*, vol. 44 no. 5 (April 24, 2000), 92.

²⁴ Stanley Hauerwas, *Hannah's Child: A Theologian's Memoir* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2010), 245.

²⁵ Tom Price, "Theologian Cited in Sex Inquiry," *The Elkhart Truth*, June 29, 1992, <http://peacetheology.net/john-h-yoder/john-howard-yoder's-sexual-misconduct—introductory-article/>.

²⁶ David Cramer, et. al., "The Case of John Howard Yoder: Theology and Misconduct," *The Christian Century* 131, No. 17, August 20, 2014, 20.

²⁷ Rachel Waltner Goossen, "'Defanging the Beast': Mennonite Responses to John Howard Yoder's Sexual Abuse," *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* 89, no. 1 (2015): 10–11.

²⁸ John Howard Yoder, "What is 'Adultery of the Heart?'" memo, Mennonite Church USA Archives, 1975, http://replica.palni.edu/cdm/ref/collection/p15705coll18/id/4323_2.

²⁹ Hauerwas, *Hannah's Child*, 244.

³⁰ Tom Price, "Yoder's Actions Framed in Writings," *The Elkhart Truth*, July 15, 1992, <http://peacetheology.net/john-h-yoder/john-howard-yoder's-sexual-misconduct—part-four/>.

expression (abrazo, touching) can celebrate and reinforce familial security, far from provoking guilt-producing erotic r[e]actions.³¹

Yoder believed he was releasing women from their fear of sexual relations and demonstrating the possibility of “familial intimacy” with a man.³²

Understanding Yoder’s actions is a complex task because of his uncanny ability to justify his reasoning based on his theological convictions about radical Christian discipleship. As Stanley Hauerwas comments, “Only someone as heady as John could have gotten himself into such a mess.”³³ Yoder interwove his sexual advances with language about theology and ethics.³⁴ He manipulated his victims by telling them “that their presumptively ‘non-erotic’ physical and emotional relationships were ‘cutting edge,’ that they were ‘developing some models for the church,’ and that they were ‘part of this grand, noble experiment.’”³⁵ He bolstered his rationale with biblical citations and theological rhetoric, perplexing both his victims and church leadership groups that attempted to work with him.³⁶

Church and seminary leaders proceeded hesitantly in investigative processes over a period of twenty years. Intimidated by Yoder’s reputation, power, and international prestige, they “feared a confrontation with their most prominent leader.”³⁷ They upheld Yoder’s demands, citing Matthew 18:15, to meet alone with any accuser. However, fear of Yoder and a desire to sever ties with him prevented his victims from coming forward.³⁸ One woman explained, “To confront Mr. Mennonite, a man of John’s stature in the church, is terrifying. When you’re dealing with a woman lay person in the church and John Howard Yoder, there is no way mediation will work because there is a gross imbalance of power.” Furthermore, some of these women sought ordination and did not want to jeopardize that process.³⁹

Unfortunately, a historic peace church failed to process Yoder’s abuse in a manner consistent with its own theology. Gerald Mast comments, “Neither Yoder’s acknowledged hurtful behaviors, nor the initial responses of his institutional employers, nor the timetable for the disciplinary process to which Yoder submitted conform very well with the politics of Jesus or the body politics of the church that Yoder’s theology advocates.”⁴⁰ Lisa Schirch points out that, contrary to the principles of restorative

³¹ Yoder, “What is ‘Adultery,’” 4.

³² Goossen, “‘Defanging the Beast,’” 12.

³³ Hauerwas, *Hannah’s Child*, 243–4.

³⁴ Goossen, “‘Defanging the Beast,’” 27.

³⁵ Jamie Pitts, “Anabaptist Re-Vision: On John Howard Yoder’s Misrecognized Sexual Politics,” *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* 89.1 (2015): 165.

³⁶ Goossen, “‘Defanging the Beast,’” 15.

³⁷ Tom Price, “A Known Secret: Church Slow to Explore Rumors Against Leader,” *The Elkhart Truth*, July 14, 1992, <http://peacetheology.net/john-h-yoder/john-howard-yoder’s-sexual-misconduct—part-three/>.

³⁸ Goossen, “‘Defanging the Beast,’” 56.

³⁹ Price, “A Known Secret.”

⁴⁰ Gerald J. Mast, “Sin and Failure in Anabaptist Theology,” *John Howard Yoder: Radical Theologian*, ed. J. Denny Weaver (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2014), 356. Mast’s wordplay references the titles of Yoder’s most widely read books, *The Politics of Jesus* and *Body Politics*.

justice, the process remained focused on the high-profile Yoder rather than the victims.⁴¹ “Denominational responses. . . show the entanglement of a theologian who had long professed a biblical frame for church discipline. . . with institutional figures reluctant, even unwilling, to adjust the frame to mitigate the effects of violence and power.”⁴² Ultimately, when pressed to craft a public statement, Yoder’s so-called apologies seemed inauthentic. He acknowledged “the intensity of my regret for the pain I caused” while shirking responsibility, explaining that the situation resulted from women’s misunderstanding of his intentions and his misreading of their consent.⁴³ At the time of Yoder’s death in 1997, the hoped-for “reconciling gestures never occurred,”⁴⁴ leaving many of his victims in a state of suffering and disillusionment. Finally in 2013, Mennonite Church USA and AMBS convened the John Howard Yoder Discernment Group. Fruits of their work include the January 2015 publication of Goossen’s informative article on Yoder, establishment of a fund for the prevention of sexual abuse and care for victims (particularly, but not exclusively, Yoder’s), a denominational statement on sexual abuse, and a “Service of Lament and Hope” during a 2015 national gathering.

PSYCHOLOGICAL INTERPRETATIONS OF YODER’S VIOLENCE

It is not the intention of this paper, nor is it fully possible, to psychologically determine what precipitated and perpetuated Yoder’s sexual misconduct. Yoder did meet with a Notre Dame-affiliated psychologist for less than a year, only to self-declare that he needed no further analysis. A consultant, however, pushed Indiana-Michigan Mennonite Conference to arrange independent analysis, speculating that Yoder “could probably manipulate a polygraph.” A Chicago psychiatrist spent two months with him, but the 23-page assessment met significant resistance. Upon reading it, Yoder was outraged and revoked the report access he had granted to the conference, threatening a lawsuit. In 2001 the conference destroyed the last known copy, fulfilling his demands posthumously.⁴⁵

When applying Jungian depth psychology to Yoder’s case, observations about Yoder’s psychic inflation, persona and shadow, and self-perception as victim shed some light on this complex scenario. In psychic inflation, unconscious repressed material overtakes the conscious personality. The ego identifies with an aspect of the unconscious “and is puffed up out of all human proportion by the instinctive energy-drive of that impersonal unconscious force. The ego feels driven by a source of energy not its own.”⁴⁶ Evidence suggests Yoder may have experienced psychic inflation as he enacted sexual violence. Yoder could not identify with his own capacity for violence, for which he made excuses such as misunderstanding the women’s cues. He was driven to initiate or continue inappropriate relationships with women even though the seminary

⁴¹ Lisa Schirch, “Afterword: To the Next Generation of Pacifist Theologians,” *John Howard Yoder: Radical Theologian*, ed. J. Denny Weaver (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2014), 391.

⁴² Goossen, “Defanging the Beast,” 79.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 60, 62.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 78.

⁴⁵ Goossen, “Defanging the Beast,” 68-71.

⁴⁶ Ulanov, *Picturing God*, 133-4.

received ongoing complaints, a covenant group met with him, and the president ordered him to cease his sexual experiments.⁴⁷ Yoder demonstrates two characteristics of psychic inflation: a failure to see and relate to both the other and one's own position.⁴⁸

Similarly, Goossen notes that Yoder embodied "'the star factor,' the internalizing of a theological framework in which a perpetrator comes to regard himself as such an unusually privileged person that he is exempt from moral principles."⁴⁹ Yoder's theological prowess fed this star factor, allowing him to see himself as outside conventional morality, clothed by the guise of a radical Christian experiment. A current AMBS professor offers an incisive critique of the integration of Yoder's abuse with his radical theology:

I am particularly concerned to describe the *modus operandi* of Yoder's sexual politics as deploying . . . his positional and personal intellectual authority; accepted biblical, theological, and historical methods of argumentation; and, especially, the claim to be 'radical.' . . . Yoder caused some of his victims, and perhaps himself, to misrecognize his violence as a legitimate form of sexual politics.⁵⁰

Because Yoder theologized his behavior, he considered his "sexual politics" acceptable and not subject to the church's authority.

As Yoder achieved fame and recognition as the foremost pacifist theologian, his repressed violence gathered momentum. "Wherever an individual falls into unconscious identification with an overly good or righteous persona, those energies and behaviors which are excluded from any social expression will accumulate in the shadow with compensatory strength."⁵¹ Indeed, his publication of *The Politics of Jesus* in 1972 and the known beginning of his sexual abuse share a striking datable correspondence. When a religious professional becomes the object of idealizing projections, he may grow to identify with that persona and seek to maintain the unrealistic projections. Undoubtedly, Yoder was such an object in the Mennonite community as his work gained broader recognition. This type of figure jeopardizes contact with the shadow, which serves as an anchor to keep one from presuming a sense of spiritual purity not grounded in reality.⁵² At the same time, a large ego casts a long shadow, making it increasingly difficult to see the other truly.⁵³

Jung writes about the construction of the persona mask that simultaneously creates the shadow, the private life behind the mask. He remarks, "The excellence of the mask is compensated by the 'private life' going on behind it."⁵⁴ Jung warns:

⁴⁷ Goossen, "'Defanging the Beast,'" 42.

⁴⁸ Ulanov, *Picturing God*, 136.

⁴⁹ Goossen, "'Defanging the Beast,'" 38.

⁵⁰ Pitts, "Anabaptist Re-Vision," 156.

⁵¹ Greene, "Persona and Shadow," 172.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 178.

⁵³ Augsburg, *Hate-Work*, 97.

⁵⁴ Carl Gustav Jung, "Anima and Animus," *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, Vol. 7, 2nd ed., ed. Sir Herbert Read, Michael Fordham and Gerhard Adler, trans. R. F. C. Hull (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1966), 193.

A man cannot get rid of himself in favour of an artificial personality without punishment. Even the attempt to do so brings on . . . unconscious reactions in the form of bad moods, affects, phobias, obsessive ideas, backsliding, vices, etc. The social 'strong man' is in his private life often a mere child where his own states of feeling are concerned; his discipline in public (which he demands quite particularly of others) goes miserably to pieces in private.⁵⁵

Tragically, in relegating Yoder's abuse to closed internal processes, Mennonite leaders drove the wedge between Yoder's persona and shadow even deeper. Acquiescing to his demands, they collaborated with Yoder to keep his shadow hidden and his violence unconscious.

Over two decades of sexual misconduct and investigation, Yoder grew to regard himself as the victim. "With total commitment and deep sincerity, the projecting person experiences the self as victim, but not as victimizer, even though imposing violent control over those attacked."⁵⁶ As investigations heightened, Yoder's self-perception shifted from the prophetic trailblazer of a new sexual ethics to a victim. Marcus Smucker, a faculty member of a seminary covenant group established to work with Yoder, noted in 1984 with great concern "Yoder's portrayal of himself as a victim of injustice."⁵⁷ After Yoder was suspended from the board of editors of *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* in 1992, he answered a colleague's letter informing him of the decision by retorting, "You are as much as victim as I."⁵⁸ This language makes it clear that Yoder was not conscious of the violence inherent within himself that drove his abusive actions, even as he consciously articulated a theology of nonviolence to the world.

CAN PACIFISTS REDEEM NONVIOLENT THEOLOGY?

Yoder's abuse provides a tragic example of the irresponsible application of scripture and nonviolent theology. In using theological language to frame his sexual experiment, Yoder manipulated his victims into a sexually abusive situation, presenting the illusion of free choice but utilizing his power and spiritual authority to violate them. Mark Thiessen Nation, a former student and devoted Yoderian scholar, denies that Yoder's writings offer any theological rationale for his behavior or beliefs about sexuality. Nation identifies three bases anchoring one to responsible application of theology—the faith community, scripture, and Christian tradition—which he suggests Yoder failed to heed.⁵⁹ Through each of these factors, the Holy Spirit works to promote theological adequacy.

Seeing Yoder's violation of women as psychologically dysfunctional, his theology of nonviolence may yet be redeemed as theologically adequate. Deborah van Deusen Hunsinger describes the possibility for images of God to be theologically adequate but

⁵⁵ Ibid., 194.

⁵⁶ Augsburg, *Hate-Work*, 103.

⁵⁷ Goossen, "'Defanging the Beast,'" 46.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 61.

⁵⁹ Mark Thiessen Nation and Marva Dawn, "On Contextualizing Two Failures of John Howard Yoder," *EMU Anabaptist Nation*, September 23, 2013, <http://emu.edu/now/anabaptist-nation/2013/09/23/on-contextualizing-two-failures-of-john-howard-yoder/>.

psychologically dysfunctional.⁶⁰ Psychological dysfunction, she argues, does not necessarily deem something theologically dysfunctional, since psychology and theology are distinct disciplines with indirect mutual influence.⁶¹ While “one would assume that theological adequacy would promote psychological functionality in an emotionally healthy person,” the way a theological concept functions in a particular individual may be investigated “to trace how it might be used in functional as well as dysfunctional ways.”⁶² Mennonite professor Ted Grimsrud agrees, suggesting that when Yoder’s theology serves as the object of particular study, his problematic behavior must be examined for effects on his precise theological constructions. However, one may recognize and build upon themes in Yoder’s theology that resonate with a larger theological tradition, in which case Grimsrud does not see Yoder’s sexual misconduct as immediately relevant. Grimsrud suspects “the roots of Yoder’s action lie elsewhere than his theology and are not likely to be visible in the theology.”⁶³ Lisa Schirch, Grimsrud’s colleague, sees naming Yoder and the Mennonite church’s mistakes as an affirmation of nonviolent theology and commitment to the church’s integrity.⁶⁴ “Yoder has a place on our bookshelves, but not on a pedestal,” she clarifies.⁶⁵ Nonviolent theology does not depend on John Howard Yoder’s credibility or idolatry.⁶⁶

ACKNOWLEDGING VIOLENCE, INTEGRATING THE SHADOW

Allowing the Holy Spirit to reveal the inner shadow and aid in its integration could help pacifists better embody the nonviolent theology to which they subscribe. Unfortunately, “even peace churches who have successfully refused to participate in the violence of the state nevertheless display the iniquities of power and violence within their own body politics.”⁶⁷ Complete spiritual renewal, according to Jung, offers the key to living with the shadow.⁶⁸ He presents consciousness as a tool for moving forward with honesty and empathy. “When we are conscious of our guilt . . . we can at least hope to change and improve ourselves. As we know, anything that remains in the unconscious is incorrigible: psychological corrections can be made only in consciousness.”⁶⁹ Jung believes consciousness generates inner transformation, which is needed in the face of repressed content that manifests itself in ways its owner does not anticipate or recognize. Someone who comes to terms with the personal shadow no longer locates violence in the other. They can no longer “say that *they* do this or that, *they* are wrong, and *they* must be fought against. . . . Such a man [*sic*] knows that whatever is wrong in the world is in himself, and if he only learns to deal with his own

⁶⁰ Deborah van Deusen Hunsinger, *Theology and Pastoral Counseling: A New Interdisciplinary Approach* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995), 140.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 219.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 142-3.

⁶³ Grimsrud, “Reflections from a Chagrined ‘Yoderian,’” 349-50.

⁶⁴ Schirch, “Afterword: To the Next Generation of Pacifist Theologians,” 392.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 287.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 385.

⁶⁷ Mast, “Sin and Failure in Anabaptist Theology,” 355.

⁶⁸ Jung, “After the Catastrophe,” 217.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 215-6.

shadow he has done something real for the world.”⁷⁰ Recognizing this hidden inner violence leads to empathy for the other and ability to experience true community. Empathy for the violent offender contributes to breaking free from the cycle of violence.⁷¹ If pacifists resist dehumanizing others, they can grow in empathy even while opposing violent behavior.⁷²

Self-understanding thus provides the foundation for community and human relationships.⁷³ Ulanov explains, “We accept the violence in ourselves, as Jung insistently urges, and do not kill our brother. By succumbing but only in part, not being swept away by destructiveness, we give something to our community. We discover that our problem reflects the problem of the whole culture in which we live.”⁷⁴ Indeed, the violence that lies repressed within Mennonites reflects an infection in the broader church, in humanity itself. Self-understanding is the first step to tackling this communal concern. Personal integration is “not individual development, although we are changed. It is service to the whole.”⁷⁵

This seems to be what Yoder could not do—face the violence within himself. The violence in one’s shadow must be welcomed into consciousness, struggled with at that level, and transformed.⁷⁶ This does not mean letting go of conscious convictions (such as nonviolent theology), but holding onto them “in the imaginative dialogue with the opposing position in the unconscious. Thus, we clarify our position to ourselves as we learn to look beyond it.”⁷⁷ When “we accept the negative, without condoning it . . . we permit evil to turn into good, allow it to be a supporter of the good, an extension of it.”⁷⁸ How, then, might our inner violence be transformed in service of nonviolent theology?

CONCLUSION: TRANSFORMING REPRESSED VIOLENCE

This paper has presented the shadow as an important concept in Jungian depth psychology, especially relevant for those with a theological commitment to nonviolence. As we have seen, when the repressed contents of the shadow manifest themselves in projection, violent action may result. For believers who consider violence outside the realm of God and the good, the shadow and its violent contents pose an imminent threat. The John Howard Yoder case provides a tragic example of an articulate nonviolent theologian who refused to see his sexual abuse and harassment of up to one hundred women as violence. Mennonite institutions were complicit in preventing the integration of Yoder’s seemingly incompatible persona as theologian and

⁷⁰ Carl Gustav Jung, “The History and Psychology of a Natural Symbol,” *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, vol. 11, 2nd ed., ed. and trans. Gerhard Adler and R. F. C. Hull (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969), 83.

⁷¹ Grimsrud, “Reflections from a Chagrined ‘Yoderian,’” 337.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 340.

⁷³ Jung, *The Undiscovered Self*, 104.

⁷⁴ Ulanov, *Madness and Creativity*, 31.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 67-6.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 53.

⁷⁷ Ann Belford Ulanov, *The Functioning Transcendent: A Study in Analytical Psychology* (Wilmette, IL: Chiron Publications, 1996), 8.

⁷⁸ Ulanov, *Picturing God*, 144.

shadow as violent abuser. Psychologically, we analyzed Yoder in terms of psychic inflation, persona and shadow, and self-victimization. We regarded the incongruity between Yoder's theology and practice as psychological dysfunction coexisting with theological adequacy, remembering that nonviolent theology is not limited to, or by, John Howard Yoder. Heeding Jung's call to individuation, we concluded that pacifists must integrate the violent shadow into consciousness, where it can be struggled with and transformed in service of nonviolent theology.

The case study of Yoder presents an extreme example of the destructive results from repressing violence in conscious subscription to nonviolent theology. Jung "asks of every symptom or depression, or even trauma: What is the Self engineering? What is being made manifest here to which we must pay close attention?"⁷⁹ The collective self, the peace church, must pay attention to the trauma of the Yoder case. Ulanov elaborates, "The symptom is a messenger, heralding a bigger way to live."⁸⁰ In this way, the trauma Yoder inflicted can serve as a symptom pointing toward a healthier future. His case serves as a powerful example of the psychological dysfunction of relegating violence to the shadow in service of a nonviolent persona. Lest the Yoderian tragedy recur in another form, it calls pacifists to acknowledge the violence within them and exercise responsibility in applying nonviolent theology.

Before disgust for Yoder becomes yet another example of projection of repressed violence, can it foster better psychological integration? The contribution of Jungian depth psychology to a peace church tradition, though, lies in its premonition that if violence is relegated to the shadow, it will emerge in a form not easily recognized or channeled. In service to nonviolent theology, pacifists must bring their inner violence into consciousness and address it there. In this way, violence can be integrated into the personality—and transformed in the process—without compromising a theological commitment to nonviolent action.

What might it actually look like to transform inner violence? Jung advocates for translating symptoms into symbols in order to move toward healing and transformation. When one becomes conscious of inner violence, it must be dealt with at a deeper symbolic level, which involves directing the questions from the other back to oneself. For example, a desire to harm another person not only causes us to ask the outward-directed question, "What bothers me so much about that person that I want to fight?" but also the inward question, "What unmet needs in my life give rise to these violent feelings?" Once inner violence is acknowledged within consciousness, one can strategize ways to address the violence that remain consistent with nonviolent theology. On a surface level, it may require a nonviolent confrontation with someone, and on an inner symbolic level, it might involve personal work toward emotional peace. Additionally, the energy of a violent symptom can be harnessed and transformed in service of nonviolence. Violence felt toward another person may make one conscious of a need to confront something with the self that has been projected or confront a systemic harm that the other person represents. Energy formerly consumed in

⁷⁹ Ann Belford Ulanov, *Religion and the Spiritual in Carl Jung* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1999), 22.

⁸⁰ Dueck and Ulanov, *The Living God and Our Living Psyche*, 35.

destructive fantasies, relegated to the realm of the shadow, can be transformed into fuel for conscious nonviolent action for justice and peace building. The goal is to gain increasing awareness of the shadow so its energy can be controlled and transformed in service of one's conscious commitments. For pacifists, this means recognizing, integrating, and transforming the violent shadow through the power of the Holy Spirit, in service of the nonviolent Christ who calls believers to follow his lead.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Augsburger, David W. *Hate-Work: Working through the Pain and Pleasures of Hate*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004.
- “Books of the Century.” *Christianity Today* 44, no. 5. April 24, 2000.
- Cramer, David, Jenny Howell, Paul Martens and Jonathan Tran. “The Case of John Howard Yoder: Theology and Misconduct,” *The Christian Century* 131, no. 17: August 20, 2014. 20–23.
- Dueck, Alvin and Ann Belford Ulanov. *The Living God and Our Living Psyche*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008.
- Goossen, Rachel Waltner. “‘Defanging the Beast’: Mennonite Responses to John Howard Yoder’s Sexual Abuse.” *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* 89, no. 1 (2015): 7–80.
- Greene, Thayer A. “Persona and Shadow: A Jungian View of Human Duality.” In *Carl Jung and Christian Spirituality*. Edited by Robert L. Moore. New York: Paulist Press, 1988. 167–180.
- Grimsrud, Ted. “Reflections from a Chagrined ‘Yoderian’ in Face of His Sexual Violence.” *John Howard Yoder: Radical Theologian*. Edited by J. Denny Weaver. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2014.
- Hauerwas, Stanley. *Hannah’s Child: A Theologian’s Memoir*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2010.
- Hunsinger, Deborah van Deusen. *Theology and Pastoral Counseling: A New Interdisciplinary Approach*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995.
- Jung, Carl Gustav. “After the Catastrophe.” *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*. vol. 10. Edited by Gerhard Adler and R. F. C. Hull. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1970. 194–217.
- . “Anima and Animus.” *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, vol. 7. 2nd ed. Edited by Sir Herbert Read, Michael Fordham and Gerhard Adler. Translated by R. F. C. Hull. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1966. 188–211.
- . “Christ, A Symbol of the Self.” *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*. vol. 9:2. Eds. Gerhard Adler and R. F. C. Hull. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969. 36–72.
- . “Definitions.” *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*. vol. 6. Edited by Sir Herbert Read, Michael Fordham and Gerhard Adler. Translated by R. F. C. Hull. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971. 408–486.

- . “The History and Psychology of a Natural Symbol.” *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*. vol. 11. 2nd edition. Edited and translated by Gerhard Adler and R. F. C. Hull. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969. 64–106.
- . *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. Revised edition. New York : Vintage Books, 1989.
- . *The Portable Jung*. Edited by Joseph Campbell. Translated by R. F. C. Hull. New York: The Viking Press, 1971.
- . *The Undiscovered Self*. Translated by R. F. C. Hull. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1958.
- Mast, Gerald J. “Sin and Failure in Anabaptist Theology.” *John Howard Yoder: Radical Theologian*. Edited by J. Denny Weaver. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2014. 351–370.
- Nation, Mark Thiessen and Marva Dawn. “On Contextualizing Two Failures of John Howard Yoder.” *EMU Anabaptist Nation*. September 23, 2013. <http://emu.edu/now/anabaptist-nation/2013/09/23/on-contextualizing-two-failures-of-john-howard-yoder/>.
- Pitts, Jamie. “Anabaptist Re-Vision: On John Howard Yoder’s Misrecognized Sexual Politics.” *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* 89, no. 1 (2015): 153–170.
- Price, Tom. “Yoder’s Actions Framed in Writings.” *The Elkhart Truth*. July 15, 1992. <http://peacetheology.net/john-h-yoder/john-howard-yoder’s-sexual-misconduct—part-four/>.
- . “A Known Secret: Church Slow to Explore Rumors against Leader.” *The Elkhart Truth*. July 14, 1992. <http://peacetheology.net/john-h-yoder/john-howard-yoder’s-sexual-misconduct—part-three/>.
- . “Theologian Cited in Sex Inquiry.” *The Elkhart Truth*. June 29, 1992. <http://peacetheology.net/john-h-yoder/john-howard-yoder’s-sexual-misconduct-introductory-article/>.
- Stassen, Glen H. and Michael L. Westmoreland-White. “Defining Violence and Nonviolence.” *Teaching Peace: Nonviolence and the Liberal Arts*. Edited by J. Denny Weaver and Gerald Biesecker-Mast. Lanham, MD : Rowman & Littlefield, 2003. 17–38.
- Ulanov, Ann Belford. *The Functioning Transcendent: A Study in Analytical Psychology*. Wilmette, IL: Chiron Publications, 1996.
- . *Madness and Creativity*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2013.
- . *Picturing God*. Cambridge, MA: Cowley Publications, 1986.
- . *Religion and the Spiritual in Carl Jung*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1999.
- . *The Unshuttered Heart: Opening Aliveness/Deadness in the Self*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2007.
- Weaver, J. Denny. *The Nonviolent God*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2013.
- Yoder, John Howard. “Fuller Definition of ‘Violence.’” Highgate, London: London Mennonite Centre, 1973. Quoted in Paul Martens and David Cramer, “By What Criteria Does a ‘Grand, Noble Experiment’ Fail? What the Case of John Howard

Yoder Reveals about the Mennonite Church,” *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* 89, no. 1 2015: 171–193.

———. “What is ‘Adultery of the Heart?’” Memo. Mennonite Church USA Archives, 1975. <http://replica.palni.edu/cdm/ref/collection/p15705coll18/id/4323>.

———. “What Would You Do? A Serious Answer to a Standard Question.” Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1983.

Catholic Ecclesiology and Hans Urs von Balthasar

The Unity-in-Difference of the Marian and Petrine Principles of the Church

MATTHEW KUHNER

Ave Maria University¹

Henri de Lubac wrote the following in his book *Méditation sur l'Église*:²

There is a profound truth in Karl Barth's statement that Marian dogma is the central dogma of Catholicism—the clearest exposition of the Catholic heresy, as he puts it—not in the sense that it eclipses the dogma of the Word Incarnate, but in this sense, that it is the 'crucial' dogma of Catholicism, that in relation to which all its cardinal propositions are elucidated. . . . Setting on one side the value judgments that go with it, we can accept the Barthian analysis.³

In this remarkable alignment of theological analysis, Henri de Lubac and Karl Barth were in agreement concerning the central dogma of Catholicism: the belief in Mary the Mother of God, Virginal, Immaculate, and Assumed, as the archetypal example of human engagement with God. The retrievals of the *ressourcement* movement in the twentieth century,⁴ the documents of Vatican Council II, and the encyclicals of Pope John Paul II verified and unfolded this claim, drawing attention to the manner in which the Marian dimension of the Church is its essential aspect, its *sine qua non*. As a result, the de Lubacian/Barthian analysis has been mirrored in contemporary ecclesial and theological reflection in a particularly prominent way. The following paper will reflect

¹ Matthew Kuhner is a Ph.D. Candidate in Systematic Theology at Ave Maria University in Southwest Florida.

² Paris: Éditions Montaigne, 1953. English Translation: *The Splendor of the Church*, trans. Michael Mason (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1986). (Hereafter cited as *SC*.) I employ here the title used in the French original, since (a) it was the original title chosen by the author (in contrast to the title given to the English translation), and (b) it arguably indicates more accurately the content of the text.

³ *SC*, 315. Barth's statement, alluded to by de Lubac, runs as follows: "It is in Marian doctrine and the Marian cult that the heresy of the Roman Catholic Church is apparent—that heresy which enables us to understand all the rest. The 'Mother of God' of Roman Catholic dogma is, quite simply, the principle, prototype, and summing-up of the human creature cooperating in its own salvation by making use of prevenient grace; as such, she is also the principle, prototype, and summing-up of the Church. . . . Thus, that Church in which there is a cult of Mary *must* be itself understood as at the [First] Vatican Council; is of necessity that Church of man who, by virtue of grace, cooperates with grace" [*Die kirchliche Dogmatik* (1938), vol. 1, 2, pp. 157 and 160].

⁴ For a basic introduction to the *ressourcement* theology of the twentieth century, see Marcellino D'Ambrosio, "Ressourcement Theology, Aggiornamento, and the Hermeneutics of Tradition," *Communio: International Catholic Review* 18, no. 4 (1991): 530-55.

upon the centrality of this Marian dimension within Catholic ecclesiology by examining a particular tension that arises from the above analysis. What is the relationship between the centrality of the Marian (feminine) dimension of the Church—representing holiness and charism—and its Petrine (masculine) dimension—representing office, institution, and sacramental life? Imbedded within this central question is another: is the Petrine dimension *threatened* by a greater emphasis on the Marian dimension?

The first half of the paper will explore a few main principles and developments of the Marian character of the Church as proposed by the recent Catholic ecclesial and theological tradition. This will bring the necessary specification to the discussion, insofar as it will outline the form and content of the Church's Marian dimension. The second half of the paper will attempt to give an account of the relation between the Marian and Petrine dimensions of the Church. This section will draw upon Hans Urs von Balthasar's ecclesiological thought in order to show how a thoroughly Marian ecclesiology does not endanger the Petrine dimension but rather enables it to become most fully itself.

I. THE MARIAN CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH

A. Ecclesial Documents, Vatican II and Thereafter

Before attempting a theological analysis of the recent developments of Marian ecclesiology, a brief historical overview of the Church's formal documents on the topic should be considered. During the *Second Vatican Council of the Catholic Church* (1962–1965), a milestone was reached concerning the relationship between Mary and the Church.⁵ The Fathers of the Council, rather than forming a separate document on Mariology, chose to include the teaching on Mary within the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* (eventually titled *Lumen Gentium* [1964]).⁶ This decision represents a two-fold claim about Mary and the Church, respectively: first, Catholic Mariology should take its place within the framework of ecclesiology and not be relegated to the realm of private devotion alone,⁷ and second, the Church cannot be exhaustively treated without reference to its Marian character.⁸

⁵ See Brendan Leahy, *The Marian Profile in the Ecclesiology of Hans Urs von Balthasar* (New York: New City Press, 2000), 33.

⁶ Joseph Ratzinger calls this moment an “intellectual watershed.” See Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger and Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Mary—the Church at the Source*, trans. Adrian Walker (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2005), 22. (The book is not co-authored but rather is a collection of their individual essays. Hereafter cited as MCS, with a specification of the particular author being cited).

⁷ This is not to say that Marian devotion is accidental or unimportant in the life of the Church. It remains essential, despite certain “incautious developments of unenlightened devotion” throughout Church history [Hans Urs von Balthasar, *The Office of Peter and the Structure of the Church*, trans. Andrée Emery (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1986), 202]. If there is a danger in over-emphasizing Marian devotion while minimizing Mary's relation to the Church, Joseph Ratzinger notes that there is also a danger in stressing Mary's ecclesiological role at the expense of Marian devotion. He writes, “Mariology can never simply be dissolved into an impersonal ecclesiology. . . . Mariology goes beyond the framework of ecclesiology and at the same time is correlative to it.” MCS, 27, 29. See *Lumen Gentium*, §§66–67.

⁸ See Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Theo-Drama: Theological Dramatic Theory*, vol. 3: *Dramatis Personae: Persons in Christ*, trans. Graham Harrison (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1993), 300: “What in patristic times was (a) largely implicit, that is, Mary's motherhood not only of Christ but also of the faithful—which means that she

Lumen Gentium has taken its place as the historical and doctrinal reference point for considerations of Marian ecclesiology in ecclesial documents. John Paul II's 1987 encyclical *Redemptoris Mater* takes up and deepens the Vatican Council's work, especially in its consideration of Mary's journey of faith.⁹ Later in the same year—which was declared a 'Marian Year' by the Church—the Pope reaffirmed the teaching of the Council in an address to the Curia: "We well understand that Vatican II effected a great synthesis between Mariology and ecclesiology. The Marian Year adheres to such a synthesis and conciliar inspiration so that the Church may be everywhere renewed through the presence of the Mother of God who, as the Fathers taught, is a model of the Church."¹⁰ In the same remarkable address, John Paul II uses—possibly for the first time in an ecclesial setting—the core terms of this essay: the Marian and Petrine "profiles" or "dimensions" of the Church. This passage offers a helpful (if not exhaustive) definition of the Marian dimension:

Mary united to Christ, Mary united to the Church. And the Church united to Mary finds in her the most refined and perfect image of its own specific mission which is simultaneously virginal and maternal. . . . The Virgin Mary is the archetype of the Church because of the divine maternity; just like Mary, the Church must be, and wishes to be, mother and virgin. The Church lives in this authentic "Marian profile," this "Marian dimension"; thus the [Second Vatican] Council, gathering together the patristic and theological voices, both eastern and western has noted this phenomenon: "The Church, moreover, contemplating Mary's mysterious sanctity, imitating her charity, and faithfully fulfilling the Father's will, becomes herself a mother by accepting God's word in faith. For by her preaching and by baptism she brings forth to a new and immortal life, children who are conceived of the Holy Spirit and born of God. The Church herself is a virgin, who keeps whole and pure the fidelity she has pledged to her Spouse. Imitating the Mother of her Lord, and by the power of the Holy Spirit, she preserves with virginal purity and integral faith, a firm hope and sincere charity" (*Lumen Gentium*, §64) This Marian profile is also—even perhaps more so—fundamental and characteristic for the Church as is the apostolic and Petrine profile to which it is profoundly united.¹¹

From this point forward, the Marian and Petrine "profiles", "dimensions", or "principles" are frequently employed when discussing the nature of the Church. A few examples will suffice. These terms are found in John Paul II's 1988 encyclical *Mulieris Dignitatem*, which was also promulgated within the Marian year.¹² Much later, in a 2005 homily given on the fortieth anniversary of the closing of the Second Vatican Council,

has a bridal relationship with Christ—becomes (b) explicit in medieval times. However, this extrapolation of Mary leads to such imbalances that (c) in the Second Vatican Council, while the essential insights gained down through the centuries are held fast, the whole mystery is brought back under the heading of ecclesiology."

⁹ See Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger's introductory essay to *Redemptoris Mater* in MCS, 37-60.

¹⁰ Annual Address to the Roman Curia, December 22, 1987, §2. Accessed online: http://www.piercedhearts.org/jpii/addresses_speeches/1997/marian_petrine_principles.htm.

¹¹ See *ibid.*, §§2, 3.

¹² See *Mulieris Dignitatem*, §27: "The Second Vatican Council, confirming the teaching of the whole of tradition, recalled that in the hierarchy of holiness it is precisely the 'woman,' Mary of Nazareth, who is the 'figure' of the Church. She 'precedes' everyone on the path to holiness; in her person 'the Church has already reached that perfection whereby she exists without spot or wrinkle (cf. Eph 5:27).' In this sense, one can say that the Church is both 'Marian' and 'Apostolic-Petrine.'"

Pope Benedict XVI notes the Marian and Petrine “aspects” of the Church,¹³ and in 2006 he spoke eloquently about the Marian and Petrine “principles” in the Church during a homily given to the college of Cardinals.¹⁴ Pope Francis generally reaffirms a Marian ecclesiology in *Lumen Fidei*¹⁵ and speaks about the Marian and Petrine “principles” directly in his interview with *Corriere della Sera* in March 2014.¹⁶ Finally, even the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* speaks about the Marian “dimension” of the Church.¹⁷

This brief historical outline was intended to illustrate the profound significance of the “great synthesis between Mariology and ecclesiology” in *Lumen Gentium*. In continuity with this great moment in the Church’s teaching, the recent popes have reaffirmed the Church’s Marian ecclesiology precisely in their use of the “Marian and Petrine dimensions.”¹⁸ It is crucial to note, however, that the synthesis achieved by the Council and its subsequent development is not the introduction of something foreign into Catholic ecclesiology; rather, it is the re-introduction, refinement, and assimilation of theological traditions which, though always present, were retrieved in a singular way by the *ressourcement* movement during the years preceding the Council. This theological retrieval must now be considered.

B. Theological Underpinnings

The following words of Benedict XVI are quoted on the cover of an English translation of Hugo Rahner’s book, *Our Lady and the Church*. “Hugo Rahner’s great achievement was his rediscovery, in the Fathers, of the indivisibility of Mary and the Church. This marvelous work is one of the most important theological rediscoveries of the twentieth century.”¹⁹ What was the content of this theological rediscovery so

¹³ December 8, 2005: “This ‘Petrine’ aspect of the Church, however, is included in that ‘Marian’ aspect.” Accessed online: http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/homilies/2005/documents/hf_ben-xvi_hom_20051208_anniv-vat-council_en.html.

¹⁴ March 25, 2006: “This providential circumstance [the public consistory of Cardinals] helps us to consider today’s event, which emphasizes the Petrine principle of the Church, in the light of the other principle, the Marian one, which is even more fundamental. The importance of the Marian principle in the Church was particularly highlighted, after the Council, by my beloved Predecessor Pope John Paul II in harmony with his motto *Totus tuus*.” Accessed online: http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/homilies/2006/documents/hf_ben-xvi_hom_20060325_anello-cardinalizio_en.html.

¹⁵ See §§103-104.

¹⁶ Accessed online: http://www.corriere.it/cronache/14_marzo_04/vi-racconto-mio-primi-anno-papa-90f8a1c4-a3eb-11e3-b352-9ec6f8a34ecc.shtml. English Translation: <http://www.ncregister.com/daily-news/full-transcript-of-pope-francis-march-5-interview-with-corriere-della-sera/>. The relevant passage runs as follows: “It is true that women can and must be more present in the places of decision-making in the Church. But this I would call a promotion of the functional sort. Only in this way, you don’t get very far. We must, rather, think that the Church has a feminine article: *la*. She is feminine in her origin. The great theologian Hans Urs von Balthasar worked a lot on this theme: The Marian principle guides the Church aside the Petrine. The Virgin Mary is more important than any bishop and any apostle. The theological deepening is in process.”

¹⁷ §773, “Mary goes before us all in the holiness that is the Church’s mystery as ‘the bride without spot or wrinkle.’ This is why the ‘Marian’ dimension of the Church precedes the ‘Petrine.’”

¹⁸ In the documents cited above, it is almost always the case that a mention of the Petrine dimension occurs in the context of a discussion of the Marian dimension. In this sense, it is reasonable to say that the mention of the Petrine dimension *reaffirms* the Marian dimension of the Church; often, the former is itself ordered towards an affirmation of the latter.

¹⁹ Trans. Sebastian Bullough (Bethesda, MD: Zaccheus Press, 2004) (Hereafter cited as *OLC*).

enthusiastically acclaimed by Pope Benedict? The following section will draw out some particular elements of the indivisibility of Mary and the Church, offering only a brief sketch of the grand picture of this topic rediscovered by Rahner and other *ressourcement* theologians.

Hugo Rahner, along with many other theologians in the twentieth century, sought to retrieve neglected sources of the Christian tradition. This retrieval was accomplished in order to maintain a truly catholic, or universal, theological acumen and approach (and not in order to favor one epoch over another). G.K. Chesterton masterfully expresses the spirit of this historical retrieval with a characteristically pithy remark: “all the men in history who have really done anything with the future have had their eyes fixed upon the past.”²⁰ One of the central aspects of this retrieval was, as Benedict remarked, the “rediscovery, in the Fathers, of the indivisibility of Mary and the Church.” Matthias Scheeben, setting the stage for Rahner and others, reintroduced a theological principle that he garnered from the Fathers already in 1870: “that the mystery of Mary and the mystery of the Church penetrate and illuminate each other perichoretically, that neither can be correctly situated and explained without the other.”²¹ The use of the term “perichoresis” (“mutual indwelling”) is pregnant with meaning, as it excludes any mere “correspondences” or external “analogies” that would presume an extrinsic solidarity of two like things.²² Rather, as de Lubac will later comment, a perichoretic relationship between Mary and Church implies that “there is, in fact, a constant exchange of attributes and mutual interpenetration between the two, which provides the basis for a certain ‘communication of idioms.’”²³ This means that ultimately, “Mary is figured in the Church, and the Church is figured in Mary.”²⁴

Rahner, who confirmed Scheeben’s principle through his staggering breadth of patristic research, suggests that it is impossible to “appreciate the thought of the early Christians unless we remind ourselves continually that for them the picture of Mary and the picture of the Church are mutually transparent, and are constantly seen as one.”²⁵

²⁰ *What’s Wrong with the World* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1994), 30.

²¹ Balthasar, MCS, 141. Quoting Matthias Scheeben, *Dogmatics*, V, n. 1819.

²² See de Lubac, SC, 317. See also the classic usage of “perichoresis” by John Damascene, who articulates its meaning with regard to the mystery of the Trinity: ἡ ἐν ἀλλήλαις τῶν ὑποστάσεων μονή τε καὶ ἴδρυσις ἀδιάστατοι γὰρ αὐταὶ, καὶ ἀνεκφοίτητοι ἀλλήλων εἰσὶν, ἀσύγγυτον ἔχουσαι τὴν ἐν ἀλλήλαις περιχώρησιν [PG 94:860b]. “The abiding and resting of the Persons in one another is not in such a manner that they coalesce or become confused, but, rather, so that they adhere to one another, for they are without interval between them and inseparable and their mutual indwelling is without confusion” [*An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, in *Writings, The Fathers of the Church Series*, vol. 37, trans. Frederic H. Chase, Jr. (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1958), 202]. For an account of the wider use of the term in the Fathers—in Trinitarian and Christological analysis—see *Lampe’s Patristic Greek Lexicon*, 1077-1078.

²³ De Lubac, SC, 328. See *ibid.*, 316: “The links between our Lady and the Church are not only numerous and close; they are essential and woven from within.”

²⁴ Serlo de Savigny, *In nativitate B. M.* (p. 117 in Tissier’s edition). Quoted in de Lubac, SC, 328. See Ratzinger, MCS, 66: “Mary is identified with daughter Zion, with the bridal people of God. Everything said about the *ecclesia* in the Bible is true of her, and vice versa: the Church learns concretely what she is and is meant to be by looking at Mary. Mary is her mirror, the pure measure of her being, because Mary is wholly within the measure of Christ and of God, is through and through his habitation. And what other reason could the *ecclesia* have for existing than to become a dwelling for God in the world?”

²⁵ OLC, 126.

How did the Fathers of the Church understand such profound unity? In what follows, three “idioms of communication,” so to speak, between Mary and the Church will be explored, each of which held a prominent place in the ecclesiological thought of the Fathers. Such an exercise will aid in illuminating the theological depth that underlies their thought, which is precisely the depth that the *ressourcement* movement sought to recover.²⁶

(1) *Faith*: In Luke’s Gospel, Elizabeth exclaimed to Mary, “blessed is she who believed” (1:45a). According to Joseph Ratzinger, it is in this statement that we find “the key word of Mariology.”²⁷ Mary’s faith is revealed to us quintessentially in the moment of her *fiat*, her acclamation that she is the handmaid of the Lord despite the apparent impossibility of the angel’s message (“How can this be, since I have no husband?” [Lk 1:34b]). Her great faith in the Lord and his Holy Spirit is extolled by Augustine in the following. “Mary’s loving motherhood would indeed have profited little, had she not first conceived Christ in her heart, and only then in her womb.”²⁸ Mary’s total surrender to God in faith—expressed lyrically in the Magnificat (Lk 1:46–55)—allowed her to “hear the word of God and keep it” (Lk 11:28b) to such an extent that the very Word of God was conceived in her womb. Her profound faith remains the archetype for the faith of the Church. Rahner comments accordingly, “The Church thus truly began her existence, as the Fathers so often said, in the womb of the Virgin Mary.”²⁹ It is precisely within this matrix of reflection that the Catholic Church’s dogma of the Immaculate Conception becomes intelligible: Mary’s great surrender was made possible by the graces and merits of her Son, through which she was preserved from original sin from the first moment of her conception.³⁰ This allowed her to be fully open to the Lord’s plan, placing no sinful limit upon her *fiat* to the Lord. Mary lives, then, as *the* handmaid of the Lord. In describing Mary’s faith, Ratzinger writes, “to magnify the Lord means, not to want to magnify ourselves, our own name, our own ego; not to spread ourselves and take up more space, but to give him room so that he may be more present in the world.”³¹ Following in Mary’s footsteps, this is precisely the mission of the Church: to magnify the Lord, that he would be more present in the world. De Lubac’s summary of this theme is worth quoting at length:

Soli Deo Gloria—everything in Mary proclaims that; her sanctity is wholly theological, for it is the perfection of faith, hope, and charity. Our Lady is the consummation of “the religion of the

²⁶ While the following three points are not intended to be exhaustive of the Fathers’ understanding, they are meant to give the reader a substantial initiation into their theological vision.

²⁷ Ratzinger, MCS, 49.

²⁸ *De sancta Virginitate* 3. Quoted in OLC, 101. See *Redemptoris Mater*, §13.

²⁹ OLC, 51. See Ildephonsus of Toledo, Sermon 2: “There is the virgin Mary, in whose womb is signified as by a pledge or earnest the whole Church; and we believe most firmly that thus the Church remains securely and forever united to God.” Quoted in OLC, 53.

³⁰ See *Ineffabilis Deus* (1854): “The most Blessed Virgin Mary was, from the first moment of her conception, by a singular grace and privilege of almighty God and by virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, Savior of the human race, preserved immune from all stain of original sin.” Quoted in *Catechism*, §491. See also *Catechism*, §492: “The ‘splendor of an entirely unique holiness’ by which Mary is ‘enriched from the first instant of her conception’ comes wholly from Christ: she is ‘redeemed, in a more exalted fashion, by reason of the merits of her Son.’”

³¹ MCS, 75.

humble”; the handmaid of the Lord effaces herself before him who has regarded her lowliness, marvels at his power, praises his mercy and faithfulness, and rejoices in him alone; she is his glory. The whole of her maternal role as far as we are concerned consists in her leading us to him. That is Mary; and so also is the Church our Mother—the perfect worshipper; there lies the focal point of the analogy between them, for there the same spirit is at work in both.³²

(2) *The New Eve*: Irenaeus writes that “the knot of Eve’s disobedience was loosed by the obedience of Mary,” and “even as she [Eve] . . . was made the cause of death, both to herself and to the entire human race; so also did Mary, by yielding obedience, become the cause of salvation, both to herself and the whole human race.”³³ We find elsewhere in *Against Heresies* (c. AD 180) that the Church participates in the role of the “new Eve”: Mary’s Magnificat—“My soul doth magnify the Lord” (Lk 1:46–55)—her song of rejoicing at God’s working of salvation through her, was prophetic of the song of the Church, who would continue to bring God’s salvation into the world.³⁴ Further, in God’s first promise of salvation in Genesis 3:15—“I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed”—the Fathers were quick to understand the “woman” as referring to Mary³⁵ and to the Church. Insofar as the Church continues Mary’s obedience to the salvific plan of God, she too will find enmity with (and victory over) the serpent. In the following quote, Augustine adds a deeper dimension to our exposition by connecting Genesis 3:15 with another aspect of the “new Eve” theme: the Church is brought forth from the side of the New Adam in the sleep of death.

These words [of Genesis] are a great mystery: here is the symbol pointing forward to the Church that is to come: she is fashioned out of the side of her spouse, out of the side of her spouse in the sleep of death. Did not the Apostle say of Adam that he is “a figure of Him who was to come” (Rm 5:14)? And is it not also true of the Church? Listen then, understand and realize: it is she that will tread down the serpent’s head. O Church, watch for the serpent’s head!³⁶

(3) *Virgin and Mother*: In 2 Corinthians, Paul writes to the Church in Corinth: “I feel a divine jealousy for you, for I betrothed you to Christ to present you as a pure bride to her one husband” (11:2). Commenting on this passage, Rahner writes, “the Church of Corinth is the virgin, and Paul is like the man who gives away the bride. She is forever

³² SC, 376–377. A more thorough exposition of Mary’s faith would have to address the profound link between Abrahamic faith and Marian faith, as well as the continuation of Mary’s *fiat* over the course of her earthly life, especially as it was offered at the foot of the Cross. Concerning the former, see *Redemptoris Mater*, §14 and MCS, 48–51, 64–69, 104–107; concerning the latter, see *Redemptoris Mater*, §§23–24, and MCS, 107–110.

³³ *Against Heresies*, Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. 1, trans. Alexander Roberts and William Rambaut (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994), 455 [Book III, ch. 22, §4].

³⁴ See *ibid.*, 424 [III, Ch. 10, §§2–3]: “For who else is there who can reign uninterruptedly over the house of Jacob for ever, except Jesus Christ our Lord, the Son of the Most High God, who promised by the law and the prophets that he would make his salvation visible to all flesh; so that he would become the Son of man for this purpose, that man also might become the son of God? And Mary, exulting because of this, cried out, prophesying on behalf of the Church, ‘My soul doth magnify the Lord . . .’ For all things had entered upon a new phase, the Word arranging after a new manner the advent in the flesh, that he might win back to God that human nature (*hominem*) which had departed from God.”

³⁵ See Ephraim the Syrian, Hymn 2 on the Birth of the Lord, v. 31 (ed. Lamy, II p. 455f): “The Lord hath spoken it: Satan is cast out of heaven. And Mary has trodden on him who struck at the heel of Eve. And blessed be He, who by His birth has destroyed the foe!” Quoted in OLC, 17.

³⁶ Augustine, *Enarr. In Psalmos* 103:6. Quoted in OLC, 17–18.

betrothed to Christ.”³⁷ For the Fathers, this character of the Church as a pure, virginal bride is most commonly constituted by her pure faith in Christ, clean of any stain of heresy or sin. Paradoxically, this virgin-Church is also a mother: “the Church never ceases to give birth to the Logos.”³⁸ Historically, de Lubac directs us to Eusebius’s *Church History* for a preserved reference to this dual title of the Church as both virgin and mother from as early as the second century.³⁹ The Fathers furthered this reflection by explicitly aligning the figure of the Church with that of Mary, who was also a Virgin Mother:⁴⁰ “the virginity, which Christ desires in the heart of the Church, He assured first in the body of Mary.”⁴¹ Augustine wrote beautifully on this aspect:

Speciosus forma prae filiis hominum: “beautiful above the sons of men” (Psalm 44:3), Mary’s Son, spouse of the Church! He has made His Church like to His mother, He has given her to us as a mother, He has kept her for Himself as a virgin. The Church, like Mary, is a virgin ever spotless and a mother ever fruitful. What He bestowed on Mary in the flesh, He has bestowed on the Church in the spirit: Mary gave birth to the One, and the Church gives birth to the many, who through the One become one.⁴²

The “communication of idioms” here between Mary and the Church is particularly profound: “St. Leo the Great, having shown ‘in the generation of Christ the origin of the Christian people,’ goes on to show how the actual mystery of our being brought to birth by the Church is the conclusion of the historical birth of Christ through Mary—its continuation, as it were, under the influence of the same Spirit.”⁴³

The two-fold account of the renewal in Marian ecclesiology attempted above—(A) the “great synthesis between Mariology and ecclesiology” in recent Catholic Magisterial documents, and (B) the theological retrieval of the indivisibility of Mary and the Church that underpinned the former—provides the context for our question: What is the relationship between the Marian and the Petrine dimensions of the Church?

II. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE MARIAN AND PETRINE PRINCIPLES

The Catholic theologian who looms large on the horizon of our topic is Hans Urs von Balthasar (1905–1988), one of the most important and prolific theological authors of the twentieth century. It is essential to observe that in John Paul II’s 1987 Curia address mentioned above—in which the core terms of this essay may have been used for the first time in an ecclesial setting—he quoted Balthasar regarding the relationship

³⁷ *OLC*, 27. See Ephesians 5:21–33.

³⁸ Hippolytus, *De Antichristo* 61 (GCS Hippolytus I, 2, pp. 41f). Quoted in *OLC*, 41.

³⁹ *SC*, 323: “As early as in the second century, in the famous letter that has been preserved for us by Eusebius, the Christians of Vienne and Lyons spoke of the Holy Church as ‘our virginal Mother,’ with a clear though implicit allusion to our Lady [see Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, bk. 5, chap. 1, no. 45].”

⁴⁰ It is important to note the ordering of this statement: “The image of the Church, virgin and mother, is secondarily transferred to Mary, not vice versa.” Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, *Daughter Zion: Meditations on the Church’s Marian Belief*, trans. John M. McDermott (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1983), 67.

⁴¹ Cyprian, *Sermo* 178, 4. Quoted in *OLC*, 31.

⁴² *Sermo* 195, 2. Quoted in *OLC*, 35. See Augustine, *De sancta virginitate*, chap. 2: “in both [the Church and Mary] he marvels at the same fertile virginity, the same virginal fertility.” Quoted in *SC*, 324.

⁴³ De Lubac, *SC*, 337. See Leo the Great, *Sermo* 26, chap. 2; *Sermo* 63, chap. 6. Quoted in *SC*, 337.

between the Marian and Petrine dimensions of the Church.⁴⁴ Balthasar wrote widely about these dimensions, with treatments occurring throughout his vast *oeuvre*.⁴⁵ Though his vision and style is original, it is clear that Balthasar is not being a theological “innovator” in his use of these terms; instead, he is highlighting dimensions of the Church that have always existed, as the above exposition shows. The retrieval of the indivisibility of Mary and the Church prior to the Second Vatican Council allowed von Balthasar to integrate Mariology and ecclesiology in his own writings, and to this day his work stands as the prime example of a truly Marian ecclesiology.⁴⁶ Brendan Leahy notes well the importance of this topic for the whole of Balthasar’s theology: “the Marian principle in the Church is a nodal point of his thought around which the whole of his theological speculation flows.”⁴⁷ This paper will largely follow Balthasar in exploring the question of whether a thoroughly Marian ecclesiology threatens the Petrine dimension of the Church.

Regarding the *status quaestionis* in secondary literature, little has been developed beyond Balthasar’s own writings. Angelo Cardinal Scola wrote in 2007 that “although there has been some limited study of the Marian dimension of the Church, the theme of the Petrine dimension . . . seems to have been completely overlooked, while there do not appear to have been any studies on the interrelations between the two

⁴⁴ Curia address, 1987: “A contemporary theologian has well commented: ‘Mary is ‘Queen of the Apostles’ without any pretensions to apostolic powers: she has other and greater powers’ (von Balthasar, *Nette Klarstellungen*, Ital. transl., Milan 1980, p. 181).” The English translation of the cited work by Balthasar: *New Elucidations*, trans. Sister Mary Theresilde Skerry (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1986). This is an action that reveals great esteem for von Balthasar on the part of John Paul II, since formally quoting a contemporary theologian is anything but common for a pope. On this point, the following is worth noting: “Cardinal Ratzinger confirmed that Pope John Paul II ‘made his own’ von Balthasar’s notion of the Marian and Petrine principles of the Church.” Brendan Leahy, “John Paul II and Hans Urs von Balthasar,” in *The Legacy of John Paul II*, eds. Gerald O’Collins and Michael Hayes (New York: Continuum, 2008), 42.

⁴⁵ Central elucidations of this aspect of Balthasar’s ecclesiology may be found in the following texts: *The Glory of the Lord: A Theological Aesthetics*, vol. 1: *Seeing the Form*, trans. Erasmo Leiva-Merikakis (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1981), 293-356; *Theo-Drama*, vol. 3, 263-360; *Theo-Logic: Theological Logical Theory*, vol. 3: *The Spirit of Truth*, trans. Graham Harrison (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2005), 307-411; *The Office of Peter*, 137-307; “Who is the Church?” in *Explorations in Theology II: Spouse of the Word* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1991).

⁴⁶ In addition to the aforementioned theological retrieval, it would be hard to overestimate the influence of Adrienne von Speyr on Balthasar’s theology. Balthasar wrote an entire book with “one chief aim: to prevent any attempt being made after my death to separate my work from that of Adrienne von Speyr” [*Our Task: A Report and a Plan*, trans. John Seward (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1994), 13]. Balthasar also wrote the following: “on the whole, I received far more from her, theologically, than she from me, though, of course, the exact proportion can never be calculated” [*First Glance at Adrienne von Speyr*, trans. Antje Lawry and Sr. Sergia Englund (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1981), 13]. In an attempt to take these statements seriously, I am in profound agreement with the claim made by Matthew Sutton: “von Speyr’s relationship with von Balthasar is essential to understanding him and deserves serious scholarly engagement” [“Hans Urs von Balthasar and Adrienne von Speyr’s Ecclesial Relationship,” *New Blackfriars* 94 (2013): 58]. On our topic, see von Speyr’s important chapter “Mary in the Church,” in *Handmaid of the Lord*, trans. E.A. Nelson (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1985), 149-155.

⁴⁷ Leahy, *Marian Profile*, 11. In addition, Father Joseph Fessio notes with great appreciation: “in the final analysis, it is perhaps the Marian dimension of the Church which is his most personal and original contribution to ecclesiology.” *The Origins of the Church in Christ’s Kenosis: The Ontological Structure of the Church in the Ecclesiology of Hans Urs von Balthasar* (STD diss., Katholisch-Theologisch Fakultät, Regensburg University, 1974), 383. Quoted in Leahy, *Marian Profile*, 12.

dimensions.”⁴⁸ In the English-speaking theological milieu, perhaps the most helpful work on the Marian principle in Balthasar’s thought is Leahy’s book (already quoted above), *The Marian Profile in the Ecclesiology of Hans Urs von Balthasar*. This text certainly has sections (albeit not exhaustive) on the interrelation between the Marian and Petrine dimensions of the Church in Balthasar; the reader familiar with this work will readily perceive my indebtedness to Leahy’s analysis in the following argument. The dearth of scholarship on the Petrine principle in particular is mitigated by these sections in Leahy’s book, the article by Scola just cited, and John McDade’s article, “Von Balthasar and the Office of Peter in the Church.”⁴⁹ In any case, what follows is not intended to be a speculative deepening of Balthasar’s account as much as a gesture toward the rich theological reflection already present in his ecclesiology.

Since a great deal has been said above about the Marian principle of the Church (and the “perichoretic” relation between Mary and the Church), it is fitting to consider now the Petrine dimension in itself. As suggested at the beginning of this paper, this dimension most properly concerns the institutional character of the Church. It “can be understood as a guaranteed ‘crystallization of love’ found in the preaching of the word, the tradition, the sacraments, the hierarchy, and other ecclesial elements such as canon law.”⁵⁰ Angelo Scola comments further:

the [Marian principle] points us to the feminine nature of the Church, i.e. that which makes her totally amenable to accept the plan of the Father. This amenability, which needs to be thought of in pneumatological terms, finds its proper paradigmatic fulfilment in the fiat which Mary repeated at the foot of the cross. The Petrine principle points us to the masculine dimension of the Church, based on the objectivity of the profession of faith, and it guarantees the objectivity of sacramental grace, in particular of the Eucharist. The hierarchical ministry is rooted in this principle. It is precisely by virtue of this service of the objectivity of faith and sacramental grace that the Church fulfills the mission which is proper to it: the communication of the event of Jesus Christ in such a way that it can be permanently welcomed by each individual member of the holy people of God, at every time and in every place, with Marian amenability.⁵¹

Now, inasmuch as the Petrine dimension is an objective guarantee—a crystallization—of the love of Christ for the world, it is unintelligible apart from the love it guarantees.⁵² It is, as will be shown, a profound *service* to the Lord and the faithful, which quickly becomes distorted if understood as anything else. With this said, the Petrine, masculine element is grounded by the authority of Christ and is specifically intended by him, the Church’s Founder, “who established it as necessary for this sinful world.”⁵³

⁴⁸ “The Theological Foundation of the Petrine Dimension of the Church: A Working Hypothesis,” *Ecclesiology* 4.1 (2007): 18–19.

⁴⁹ *The Way* 44.4 (October 2005): 97–114. For a helpful overview of Balthasar’s entire ecclesiology, including a brief but lucid discussion of the Marian and Petrine principles of the Church, see Aidan Nichols, *Figuring Out the Church: Her Marks and Her Masters* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2013), 133–152.

⁵⁰ Leahy, *Marian Profile*, 127.

⁵¹ Scola, “Theological Foundation of the Petrine Dimension,” 18.

⁵² See John Seward, “Mary and Peter in the Christological Constellation: Balthasar’s Ecclesiology,” in *The Analogy of Beauty: The Theology of Hans Urs von Balthasar*, ed. John Riches (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986), 127–129.

⁵³ Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Explorations II*, 26. See *ibid.*, 319: “The ministerial structure of the Church is the highest wisdom of the Church’s Founder but also his free creation.”

In an effort to articulate an account of the relationship between the Marian and Petrine dimensions, it is important to establish a hermeneutic that is congruent with Balthasar's approach. Insofar as he states explicitly that "both the Marian and the Petrine principles are coextensive with the Church"—which means that at one and the same time "the entire Church is Marian" and "also Petrine"⁵⁴—their relation must be both non-homologous and non-competitive at the same time. On the one hand, the distinctive principles cannot be understood as empty linguistic labels that fail to communicate anything of substance; Balthasar clearly has something deeper in mind when he says that the principles are "co-extensive with the Church." On the other hand, a relationship modeled on physical displacement, in which one is vying for the space occupied by the other, is also ruled out. Avoiding these overly material conceptions of unity and difference will clear the way for a proper and fruitful engagement with the relationship between the two dimensions.⁵⁵

With this hermeneutic in mind, it is important to consider first the coextensive *unity* of the principles. For Balthasar, the *priority of Christ* is essential to the Church's life and constitution. Any understanding of the Church's "principles" must start here, unified in origin in the living person of Christ. The Church must always be understood as the Bride of Christ, her Head, and not an autonomous, self-standing society. Neither principle of the Church—the Marian nor the Petrine—makes sense apart from its prior relationship to Jesus the Lord, who "loved the Church and gave himself up for her" (Eph 5:25b). Balthasar writes, "when Mary and Peter enter into relation with this unity [of the Church, effected by Christ] in their particular ways, they do so as commissioned by the Lord and for his service . . . naturally, therefore, the Marian motherliness as well as the Petrine pastoral care must be patterned after this Christological model of self-sacrifice."⁵⁶ In other words, ecclesiology can never be separated from Christology, the Bride from her Spouse.⁵⁷ Balthasar specifies even further the unity of the principles, as originating in the person of Christ:

one can say that Christ, inasmuch as he represents the God of the universe in the world, is likewise the origin of both the feminine and masculine principles in the Church; in view of him, Mary is pre-redeemed,⁵⁸ and Peter and the Apostles are installed in their office.⁵⁹

There is here no opposition between total dependency on Christ and the most active (even if not visible) service in the Church. Rather, Peter and Mary serve precisely because they have given themselves exhaustively to the Lord. Only out of their poverty—their *fiat* to the Lord—do they serve: "Lord, you know everything; you know

⁵⁴ Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 205.

⁵⁵ Leahy suggests a similar hermeneutic in *Marian Profile*, 130.

⁵⁶ Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 205.

⁵⁷ Balthasar, *Explorations II*, 315.

⁵⁸ This is a reference to the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. See above, n. 29.

⁵⁹ Balthasar, *New Elucidations*, 193. See Balthasar, *Explorations II*, 34: "The Church, then, must be conceived of as having her center not within herself, as an external worldly organization, but outside herself, in Christ who engenders her." See *ibid.*, 28: "The Church and the Christian are, undoubtedly, products of this unique generative power on the Cross. This does not mean, however, that, as products, they are ever separable from the act by which they originated."

that I love you" (Jn 21:17b); "My soul magnifies the Lord, and my spirit rejoices in God my Savior, for he has regarded the low estate of his handmaiden" (Lk 1:46b–47).⁶⁰

After considering their unity, it is essential to take up the *difference* between the two principles. The essential difference comes to light when the relationship is viewed from the perspective of the Marian principle. Balthasar says quite directly that the Marian dimension "precedes the Petrine."⁶¹ He writes, "the Marian *fiat*, unequalled in its perfection, is the all-inclusive, protective and directive form of all ecclesial life."⁶² This *fiat* came before the Incarnation and the commissioning of Peter, and thus the Marian dimension has *chronological* precedence.⁶³ This is not all, however: "qualitatively, the form of the Marian faith (consenting to God's activity) is offered to the *Catholica* as the model of all being and acting, while the catholicity of Peter's pastoral care, though all embracing in its object, is not communicable in its specific uniqueness."⁶⁴ The very specificity of Peter's role as shepherd of the flock limits its communicability among all the faithful (i.e., his role constitutively excludes its being shared among the entire people of God). Thus the Marian dimension precedes the Petrine *fundamentally* as well as chronologically, for "perfect holiness is also wisdom; it is Mary, not Peter, who is called 'Seat of Wisdom.'"⁶⁵ Mary's holiness is at the center of the Church, for Mary's *fiat* to the salvific action of the Lord is the goal of every Christian life.

When viewed from the perspective of the Petrine dimension, the same difference comes to light. Yet the contrast of perspective does illuminate a new aspect of this difference: the very uniqueness of its mission grants to the Petrine dimension a certain qualified primacy. Balthasar states, almost paradoxically, "to such an extent does [the institution] belong to the visibility of the Church in this world that even Mary, as a visible member of the Christian people, stands under Peter."⁶⁶ The uniqueness of Peter's mission lies in his *guarantee* of the Marian holiness of the Church. Leahy writes,

Institution is the condition of possibility for the continuing realization of the nuptial dialogue-event between Mary-Church and Christ throughout history. Through the institution we are guaranteed the possibility of participating in the original event of the Church's birth from

⁶⁰ Implicit here—in the understanding that Peter's office and Mary's involvement in the event of salvation are not an affront to God's majesty, but rather a testament to it—is a crucial disagreement with the following statement by Karl Barth: "Wherever it puts forth shoots, it comes from a single root. Anyone who says 'faith and works', 'nature and grace', 'reason and revelation,' if he is consistent, must go on to say 'Scripture and tradition.' It . . . is only an indication, *one* indication, of the fact that the majesty of God in his dealings with men has already been relativized." *Die kirchliche Dogmatik* [Church Dogmatics], vol. 1, pt. 2, 619–620. Quoted in Balthasar *Office of Peter*, 303. While Barth seems right about his claim regarding consistency, it does not necessarily follow that the Catholic "And" relativizes the majesty of God. De Lubac writes that the mystery of the Mother of God (*Theotokos*) "bears witness to the divine plan of associating God's creatures with the work of their own salvation: 'For the Lord will give goodness: and our earth shall yield her fruit' (Ps 84:13)" [SC, 315].

⁶¹ *Catechism*, §773.

⁶² Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 208.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 206.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵ Balthasar, *Theo-Drama*, vol. 3, 357–358.

⁶⁶ Balthasar, *Explorations II*, 319.

Christ at any and every time. Christ the head continues to be present to his (Marian) body-bride, making her fruitful, giving life through the distribution of sacraments and ministry.⁶⁷

Peter's mission as guarantor requires him to have a certain "freedom of action," and it is this freedom *for* the sake of Marian holiness that grounds his (infallible) authority.⁶⁸ This grounding is true even insofar as the Petrine dimension is seen as the mark of unity within the Church: "'the center of unity,' the papacy, must necessarily refer to this unity in faith—of the whole Church and the whole episcopate—because, with all its privileges, its role is nothing else than that of guaranteeing unity in faith and love."⁶⁹ This refers us back to the loving service that grounds the Petrine principle, proceeding as it does from participation in the self-sacrificial love of Christ. To recap the differences by situating them within the aforementioned unity between the principles, the following may be proposed: if Mary's *universality* consists in her *perfect humility* (insofar as it is the universal model of being and acting for the Christian), then Peter's *primacy* (non-universality) consists, we might say, in his *perfect humiliation*: "The Pope comes 'forward from the ranks' as a servant, in the service of a slave (Mt 20:25–27), as *servus servorum Dei*, as first only in order to be most humilatingly last of all."⁷⁰

The unity-in-difference of the Marian and Petrine principles of the Church gives the basic form to their relation. But the final thesis of this paper goes one step further: not only is the relation between the principles non-competitive—in addition, the relation can and should be understood as "perichoretic" in a manner analogous to the relation between Mary and the Church explicated in Part I. Brendan Leahy is particularly insightful on this point; he writes, "The two aspects of the Church move toward one another in reciprocity in order to become one Church of Christ. In mutually indwelling one another (*perichoresis*) the Marian and Petrine principles point beyond themselves to the transcending unity of Christ."⁷¹ This "mutual indwelling" is the very movement of love that preserves the unity-in-difference suggested above, as it prohibits the principles from a false separation on the one hand and a loss of distinction on the other. The chronological and fundamental precedence of the Marian dimension can coexist with the unique primacy of the Petrine precisely because they exist *in* and *through* each other, with the latter existing for the sake of the former. In "the kingdom of mutual love that is the Church everything is in constant movement between these two principles."⁷²

⁶⁷ *Marian Profile*, 131–132.

⁶⁸ See Saward, "Mary and Peter," 128: "all that seems at first sight to distance the Pope from the bishops and the Church, this Petrine 'freedom of action,' in fact brings him into even deeper union with the college and the faithful, for it is a service he undertakes on behalf of the whole Church." See Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 211: "Peter has to step forward as an individual, over against the others, be they the people with whom he is in *communio* or the bishops with whom he forms a *collegium*, not by 'domineering' (1 Pet 5:3), but as a servant who does not detach himself from *communio* or *collegium* but rather 'strengthens' them (Lk 22:32), frees them to be themselves in true liberty." For an illuminating study of Petrine infallibility in relationship to the Church's Marian nature, see Roch Kereszty, "The Infallibility of the Church: A Marian Mystery," *Communio: International Catholic Review* 38, no. 3 (2011): 374–390.

⁶⁹ Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 219.

⁷⁰ Saward, "Mary and Peter," 128.

⁷¹ Leahy, *Marian Profile*, 130.

⁷² Balthasar, *Christen sind einfüllig* (Einsiedeln: Johannes Verlag, 1983), 68. Quoted in Leahy, *Marian Profile*, 131.

The “mutual indwelling” of the principles is the guarantee that the unity-in-distinction will endure. But the “perichoretic” movement fulfills this role only because it is the movement characteristic of love. Thus the self-giving love that grounds and constitutes the Church enfolds the unity and the difference of the Marian and Petrine principles. Most notably, love itself stands at both the origin and the end of the difference between precedence and primacy. It is here that the Church appears in its truly supernatural character: it is first and foremost the Bride of Christ, the one who “...follow[s] the Lamb wherever he goes” (Rv 14:4b), even “to the end” in love (Jn 13:1). As two aspects of this Bride-Church, the Marian and the Petrine dimensions manifest this love: Mary and Peter are united in their love for Christ and in their *being loved* by Christ (see 1 Jn 4:19), and so they follow his call regardless of how differentiated their given missions may be. “Just as Mary received the unconditional quality of her Yes from God (who in Jesus is ‘always Yes’: 2 Cor 1:19), Peter received his keys from the same Lord who irrevocably opens and closes (Rv 3:7).”⁷³ Accordingly, the Marian and Petrine dimensions are not constituted in their unity-in-difference simply because they are structurally compatible as an asymmetrical combination of missions. While this may be factually true, it is not the distinctive element of this relationship (since such an arrangement could likely be achieved on the purely human level). The unity-in-difference of the principles is constituted distinctively by a movement of love in simultaneous service of the Lord and one another: the Petrine humbles itself by preserving and communicating the chronological and fundamental precedence of the Marian, and the Marian humbles itself by allowing itself to be preserved and communicated in the primacy of the Petrine.

Balthasar’s Marian ecclesiology has led us to a somewhat surprising conclusion. An emphasis on Marian ecclesiology is not a threat to the Petrine dimension of the Church but rather its fulfillment. Following the thesis unfolded in the second half of this paper, I would argue with von Balthasar that the “great synthesis between Mariology and ecclesiology” retrieved in the twentieth century *bears no threat* to the Petrine dimension of the Church. Rather, when understood properly, the renewal of Marian (feminine) ecclesiology is the *firm affirmation* of the Petrine (masculine). If Part I of this paper assessed the recent emphasis upon the Marian dimension of the Church, Part II has argued that the Petrine dimension becomes more intelligible and important precisely on account of this centrality: the more the Marian dimension, and its *fiat*, is brought into prominence, the more the essential nature of the Petrine as an essential *service* and *protection* of this Marian holiness is brought into view.⁷⁴ Truly, the Petrine principle finds

⁷³ Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 210.

⁷⁴ This remains the case even if the Petrine dimension includes elements that may not be necessary in an absolute sense; certain aspects of it may exist only in order to protect and guarantee the nuptial encounter between God and the creature while the Church awaits the Bridegroom’s return. See Balthasar, *Explorations II*, 158: “The whole structural aspect of the Church is also mediating and instrumental. . . . Much in these institutions is, in the deepest sense, conditioned by time and disappears when fulfillment is reached in the next world. This is the case with the official, hierarchic structure of the Church and her individual sacraments and also with certain provisional forms of the life of grace they impart. . . . What never falls away is the nuptial encounter between God and the creature, for whose sake the framework of the structures is now set up and will later be dismantled. This encounter, therefore, must be the real core of the Church. The structure and the

its *raison d'être* in being the “handmaid to the handmaid,” or the *servus servorum Dei*—the servant of the servants of God. Seen in this way, the “perichoretic” relationship between the Marian and Petrine principles is the unfolding of a soaring vision of the Church, depicted by Balthasar as an extension of Trinitarian love in the world. On this view, any explicit or implicit introduction of antagonism into this relation would obfuscate the very nature of the Church as “the kingdom of mutual love.”

graces they impart are what raise the created subjects up to what they should be in God’s design: a humanity formed as a bride to the Son, become the Church.” Quoted in Leahy, *Marian Profile*, 132.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Balthasar, Hans Urs von. “Who is the Church?” In *Explorations in Theology II: Spouse of the World* 143–191.
- . *First Glance at Adrienne von Speyr*. Translated by Antje Lawry and Sr. Sergia Englund. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1981.
- . *New Elucidations*. Translated by Sister Mary Theresilde Skerry. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1986.
- . *Our Task: A Report and a Plan*. Translated by John Saward. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1994.
- . *The Glory of the Lord: A Theological Aesthetics*, vol. 1: *Seeing the Form*. Translated by Erasmo Leiva-Merikakis. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1981.
- . *The Office of Peter and the Structure of the Church*. Translated by Andrée Emery. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1986.
- . *Theo-Drama: Theological Dramatic Theory*, vol. 3: *Dramatis Personae: Persons in Christ*. Translated by Graham Harrison (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1993).
- . *Theo-Logic: Theological Logical Theory*, vol. 3: *The Spirit of Truth*. Translated by Graham Harrison. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2005.
- Balthasar, Hans Urs von., and Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger. *Mary – the Church at the Source*. Translated by Adrian Walker. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2005.
- Benedict XVI. “Homily During the 40th Anniversary of the Closure of the Second Vatican Council.” Vatican Website. December 8, 2005. http://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/homilies/2005/documents/hf_ben-xvi_hom_20051208_anniv-vat-council.html.
- . “Homily During the Ordinary Public Consistory for the Creation of New Cardinals.” Vatican Website. March 25, 2006. http://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/homilies/2006/documents/hf_ben-xvi_hom_20060325_anello-cardinalizio.html.
- Catechism of the Catholic Church*. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1997.
- Chesterton, G. K. *What’s Wrong with the World*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1994.
- D'Ambrosio, Marcellino. “Ressourcement Theology, Aggiornamento, and the Hermeneutics of Tradition.” *Communio: International Catholic Review* 18, no. 4 (1991): 530–55.

- Damascene, John. *An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*. In *Writings*. The Fathers of the Church Series, vol. 37. Translated by Frederic H. Chase, Jr. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1958. 165–406.
- Francis. “Interview.” *Corriere della Serra*. March 4, 2014. http://www.corriere.it/cronache/14_marzo_04/vi-racconto-mio-primo-anno-papa-90f8a1c4-a3eb-11e3-b352-9ec6f8a34ecc.shtml?refresh_ce-cp.
- . *Lumen fidei*. Vatican Website. June 29, 2013. http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20130629_enciclica-lumen-fidei.html.
- John Paul II. “Annual Address to the Roman Curia.” *Servants of the Pierced Hearts of Jesus and Mary* Website. December 22, 1987. http://www.piercedhearts.org/jpii/addresses_speeches/1997/marian_petrine_principles.htm.
- . *Mulieris dignitatem* [On the Dignity and Vocation of Women On the Occasion of the Marian Year]. Vatican Website. August 15, 1988. http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_letters/1988/documents/hf_jp-ii_apl_19880815_mulieris-dignitatem.html.
- . *Redemptoris mater* [On the Blessed Virgin Mary in the Life of the Pilgrim Church]. March 25, 1987. http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_25031987_redemptoris-mater.html.
- Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. 1. Translated by Alexander Roberts and William Rambaut (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994).
- Kereszty, Roch. “The Infallibility of the Church: A Marian Mystery.” *Communio: International Catholic Review* 38, no. 3 (2011): 374–390.
- Leahy, Brendan. “John Paul II and Hans Urs von Balthasar.” In *The Legacy of John Paul II*. Edited by Gerald O’Collins and Michael Hayes. New York: Continuum, 2008). 31–50.
- . *The Marian Profile in the Ecclesiology of Hans Urs von Balthasar*. New York: New City Press, 2000.
- Lubac, Henri de. *The Splendor of the Church*. Translated by Michael Mason. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1986.
- McDade, John. “Von Balthasar and the Office of Peter in the Church.” *The Way* 44, vol. 4 (2005): 97–114.
- Nichols, Aidan. *Figuring Out the Church: Her Marks and Her Masters*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2013.
- Pius IX. *Ineffabilis Deus*. New Advent Website. December 8, 1854. http://www.newadvent.org/library/docs_pi09id.htm.
- Rahner, Hugo. *Our Lady and the Church*. Translated by Sebastian Bullough. Bethesda, MD: Zaccheus Press, 2004.
- Ratzinger, Joseph Cardinal. *Daughter Zion: Meditations on the Church’s Marian Belief*. Translated by John M. McDermott. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1983.
- Saward, John. “Mary and Peter in the Christological Constellation: Balthasar’s Ecclesiology.” In *The Analogy of Beauty: The Theology of Hans Urs von Balthasar*. Edited by John Riches (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986). 105–133.
- Scola, Angelo. “The Theological Foundation of the Petrine Dimension of the Church: A Working Hypothesis.” *Ecclesiology* 4, no. 1 (2007): 12–37.

- Second Vatican Council. *Lumen gentium* [Dogmatic Constitution on the Church]. Vatican Website. November 21, 1964. http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html.
- Speyr, Adrienne von. *Handmaid of the Lord*. Translated by E.A. Nelson. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1985.
- Sutton, Matthew Lewis. "Hans Urs von Balthasar and Adrienne von Speyr's Ecclesial Relationship." *New Blackfriars* 94 (2013): 50–63.

The Deceitful Savior and the Emasculated King

Heterosexist Violence in Judges 3:12–30

DAVID B. SMITH

*Princeton Theological Seminary*¹

I. INTRODUCTION

The complex narrative preserved in Judges 3:12–30 has puzzled commentators for centuries. The seemingly humorous and possibly indecent nature of the pericope leads some to avoid its more ambiguous literary components and inspires others to offer unbridled critique. Though modern readers often find the intricacies of the narrative difficult to grasp, the text is laced with sexual intimations and violent imagery. Consequently, some commentators have concluded that the assassination of Eglon by Ehud contains an implicit reference to male-on-male rape. This argument draws upon emerging understandings of the relationship between sex, gender, religion, and power politics in the ancient Near East. Even if the author did not intend to recount a *literal* rape scene, the clandestine sexual innuendo and violent imagery in the passage invites a sexualized reading. Within its historical context, Ehud's murder of Eglon would have elevated the masculinity of Israel's men, while simultaneously proliferating the anti-Moabite racism that runs throughout the Book of Judges. The text employs these concepts to make a dangerous theological claim: heterosexist violence and racial othering is justified if it is done in the name of YHWH. In light of these themes, this article will argue that Judges 3:12–30 should be read as an example of divinely sanctioned heterosexist violence, which intensifies racial othering via the feminization of Israel's enemies.

¹ David B. Smith is a student in the Master of Divinity Program at Princeton Theological Seminary and a Candidate for Ordination as a Teaching Elder in the Presbyterian Church (USA). He is grateful to Dr. Heath D. Dewrell, Assistant Professor of Old Testament at Princeton Theological Seminary, for his detailed feedback on an earlier version of this article.

Given that so little attention is paid to the silenced topic of male-on-male rape in mainstream academic discourse, most who espouse the position articulated in this paper do so from queer and feminist hermeneutical perspectives. Though Judges 3:12–30 does not appear in works that are dedicated to the analysis of ‘texts of terror’ for LGBTQ people, some have suggested that it is “deserving of a place”² in those compilations. If so, the hermeneutical, theological and practical significance of the proposed reading of this pericope should not be underestimated.

This article approaches the biblical text through a lens of hermeneutical suspicion that draws upon recent queer and feminist scholarship. The goal of this approach is to honestly engage with the aspects of the narrative that challenge modern readers most. This method endeavors to create a *safe hermeneutical space* for those who have been ostracized in the name of ‘scriptural authority.’ It seeks to enable oppressed communities to grapple with the Bible’s legacy through the lens of their experience of marginalization. It searches for ways to empower them to name the suffering they have endured, even if that means *reading against* a sacralized text. For those who have lived their lives as ‘insiders,’ reading a ‘holy book’ in this way is a risky venture. For people who find themselves on the margins, it is a spiritual necessity.

II. SETTING THE STAGE: LITERARY AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Ancient Near Eastern Context

Various cultures in the Ancient Near East coexisted in an environment that was largely defined by prevailing assumptions about masculinity and femininity. The sexual lives, both individual and cooperative, of the people in these societies were characterized by “an interaction between active masculine and passive feminine gender roles.”³ There were clearly defined assumptions about how one was to interact with people of the opposite or same sex. In this dichotomous construction between male and female, a man’s honor was dependent upon his ability to remain the dominant and penetrative partner in sexual intercourse. Sexual activity between men was generally frowned upon, because it compromised the culturally engrained gender binary. Though both partners in homoerotic intercourse were condemned in ancient Israel,⁴ other ANE cultures were less prescriptive. In those contexts, “to engage in same-sex relationships was not dishonoring in and of itself, but unless one was a younger or inferior male, taking a passive role would be looked upon with contempt.”⁵ To be penetrated was to be feminized, because it meant assuming the role assigned to women (passive/receptive) in the sexual act. It is in this context that homoerotic violence was often employed, both by individuals and armies, in order to feminize male enemies, while bolstering the heterosexuality of the perpetrator.

² Deryn Guest, “Judges,” in *The Queer Bible Commentary*, ed. Deryn Guest, Robert E. Goss, Mona West, and Thomas Bohache (London: SCM Press, 2006), 177.

³ Brian Carmany, *Rethinking Eros: Sex, Gender, and Desire in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Bloomington, IN: AuthorHouse, 2010), 83.

⁴ Leviticus 18:22.

⁵ Guest, “Judges,” 183.

The sexual violence that was perpetrated against men and women by ancient hetero-patriarchal social and theological structures is exemplified in the Egyptian myth of the battle between the gods Horus and Seth. In this text, the two gods go to war with one another in an effort to gain control of the Egyptian pantheon. During their battle, Seth anally rapes Horus in order to force him “into a position of a defeated and raped enemy, thus making him unfit for the status of a king.”⁶ A prescription regarding the perpetration of heterosexist violence can also be found in the *Middle Assyrian Law Code*, which reflects a fear of the feminizing power of male-male anal sex upon the passive recipient:

If a man furtively spreads rumors about his comrade, saying: “Everyone has sex with him,” or in a quarrel in public says to him: “Everyone has sex with you, I can prove the charges,” but he is unable to prove the charges and does not prove the charges, they shall strike him fifty blows with the rods.⁷

Both the Egyptian myth of the battle between Horus and Seth and the Middle Assyrian Law Code indicate that accusations of passive reception in anal intercourse could cause the victim to lose his social standing in the hetero-patriarchal societies of the ancient world. These texts also exemplify the complex interaction between gender, sexuality, religion, and ANE geo-politics that ‘set the stage’ for the Book of Judges.

Ethnic-Racist Humor in the Book of Judges

The possible allusion to male-on-male sexual violence in Judges 3:12–30 becomes all the more significant when one considers the role of feminization in the honor/shame system of race-based, sexualized warfare. By alluding to anal rape throughout the pericope, the narrative effectively feminizes the Moabite king and compromises the masculinity of his subjects by proxy. Like their ruler, the Moabites “are feminized, sexualized, dehumanized, and hence discredited as foreigners, the others, who deserve contempt, ridicule, sexual violence and even murder.”⁸ The figurative rape and murder of Eglon can thus be seen as a foreshadowing of verse 30, where the author employs violent sexual imagery to describe Moab’s defeat by Israel’s forces.⁹ By compromising Moabite masculinity in this way, the narrative also satirizes Israel’s enemies, which “would give storyteller and audience a delightful sense of superiority, as well as help define ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders.’”¹⁰

⁶ Martti Nissinen, *Homoeroticism in the Biblical World: A Historical Perspective* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1998), 19, quoted in Carmany, *Rethinking Eros*, 83.

⁷ *The Assyrian Laws*, ed. and trans. G.R. Driver and John C. Miles (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, 2005), A § 19, quoted in Carmany, *Rethinking Eros*, 83.

⁸ Susanne Scholz, “Judges,” in *Women’s Bible Commentary*, ed. Carol A. Newsom, Sharon H. Ringe, and Jacqueline E. Lapsley, 3rd ed. (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012), 117.

⁹ The language of being “subdued” (עָרַב) could be a sexually violent image. This assertion is consistent with the conclusions of various feminist scholars, who “have already noted how sex permeates [the Book of Judges].” See Guest, *Judges*, 168.

¹⁰ Carolyn Pressler, *Joshua, Judges, Ruth*, Westminster Bible Companion Commentary Series 5 (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 150.

Anti-Benjaminite Sentiments in the Book of Judges

It is commonly argued that the “stories [in Judges] are arranged so that good examples of leadership (Othaniel, Deborah, Jephthah) alternate with not so good examples (Ehud, Gideon, Samson), with the whole book centering on Abimelech’s abortive reign at Shechem.”¹¹ The fact that Ehud is grouped within the ‘less desirable’ secondary class of heroes may reflect the untoward nature of his mission. It may also demonstrate the tendency of the book’s Judahite redactors to proliferate racial stereotypes of Benjaminites. This will become more clear once the idiomatic humor of the pericope has been explored in greater detail.

III. THE DECEITFUL SAVIOR AND THE EMASCULATED KING

The primary themes that run through the story of Judge Ehud and King Eglon are personified in the paradoxical nature of both characters’ identities. Ehud, the deceitful savior, is sent to kill Eglon, who becomes the emasculated king. Ehud’s name (אֶהוּד) which can be rendered “loner” in English, inspires some to depict him as a “lone ranger,” who faces off against [Eglon,] a royal “fat cat.”¹² Though English readers find it difficult to grasp the intricacies of the narrative, readers of Hebrew often call it “secular and even crude, [a story that is] characterized by ribald humor; puns, insults, [and] scatological jokes.”¹³ In this ancient example of racial humor, the dubious hero becomes something like an ancient “James Bond who single-handedly upsets Moabite rule by successful political assassination.”¹⁴

Queer readings of this pericope draw heavily on the dominant traits of the narrative’s primary characters and upon the idiomatic humor that permeates the text. There are three aspects of Ehud’s identity that make it possible to recognize a veiled reference to male-on-male rape in the selected text. The first is the apparent emphasis upon his left-handedness (v. 15). The second is the repeated references to his ‘hand’ (יָד), and the third is his Benjaminite heritage.¹⁵ When one considers Eglon’s defining characteristic, the jovial nature of the pericope comes into full view. The Moabite king is described as “a very fat man (אִישׁ בָּרִיאַ מְאֹד)” in v. 17. Apparently, he is also powerful enough to have formed an alliance with the Ammonites and the Amalekites to defeat Israel some eighteen years prior to the setting of the Ehud story (vv. 13–14).

The Hebrew idiom “אֶטֶר יְדִימִינוֹ,” which is frequently translated “left-handed,” can also be rendered “restricted/bound in his right hand” (v.15). Consequently, “some think that [Ehud’s left-handedness] has to do with a disability, which would account for the Moabites’ lack of suspicion about this Israelite.”¹⁶ Yet, Ehud must be at least nominally

¹¹ Robert G. Boling, “Judges,” in *The HarperCollins Study Bible Fully Revised and Updated: New Revised Standard Version, with the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books*, ed. Harold W. Attridge et al. (New York: HarperCollins, 2006), 347.

¹² J. Clinton McCann, *Judges*, in Interpretation Commentary Series (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 44.

¹³ Pressler, *Joshua*, 147.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Guest, “Judges,” 168.

¹⁶ Pressler, *Joshua*, 147.

ambidextrous, because he needs to appear right-handed in order to trick his Moabite victim. Upon consideration of this fact, other commentators have proposed that the idiom implies, “Ehud belonged to an elite group of commandos trained to wield a sword with either hand, possibly by binding their dominant hand.”¹⁷

The exact meaning of the phrase used to describe Ehud’s left-handedness is a matter of debate, and English readers may find it difficult to recognize the exegetical relevance of this linguistic nuance. The fact that Ehud can use his left hand proficiently seems to be nothing more than a forgone conclusion of the narrative’s trajectory. It also allows him to hide his weapon on his right thigh, “where it would not be expected,”¹⁸ because swords were generally carried on the left hip. It is only when one considers the broader historical context in which the narrative is situated, that the plausibility of a deeper meaning becomes apparent. It is possible to read this complicated idiom as an “indication that left-handedness was considered peculiarly unnatural.”¹⁹ In the worldview of the ANE and many other ancient cultures, left-handedness was a sign of “a perverse and devilish disposition: every left-handed person [was] a possible sorcerer, justly to be distrusted.”²⁰ By making Ehud’s left-handedness his defining character trait, the author could be indicating that the task to which this unlikely savior has been assigned is particularly dubious, unnatural and untoward.

Ehud’s left-handedness is referenced twice in the pericope (vv. 15 and 21). In addition to emphasizing his deviousness, the author may also be using repetition to highlight the erotic undertones of the passage. Every culture employs its own euphemisms to convey sexual innuendo without directly referencing a sexual act. The Hebrew Bible is replete with such idioms. Body parts like “hand” and “foot” are often used as metaphors for sexual organs. In the Hebrew of the biblical period, “some words are used exclusively for the male organ; one is ‘hand’ [יָד] because of its resemblance to the erect phallus.”²¹ English speakers employ similar euphemisms today when they make references to male and female genitalia. Given that this narrative is frequently characterized as “bathroom humor,” it is logical to conclude that the author is employing repetitive *double entendre* to convey a ‘humorous’ sexual message.²² When one considers the fact that Ehud uses

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Boling, “Judges,” 352.

¹⁹ Robert G. Boling, *Judges*. The Anchor Bible Commentary Series 6A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., 1969), 86. See also, John J. Owens, *Analytical Key to the Old Testament, Vol. II* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1992), 13.

²⁰ Robert Hertz, *Death and the Right Hand*, trans. Rodney and Claudia Needham (Aberdeen: Cohen & West, 1960), 106, quoted in Guest, “Judges,” 169.

²¹ Michael Coogan, *God & Sex: What the Bible Really Says* (New York, NY: Twelve, 2010), 14. There are two Hebrew words that are frequently rendered “hand” in English. One is יָד and the other is כַּף. Of the two, only כַּף (used in the selected text) is employed as a euphemism for male genitalia. There are instances of this use in other biblical passages (see Is. 57: 8-10 and Song. 5:4). The *Community Rule Scroll* of Qumran also employs the term in reference to male genitalia (1QS 7:13). Nevertheless, there are many situations in which כַּף simply means “hand,” without any euphemistic implications. Context is the determining factor regarding the decision to read the author’s use of כַּף as sexual innuendo. (C.f., Coogan, 14 and Ch. 1 n. 27)

²² McCann, *Judges*, 44.

his hand to violently *thrust* the sword into his victim, one begins to see how it is possible to read this passage as a “deliberately scripted figurative rape scene.”²³

In biblical tradition, the Tribe of Benjamin derives its name from its forbear, Benjamin, the second son of Jacob and Rachel.²⁴ The author of Judges makes it clear that Ehud is of this tribe, which seems to have “a genetic predisposition to left-handedness.”²⁵ This trait also appears to “play upon the name of their eponymic ancestor which means ‘son of the right hand.’”²⁶ Additionally, the Book of Judges concludes with a story characterized by hetero-patriarchal violence that results in the rape of a Levite’s unnamed ‘secondary wife’ (19–21). The rape took place in Gibeah, which was under the control of the tribe of Benjamin (19:16). Thus, it seems that the Judahites who crafted the Book of Judges wanted their readers to view Ehud’s activities in a less-than-laudable light and in connection with their dubious sister-tribe. Based upon this assertion, it has been argued that the story of Ehud “foreshadows some of the problematic events during the rivalry of David and Saul, including the relationship of David to another Benjaminite man, Jonathan, with whom he has a homoerotic relationship.”²⁷

In contrast to Ehud, who is introduced as a “devious prophet-diplomat,”²⁸ Eglon is characterized as “a ridiculous figure, obese and gullible.”²⁹ Obesity was related to opulence, wealth and greed throughout much of the ancient world, but “it was also especially associated with effeminate men.”³⁰ Thus, from the moment he is introduced, Eglon is portrayed as inherently ‘less manly’ than his attacker. Like Ehud’s left-handedness, the king’s obesity becomes integral to the story’s plot, which can only be fully grasped by reflecting upon the gruesome details of the murder scene.

Once the identities of the characters have been established, the author sets the stage for Eglon’s murder, which is the climax of the narrative. Ehud leaves for Moab with the weapon that he has fashioned for his strange mission. The sword is short enough to be fastened “on his right thigh (עַל יָרֵךְ יְמִינוֹ),” so that it can be easily concealed. Unlike the typical sword of the period, “which had a curved side with which one hacks away at enemies,” Ehud’s weapon is flat, straight, and double-edged. It is well-suited for stabbing.³¹ Additionally, the sword is said to be “גָּמָד” in length. The Hebrew word גָּמָד is a *hapax legomenon*, so it is difficult to ascertain its exact meaning. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the word has an Arabic cognate (*jamada*), which some have translated “to be hard.”³² In light of the sword’s design, its placement on Ehud’s left thigh (the center

²³ Guest, “Judges,” 170.

²⁴ Genesis 35:18.

²⁵ Susan Niditch, *Judges: A Commentary*, in *The Old Testament Library*, edited by William P. Brown, Carol A. Newsom and David L. Peterson (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2008), 57. See also Judges 20:16.

²⁶ Niditch, *Judges*, 57.

²⁷ Susanne Scholz, *Sacred Witness: Rape in the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2010), 161.

²⁸ Boling, *Judges*, 85.

²⁹ Pressler, *Joshua*, 147.

³⁰ Guest, “Judges,” 172.

³¹ Marc Zvi Brettler, *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel* (London: Routledge, 1995), 92, quoted in Guest, “Judges,” 171.

³² Guest, “Judges,” 171.

of male fertility in the ANE worldview),³³ and its use to *penetrate* the king's belly, it is possible to understand the sword as a phallic image.

After the deceitful savior presents his tribute to the king, Ehud tells his future victim that he has a "secret thing (דְּבַר־סֵתֶר)" for him (vv.19, 20).³⁴ Eglon sends his servants away as Ehud "comes to him (בָּא אֵלָיו)." The Hebrew word "בָּא," which means "to come/to enter," is commonly used to describe sexual penetration.³⁵ The encounter takes place in Eglon's "cool roof chamber (בְּעֶלֶית הַמִּזְבֵּחַ)," which was probably a private bathroom and/or seasonal parlor. Ehud's "secret thing" is revealed as his cloak is loosened, and the phallic sword is exposed. With the language of sexual penetration in the proverbial air, the two men find themselves locked away in a private chamber. When one all of this alongside the trepidation with which the servants approach the sealed room at the end of the narrative (v. 24), the sexual nuance of the pericope comes into full view.

After the servants have been sent away, Ehud loosens his cloak and springs into action. "Force and aggression are implicit"³⁶ in the struggle that ensues. Ehud thrusts his blade "into [Eglon's] belly (בְּבֶטֶן)." The Hebrew word בֶּטֶן, which is translated "belly" in this text, is most commonly used to refer to a woman's womb. The blade disappears into the king's belly, as it forms what some have called a "strongly vaginal"³⁷ image. The weapon is left in the king's body, but "the dirt (הַפֶּךְ־שֶׁדֶנֶה)," which is probably excrement,³⁸ comes out. By the time the phallic sword has been violently thrust into the king's womb-like belly, and the excrement has been exposed; it is virtually impossible for readers (ancient and modern) to miss the sexual intimations that run throughout this terrifying murder scene.

In light of the conclusions drawn above, modern readers may find it difficult to understand why the Judahite author of this pericope chose to cast the deceitful and devious Ehud as an agent of YHWH's salvific action on their behalf. In response to this concern, some have argued that the narrator is attempting to "taint Ehud with all the derogatory implications associated with Saul and 'depict' the disadvantages to Israel of serving under non-Judahite leadership."³⁹ This assertion is consistent with the anti-Benjaminite propaganda that runs throughout the book. At the same time, it is also distinctly possible that "Ehud is meant to be an exonerated figure."⁴⁰ The sexual act that is implied in the text would have been considered an "abomination" under Levitical law.⁴¹ Yet, the prowess Ehud exhibited over the Moabite King would have bolstered the masculinity of Israel and of Israel's male God within the gender-based honor/shame

³³ Gen. 46:26; Ex. 1:5.

³⁴ סֵתֶר is a very common term, which does not necessarily imply a reference to sexual behavior. Yet, it is attested in the context of sexuality (see Prov. 9:17).

³⁵ Gen. 6:4; 16:2, 4; Deut. 22:13.

³⁶ Niditch, *Judges*, 58.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ McCann, *Judges*, 44.

³⁹ Robert H. O'Connell, *The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996), 285, quoted in Guest, "Judges," 172.

⁴⁰ Guest, "Judges," 176.

⁴¹ Leviticus 18:22.

system of the ANE. His methods would have been considered unlawful, but he would have been excused from punishment or derision, because the means he employed to uphold the national pride of Israel were ultimately justified by the efficacy of his action. The biblical narrative is replete with characters who are honored because their less-than-lawful activities served the ultimate purpose of saving Israel and glorifying YHWH.⁴² Therefore, it is possible to conclude that Ehud is depicted as *both* an unfavorable *and* an exonerated figure. Nevertheless, the author's Judean audience would have found it easier to grapple with the heinousness of Ehud's story, because the deceitful Benjaminite was a standard bearer for a tribe that they already saw as devious and debauched.

IV. HETEROSEXIST VIOLENCE AND THE COMPLICIT DEITY

"The Lord Raised up a Deliverer"

When considering the theological and practical ramifications of the proposed reading, it is important to note that some have characterized queer renderings of Judges 3:12–30 as "faddish."⁴³ Yet, it has been argued that similar interpretations existed as early as the thirteenth century, which indicates that this reading is not "simply the product of modern, post-Freudian sensibilities, but may be an integral part of the biblical story."⁴⁴ Even if readers do not accept the interpretive assertions made in the forgoing sections, Judges 3:12–30 still poses a significant theological challenge to modern readers.

Many of the historic interpretations of this text have failed to address its latent sexual innuendo, but its misogynistic and racist elements have not been so easily avoided. The patristic theologian, Origen of Alexandria, writes:

Moabite is translated as "flow" or "effusion." Who can the ruler or leader of this flowing and dissolute people be seen or understood to be, therefore, other than the word of that philosophy which adjudges pleasure to be the highest good, a philosophy which the word of the gospel, which has been compared to a sword, killed and destroyed?⁴⁵

It is not difficult to grasp the negative ramifications of relating an entire people-group to a philosophical school that has been "killed and destroyed" by the gospel, for which Ehud's sword is an allegory. Origen's interpretation exemplifies the danger of reading this text without a lens of hermeneutical suspicion. The fact that the central character of the Hebrew Bible—YHWH—is "evoked as a complicit collaborator in this piece of ethnic humor raises serious ethical [and theological] questions."⁴⁶ Modern readers simply cannot ignore these concerns.

In the opening verses of the passage, the author claims that YHWH is the one who forced the people of Israel into their dire situation. It is also clear that the God of Israel is the one who sent the deceitful savior on his dreadful mission (vv. 12–15). God is the one

⁴² See Josh. 2; Judg. 4-5; and Jdt. 12-15 in the Apocrypha.

⁴³ Guest, "Judges," 171.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Origen of Alexandria, *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1897), Homilies on Judges (4.1), quoted in *Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1-2 Samuel*, Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture Series 4, ed. John R. Franke (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2005), 113.

⁴⁶ Guest, "Judges," 176.

who “raised up for [the Israelites] a deliverer (v. 15),” who then went on to murder the Moabite king. It is God who works behind the scenes of this ancient example of ethnic humor, and it is ultimately God who endorses the racially motivated heterosexual violence that exists in this pericope.

In light of YHWH’s role in the narrative, theological commentators must earnestly ask the question, ‘what does this story say about the God whom the Israelites worshiped?’ Though Ehud’s actions are described by various commentators as “peculiar, unnatural, devious, sinister” and even “queer,”⁴⁷ YHWH is ultimately the initiator of the heterosexual violence that claims Eglon’s life. In other words, “it was not Ehud who killed Eglon, but Yahweh, who used Ehud as his agent.”⁴⁸ The skilled assassin is “but a foil for the elevation of YHWH as Israel’s true deliverer.”⁴⁹ When approached from the perspective of ancient Israel’s henotheistic religious beliefs, the ultimate goal of the pericope comes into full view. The author does not merely intend to glorify Ehud’s masculinity over and against that of Eglon. The primary assertion of this text is theological. Ehud is the agent of Israel’s male god YHWH; whose masculinity is ultimately proven superior to that of the Moabite gods. Like the Egyptian god Seth, in the story of the battle between Horus and Seth, YHWH gains superiority in the religious pantheon of the ANE by anally raping the Moabite deities (represented by Eglon) through his proxy: Ehud. Thus, Israel’s god is complicit in the racist, heterosexual violence that is perpetuated by an oppressive androcentric social order.

Some modern scholars dismiss the problematic implications of the pericope by asserting that the methods God employs to achieve God’s will do not “necessarily fit into our moral codes.”⁵⁰ These commentators believe that the troubling nature of this passage does not negatively impact the overall message of the Book of Judges, which is YHWH’s deliverance of Israel. In making this argument, they have fallen into the trap that the author of this passage set thousands of years ago. They read from the perspective of the Israelites; from the point of view that only an ‘insider’ can share. From this vantage point, it is less than terrifying that YHWH uses racially motivated heterosexual violence to figuratively rape ‘outsiders’ who stand opposed to the realization of Israel’s power. It is only when this passage is read from the perspective of an ‘outsider,’ that YHWH is exposed as the true tyrant of the Ehud story.

“A Text of Terror”

In order to understand how this passage can be read as a “text of terror for gay identified readers,”⁵¹ one must first recognize the difference between the consensual homosexual sex and homoerotic violence that is perpetrated by the hetero-patriarchal social structures. The epistemological concept of sexual orientation did not arise until

⁴⁷ Ibid., 174.

⁴⁸ John L. McKenzie, *The World of the Judges* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1966), 124, quoted in Guest, “Judges,” 175.

⁴⁹ O’Connell: *The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges*, 91, quoted in Guest, “Judges,” 175.

⁵⁰ Pressler, *Joshua*, 150.

⁵¹ Guest, “Judges,” 176.

the nineteenth century.⁵² Readings that recognize the sexual innuendo of the passage, while failing to acknowledge the distinction between heterosexually motivated male-on-male rape and consensual male-male anal intercourse “will only perpetuate anti-gay/lesbian reactions within Christian and Jewish discourse.”⁵³

The rampant anti-Moabite racism in Judges 3:12–30 is enough to raise serious questions about the theological assumptions of the pericope. The fact that it offers no critique of androcentric social structures, which associate femininity with the ‘outsider’ is also troubling. Yet, for many, the terror of this text comes into full view upon consideration of the violent heterosexism that has characterized the common life of the world’s Abrahamic faiths. In the world today, religious individuals and institutions are the primary perpetrators of what has been called “covert cultural sexual abuse.”⁵⁴ This abuse often takes the form of “chronic verbal, emotional, psychological, and sometimes sexual assaults against individual’s gender expression, sexual feelings, and behaviors.”⁵⁵ Though the impact of covert cultural sexual abuse is certainly not limited to violent physical assault upon men, it should be noted that Forty percent of gay men, forty-seven percent of bisexual men and twenty-one percent of heterosexual men report being the victim of sexual violence in their lifetimes.⁵⁶ In light of these statistics, the possible impact of this text upon the lives of LGBTQ people in churches and synagogues cannot be underestimated.

In ancient, as well as modern times, those who are gay or gender non-conforming are often subjected to ridicule and sexual violence in the name of religious conviction. The same androcentric social structures that have oppressed women of all sexual orientations for centuries are often coopted by religious groups to justify the devaluation of LGBTQ life. Like the Moabites, queer identified people are “are feminized, sexualized, dehumanized, and hence discredited as foreigners, the others, who deserve contempt, ridicule, sexual violence and even murder.”⁵⁷ Those who attempt to redeem the selected text for theological discourse without critical reflection do so at the expense of LGBTQ people. Their readings often insinuate that Eglon deserved to be violated, because he was ‘less of a man’ than God’s chosen savior. Today, religious people do the same thing when they perpetuate heterosexist violence against queer people in the name of their salvific figures.

It is only natural for ‘straight’ readers to identify with the Israelite hero in this pericope, but LGBTQ people simply cannot afford to do so. Queer interpretations of Judges 3:12–30 invite marginalized people to read *against the text* that has been presented

⁵² For a detailed analysis of the epistemological development of the concept of sexual orientation see Arnold I. Davidson, *The Emergence of Sexuality: Historical Epistemology and the Formation of Concepts* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001).

⁵³ Guest, “Judges,” 189.

⁵⁴ Joe Kort, *Gay Affirmative Therapy for the Straight Clinician* (New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, 2008), 48.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ National Sexual Violence Resource Center, *Statistics About Sexual Violence* (2015), accessed December 3, 2015, http://www.nsvrc.org/sites/default/files/publications_nsvrc_factsheet_media-packet_statistics-about-sexual-violence_0.pdf.

⁵⁷ Scholz, *Judges*, 117.

in order to find liberation from the oppressive structures that it supports. For the sake of their own emotional, physical and spiritual well-being, they must reject the life-denying claims of texts, theological constructions, and religious institutions that proliferate heterosexist violence against them. They must stand with groups who reject racist and sexist social structures. They must also challenge those who either ignore or use passages like Judges 3:12–30 to bolster modern expressions of heterosexism through the feminization and racial othering of marginalized communities around the world.

V. CONCLUSION

The complex relationship between sex, gender, religion and power politics in the ANE provides the historical context in which Judges 3:12–30 must be interpreted. Masculinity was constructed upon an honor/shame system that based male social standing upon an ability to remain the penetrative partner in sexual intercourse. If a man either volunteered or was forced to assume the receptive role in anal sex, his masculinity was compromised. It was not uncommon in ancient cultures for individuals and armies to rape their male enemies in order to feminize them. This feminization was only acceptable when it was directed toward racial “others,” who were often depicted as deserving of violation. Homoerotic violence was not a result of homosexual orientation, which is an epistemological concept that did not exist at the time. It was a weapon of war that promoted the heterosexuality of the perpetrator over and against that of the victim.

Though English readers find it difficult to grasp the idiomatic intricacies of the selected text, it is laced with clandestine sexual innuendo that cannot be overlooked. Violent imagery and *double entendre* combine to evoke an image of male-on-male rape in the climactic scene of the narrative. Ehud is described as a cunning and devious deliverer who had been sent on a perilous mission from YHWH. Eglon, on the other hand, is depicted as an effeminate tyrant, deserving of his gruesome death. For its Israelite audience, this passage would have been a humorous story which glorified their masculinity by feminizing their Moabite enemies, who were considered a racial ‘other.’

In the forgoing pages, it has been argued that the sexual innuendo in Judges 3:12–30 should be read as an example of divinely sanctioned heterosexist violence, which intensifies racial othering through the feminization of Israel’s enemies. Those who accept this rendering of the text must be willing to address the difficult theological and ethical challenges that it raises for modern readers. From a theological perspective, Ehud is merely a tool for YHWH’s action in the world. Israel’s male god is the one who anally rapes Eglon (the representative of his people) through his proxy: Ehud. Israel’s god successfully feminizes the gods of the Moabites through heterosexist violence, thus proving his (and Israel’s) superior masculinity. When one considers the violent legacy of the world’s Abrahamic faiths toward the LGBTQ community, it is not difficult to see how this passage can be read as a ‘text of terror’ for queer identified people. For many, honest engagement with the issues raised in this article will be daunting, but it is a task to which all people of faith are called.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Boling, Robert G. "Judges." In *The HarperCollins Study Bible Fully Revised and Updated: New Revised Standard Version, with the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge et al. New York: HarperCollins, 2006.
- . *Judges*. The Anchor Bible Commentary 6A. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1969.
- Carmany, Brian. *Rethinking Eros: Sex, Gender, and Desire in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Bloomington, IL: AuthorHouse, 2010.
- Coogan, Michael. *God & Sex: What the Bible Really Says*. New York: Twelve, 2010.
- Davidson, Arnold I. *The Emergence of Sexuality: Historical Epistemology and the Formation of Concepts*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Franke, John R., ed. *Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1-2 Samuel*. Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture Series 4. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2005.
- Guest, Deryn, Robert E. Goss, Mona West, and Thomas Bahache, eds. *The Queer Bible Commentary*. London: SCM Press, 2006.
- Kort, Joe. *Gay Affirmative Therapy for the Straight Clinician*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2008.
- McCann, J. Clinton. *Judges*. Interpretation Commentary Series. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.
- National Sexual Violence Resource Center. *Statistics about Sexual Violence*. 2015. Accessed December 3 2015. http://www.nsvrc.org/sites/default/files/publications_nsvrc_factsheet_media-packet_statistics-about-sexual-violence_0.pdf.
- Newsom, Carol A., Sarah H. Ringe, and Jacqueline E. Lapsley, eds. *Women's Bible Commentary*. 3rd ed. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012.
- Niditch, Susan. *Judges: A Commentary*. In *The Old Testament Library Series*. Edited by William P. Brown, Carol A. Newsom, and David L. Peterson. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.
- Owens, John J. *Analytical Key to the Old Testament: Vol II*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1992.
- Pressler, Carolyn. *Joshua, Judges, Ruth*. Westminster Bible Companion Commentary Series 5. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.
- Scholz, Susanne. *Sacred Witness: Rape in the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010.

Book Reviews

Michael Banner. *Ethics of Everyday Life: Moral Theology, Social Anthropology, and the Imagination of the Human*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015, pp. 240. \$35.00 (hardcover).

Michael Banner, of Trinity College at the University of Cambridge, takes up two broad tasks in *Ethics of Everyday Life: Moral Theology, Social Anthropology, and the Imagination of the Human*. The first is to argue that moral theology, moral philosophy, and social anthropology currently relate to one another in a disordered way and that there should be a disciplinary realignment that addresses this disorder. The second and more constructive task is to demonstrate, albeit in a cursory fashion, what this new-found relationship between moral theology and social anthropology might look like.

Banner takes up the first task in the Introduction and Chapter 1. Here he locates the need for a disciplinary realignment in the failure of moral theology to adequately provide an everyday ethics. Banner identifies this failure in moral theology's tendency to focus on "hard cases" or dilemmas and questions about what is licit or illicit. Turning to moral philosophy, however, is no help. The leading forms of moral philosophy, according to Banner, are completely disassociated from the social and fail to understand morality as a social practice (18). Thus, argues Banner, moral theology needs to turn to social anthropology because it is the only discipline of the three that is concerned with 'morality.' "Morality here means an everyday practice which exists on the ground—the practice of appraising ourselves and others against notions of the good, or the right, or the fitting," explains Banner (7).

Banner then turns to the constructive element in chapters 2 through 7. The central question of these chapters is: "how does the Christian imagination of conception, birth, suffering, death, and burial bear on the human life course, and envisage and sustain a Christian form of human being?" (5) In chapters 2 and 3, Banner considers the issues of in vitro fertilization, kinship, and the desire to have children. In Chapter 4, Banner addresses suffering, the politics of compassion, and humanitarianism. Banner speaks to euthanasia, Alzheimer's disease and hospice care in Chapter 5 before turning to the various practices of burial and mourning in Chapter 6. Finally, Banner addresses the idea of memory in Chapter 7. These chapters are meant to "demonstrate that an engagement with social anthropology, which seems promising in theory, really is so in practice and can assist moral theology in undertaking its proper work" (28).

Chapter 2 is one of the clearest examples of the constructive moral theology of everyday ethics Banner seeks to encourage. Banner argues that Christian moral theology can respond to questions of conception and kinship more effectively and more

therapeutically by grasping lived reality through engagement with social anthropology. For example, Banner thinks we are able to see how the use of Assisted Reproductive Technologies (ARTs) is socially framed. He identifies two underlying issues. First, Banner identifies the feeling of the 'desperation of childlessness' and second, the notion that the best way to resolve the desperation is to have a 'child of one's own' (37). Banner then turns to the Christian tradition, beginning with Augustine, which challenges both of these notions because the "Christian reconstruction of kinship...believes neither in the tragedy of childlessness, nor in the possibility of answering that tragedy by obtaining a child of one's own" (38).

Moral theology, as it currently stands, might only be able to offer a verdict about the licitness or illicitness of IVF and other ARTs. However, Banner believes that a better understanding of the psychological and sociocultural phenomena that undergird the contemporary turn to ARTs enables moral theology to respond more therapeutically. Moral theology can then illuminate the ideas of spiritual kinship, godparenthood, and virginity from the Christian tradition and imagination. The rest of Banner's chapters take up a similar methodological dance between current research in social anthropology and the Christian tradition as it pertains to issues that make up the "human life course."

If Banner's project is over-ambitious, it is nonetheless exciting. To be fair, he cautions his readers that he has the modest goal of taking "initial steps" towards the disciplinary realignment that he imagines (4). While this disclaimer helps to keep the book's aims in perspective, the idea that these are "initial steps" falls a bit flat, at least for some readers in the United States. Certain strands of Christian ethics have sought to dialogue with literature, history, and social anthropology over moral philosophy for quite some time. For example, in *Katie's Canon: Womanism and the Soul of the Black Community*, Cannon turns to the black women's literary tradition in order to illuminate "the concrete depiction of Black life" in America (77). One of her main sources is Zora Neale Hurston, a novelist and anthropologist, whose social and moral imagination reflected her understanding of the lived experience of African Americans in the United States. So perhaps it is better to understand Banner's book as a contribution to these strands of Christian ethics, which have already sought to think theologically about the everyday texture of our moral lives.

For many Christian ethicists and moral theologians who are eager for deeper engagement between anthropology and theology, Banner's book is a welcomed contribution and clearly articulated argument for disciplinary realignment. Furthermore, since each of his six constructive chapters would certainly warrant a book-length ethnography of their own in order to provide the thick and rich account of social life needed for adequate theological reflection, the book gestures towards a future in which these issues can be more fully explored.

STEPHANIE MOTA THURSTON
Ph.D. Student, Religion & Society
Princeton Theological Seminary

Kimlyn Bender. *Confessing Christ for Church and World: Studies in Modern Theology*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2014, pp. 389. \$40.00 (paperback).

In *Confessing Christ for Church and World*, Truett Theological Seminary's Kimlyn Bender presents a collection of essays which set Karl Barth and—to a lesser extent—Friedrich Schleiermacher in conversation with the American theological landscape. Bender's desire in this collection is to look along with (rather than at) Schleiermacher and Barth toward the "the true object... nothing less than God's glorious breaking into our world in the person of Jesus Christ" (16). The topics range from ecclesiology to revelation to the legacy of the reformation, and are helpfully divided into three thematic sections: "Church and Conversation," "Canon and Confession," and "Christ and Creation." While these three sections may appear to be thematically distinct, they are united by Bender's thoroughgoing Christological orientation.

Bender's commitment to confessing Christ as Lord also guides a lesser but nonetheless significant subtheme: a celebration of the legacy of the Protestant vision for American Christianity (13). For example, in a particularly stirring essay, "The End of the Reformation?", Bender utilizes Christology to explain Protestantism's lackluster ecclesiology: "It is the asymmetrical and irreversible relation between Christ and the church in Protestantism, with its insistence on seeing the church as a witness to the incarnation rather than its extension, that is at the root of the Protestant principle that there can be no absolutizing of the church and its dogma" (138). For Bender, as for Barth, "the church is both divine event and human institution, but with these also in irreversible order, the first giving rise to the second" (87). Given this commitment, when offered an opportunity to apologize for Protestant deficiencies in the area of ecclesiology, Bender takes the opportunity to highlight how Protestantism's Christological center explains Protestant doctrine writ large: "None of these [doctrines] make sense if this ecclesiological distinction, which really is a Christological one, is not understood" (140). While boldly defending the viability of the Protestant vision for the church, Bender does not allow himself to become a mouthpiece for Protestant dogma. Rather, he engages his topics graciously, talking across denominational lines. Bender draws lines of sight between evangelicals and Catholics, and Baptists and Barthians, among others. What this amounts to is a collage of American Christian thought, as the essays' scope and variety make good on Bender's commitment to context of the North American church, in all of its diversity (14).

Issues of canon and scriptural authority are addressed along the way; see Bender's critique of fellow Princeton Seminary alumnus Bart Ehrman in "The Canon as Theological Category," as well as his description of Barth's struggle to develop a doctrine of scripture in "Scripture and Canon in Karl Barth's Early Theology." Pushing on into cosmology and election, God's relationship with creation is defined in Christological—and overtly Barthian—terms in "Christ, Creation, and the Drama of Redemption": "The relation between God and the world is not a free imaginative construal; the relation itself is freely defined and determined in God's eternal election to be God for us in Jesus Christ" (313). Along the same vein, an elegant postscript to

Schleiermacher's Christology sees Bender in agreeable conversation with Kevin Hector on the subject of Schleiermacher's allegedly "low" Christology.

All told, Bender's collection of essays provides space for dialogue across the American Christian spectrum, while not sacrificing his own Protestant outlook. What makes such an exchange possible is not the diversity inherent in American expressions of Christian religion, but rather Bender's own conviction that there is common ground to be found at the center of all Protestant principles: the preeminence of Christ over church, over canon, and over creation.

MAX HEIDELBERGER
M.Div. Senior
Princeton Theological Seminary

Walter Brueggemann, *Ice Axes for Frozen Seas: A Biblical Theology of Provocation*, ed. Davis Hankins. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014, pp. 439. \$59.95 (hardback).

The main title of this collection of Walter Brueggemann's recent writings draws the attention, while the subtitle gives an idea of the content. In line with the prolific agitator's oeuvre, these pieces—edited by his former student and current collaborator Davis Hankins—aim to crack open hearts, minds and communities made numb by our society's unrelenting anxiety. Brueggemann does so through sharp-edged and clear-eyed examination of biblical texts, avoiding the closure of fundamentalism on one hand and the aimlessness of progressivism on the other by wrestling with the God of the texts as an active agent. The essays are liberally peppered with references to the time in which they were written, between 2008 and 2012, in the midst of economic crisis, but before the social movements that emerged in the last four years.

Hankins greets readers with an engaging, though philosophically dense introduction that frames the current work in light of Brueggemann's career. For those familiar with his writings, the introduction hints at unrecognized motifs and surprising interlocutors—such as the philosophers Gilles Deleuze and Ernesto Laclau—who resonate with Brueggemann, but whose names never appear in his bibliographies. For the lay reader or new reader, these insights will hit with less force, though the shape that Hankins brings to the collection remains most welcome.

As a collection, the book resists simple summary, which is just as well, since Brueggemann consistently pushes for poetry's generative ambiguity over the anaesthetizing calculations of lists, summaries and memos. Nevertheless, an exploration of the themes under which Hankins gathers these occasional pieces will hopefully inspire interest. In Part I, Brueggemann explores the dynamics of hope, the complexities of divine and human action, and the provocative, poetic nature of biblical rhetoric. One senses him wrestling with what it means that the United States elected President Obama, a candidate of hope and change. What does it mean to hope? How do we change? Can we govern or even protest in poetry instead of prose?

Part II moves to thoughtful examination of biblical narratives, mostly the Exodus and the reign of King Solomon. Where Part I illuminated ideologies, these essays highlight

economics; Pharaoh and Solomon's consumptive anxiety contrasted with God's gracious abundance. In these selections, Brueggemann engages the ways of being and thinking that led to the Great Recession and emphasizes the importance of intentional remembering and lively engagement with tradition.

From there, the collection considers how these ways of being are concretely performed. In performance there is interpretation; each Hamlet wonders "To be or not to be" differently. How do these ideologies and economics play out in practice? The central quote for Part III comes from Deuteronomy 5:3, "Not with our ancestors did the Lord make this covenant, but with us, who are all of us here alive today." (256) Though still primarily working with textual analysis, Brueggemann here references more contemporary events, even though he can only do so "by analogy." (268)

The final part transitions most fully to the present. Brueggemann dives into the current moment, referencing the earlier textual work while talking about Elie Wiesel, Martin Luther King, Jr., Michael Walzer, Donald Rumsfeld, and Walmart. The essays are not ordered chronologically, so, while recurring phrases and preoccupations lend coherence to the whole, it might also be instructive to check the footnotes, matching these final pieces with the more removed essays earlier in the book.

Brueggemann prods and points toward greater faithfulness—to the text, to the moment, and to the God who leaps disruptively from the text into the now. These essays' power stems from their ability to hold a mirror to recent events. We see our tattered state, but we also find a piece of glass in need of serious dusting. We discover our rough edges *and* our inability to read clearly—both a blessing and curse. Scripture provokes us, discomfits us, forces us to look more closely.

This leads one to wonder how these essays would have changed if written a few years later. Economics dominated the post-collapse discussion, matching Brueggemann's long-standing preoccupations with things like the Occupy Wall Street Movement. (319) But President Obama's tenure has also reminded us that we are not yet done with racism, sexism or heteronormativity. While race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation and class are deeply interrelated, certain voices rise up in certain moments. From 2008 to 2012, this voice belonged to Occupy Wall Street. Reflecting this, in the essay, "Obedience," Brueggemann employs Martin Luther King Jr.'s legacy through the lens of Pharaoh's empire of discrimination, fear and violence. He writes, "the force of such discrimination is powerful among us. It takes the form of racial and ethnic exclusion. But as Martin saw clearly, the deeper discrimination is economic; the rich have more and more advantages and the poor are consigned to hopelessness." (347) In the four years since the last essay was composed, Black Lives Matter has replaced Occupy Wall Street. In light of the testimony of black bodies and black communities who have "a story to tell" and "bodily scars that bespeak both pain and hope," one wonders if Brueggemann would have allowed his economic narrative to be disrupted. (328) One wonders if the disproportionate psychological and economic burden laid upon black communities, as well as the violence against black people who hold advanced degrees, black women, and black transgender persons would have prompted Brueggemann to read the situation differently.

These ponderings come not in spite of, but because of the excellent work on display here. *Ice Axes for Frozen Seas* demonstrates that, decades into a prophetic vocation, Walter Brueggemann remains no less challenging for the Western Church and no less essential a voice. Though some of the essays will be difficult or nearly inaccessible for lay readers or pastors without specific academic training, the clarity and forcefulness of the writing often pushes through to reach the dedicated reader. May we all have hope that, faced with a world of anxiety and acquisition, “it can be otherwise in a practice of ‘Thou,’ in a world of subversive testimony, in a culture of the poetry of possibility that refuses the memos of certitude” (385).

MARCUS A. HONG
Ph.D. Candidate, Practical Theology
Princeton Theological Seminary

John Webster. *God Without Measure: Working Papers in Christian Theology. Volume II: Virtue and Intellect*. New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016, 187 pp. \$112.00 (hardback).

In several senses, *God Without Measure* is an appropriate title for this collection of essays by John Webster. Firstly, *God* is without measure. Thus, even though Webster is ostensibly addressing virtue and intellect in this volume, his ultimate aim is to refer these back to God. That is, Webster is concerned that moral theology be moral *theology* – and only to this extent is it truly moral. Furthermore, *God* is *without measure* in at least three senses for Webster: God is beyond any standard of comparison to created things (since God is their source), God lies beyond any bounds or measurements, and God is beyond complete comprehension. Finally, it is fitting that this is *Volume II*, as this embodies Webster’s key conviction that action follows being – Webster’s first volume dealing with God *in se* and then *ad extra*.

These matters deserve further comment since they illuminate key themes for Webster throughout the essays. Webster’s introduction orients the reader to his concerns, demonstrating his material order. He argues that theology deals with God and all things in relation to God—as he states later, “Theology is comprehensive in scope; it is the science of all things. Theology is about everything; but it is not about everything about everything, but about everything in relation to God” (141). There is a material order to his theological method: theology first considers God absolutely, *in se*, and then relatively towards creatures, *ad extra*. Only after these matters are explicated can theology turn to the activities of creatures themselves. Thus, for Webster, action follows being, though this material order may differ from the orders of instruction or discovery. Action follows *being*, in that theology must begin with the being of God, and action *follows* being, in that action cannot be severed from discussions of being.

Webster’s essays thus primarily deal with the actions of creatures, but always in relation to God. He discusses the connection between Christology and ethics in Chapter 2, arguing that Jesus Christ determines the orders of moral being and knowing. Chapter 3 addresses the dignity of creatures as grounded in God’s creating, reconciling, and perfecting work. In Chapter 4 Webster founds the mercy of creatures in God’s active,

merciful presence. Chapter 5 examines sorrow, arguing for its rightful (since sorrow flees from evil) but derivative (in that evil is subordinate to good) place in the Christian life. In Chapter 6, Webster argues that courage is possible, fitting, and necessary since God has bestowed a new nature upon believers, but the promised future good is not yet realized. Contemplating mortification and vivification (Chapter 7), Webster stresses their conformity to the pattern of the death and resurrection of Christ. Discussing sins of speech (Chapter 8), Webster demonstrates the impact of depravity upon human speech but keeps in mind the priority of creation and reconciliation over sin. Webster's final three essays thoughtfully consider the intellectual life, universities, and intellectual patience, grounding the created intellect in God's intellect and tracing patience to its source in God.

Apart from the brief introduction and the essays on mercy and intellectual patience—though the latter was an inaugural lecture at St. Andrews—most of these essays have been published before. Though much stands out, one particular point from Webster's unique contribution on mercy should be examined. Webster begins the essay by speaking about Christ, not merely as an example or teacher, but as the eternal Son made flesh. Thus, teaching about mercy runs backwards into the doctrine of the Trinity, but it also runs forward into the lives of God's children. Webster claims, "mercy is proper to God," but this does not mean that creaturely need is the occasion of God's mercy; rather, God remains completely free in his action (55). Further, Webster argues that mercy is a divine affection, but not a divine passion – as passion implies for him that God is placed under compulsion. Thus, "[W]hat God does in the economy of his works has its principle in who he is in himself and so in what he is capable of doing without deprivation" (55). However, the question might be raised whether God is free but has *chosen* to be subject to 'compulsion.'

More broadly, it should be noted that Webster's conviction that action follows being does not eliminate the need for meaningful creaturely action. To be a *creature* (as Webster often points out) is to recognize that your being is not dependent upon you, since God (as *Creator*) is the source of creaturely being. This recognition of creatureliness in fact secures meaningful action, as it grounds proper action in relation to God. Moreover, Webster is not naïve in regards to the effects of sin, but denies that good and evil are equal sparring partners. Rather, God is good, and made a good creation – thus, the fundamental movement of creatures is towards life.

Webster's essays in *God Without Measure* operate from a set of common principles which he regularly revisits. Webster's discipline in returning to these principles throughout the work is commendable, although the principles themselves are by no means self-evident and, in fact, are contestable at points. For example, one wonders if Webster's account strikes too much of an intellectualist note by giving governing primacy to reason in human life as an undefended presupposition. However, Webster places primacy upon exposition over disputation: "What the church says to itself and what the church says to its neighbours outside the church will be the same thing; in both contexts, theology has to describe the gospel well, and to persuade by description. In terms of its speech before the world, therefore, theology simply speaks the gospel and leaves the gospel to look after itself" (50). Webster's collection of essays ably

demonstrates this conviction, and for this fact alone is well worth reading, dwelling upon, and discussing.

ALEX SIEMERS
M.Div. Junior
Princeton Theological Seminary

About the *Princeton Theological Review*

The *Princeton Theological Review* is an annual, student-run journal that exists to serve students of Princeton Theological Seminary as well as the wider theological community. It is committed to engaging theological issues in ways that are grounded in Scripture, centered on Jesus Christ, formed by the work of the Holy Spirit, and oriented toward the historic and contemporary reflections of the church. Through a free and open exchange of ideas, the *Princeton Theological Review* will provide a resource that challenges, informs, and equips readers to become more effective and faithful witnesses to the Lord Jesus Christ.

PTR ONLINE

Please note that our website address has changed. We are happy to announce that in addition to the content in the hard copy of this journal, we will feature exclusive online content on our website: sga.ptsem.edu/princeton-theological-review. Please refer to our website for our current issue, past issues, contact info, our latest call for papers, and submission guidelines.

CONTACTING THE EDITORS

Your responses to the materials published in the *PTR* are a critical part of the journal's success. We welcome and appreciate your ideas. Please send all correspondence to ptr@ptsem.edu or *Princeton Theological Review*, P.O. Box 821, Princeton, NJ 08542.

SUBSCRIPTION INQUIRIES

We are not currently accepting subscriptions, but if you or your institution would like a hard copy of our journal, please contact us at ptr@ptsem.edu. All of our articles and book reviews are also available online at sga.ptsem.edu/princeton-theological-review.

SUBMITTING TO THE PTR

The *PTR* welcomes article submissions from graduate students of all levels, disciplines, and institutions, as well as from early-career scholars. Individuals are invited to submit papers from various disciplinary perspectives (Ethics, Systematic or Historical Theology, Practical Theology, Church History, Biblical Studies, etc.) as they relate to the theme. We also invite interdisciplinary papers from other perspectives within the social sciences (anthropology, sociology, communication, etc.). All submissions will be selected in a blind, peer-review process based on clarity, argument, and relation to the theme. Please check the website in early fall for the Call for Papers for the 2017 issue.

Articles should be between 4500–5000 words and should be submitted as .doc or .docx attachments via e-mail to ptr@ptsem.edu. All submissions should be in final form and follow *The Chicago Manual of Style*. Before submitting a paper, please review the Submission Preparation Checklist on our website to ensure it meets all guidelines.

All members of the Princeton Theological Seminary community are invited to apply to review books. Please visit our website for a list of books available for review. Books are on topics related to theological or biblical studies and have been published within the last two years.

The PTR reserves the right to edit all submissions before publication.

REPRINTING FROM THE PTR

If you want to photocopy material from the PTR, please follow these guidelines: For personal use or use in congregations or classrooms, we grant permission for fifty copies to be made, provided the copies are distributed at no charge and you include the following information: “Copyright (year) (author). Reprinted from *The Princeton Theological Review*.”

The Princeton Theological Review is not an official publication of Princeton Theological Seminary, and the opinions expressed in the PTR are not necessarily those of the editors or of Princeton Theological Seminary.

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

*P.O. Box 821
Princeton, NJ 08542
ptr@ptsem.edu*

EXECUTIVE EDITOR

Chris Waks

GENERAL EDITOR

Brandon Watson

GENERAL EDITOR

Emily Chesley

BOOK REVIEW EDITOR

Luke Zerra

MANAGING EDITOR

William Stell

PRODUCTION EDITOR

Mary Nickel

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Mark Almquist

Sheena Crosby

Brian Fox

Max Heidelberg

Heather Koenig

Kelly Lapenske

Jillian Marcantonio

Clint Mosley

Matthew Rucker

Alexander Siemers

Emilee Snyder

Kyle Sorkness

