

The “Spiritual Senses,” Natural, and Supernatural in Balthasar’s Theological Aesthetics

Copyright Mark McInroy 2005 All rights reserved.

In this paper I propose a new argument about the theme of “mysticism” in the theology of Hans Urs von Balthasar; I make the bold claim here that the so-called “spiritual senses” tradition, which argues for an analogical relation between corporeal and spiritual perception in the human being, should serve as the hermeneutical key to Balthasar’s understanding of the relationship between the natural and the supernatural in his theological aesthetics, *The Glory of the Lord*.¹ Balthasar often utilizes the term, “mysticism,” but at every point clearly understands the word in distinction from a modern, Jamesian, individualized notion of mysticism. For Balthasar, mystical states are bestowed upon persons *not* for the sake of their own inner experience, but always for the concrete good of the Church. Thus, Balthasar’s entire approach to mysticism is implicitly critical of the modernistic psychologized vision of ineffable states ostensibly separate from concrete traditions and cataphatic claims.²

My goal in this short paper is the enunciation of three novel theses, the first two of which observe the interpersonal-corporeal and kenotic aspects, respectively, of

¹ Balthasar’s treatment of the spiritual senses figures prominently in his theological aesthetics, especially *The Glory of the Lord I: Seeing the Form* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1982), hereafter *GL I*, and *The Glory of the Lord II: Studies in Theological Style: Clerical Styles*, trans. A. Louth, F. McDonagh, and B. McNeil (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1984).

² *GL I*, 407-17: “Mysticism within the Church.” Thus, though Balthasar never overtly comments on the four marks of Jamesian mystical experience, he is implicitly critical of their definitiveness for models of mysticism. Balthasar, for instance, puts forth a notion of mystical states that are neither transient nor categorically *ineffable*. Passivity could be said to play a role in Balthasar’s model of mystical experience, but the human being is certainly not exclusively or wholly passive in the experience of God on his model. Similarly, the noetic quality of mystical states that James describes does characterize Balthasar’s understanding to some extent, but the knowledge that comes from mystical encounter is certainly not *private* for Balthasar. Cf. William James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985).

Balthasar's decidedly Barthian modification of the spiritual senses tradition in accord with Barth's biblical anthropology in his *Church Dogmatics* III/2.³ The last thesis insists on the pivotal role of the spiritual senses in the all-important task of "seeing the form" in Balthasar's theological aesthetics. Both the radicality of Balthasar's reinterpretation of the spiritual senses and the epistemological centrality of this portion of his project have been overlooked in prior Balthasar scholarship. Only Stephen Fields has devoted an article-length study to the spiritual senses in Balthasar;⁴ in it he is interested to contrast Balthasar's *cataphatic* understanding of the doctrine with Karl Rahner's primarily *apophatic* interpretation, using each figure's reading of Bonaventure as a point of departure for his study. But I shall argue in contrast three main points: 1) Whereas Fields holds Bonaventure to be the greatest influence on Balthasar in his interpretation of the spiritual senses, I am proposing counter-intuitively—it might seem—that it is first and foremost Karl Barth who lends Balthasar the theological resources with which he renders his distinctive treatment of the doctrine. On my reading Barth's "Biblical" anthropology serves as the foundation on which Balthasar reconstructs the doctrine of the spiritual senses so as to integrate both interpersonal love for the neighbor and corporeality into mystical encounter. Indeed, the novelty of Balthasar's model lies not only in his idea that mystical experience has an inextricably corporeal element, but also

³ Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics. Vol. III: The Doctrine of Creation, Part Two* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1960), 247, hereafter CD III/2 [Original German: *Die Kirchliche Dogmatik, III: Die Lehre von der Schöpfung, 2* (Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag A. G. 1948)].

⁴ Stephen Fields, "Balthasar and Rahner on the Spiritual Senses," *Theological Studies* 57 (1996), 224-41. The spiritual senses receive very brief mention in three recent works on Balthasar's theology: Stephan van Erp, *The Art of Theology: Hans Urs von Balthasar's Theological Aesthetics and the Foundations of Faith* (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2004); D.C. Schindler, *Hans Urs von Balthasar and the Dramatic Structure of Truth*, (New York: Fordham Press, 2004); Roland Chia, *Revelation and Theology: The Knowledge of God in Balthasar and Barth* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1999). However, these treatments are at most a few pages in length and hardly regard the doctrine as integral to understanding Balthasar's theology. Instead, the spiritual senses seem to be understood as a mere point of minor interest on the way to larger themes in his work.

in his unprecedented claim that such experience is mediated primarily through the corporeal-spiritual encounter with the fellow human being. 2) Though the spiritual senses have been traditionally associated with incremental *stages* of mystical ascent in the soul's progression toward God, Balthasar draws on the Barthian refusal of the *capax dei* to formulate a radically grace-centered model of the doctrine that undercuts human strivings toward greater understanding and knowledge. On Balthasar's reinterpretation of the spiritual senses, the human mind does not journey into God, as in Bonaventure's *Itinerarium*;⁵ rather, it is God who journeys into the mind—and body—of the human being. 3) The spiritual senses thus function as the key epistemological bridge in the analogy between the natural and the supernatural orders in Balthasar's *The Glory of the Lord*; it is through the spiritual senses that Balthasar carefully nuances the relationship between the natural capacities of the human being and the revelation of divine beauty in “mystical” encounter.

(1) Though the influence of Barth on Balthasar is well-documented as it pertains to Balthasar's theology *in general*, the particular significance of Barth's theological anthropology to Balthasar's doctrine of the spiritual senses remains unexplored. On my reading Barth enables the interpersonal-corporeal structure to Balthasar's doctrine of the spiritual senses through the Barthian notion of the human being as one who is fundamentally constituted in encounter with—and not prior to—the other.

In the first volume of his theological aesthetics, Balthasar explicitly states that he is looking for a “Biblical,” and not a “philosophical” anthropology on which to base his

⁵ Bonaventure, *The Mind's Journey to God (Itinerarium Mentis in Deum)*, translated by Lawrence Cunningham (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1979).

understanding of the relationship between the corporeal and the spiritual,⁶ and that for this reason he looks to Barth's biblical anthropology as articulated in his *Church Dogmatics* III/2. The biblical treatment of the human being may "appear defective to the philosopher,"⁷ Balthasar writes, but its constructive theological value lies in the fact that, in the Bible, "man is not examined 'in himself', but, from the outset, in his 'vital act' and engagedness."⁸ That is, according to both Barth and Balthasar, the anthropology of the Bible does not first consider the human being as a discrete, individual entity before speaking of that being's relation to the world; rather the Bible portrays the human being as a being who is at her most fundamental level *already* in relation to others. Thus there is no "I" to speak of anterior to the "I" *in relation*.⁹ Quoting Barth, Balthasar writes, "The humanity of each and every man consists in the determination of man's being as a being with others, or rather with the other man."¹⁰ "The I," Balthasar adds to Barth's formulation, "attains to itself only in its encounter with the Thou."¹¹

Inasmuch as "philosophy" looks for an abstract essence of the human being prior to encounter with other human beings and with God, says Balthasar, it proceeds via a method unfamiliar to the Bible. He writes, "With Barth, then, we must profoundly deplore the fact that the Patristic and scholastic anthropology strayed away from this first of all Biblical premises concerning human reality and let itself be inspired by an abstract Greek concept of essence."¹² For Balthasar, then, even Aristotelian and scholastic

⁶ *GL* I, 380.

⁷ *GL* I, 380.

⁸ *GL* I, 381.

⁹ *CD* III/2, 247.

¹⁰ *CD* III/2, 243. Quoted in *GL* I, 382.

¹¹ *GL* I, 382.

¹² *GL* I, 382. Balthasar further writes, "It is an abstracting thought-process which first projects onto Being the conceptual laws of the distinction of species and specific difference. When this happens, the Platonic

correctives to neo-Platonism do not properly account for the fundamentally intersubjective nature of the human being.

The encounter with the fellow human being, of course, occurs through concrete perceptions.¹³ Barth writes, “When biblical man perceives...he is open as whole man...The one act of perception is the act of the whole man.”¹⁴ One cannot speak of what the human being *is*, then, outside of encounter with another, and this encounter necessarily has both a corporeal and a spiritual dimension. One could, of course, hold that Bonaventure, too, regards perception as having a simultaneously corporeal and spiritual aspect. However, Bonaventure does not insist on the irreducibility of the fellow human being in encounter, which is the hallmark of Balthasar’s innovation.

Barth’s biblical anthropology indeed has far-reaching effects on Balthasar’s doctrine of the spiritual senses, for if bodily sense faculties are entirely *inseparable* from intellectual and volitional faculties, then the spiritual senses must be inextricably linked to the bodily senses, an emphasis that strongly modifies the Origenistic understanding of the spiritual senses as radically interior.¹⁵ For Origen, the spiritual eye opens only to the

image of man automatically emerges and comes to dominate the whole of anthropology as a silent *a priori*, and this holds even for the Aristotelian and scholastic correctives to Platonism” *GL I*, 382-3.

¹³ *GL I*, 384.

¹⁴ *CD III/2* 405-6.

¹⁵ Balthasar, of course, is not wholly Barthian in his anthropology, though he does attempt to downplay their differences in his treatment of the spiritual senses. Alluding to his well-known critique of Barth in regard to the *analogia entis* and the *analogia fidei*, Balthasar writes, “We need not here rehearse every nuance of Barth’s anthropology, especially not that aspect of it which does not tolerate any relation (from the lower to the higher) between the social construct (*Bild*) and the revealed archetype of the Covenant. This doctrine, peculiar to Barth, need not detain us here because for him the total human image is founded on God’s covenantal intention, to such an extent that, outside this archetype, the properly human cannot, in the last analysis, either understand itself or be made theologically comprehensible” (*GL I*, 383-4). What Balthasar objects to in Barth’s theology is that Barth collapses creation into covenant, and that therefore a “Christo-monism” permeates Barth’s theology whereby no aspect of creation retains any “relative autonomy” from Christ. Though Christ is indeed still the Absolute on Balthasar’s model of the relationship between nature and grace, that which is relative in relation to the absolute nevertheless has a real and enduring significance that precludes its being collapsed into an exclusively Christological mold.

extent that the physical eye closes.¹⁶ Most importantly, however, on Balthasar's understanding, corporeal perception itself is irreducibly interpersonal. He writes, "It is with both body and soul that the living human being experiences the world and, consequently, also God...Man always finds himself within the real, and the most real reality is the Thou—his fellow-man and the God who created him and is calling him."¹⁷ Coming into contact with the most real reality, then, involves a meeting between subjectivities. Reality at its most fundamental level has a distinctly *personal* aspect. Balthasar thus sees through Barth's Biblical anthropology to its logical conclusion: if human beings are able to experience God at all, and if they are fundamentally constituted in an interpersonal act that perceives in a simultaneously spiritual-corporeal event, then the experience of God must also occur as an encounter with the other that has both a bodily and spiritual dimension. Indeed, Balthasar most radically breaks from the tradition of the spiritual senses when he, drawing on Barth's notion of the human being as a being in encounter, integrates this interpersonal dimension into his doctrine of the spiritual senses. He writes, "In his love for his neighbour, the Christian definitively receives his Christian senses."¹⁸ One cannot exaggerate the *sui generis* quality of this understanding of the operation of the spiritual senses, for it is nowhere evidenced in any of the tradition of the spiritual senses that precedes Balthasar.

Through Barth's Biblical anthropology, then, Balthasar claims to supply the necessary corrective to middle or neo-Platonic interpretations of the spiritual senses that have, according to him, both regarded the human being as an individual entity prior to

¹⁶ Origen, *On First Principles*, translated by Henri de Lubac (Gloucester, MA,: Peter Smith, 1973), *The Song of Songs: Commentary and Homilies*, translated by W.P. Lawson (Westminster, Md.,: Newman Press, 1957), *Contra Celsum*, translated by Henry Chadwick (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1965).

¹⁷ *GL* I, 406.

¹⁸ *GL* I, 424.

encounter with others and privileged spirit over matter in their understandings of the relationship between the human being and God.¹⁹ Balthasar insists to the contrary that bodily sense perception and the encounter with the neighbor are both inextricable components of the spiritual senses, and therefore of the highest mystical encounter with God.

(2) Another Balthasarian innovation on previous understandings of the spiritual senses bears a distinctively Barthian stamp and involves his handling of the issue of *ascent* that figures so prominently in other renderings of the doctrine in the Christian mystical tradition. Unlike the doctrines of those figures (most notably Origen) who would regard human beings as capable of *progressing* toward God in incremental stages of increasing knowledge and understanding, and echoing instead the Barthian refusal of the *capax dei* in the human being, Balthasar reconceptualizes the spiritual senses such that they enable only the self-emptying necessary for the glory of the Lord to be shown in its fullness. He writes, “To be a recipient of revelation means...the act of renunciation which gives God the space in which to become incarnate and to offer himself as he will. Only in this way is the sphere of the ‘spiritual senses’ given its proper place.”²⁰ Indeed,

¹⁹ A complex interpretive issue arises on the subject of Balthasar and “philosophy” in his treatment of the spiritual senses. Those familiar with Balthasar’s theology in general and his conversation with Barth in particular will no doubt recall Balthasar’s *defense* of philosophy, not his apparent renunciation of it. Importantly, in spite of his many statements against philosophical anthropology in *The Glory of the Lord*, Balthasar does nevertheless speak of the significance of philosophy for his project: “The exclusion of the philosophical dimension from Barth’s theology takes its toll in two respects: he fails to include the social element in the nature common to all men (and this nature is, indeed, more than mere ‘reciprocity’); and he fails also to include the religious element in the ‘all-embracing’ reality of Being, with the result that both our neighbour and God can be conceived only under the sign of ‘the other’” (*GL I*, 384). Balthasar, though, regards these aspects of Barth’s anthropology to be of no substantial import for his immediate purposes. “These deficiencies [in Barth] are of little consequence for the analysis of man’s spiritual-corporeal nature, which is what concerns us” (*GL I*, 384). For an assessment of Balthasar’s specific relation to Platonism, see Noel O’Donoghue, “Do We Get Beyond Plato?: A Critical Appreciation of the Theological Aesthetics,” in *The Beauty of Christ: An Introduction to the Theology of Hans Urs von Balthasar*, edited by Bede McGregor, O.P. and Thomas Norris (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994).

²⁰ *GL I*, 418.

one of the most striking ways in which Balthasar breaks from the tradition that precedes him involves his apparent unconcern with describing either any practice one can undertake in order to cultivate the spiritual senses or any sort of *improvement* in one's ability to perceive God. He writes, "No achievement, no amount of training, no prescribed attitude can force God to come to us!"²¹ Even more radically, Balthasar holds that the senses must undergo *death* if they are to be spiritualized through the resurrected Christ.²² "For our senses... must die with Christ and descend to the underworld in order then to rise unto the Father in an unspeakable manner which is both sensory and supersensory."²³ For Balthasar, then, the spiritual senses are not employed when one has, after much training, attained to the stage of "the perfect" (Origen), nor does the mind journey into God (Bonaventure); rather it is God who descends to the human being. The cultivation of the spiritual senses involves simply *making room* for God through self-emptying and humility, not greater knowledge and understanding. As Balthasar puts the point, "This purification of subjective attitudes is the way in which he is to encounter the real Lord and God in a fully human manner and with less and less dangers. God will enter precisely by the door which allows him full freedom of action."²⁴ The role of the human being is only to be obedient and "indifferent" such that he or she can go wherever God's call might lead. It is only after this purification of the *subjective* has been completed that the revelation of the *objective* may take place.

Other figures in the tradition, of course, certainly have a place for grace in their doctrines of the spiritual senses. The difference between Balthasar and others is that the

²¹ *GL I*, 418.

²² *GL I*, 406, 425.

²³ *GL I*, 425.

²⁴ *GL I*, 418.

other exponents of the spiritual senses generally hold that human strivings are to some extent efficacious in one's journey to God, even if the human being is ultimately dependent on grace. Balthasar, by contrast, undercuts any sort of achievement toward which the human being may aspire in the interest of putting forth a radically grace-centered model of the spiritual senses that leaves their development solely up to God.

Using Barth as his guide, then, Balthasar drastically revises the doctrine of the spiritual senses from its historical articulations in Origen, Bonaventure, and others. Self-consciously breaking with his Patristic and scholastic forebears, Balthasar roots his doctrine in a biblical anthropology that gives the spiritual senses an interpersonal inflection, an inextricably corporeal dimension, and a radically grace-centered mode of operation. Thus, the spiritual senses on Balthasar's model should be considered neither Origenist nor Bonaventurian, but rather deeply *Barthian* in inspiration.

(3) The third, and most significant, feature of Balthasar's doctrine of the spiritual senses involves the work they perform in his theological project as a whole. Here I am making a bold claim not previously ventured in secondary assessments of Balthasar's work: namely, that the spiritual senses actually function as the anthropological and epistemological structure requisite to the reception of revelation in Balthasar's theological aesthetics and mystical theology. In other words, it is through the spiritual senses that one performs the all-important task of "seeing the form." Inasmuch as Balthasar's entire program of theological aesthetics hangs on successfully bringing together concretely manifested beauty in the world and the absolute beauty of God, the notion that the spiritual senses perform this task by perceiving the supersensory in the

very midst of the sensory provides the hermeneutical key to his understanding of the relationship between the natural and the supernatural.

Balthasar's text provides ample support for this claim: Balthasar himself views the spiritual senses as absolutely essential to his project. He writes, "The whole range of questions concerning the subjective evidence of revelation culminates in a final central area of discussion in which the spiritual senses are to be found."²⁵ Structurally, it is telling that the doctrine of the spiritual senses occupies the exact middle point of the first volume of *The Glory of the Lord*. Balthasar's treatment concludes "The Subjective Evidence" (as Balthasar terms the first half of his book), and immediately precedes "The Objective Evidence" which occupies the remainder of the volume [cf. "Appendix A"]. As this "final word" on the *ascesis* of the human being, and as the bridge between the subjective and objective portions of volume one of *The Glory of the Lord*, Balthasar's description of the spiritual senses occupies a position of noteworthy prominence in his theological aesthetics.

Thematically, a pressing lacuna remains in present Balthasar scholarship in regard to the question of just exactly *how* the human being is made capable of perceiving the form through which divine revelation shows itself. Louis Dupré comes closest to addressing this issue when he claims that the human being receives revelation when God's Spirit takes possession of the human mind and God's revelation establishes its own sensorium in the soul.²⁶ However, Dupré has overlooked the centrality of the spiritual senses to Balthasar's model of revelation in general, and the Barthian anthropology on

²⁵ *GL I*, 365.

²⁶ Louis Dupré, "The Glory of the Lord: Hans Urs von Balthasar's Theological Aesthetic," in Schindler, David L., ed. *Hans Urs von Balthasar: His Life and Work* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1991), 183-206, 198.

which the encounter with God rests in particular. Dupré thus misleads his reader in a number of crucial ways. First, in accord with the first thesis advanced here, to speak of God as functioning in the human mind or soul without also admitting the corporeal aspect to this encounter neglects Balthasar's appropriation of Barth's biblical anthropology, by which soul and body exist in one psychic-corporeal totality such that neither can be separated from the other. The encounter with God cannot take place in mind alone; instead it occurs as one simultaneously spiritual and corporeal act.

Second, Dupré's position on Balthasar's theology of revelation gives the erroneous impression that the subjectivity of the human being is abrogated by the action of divine grace. That is, if God takes possession of the human mind in divine revelation, as Dupré advocates, then one wonders what happens to the human *qua* human in this encounter. Dupré will say, echoing Aquinas, that the action of grace does not destroy, but rather perfects and fulfills human nature, but Dupré leaves unaddressed the precise location of subjectivity in mystical encounter. Who is having the experience, the human being, or God?

According to Balthasar's kenotic revision to the spiritual senses, it is indeed true that the human being strives toward a purification that makes room for God through an emptying of the self. The gift that is given by God arrives when space is cleared for it. However, as much as the new sensorium is given by God as a gift, Balthasar is at pains to say that it is simultaneously given to the human being as his or her own.²⁷ Furthermore, Balthasar explicitly notes that, even though grace brings the human being into the sphere of God, "the structure of human thought remains the same."²⁸ It is therefore absolutely

²⁷ *GL I*, 249.

²⁸ *GL I*, 248.

crucial to observe that, for Balthasar, the human being in mystical encounter does not think in the same way that God thinks; God does not intrude into the consciousness of the human being in such a manner that God has the experience on behalf of him or her. To use the language of taking possession of the mind, then, belies Balthasar's consistently held notion that the experience of God must be the creature's own. "The inspiration, therefore, descends upon believing man from the heights of the absolute as the absolute genius which is essentially superior to man in every respect. And yet, at the same time, the inspiration rises from man's own most intimate depth: it is the person himself who loves and tastes God, and not an alien principle that does this through the person."²⁹ The sensorium infused into the human being transforms—*but does not supplant*—his or her subjectivity.

Third, to speak of the relationship between the human being and God without reference to the fellow human being overlooks Balthasar's most radical innovation on the spiritual senses tradition: namely, his introduction of love for neighbor as the definitive arena in which one is given one's spiritual senses. Whereas Dupré remains occupied with a sort of direct infusion on the vertical axis, Balthasar's deeply interpersonal account of the operation of the spiritual senses renders the encounter with God as mediated on the horizontal plane.

In the wider discourse of mysticism in the twentieth century, it is certainly striking that Balthasar, who does not disdain to use the language of "mysticism," and who was, arguably, at least subliminally aware of its development in Jamesian religious studies, gives in 1961 a prescient critique of the perennialist model, on which a supposedly trans-religious category of "mystical experience" can be applied across

²⁹ *GL I*, 250.

religious traditions, articulating instead a notion of mysticism firmly rooted in religious traditions and inextricably bound to cataphatic expression. In Balthasar we witness a magisterial, dogmatic proposal that anticipates and responds to Stace, Smart, and Katz³⁰ in their initial skirmishes in the 1960's and '70's about the category of mysticism, and more recent post-modern accounts that further problematize the categories of mysticism and epistemology. Balthasar, of course, still stands in distinction to Katz³¹ and others in the contemporary debates on mysticism; all the more reason, then, to regard him as a valuable conversation partner in the present setting.³²

³⁰ See Ninian Smart, *The Science of Religion and the Sociology of Knowledge: Some Methodological Questions* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1973), W.T. Stace, *Mysticism and Philosophy* (London: Macmillan, 1960), and Steven Katz, "Language, Epistemology, and Mysticism," in *Mysticism and Philosophical Analysis*, edited by Steven Katz (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978). Katz is well known, of course, for his notion that there are no *pure* (i.e. unmediated) mystical experiences, meaning that all experience is processed through and organized by concepts that shape the experience. In later work Katz notes the ease with which we moderns have regarded the mystic as the "great religious rebel" whose beliefs run counter to the orthodox establishment, "placing his own experiences above the doctrines of the accepted authorities." However, he maintains, to emphasize this aspect of the history of mysticism is to erroneously downplay the extent to which mystics are quite often conservative in their theological stances. See Steven Katz, "The 'Conservative' Character of Mystical Experience," in *Mysticism and Religious Traditions*, edited by Steven Katz (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983). Wayne Proudfoot similarly insists that though claims to a common religious experience have insisted on its pre-linguistic, pre-conceptual character, in matter of fact experience always has a linguistic, conceptual, grammatical component. See Wayne Proudfoot, *Religious Experience* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1985).

³¹ Most notably, for Balthasar the notion that mystical experience is mediated does not compromise that experience, as the natural order for Balthasar is capable of revealing the supernatural. That is, Balthasar, following Henri de Lubac and others in *la nouvelle theologie* maintains that there is no such thing as a "pure nature," and that instead grace permeates the natural order from the moment of creation. Though it is true that covenant (through Christ) also bestows a grace, the initial grace given at creation functions to allow for the divine to shine through the natural order.

³² For other exemplifications of the "modern" stance on mystical experience, see Aldous Huxley, *The Perennial Philosophy* (London: Harper and Brothers, 1946), and Rudolf Otto, *The Idea of the Holy*, translated by John W. Harvey (London: Oxford University Press, 1958). For instances of the "post-modern" stance, cf. Steven Katz, "Language, Epistemology, and Mysticism," in *Mysticism and Philosophical Analysis*, edited by Steven Katz (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), Steven Katz, "The 'Conservative' Character of Mystical Experience," in *Mysticism and Religious Traditions*, edited by Steven Katz (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), Gershom Scholem, *On the Kabbalah and Its Symbolism*, translated by Ralph Manheim (New York: Schocken Books, 1969), and Wayne Proudfoot, *Religious Experience* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1985).

Appendix A: The Structure of Balthasar's *The Glory of the Lord. Vol. I: Seeing the Form.*

- I. Introduction

- II. The Subjective Evidence
 - A. The Light of Faith
 - B. The Experience of Faith
 - 1. Experience and Mediation
 - 2. Archetypal Experience
 - 3. The Spiritual Senses**

- III. The Objective Evidence
 - A. The Need for an Objective Form of Revelation
 - B. The Form of Revelation
 - C. Christ the Centre of the Form of Revelation
 - D. The Mediation of the Form
 - E. The Attestation of the Form

Works Consulted

- Balthasar, Hans Urs von. *The Glory of the Lord. Vol. I: Seeing the Form*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1982 [Original German: *Herrlichkeit: Eine Theologische Ästhetik. Band I: Schau der Gestalt*. Einsiedeln, Switzerland: Johannes Verlag, 1961].
- Barth, Karl. *Church Dogmatics. Vol. III: The Doctrine of Creation, Part Two*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1960 [Original German: *Die Kirchliche Dogmatik, III: Die Lehre von der Schöpfung, 2*. Zürich. Evangelischer Verlag A. G. 1948].
- Bonaventure. *The Mind's Journey to God (Itinerarium Mentis in Deum)*. Translated by Lawrence Cunningham. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1979.
- Chia, Roland. *Revelation and Theology: The Knowledge of God in Balthasar and Barth*. Bern: Peter Lang, 1999.
- Dupré, Louis. "The Glory of the Lord: Hans Urs von Balthasar's Theological Aesthetic." In *Hans Urs von Balthasar: His Life and Work*. Edited by David Schindler. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1991, 183-206.
- Erp, Stephan van. *The Art of Theology: Hans Urs von Balthasar's Theological Aesthetics and the Foundations of Faith*. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2004.
- Fields, Stephen. "Balthasar and Rahner on the Spiritual Senses," *Theological Studies* 57 (1996), 224-41.
- James, William. *The Varieties of Religious Experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985.
- Huxley, Aldous. *The Perennial Philosophy*. London: Harper and Brothers, 1946.
- Katz, Steven. "Language, Epistemology, and Mysticism." In *Mysticism and Philosophical Analysis*. Edited by Steven Katz. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Katz, Steven. "The 'Conservative' Character of Mystical Experience." In *Mysticism and Religious Traditions*. Edited by Steven Katz. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- O'Donoghue, Noel. "Do We Get Beyond Plato?: A Critical Appreciation of the Theological Aesthetics." In *The Beauty of Christ: An Introduction to the Theology of Hans Urs von Balthasar*. Edited by Bede McGregor, O.P. and Thomas Norris. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
- Origen. *On First Principles*. Translated by Henri de Lubac. Gloucester, MA.: Peter Smith, 1973.
- _____. *The Song of Songs: Commentary and Homilies*. Translated by W.P. Lawson. Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1957.
- _____. *Contra Celsum*. Translated by Henry Chadwick. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- Otto, Rudolph. *The Idea of the Holy*. Translated by John W. Harvey. London: Oxford University Press, 1958.
- Proudford, Wayne. *Religious Experience*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1985.
- Schindler, D.C. *Hans Urs von Balthasar and the Dramatic Structure of Truth*. New York: Fordham Press, 2004.
- Scholem, Gershom. *On the Kabbalah and Its Symbolism*. Translated by Ralph Manheim. New York: Schocken Books, 1969.
- Smart, Ninian. *The Science of Religion and the Sociology of Knowledge: Some Methodological Questions*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1973.
- Stace, W.T. *Mysticism and Philosophy*. London: Macmillan, 1960.