

“Psychological truth leads to theological truth”: Recent Works on Theology and Psychoanalysis

In Memoriam

Metropolitan Kallistos (Ware) of Diokleia (1934–2022)

In gratitude for his compassion, creativity, and openness

“This limitless mystery of our own personhood”

Eudoxia Delli and Vasileios Thermos, eds. *Soul and Psyche as a Surprise: Psychoanalysis and Orthodox Theology in Dialogue*. Alhambra, CA: Sebastian Press, 2021. 300 pp.

Adam A. J. DeVille. *Everything Hidden Shall Be Revealed: Ridding the Church of Abuses of Sex and Power*. New York: Angelico Press, 2019. 154 pp.

Carlos Domínguez-Morano. *Belief after Freud: Religious Faith through the Crucible of Psychoanalysis*. Translated by Francisco Javier Montero and Verónica Polo Torok. London: Routledge, 2018 (Spanish ed.1998). 265 pp.

Fr. Vasileios Thermos. *Psychology in the Service of the Church: Theology and Psychology in Cooperation*. Bishop Maxim Vasiljević and the St. Herman Brotherhood. Alhambra, CA: Sebastian Press, 2017. 166 pp.

D. W. Winnicott. *Through Paediatrics to Psycho-Analysis*. London: Karnac Books, 1992 (1st ed. 1958). 350 pp.

Orthodox theology in the last thirty years has, especially in the English-speaking world, engaged with sundry fields, movements, and subjects of cultural significance, from science and politics to religious and sexual diversity. What is often unapparent, at least to those outside Europe and, especially, outside Greece, is the considerable literature on the dialogue of Orthodox theology with psychoanalysis and the schools of psychology and psychotherapy. In the last decade, a steady stream of publications has appeared in English, often in translation from Greek, that attempts to rethink multiple aspects of Orthodox theology in light of ideas drawn from psychoanalytic teaching and practice.

I say “practice” because psychoanalysis is less marked by a particular orthodoxy than by the psychoanalytic experience. Psychoanalytic teaching is a post-factum reflection on practice. Psychoanalysis usually consists of forty-five-minute to fifty-minute sessions, three to five times per week, between an analyst and patient (the analysand), almost always with the patient lying on a couch and the analyst/therapist just out of view. Usually lasting for many years, an analysis will typically explore the complete emotional and psychological universe of the patient, including the patient’s neuroses, addictions, and relationships with family, friends, and colleagues. The far more common psychodynamic psychotherapy/psychoanalysis differs more in intensity than in working assumptions, meeting one to two times per week, and mostly without the use of a couch. There are, however, a few key working ideas in psychoanalysis, especially, “transference”, “repression”, and the “unconscious.” In psychoanalysis, the “unconscious” is that part of mental functioning (feelings, thoughts, desires, memories and urges) about which subjects make themselves unaware through “repression.” In therapy, the patient’s (often unconscious) feelings, desires, expectations and patterns of behaviour, which were previously experienced in

significant relationships, are made conscious and redirected (“transference”) onto the therapist where they can be examined and resolved.

A large body of literature exists in English on mental health and Orthodoxy, often touching on psychoanalysis and related disciplines. Here we see two broad trends. The first is seen in the work of Metropolitan Hierotheos (Vlachos), whose *Orthodox Psychotherapy* (1986; English 1994) still retains a certain vogue among traditionalists, and in Jean-Claude Larchet’s voluminous *Therapy of Spiritual Illnesses* (1991; English 2012). These sorts of writings either attack and wholly reject the fields of modern mental health as non-patristic and thereby “heterodox,” or, alternatively, they strongly minimize the contribution of modern psychology and psychotherapy in order to credit all healing to the Church by elevating what they term “Orthodox psychology” and “therapeutics,” found uniquely, it is claimed, within literature like the *Philokalia*. It is not a coincidence that the same sorts of writers tend to be anti-ecumenical and often engage in anti-Western polemics.

The second trend has proved more robust and includes many Orthodox Christians working in mental health who draw on their expertise in psychotherapy and psychology. These scholars tend to connect Orthodox themes of spiritual healing with areas like confession and spiritual direction, but also try to discern the best sort of model for the relationship of Orthodoxy to modern mental-health approaches. Here one thinks of the pioneering work of Father Joseph Allen, John T. Chirban, Father John Chryssavgis, Father Stavros Kofinas, Father Nikolaos Loudovikos, Albert Rossi, and Father Vasilios Thermos, among others. It is not surprising, then, that multiple professional organizations for Orthodox mental-health professionals now exist in both the US and the UK, with annual conferences. Perhaps the oldest (founded in 1981), largest, and best known is the US-based Orthodox Christian Association of Medicine, Psychology and

Religion (OCAMPR), which is approved as an “affiliate ministry” of the American Assembly of Canonical Orthodox Bishops (formerly SCOBA) (<https://ocampr.org/>). These groups have proved crucial in responding to sexual-abuse cases in the Orthodox Church and broader safeguarding issues. It is now a basic requirement for candidates for ordination to undergo a psychological evaluation, due not merely to a greater Orthodox awareness of the utility of psychology and the centrality of good mental health but also to insurance requirements for churches.

However, despite this sea change within diaspora Orthodoxy in regard to psychotherapy and psychology, there are few active Orthodox theologians in the English-speaking world who have drawn deeply on these disciplines or, for that matter, who have attempted to put the Orthodox tradition into conversation with well-known luminaries and practitioners of psychotherapy and psychoanalysis, such as Sigmund Freud (1856–1939), Carl Jung (1875–1961), and Jacques Lacan (1901–81), as well as the equally important, but mostly unknown except by specialists, Melanie Klein (1881–1960), Anna Freud (1885–1960), W. Ronald D. Fairbairn (1889–1964), Donald W. Winnicott (1896–1971), Wilfrid Bion (1897–1974), John Bowlby (1907–90), and Hanna Segal (1918–2011). Two things are missing in the body of literature in English: the use of tools of psychotherapy to strip away some of the accumulated illusions that wound Orthodoxy regarding its conceptions of spiritual authority and even the image of God; and use of psychoanalysis for a detailed rethinking of key Orthodox concepts from *theosis* and apophaticism to the eros/desire and ectasis that is seen in divine and human relations.

We must turn to writers such as the Jesuit psychoanalyst Carlos Domínguez-Morano and the Ukrainian Catholic theologian and psychoanalytic psychotherapist Adam A. J. DeVille to see

what is missing in the present English Orthodox literature: the destruction of our self-fashioned religious idols (*Everything Hidden Shall be Revealed*, 26–29). In a truly remarkable and sweeping work, *Belief after Freud: Religious Faith through the Crucible of Psychoanalysis*, Domínguez-Morano gives a total prospectus of how the “experience of faith” might be reenvisioned through the “psychoanalytic experience” (16). The first section critically explores Freud’s writings on religion, concluding that many of his opinions were distorted by biographical elements that formed in him an “anti-religious prejudice” (70), so that we must “turn our attention to differentiating what . . . is properly psychoanalytical from which is specifically Freudian” (67). Freud is most helpful for revealing truths about human nature and, above all, how we are deeply influenced by our unconscious, which is not within our reach (71). These truths can be discovered through the psychoanalytic experience when various emotional patterns and problems that we unconsciously recycle again and again in our broken relationships are repeated and worked through. These dysfunctional emotional patterns are positively “contained” or “held” by the analyst, aiding the patient to confront them (and herself) in their stark and even horrific reality, and, finally, they are reintegrated into the self by the patient who is healed in the trusting relationship with the analyst. When matters of faith are encountered through the psychoanalytic experience, the substance of faith proper is questioned less than the person’s relationship to faith because faith is “rooted in the deepest emotional structures and is expressed in terms which being similarly rooted, can be felt on many levels,” including the imaginary and the symbolic. This might include, for example, considering fundamental elements, such as how we understand such basic names (in Dionysius’s sense) as “Father”, “Son”, “Spirit”, and “Mother” (76).

Part 2 of *Belief after Freud* looks at how we construct our understanding of God, guilt, and salvation. Part 3 then applies the wisdom learned to key issues in the Church like obedience, sexuality, power, and money. In these sections, Domínguez-Morano argues with great beauty and immense insight that we have unconsciously “fabricated a controlling God” who either serves as the container for our impossible “dark ideals” or as “endless prohibitions that are often nothing more than the prohibitions of our unconscious against the instincts that are feared” (144). Through our guilt and our unacknowledged desire for domination, we turn the God of freedom and life into an omnipotent God of death: “a God of boots and war, inquisition and fire, orthodoxy and excommunication” (117). This “Nobodaddy” that is “silent and invisible / Father of Jealousy” (William Blake, “To Nobodaddy”) is the “God of the child,” the “God of the taboo,” who is “built to fit the desires and fears of our childhood” and is definitively “not the God of Jesus.” To reach that God of the Gospel we need a radical and deep conversion of mind, becoming “catechized by the God of Jesus.” In this spiritual and psychological task, we are assisted by psychoanalysis, which helps us in becoming conscious of our false gods then aids us in smashing the idols we create for ourselves (109–10). This overcoming of the father figure (164), or, rather, the idol of the father, as a cruel superego, is not merely an abstract matter, for, as Christians, we endlessly and compulsively set up father figures throughout our lives, especially in the Church, as an “authoritarian system” (201), sacralizing domination/sadism in ecclesiastical hierarchy and masochism in obedience because we fear freedom.

Moreover, in an authoritarian system like the Catholic Church, where the human essence is only represented by a distorted paternity, Domínguez-Morano argues that women, deprived of that essence, are simply silenced, reduced to their biological functions, either denied their sexuality (virginity) or limited “to the womb that bears and the breast that nurses” (i.e.,

motherhood) (168). A woman in a patriarchal dominated church exists to respond to the voice and desire of the only subject that exists in the system—the male (165). Domínguez-Morano, drawing on Freud, holds that the reason women are so dominated and subjugated in the Church is that for men, feminine genital sexuality provokes threatening castration fantasies: out of fear of her as a “mutilated being,” she is moved aside in her difference, abased, in order to ease the pervasive male terror of the female, and so the “phallic supremacy is, thus, reinforced” (167).

Whatever one may think of this particular Freudian analysis, we see Mary and the other female disciples of Christ in the Gospels not as women who are blessed or cursed for their biology but, like the men, based on whether they listened to the Word of God and put it into practice (168). Mary rejoices in the Magnificat (Luke 1:46–55) not for being set free from her sexuality, “but because God begins to build His Kingdom by eliminating inequality” between men and women (168). This certainly should lead us to think about the need for greater inclusion of women and a larger and fuller role for them in the Church (168–69). These are major issues not only in Catholicism but also in Orthodoxy, where in many churches women are not even allowed to enter into the altar, let alone to read or teach during the services. Here, if one wonders why there has been so little progress in the revival of the female diaconate in world Orthodoxy, one only needs to turn to those who would make such a decision: an entirely male monastic episcopate mired in endless territorial, theological, and canonical schisms and squabbles with other members of their caste (e.g. the recent ecclesiastical dispute about Ukraine).

DeVille’s short but magnificent study, *Everything Hidden Shall Be Revealed: Ridding the Church of Abuses of Sex and Power*, deals with this ecclesial legacy of toxic masculinity and false paternity, building directly on Domínguez-Morano’s work. DeVille is one of the most creative theologians writing on ecclesiology today, and in the last decade he trained as a

psychotherapist (many of his profound reflections, drawing on his work as a psychotherapist, can be found in *The Catholic World Report* and *America: The Jesuit Review*). Utilizing psychoanalysis, DeVille argues that the problem of sexual abuse in the Latin Catholic Church (chapter 1) is the result, at least in part, of the creation of a modern Catholic imaginary of “domineering father figures” (23) (seen, above all, in the modern cult of the papacy). These men, in an infantilizing move that derives from the same place as Domínguez-Morano’s omnipotent “God of the child,” are idealized and even idolized by the laity as their clerical saviors, and are treated by the laity as “even gods” (28). The laity masochistically prostrate themselves before the clergy as “omnipotent paternal authority figures to both dominate them and to rescue them” (35). But with the revelations in the last forty years of the systematic ecclesiastical cover-up of clerical sexual abuse in Latin Catholicism, we see the mask on the clerical order (priests, bishops) torn off—they are revealed as “anti-fathers” (32), not caring for the “little ones” (Matt. 18:6), and “nothing more or other than human beings, although in some cases exceptionally depraved ones whose capacity for evil has been aided and abetted precisely by their ‘sovereignty’ and lack of accountability to others” (32).

DeVille calls, therefore, for a complete demythologization of the clerical order using the tools of psychoanalysis, purging the Church of paternalistic titles, images, and practices (32). The rest of the volume is a reasoned appeal for “shared authority” (49) between clerics and the laity as brothers and sisters working together on the same level (46). Drawing on the great Russian emigrée theologian Nicholas Afanasiev (1893-1966) and others like the French Dominican theologian Yves Congar (1904-55), he argues that laypeople are ordained in their baptism and chrismation as a distinct order governing the church in cooperation with the clergy. In the remaining chapters he sets out a successive program to give parish councils decision-



making power in cooperation with their priest (chapter 2), to return to regular diocesan synods including the laity with the local election of bishops (chapter 3), to reform episcopal conferences and return them to their ancient role as governing synods (chapter 4), and to explore married priests (on which DeVille has just published *Married Priests in the Catholic Church* [University of Notre Dame, 2021]) and bishops with smaller and more numerous dioceses (chapter 5).

Orthodox can learn from the Catholic call to topple the idolatry of clerical authority and for clergy and laity to govern the church as “*co-workers in the truth*” (69 (emphasis in the original)). Lay-clerical cooperation in church governance was famously upheld at the 1917–18 All Russian Local Council, with its vision of the laity cooperating with the hierarchy in a *sobornal* or conciliar and catholic cooperative upbuilding of the Church, including the lay participation in the canonical election of both local bishops and the primate. Sadly, this alternative vision of Orthodox ecclesiology, seen in the great writers of the Rue Daru Russian Exarchate and the OCA (e.g., Afanasiev, Bulgakov, Florovsky, Schmemmann, Meyendorff), has perished both in the Russian Orthodox Church and its multiple diaspora epigones, which have capitulated in the last decade to the Moscow Patriarchate’s characteristic mix of authoritarianism, ethno-phyletism, and enervating nostalgia, increasingly unrecognizable as even Christian.

As we look throughout the Orthodox world today, which is, in many places, in schism, there are few problems that cannot be traced to an overweening episcopal authority and rank incompetence directly created and fostered by a laity who elevate their hierarchs, effectively worshipping them, praying that their bishop might live forever even as a god (“*Ton Despotēn kai Archiereā ēmōn, Kyrie phylatte, eis polla etē, Despota*” (in the common Orthodox liturgical acclamation for a bishop)). When the bishop acts autocratically like a sacred, omnipotent

monster, the “God of the child,” instead of the one who girded himself as a slave (Luke 12:37, John 13:4), the “God of Jesus” (*Belief after Freud*, 109), there should be no surprise given that *the laity* have, mostly unconsciously but sometimes consciously, formed them into abusive autocrats. The startling claim of psychoanalysis is that clericalism is partially the creation of a laity that masochistically colludes in its own abuse: we shape our own worst nightmares. Hence psychoanalysis as a discipline urges that we strive for total psychological liberation through an awareness of the full reality of our own (self-)enslavement. Orthodox quite commonly attack Catholics for their papalism, but, in Orthodoxy, all too frequently, we see every bishop, and many priests, acting like the worst caricature of an infallible pope. This clericalism is, at least in part, the product of lay collusion.

These Catholic writers are not alone in drawing constructively on the resources of psychoanalysis: multiple Greek writers in recent years have advanced the dialogue between Orthodox theology and psychoanalysis and psychotherapy. In Greece, psychoanalysis is much more mainstream than in the Anglo-Saxon world. Indeed, one of the contributors to the volumes reviewed here, Dimitrios Kyriazis, is not only a medical doctor and psychoanalyst but also a retired two-star general of the Greek Air Force, who taught trainee officers using wisdom drawn from psychoanalysis (*Soul and Psyche as a Surprise*, 207). The editors of the recent collection *Soul and Psyche as a Surprise: Psychoanalysis and Orthodox Theology in Dialogue*, Eudoxia Delli and Father Vasileios Thermos, tell us that pastoral theology courses at Greek seminaries have been drawing on psychoanalysis since the 1970s, that multiple international conferences have been organized in Greece since the 1990s with a large literature accompanying them, and that there is even a special academic journal (since 2011) devoted to psychoanalysis and Orthodoxy (*Psyches Dromoi* (Ways of the Soul)). This is startling to learn for anyone from an

English-speaking context, where psychoanalysis is an arcane and peripheral interest at best and at worst is regarded as an unscientific pseudo-religious cult. Thermos, who is a child and adolescent psychiatrist and psychotherapist as well as professor of pastology theology in Athens, is perhaps the leading Orthodox theologian in the world today who engages with psychoanalysis and psychology, notably in his massive, untranslated *Attraction and Passion: An Interdisciplinary Approach of Homosexuality* (2016). He has published multiple volumes on psychology and psychoanalysis in dialogue with Orthodoxy through the publishing leader in this area, St. Sebastian Orthodox Press. His most recent research project is studying the phenomenon of religious conversion to Orthodox Christianity to better help Orthodox clergy to be more familiar to what is required for better pastoral treatment before and after a conversion to the Orthodox Church.

*Soul and Psyche as a Surprise* is the product of the revised contributions from a 2018 workshop organized by the National Research Foundation of Greece and a part of the large project Science and Orthodoxy around the World, or SOW ([project-sow.org/](http://project-sow.org/)) (its successor volume from a workshop in the autumn of 2022 at the Volos Academy of Theological Studies is now in press). Like many such conference volumes, it reflects the varied interests of the contributors, most of whom are practitioners of psychoanalysis and psychotherapy. The majority of these contributions are strong and the varied topics are highly refreshing, including a brief history of psychoanalysis and Christianity (Steven-John M. Harris), Delli's masterful overview of the field, and Father Grigorios Chrysostom Tympas's lively outline of structures and principles to facilitate the discussion of patristic anthropology and psychoanalysis (Tympas has an earlier groundbreaking study on Jung and Orthodoxy, *Carl Jung and Maximus the Confessor on Psychic Development* [2014]). Noteworthy is Dimitrios Kyriazis's impressive analysis of the

points of contact between Orthodoxy and Fairburn, Lacan, Winnicott, and Bion (the last of these, he argues, holds to a form of apophaticism [97–98]). Also included is Father Nikolaos Loudovikos—a pioneer in this dialogue and one of the major contemporary Orthodox theologians writing today—with a fascinating precis of his important 2003 *Psychoanalysis and Orthodox Theology* (sadly, still just in Greek) in which he argues that the unconscious is dialogical, ecstatic, and apophatic (173–74). The common thread of the volume is best seen in Thermos’s contribution, where he argues that psychoanalysis has Judeo-Christian origins (104), pointing to links between Winnicott and Maximus on the inherent goodness of humans in their freedom (113) and Lacan’s concern for desire, which aligns with Maximus’s understanding of the natural will (117–18). He argues that only when psychoanalysis returns to its theological roots will it be reenergized with ontological dynamism, renewing an exhausted Western world that has forgotten the sacred mystery of the subject (118–20).

The unfathomable mystery of the human subject is a hallmark of Thermos’s earlier volume *Psychology in the Service of the Church: Theology and Psychology in Cooperation* (2017), which is a collection of occasional articles published in Greek. I was particularly struck by a piece entitled “Between Heaven and Hearth: Pastoral Reflections on the Psychodynamics of the Clergy Family,” where he points to the twin dangers of “psychological Nestorianism” (ignoring the parish, treating it as a cash cow, and being concerned only for the family’s financial future) and “psychological Monophysitism” (where the family is ignored in favor of the Church, with the priest often creating a “home monasticism”) (37–38, 41). In contrast to these poles, Thermos holds that priests are to equally incarnate the love of the God-Man, to act “theanthropically”—divine and human at once—in both their parish service and their families, because, “After all, if dogmas are not to be lived in our souls and lives what are they good for?”

(36). In this sense, Chalcedon articulates a spiritual truth that needs to be embodied psychologically and in terms of the dynamics of the family.

The other piece in this collection that shines is “The ‘True’ and ‘False’ Self According to Donald Winnicott and Saint Gregory Palamas” (83–116), which is one of the most creative and startling theological essays I have read in recent years. D. W. Winnicott (1896–1971) was one of the most influential pediatricians and psychoanalysts of the last half century, and is known particularly for his ideas on developmental psychology. Thermos contends that Winnicott and Palamas are in harmony in that they both see the “true self” as one that balances intellectual discursivity with the emotions and desires that characterize embodiment. In a breathtaking synthesis, Thermos engages with multiple texts of both writers, but, in particular, draws on Winnicott’s well-known 1953 paper “Mind and Its Relation to the Psyche-Soma” (*Through Paediatrics to Psycho-Analysis*, 243–54). Winnicott argues that to become a person, to be physically alive, one must be a psyche living in and through a body (soma), imaginatively elaborating one’s somatic parts, feelings, and functions, which are not to be “distinguished except according to the direction from which one is looking” (244). Thus, to be human is to be a “psyche-soma” rather than a psyche dwelling apart in a body like a ghost in a machine.

The perils of separation of psyche and soma begin in infancy, according to Winnicott. An “ordinary good mother” who is “good-enough” (245), Winnicott argues famously, adapts to the needs of her infant, accepting all his or her changes and affirming that the infant is good as he or she is and does not have to change in any way to be loved and accepted by the mother. In his famous paper of the same year, “Transitional Objects and Transitional Phenomena” (229–42), Winnicott elaborates further on this concept of the “good-enough mother” (now adapted as “good-enough parent”):

The good-enough “mother” (not necessarily the infant’s own mother) is one who makes active adaptation to the infant’s needs, an active adaptation that gradually lessens, according to the infant’s growing ability to account for failure of adaptation and to tolerate the results of frustration. . . . The good-enough mother, as I have stated, starts off with an almost complete adaptation to her infant’s needs, and as time proceeds she adapts less and less completely, gradually, according to the infant’s growing ability to deal with her failure (237–38; cf. Adam DeVille’s inspired 2018 discussion on “The Mother of God and Psychoanalysis,” <https://churchlifejournal.nd.edu/articles/the-mother-of-god-and-psychoanalysis/>).

However, Winnicott holds that certain kinds of failures on the mother’s part—especially erratic behavior and expectations for the baby instead of complete acceptance—can “produce over-activity of the [baby’s] mental functioning” so that the “mental functioning becom[es] a thing in itself” (“Mind and Its Relation to the Psyche-Soma,” 246) that replaces the mother but in an inauthentic and unhealthy fashion for individuation. Thus the infant becomes alienated from his or her own soma, including emotional and bodily life, so that he or she develops a “mind-psyche” that is pathological: a “false” instead of a “true self” (249), which is the psyche-soma.

Thermos argues that in his own clinical practice he has seen multiple female and male children who are disconnected from their bodies, emotions, and desires, and who look for their identities in their intellectual lives, being effectively “trapped” in their heads (*Psychology in the Service of the Church*, 84–90, 95–101). He creatively links this to the debate of Barlaam of Calabria with Gregory Palamas, in which Barlaam understood the soul as contaminated by the body (91) and Barlaam’s attempt to offer God “a pure mind” (92), in contrast to Palamas, who, like Irenaeus, saw the true human being as a person fully alive in the face of God (“Homo vivens

Gloria Dei et vita hominis visio Dei est” (*Adv. Haer.* 4.20.7)), body and soul in unity: “We were given the command to crucify our flesh together with its passions [emotions] and desire, not to commit suicide, but to become men of spiritual desires” (Palamas, *Triads* 2.2.33, cited in Thermos, *Psychology in the Service of the Church*, 93).

Thermos concludes in a creative synthesis, weaving together Palamas and Winnicott, that in Orthodox Patristic teaching and psychoanalysis we see the same truth articulated in different terms: “A man without the fullness of bodily functions and wholeness of his emotions and desires is crippled and mortified” (93). God calls us, Thermos argues, to personal communion with him by raising the human being to the level of a person who feels and desires precisely because God is “the source of feeling and desiring” (115). To become a person, a true self, is not to unravel into chaos, being a mind simply trapped in a body, but to be at home in oneself and to meet the world as an embodied self. Thermos’s point is here reminiscent of the phenomenology of the French philosopher Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1908-61): “The world is not what I think, but what I live through. I am open to the world, I have no doubt that I am in communication with it, but I do not possess it; it is inexhaustible” (*Phenomenology of Perception* [Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962], xvi–xvii.).

The pioneering encounters of psychoanalysis with Orthodox theology traced here ultimately aim at the one self-same truth of Christ, who is the true self and the preeternal logos of the human person. Psychoanalysis, at its best and often despite itself, aims to discern the theology of the human subject through the psychoanalytic experience. As Thermos puts it: “Psychological truth leads to theological truth if, of course, it is in accordance with one’s intentions; the personal psychological truth of the subject is an ally of the theological truth of the Church” (114).

BRANDON GALLAHER

<sc>University of Exeter, United Kingdom</sc>