

The God-Word

WILLIAM C. TREMMEL

The impious is not the one who denies the gods of the many, but he who attaches to the gods the ideas of the many.

—Epicurus

IN the first essay of this series¹ we went to some trouble to avoid defining religion theocentrically.

Now we must in a sense reverse the position and say that the God word, the God idea, is in fact a fundamental concept in all religions. It is an essential word used to explain why things are (especially non-manipulables) as they are, and how one is to operate (function ritualistically and/or morally) in an effort to negotiate the fundamental frustrations of the human condition.

As man rationalizes his world (his existential medium) in theology, the idea of determinative power emerges: the idea that there is a power or powers which cause things to be and to be as they are. This idea, or fact, of determinative power constitutes the class of God. This is what men mean, at the bottom of it, when they used the word God or some functional equivalent of the word; e.g., Manitu, Mana, Karma, Brahman, YHVH, Allah, Father.

Put somewhat differently: the word God is used to designate the dynamic determinate of ultimate values. The term ultimate values when used in this context is intended to mean anything that is of critical importance to the welfare of man, especially when such value is in jeopardy, is non-manipulable. In line with these thoughts, I shall propose a new name for the God class: it is

"dynazon" from the Greek word *dunamis* which means dynamic, and the Greek word *horizon* which means to bound or determine. God is the dynazon, or the dynazonic agency; i.e., the dynamic limitation which causes things to be and to be the way they are. That the God word basically means this can be readily concluded from a general observation as to how in ordinary language the word is generally used. That is to say, this is what people mean when they use the word God (or a functional equivalent) when they are doing theology and religion. When, for example, the primitive speaks of Mana and Spirits he is referring to the powers which cause things to be, and to be the way they are. When Christians use the word God, they mean the same thing. For all their grandiose comments about the perfection and beauty and wisdom of God, Christians are, at the heart of it, referring to the Father who causes, and causes to be this way and not that. Similarly Brahman is the causative source of all reality. Allah created the world and individual fates. Karma makes life happen in a certain way. And so on. God words basically belong to the category of limiting power.

As a scientific/philosophical concept the term God refers to the power that causes all things to be the way they are. We shall call this the Ontic Dimension of the Dynazon. This is a more extensive dimension than the dimension we shall call the Religious Dimension of the Dynazon. In the Ontic Dimension, for example, God is the causative principle or power of mountains and rivers and rainbows and universes, any of which may or may not have much religious significance to a given worshipper or a particular theology. On the other hand, the Religious Dimension of the Dynazon

¹ *Iliff Review*, Winter, 1970, "The Theocentric Error."

WILLIAM C. TREMMEL is Professor of Religion and Chairman of the Religious Studies Program at the University of South Florida.

refers to the power that causes to be and to be as they are the critical, non-manipulables of man's existence. In this dimension the God word obviously takes on agathonic importance because the power of the God affects critical human values. In the religious dimension, God is that through which metatechnological and/or metapsychological² effects are effected. In a sentence: God in religion is the dynazonic agent or agents or agency in terms of which religious values are established and secured in the lives of the men and women who are doing the religion.

We are proposing that the God word when used by man refers to the power that determines, causes, things to be and to be as they are; and that when he is using it in its religious dimension he is referring to the God power as it controls and/or conditions man's life and destiny. And this is the meaning of the God word whether the theology is Christian, Buddhist, Moslem, or any other. God in the Ontic Dimension is the word for that which causes and orders creatures and processes. God in the Religious Dimension is that which causes and orders conditions which seriously affect man's ultimate values. This is what God is for all men everywhere. This we shall call the Quintessential meaning of the God word.

But man does not limit his God-talk simply to denoting the dynazonic class in its Quintessential meaning. He does not simply say that God, Allah, the Spirits, Brahman, etc., is "cause of things," or "ground of being," or "that which causes things to be and to be as they are." He does not say just so much and stop. He goes on to describe what the dynazonic power is like. He may call it intelligent, friendly, terrible, manlike, mysterious, ineffable, personal, etc. Theology not only denotes God (declares God to be dynazon) but also attempts to describe

God, to supply God with attributes. From various sectarian postures (Christian, Primitive, Buddhist, etc.) theological language particularizes God. This we shall call the Particularized Order of Theological Language, or simply Particularized Theology; as opposed to another kind of theological language which identifies the common elements in different religions, and which we shall call the Universal Order of Theological Language, or simply Universal Theology.

The following illustration may help to draw the distinction, yet relatedness, between Particularized Theology and Universal Theology. A professor was asked by a student, "Did God create man or did man create God?" The professor replied, "Yes." Being urged to elucidate this laconic answer, the professor pointed out that it is an obvious fact, corroborated by science, that once there was a Being or a Process (a creative power or powers that caused men to be, and to be as they are) which created or caused men to become. Whether this was accomplished by divine fiat or out of evolution does not really alter the fact that man was a created creature. There was, therefore, a God-who-created-man reality someplace in the world—a dynazonic agent or agency. *Ipso facto*—God created man. But, on the other hand, once created or sometime thereafter man, being a creature of self-consciousness, imagination, reason, and possessing a passion for words, turned back upon the Being or Process which created him to describe, if he could, the nature of his creator. In doing this, man created, and yet creates, concepts of what God was and/or is like. Man attributes God; he defines God; he names God. He gives God various kinds of qualities: goodness, power, intelligence, personality, life, etc. And these ideas, this God-talk then becomes an important dimension and limitation governing the behavior of the human inventor. In this sense, at least, man creates God. The answer remains "yes."

² *Iliff Review*, (Spring 1970), "The Anthropocentric Definition: Religion—An Expression of Human Need."

In this illustration we find the professor dealing first with the simple affirmation that something caused man to be. This kind of God-talk has universal endorsement. It is Universal Theology. The determining power, the dynazon may be called by various names—Fate, Brahman, Allah, Old-Man-In-The-Sky—but the name is not the important consideration on the Quintessential Level. All of the names denote fundamentally the same thing: the power that caused man, and all other creatures, to be and to be as they are.

But the professor also observed that this was not the end of it. Men do not settle for saying there was a "something" that caused them to be; or are they satisfied just to give it a name. They want to describe it, to discover or invent its characteristics. It must be particularized. There are some few men in the world (sannyasin: holy men of India, for example) who simply meditate upon God undescribed, God without attributes (Nirguna Brahma), but most people, for religious reasons, must "see" God as somewhat, somewhere. They particularize God (i.e., begin to talk about God according to the Particular Order of Theological Language) in order to get God into some kind of intellectually and religiously meaningful and manageable form. They particularize God so that the dynazon can be thought about rationally and ritualized meaningfully. To deal with God religiously, to secure religious values, men use words to describe God and God's relationship to the world and men. In this way God gets named and stylized. God gets characterized beyond the Quintessential Level of the Religious Dimension of the Dynazon and the Universal Order of Theological Language. God gets particularized in Particularized Theology.

Types of Particularization

We are saying that every religious system describes the Gods or the God or their surrogates. These descriptions are fabulous and extensive. There are in

India alone a million or more Gods particularized. However, the many particularizations of God can be mostly subsumed under a few types. We shall look at just five types (Mana, Animistic, Anthropomorphic, Ineffable, Neuter Energy) and give examples.

1) The Mana Type. Mana is an invisible power that causes things to be somehow special. It is not itself pictured; rather it is defined according to what it does. It is not unlike the way we think of electricity. But this Mana power is available in all sorts of things and situations: in a stone that sparkles more than others, or is harder; in a stronger wind or a swifter river, or a more terrifying thunderclap. It is seen in a tree that grows taller than others; in birds that fly faster or higher; in animals that are more powerful and ferocious. It is in the warrior who wins battles; the elder who lives longer; the father of more children; the artist who paints more beautiful pictures, and especially in the shaman who not only has Mana in large amounts in himself, but who knows how to manipulate and even make Mana in magic. Mana is dynazonic positive and dynazonic negative.³ Actually (like electricity) it is neither good nor bad. Rather it is "powerful" and therefore dangerous if misunderstood or misused. One privy to its control—the shaman, witch doctor, magician—can use it for good or ill, but Mana itself is morally neutral. This God is simply extranatural or supernatural power.

2) The Animistic Type. Different from simple Mana power is the power which does not cause things to happen simply, but causes them to be alive. Here we are dealing with such words as spirits and souls. A spirit is not just a free flowing power, but a living power (anima).

³ The dynazonic positive and the dynazonic negative are characteristics of the Dynazon, and will be explained more fully in subsequent statements in this essay; see God and the Demonic, and The Structure of Theology.

Whereas Mana Gods are impersonal, spirits and souls are conceived with "personalities." They have minds, feelings, wills. They respond in person-like fashion—lovingly, angrily, moodily, happily. These sorts of Gods are pictured in mythology as being frog - maidens, bird - women, vampires, were-wolves, weretigers, jinns, jivas, gremlins. Also, even among primitive people, there are sometimes Gods who stand above the others as the great ancestor, the first father, the old man of the sky; the God far away, long ago, who made everything, man, earth, sky, sea. With these "high gods," these great ones who have some universal character, we move to a different but similar type of God particularization; namely, the great man God—anthropomorphism.

3) The Anthropomorphic Type. God is depicted as manlike. As the lion's God would be a great lion, so is man's God often a man twelve feet tall. For example, the Greeks (especially following Homer) pictured Gods anthropomorphically. Mercury, the God of speed, was a young man-like God with winged feet. Aphrodite was a beautiful woman-like Goddess of delightfully erotic propensities. Zeus, King of the Gods, was a handsome, bearded patriarch. The Jews also pictured their God anthropomorphically. God was a grand, solitary, personal being: one alone, distant and austere, awful and frightening; yet, paradoxically, the God of a people whom he loved with infinite tenderness. El Shaddai/Elohim/YHVH, was lord of their lives; their immediate protector; their daily companion. But for all this familiarity and personal encounter, the Jews were uncomfortable with their particularization of God. They felt, at times quite keenly, that God was not like anything they called him; that he was, in fact, beyond any kind of description. This kind of thinking indicates a different kind of particularization classification, which is, indeed, a particularization which denies particulariza-

tion. We shall call it the Ineffable Type.

4) The Ineffable Type. In the theologies of most non-primitive religions there are not only particularizations of the Gods, but sometimes denials of the efficacy of particularizations. Early in Jewish theology, for example, the Hebrews began to refer to God with circumlocutions rather than to speak the holy name. They addressed God as my Lord (Adonai), or as Adoshem (literally—"the name of the Lord"), or as Boray (Creator), or with many other terms, but they avoided using God's name.⁴ God's name YHVH, was not spoken, except once each year by the high priest in the Holy of Holies. In the Middle Ages theologians in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam proposed speaking of God's attributes only negatively. Thus to say "the living God" does not mean that God has life as man has life; it means only that God is not dead. To attribute knowledge to God does not mean that God knows as man knows through experience and reason; it means only that God is not ignorant. The oneness of God does not mean one as in number; it means only that God is not plural. The uneasiness at talking about GOD—Particularizing God—in the Near Eastern religions, became the *modus vivendi* of certain theologies in India and the Far East. Brahman, for example, is experienceable but unutterable. Those who have experienced Brahman literally have nothing to say. And the great Chinese Taoist Lao Tzu put the ineffability of God in these words:

The Tao that can be expressed
is not the eternal Tao;
The name that can be defined
is not the unchanging name . . .

⁴ Other epithets for God were: Avenu Sheb-ba Shamyim—Our Father Who is in Heaven; Ha-Makom—the Place, the Omnipresent; Ha-Gibor—the Power; Sh'chinah—the Divine Presence; Rakhmanah—the Compassionate; Ha-Kadosh Barukh Hu—the Holy One Blessed Be He; El or Elohim—God. God's name was YHVH (Yahveh) and means, probably—He who causes being, or will cause bring.

From this point of view, to speak of God—whether he be called Mana power, spirit, lion, tall man, father, principle, oblong blur or even to call God he or to say that God is one or good or exists is (according to certain theologians of both Occidental and Oriental traditions) to commit an error. We shall call this error the fallacy of false naming or the fallacy of the pseudonym. If God is ineffable, then to particularize God is to commit an error, if not a sacrilege. Such particularization, however, has a very practical function. It gets the God word, the God experience, into some kind of manageable dimension so that we can conceive him, or worship him, or understand him, all for religious purposes; namely, to deal metatechnologically and/or metapsychologically with him.

The question might be put to such theologians: if one cannot define God in any adequate way, why not give up the attempt? Why not disband theology? The answer to such a challenge can be given on psychological grounds and on pragmatic grounds. First, man cannot stop talking about God (the dynazon) as long as he is man. Man must deal with his religious needs. He must interpret his existence to himself in terms of his ultimate values. Also, man is the "word animal." He has a lust for words. He must speak. Not to speak is to be not human. To be human is to search for meaningful life and the key to meaningful human life (unlike the instinct guided other animals) is to search for the meaning of life as it arises in the dynazonic encounter. So man always searches with words to express God's nature, and will continue to do so. And though his nets of words (according to the theology of the Ineffable) have never captured God, and never will, they have become increasingly better meshed and finer and richer, and man, if not God, has been greatly enhanced. The admonition then is not to stop engaging in the fallacy of false naming but only to recognize that the pseudonym is a pseudonym.

5) Finally, we have a particularization of the God word according to what we shall call the Neuter Energy Type. Here we find such God words as Brahman, the Prime Mover/Pure Actuality/First Intelligence, and Complexification.

First the idea of Brahman. The major movement of thought in the Hindu Upanishads is that the ground of all beings, whether material or spiritual, that which stands as the cause of all worlds, is an all-inclusive, unitary, spiritual energy. It is the ultimate "substance," infinite in essence and self-sufficient. It is impersonal energy; but spiritual energy rather than physical energy. And it is all-inclusive. All separate things of the world are simply manifestations of Brahman.

Concerning the Prime Mover/Pure Actuality/First Intelligence concepts of Aristotle and St. Thomas: Aristotle especially conceived of God as unaffected by anything outside his own intelligence. God was thought thinking about itself, according to Aristotle. But the supreme actuality of God, his utter perfection, acted like a magnet upon the world, setting it into motion and setting for it the final causes of all its strivings. God, although a person in the sense of being intelligent, was neutral toward the world. The power God exerted was neuter power.

And, finally, we have the idea of complexification as developed in the thought of Teilhard de Chardin. Although Teilhard, with his Catholic Jesuit background, identifies God with his Omega Point, which he seems to equate with an Aristotelian final cause, he has a much more intriguing dynazonic agent in his "law of complexification." Teilhard sums up the first 300 pages of his basic work *The Phenomenon of Man* with this affirmation:

... if the universe, regarded sid-
erally, is a process of spatial expansion
(from the infinitesimal to the im-
mense), in the same way and still
more clearly it presents itself to us,
physico-chemically, as in process of
organic involution upon itself (from

the extremely simple to the extremely complex)—and moreover this particular involution 'of complexity' is experimentally bound up with a correlative increase in interiorisation, that is to say in the psyche or consciousness.

Teilhard arrives at this affirmation after having traced the evolution of radial (within) energy through the geosphere, the zoosphere, to the noosphere; in other words, from the primordial atoms to the complexity of human self-consciousness. There is as the dynamic of nature itself a law of "complexification." This law is another way of saying that current evolutionary theory sees the world as moving from its simple origins to its present state by a creative process characterized by a growing complexification of original elements. This process has not yet ended. It is aiming at what Teilhard calls the Omega Point, which will be that point in evolution where there will be a universal (yet individualized) consciousness centered in, organized around and directed by love. Teilhard calls this Omega Point God. What he does not seem to see, but which we are indicating as an illustration of God as Neuter Energy Type, is that the determined process which causes things to be and to be as they are—the law of complexification—is itself an example of dynazonic agent; is God.

Concerning Atheism

In another place,⁵ I have discussed the question of God and atheism. In that article I argued that when doing theology or when talking religion man refers to God on two levels of meaning: (1) on the universally denotative level (the Quintessential Meaning) which refers to God simply as the creator or source of beings and processes; and (2) on the connotative level (the Particularized Meaning) which defines or assigns God's characteristics.

I further argued that (even in the

religious dimension) few people, even the most skeptical, deny the reality of God on the level of Quintessential Meaning. Few people deny that there is a dynazonic agency affecting their ultimate values; an agency in terms of which they must relate to achieve adequate courage to live with zest not simply because of, but in spite of the lives they experience. Where people "commit atheism," where they deny God, is in the particularizations about God made in sectarian theologies. They reject somebody's idea about what God is like.

If, of course, atheism is to be reserved for those who reject some particularized order of God terms, then from someone's point of view everyone is an atheist, for surely everyone rejects someone's idea of God. Obviously this amounts to "pseudo-atheism." Real atheism must be reserved for persons who deny God not only in some particularized meaning, but in the Quintessential Meaning.

Now, it is one thing to deny a particularized definition of God (which we all do), and quite another thing to deny the reality of any God of religious significance; i.e., any non-human source of values and meanings in which and through which men work out their lives religiously. But even on this dimension God is sometimes denied. This would appear to be the case in the atheistic existentialism of Sartre and Camus.

However, we are now saying in this essay that beyond the religious dimension of the Dynazon there is the Ontic Dimension (i.e., the Dynazon itself). We are speaking not only of the religious meaning of the God term, but of its Ontic meaning. The God word stands for whatever power or powers cause ALL things to be and to be as they are. The word stands not simply in relation to man and his religious values, but to all beings and processes and their source or sources. In this dimension, as a scientific / philosophical discourse, it

⁵ *Iliff Review* (Spring, 1969), "Atheism and University."

seems impossible to deny the fact of God. Atheism becomes not simply "pseudo," but impossible. To deny God on the Ontic Dimension becomes tantamount to denying one's self. Perhaps nothing of "religious significance" causes man to be and to be as he is, but self-evidently something of "ontic significance" causes him to be and to be even, perhaps, utterly skeptical.

God and the Demonic

To speak of God as the Dynazon (in both ontic and religious dimension) raises the question of how to view the demonic in theology. Put differently, where does "the Devil" fit into the classification of God? To get at this let us review briefly the idea of the demonic element in two world religions; namely, Juana Marga and Bhakti Marga Hinduism, and Zoroastrianism.

In Hindu thought the problem of the demonic is dealt with partly by the concept of Ignorance (avidya) and partly by the God Shiva. In the first case (in a type of sectarianism called Juana Marga) the cause of human misery is Ignorance. Man is so basically in error about his own nature that it is his own ignorance that lies at the root of the non-manipulable aspects of his existence. What man does not know, what it is almost impossible for him to know, is that he is not a separate person (ego) in a world of things, but that he is in fact, as all things are, exactly what Brahman (i.e., God) is. As long as man lives in Ignorance, believing that he possesses a separate selfhood, he will be bound to the wheel of reincarnation and determined in successive births by the Law of Karma. Ignorance is evil. It is the root of human misery. It necessitates the misery of continued existence in the vice-grips of reincarnation and karma. It is one of the factors that cause things to be, and to be as they are. It is a dynazonic negative. And in this man himself becomes a demon just as more basically he is Atman-Brahman-God.

In a different interpretation of Hindu

religion called Bhakti Marga (the way of devotion), the idea of the demonic is placed directly in the divine order. Here the reference is to God Shiva—one of the three greatest God manifestations of Brahman. Hinduism is not a religion, but a whole spectrum or family of religions. All of them subscribe to karma doctrine and reincarnation doctrine. All of them are generally respectful of the Juana Marga (way of knowledge) mentioned above, and also of the highly sophisticated system of Yoga and the various philosophies of Vedanta. But an ordinary Hindu can no more understand most of these erudite systems than an ordinary westerner can understand relativity, $E=MC^2$, or the second law of thermodynamics. The sannyasin (holy man) is admired, as Einstein is admired, because he has discovered or conceived something very wonderful, but what it is no ordinary man understands. The Hindu masses have no clear conception of the highly speculative theologies of Hinduism, nor of the highly sophisticated value experiences (Samadhi-Nirvana) of the religious elite. For the ordinary Hindu religion is a more ordinary devotion to the Gods and techniques intended to secure divine support for basic and threatened human values. Especially this Hindu theology emphasizes the great triunity of Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva. This triunity is an important manifestation of dynazonic reality called Brahman. Brahman, the basic impersonal ground, achieves religious significance in three personal deities who represent the functions of creation (Brahma), preservation of life and value (Vishnu), and the destruction of life (Shiva). Shiva is our concern here because Shiva is the "demonic power" which is yet regarded as a God and not a devil. Shiva is called Mahaveda, which means the great God. Yet in the words of the Yajur Veda, this God is "the threatener, the slayer, the vexer, and the afflictor." He is the man-slayer; the all slayer. Yet despite this Shiva is ad-

mired and worshipped for is not the destroyer and the slayer also the purifier, the preparer of the ground for new life in plants, animals, men? He clears the way for the new, the returning, the springtime, the new-born child. Without the destroyer life would choke on its own multiplicity. So Shiva, the demonic, is also characterized as the personification of the reproductive forces of life. He is the Great Dancer as well as the Great Destroyer. He is demonic. He destroys. He is also Brahman/God.

In Hinduism (especially in Bhakti Marga) there appears to be what some might regard as a peculiar use of dynazonic language. The God class seems to include what one would expect to exclude from it; namely, the demonic. This "peculiarity" becomes even more evident when we examine Zoroastrian religious thought. In Zoroaster the creative source of the universe (the power that causes things to be and be as they are) is the dual power of Ahura Mazda (Wise Lord; the God of good creations) and Angra Mainyu (Bad Spirit; the demon of bad creations). These two dynazonic agents are regarded as primal in creation. When in the beginning these two spirits came together they established the dualisms of life and death, good and evil, Hell and Paradise. Ahura Mazda (also called Ormazd) caused the positive; and Angra Mainyu (also called Shaitin or Satan) caused in opposition to Ahura Mazda's work, the negative. There is some ambiguity in the Gathas as to how Angra Mainyu came into existence. Zoroaster apparently regarded Ahura Mazda as the supreme power. Did Ahura Mazda, then create Angra Mainyu? Or did they always co-exist? Or is Angra Mainyu simply the necessary opposition without which goodness could not exist? Whatever the basic Zoroastrian concept is, there is clear indication that in the development of Zoroastrian theology there is the idea of an arch-fiend who has always opposed the good God. God is particularized as good and Satan is

particularized as evil, but in theological fact both cause the world to be as it is and therefore are of the dynazonic order—are God.

One need hardly mention that somewhat less consistently (and most surely as a borrowing), Christianity has done the same thing with the demonic. No matter how bad his name Satan is a form of God.

From these observations of the demonic as divine we may conclude that in theology not only does a God concept emerge, but also a Devil concept emerges, and that these two orders of concepts both belong to the same class. They are both God. We seem to have, then, a dynazonic positive and a dynazonic negative. In religion the dynazonic negative acts as the impulse to religious explanation and operation; it is the ground of the non-manipulable. The dynazonic positive is the answer or aim of religion. It is the agency of the accomplishment of metatechnological and/or metapsychological fulfillment.

The power that determines the destiny of man both benefits him and harms him. It is only as men particularize God (speak of God in some Particularized Order of Theological Language) that they can separate the dynazonic negative from the dynazonic positive and call the value producing, value supporting, "good" power God, and the value limiting, value destroying, "bad" power something other than God; e.g., Avidya, Shiva, Angra Mainyu, Satan, the Devil.

The Structure of Theology

Let us now draw into systematic arrangement the central concepts stated in these few pages; seeing first the theological terms as they relate to each other:

DYNAZON (class of God)

- I. Ontic Dimension (the All-Source)
- II. Religious Dimension (the religiously significant aspect)

III. Universal Theology (common God-talk)

IV. Particularized Theology (sectarian God-talk)

V. Dynazonic Positive (God supporting)

VI. Dynazonic Negative (God destroying)

1) The Dynazon is the class of God. It stands for (a) what is said to be that which causes things to be and to be as they are; and (b) that which is, in fact, what causes things to be and to be as they are.

2) The Ontic Dimension of the Dynazon (I) is God as the cause of all things, and the cause of their being as they are. The Ontic Dimension is the Dynazon.

3) The Religious Dimension (II) is that part of the Ontic Dimension of the Dynazon which affects man and man's destiny as they relate to man's ultimate values. This is God involved in (a) the religiously significant non-manipulables of ignorance and of condition⁶ and (b) God as the object of mystical worship and Atman-Brahman type identification. This is the dimension wherein man does theology and religion in order to deal with the non-manipulable aspects of his existence positively; i.e., religiously.

4) Theology has two orders of language (a) Universal Theology (III). In Universal Theology we have those

common statements which are affirmed in all sectarian systems of religion. The following are examples of Universal Theology: (1) God (or a functional equivalent for God) is part of religion. (2) Religion functions where critical human values are threatened. (3) There is in religion an experience of mystical ecstasy. (b) Particularized Theology (IV) is sectarian theology. It comprises God statements which are not universally recognized or affirmed. The following are examples of Particularized Theology: (1) Jesus Christ is God. (2) Manu was the first man on earth. (3) God thinks. (4) Evil persons will be punished in Hell.

5) The Dynazon, as the ultimate power structure, confronts man both positively (V) and negatively (VI). It creates and supports him and his values. It also assaults and destroys him and his values. In both instances man is confronted with the power that causes things to be and to be as they are. He may call the one good and the other bad, but in fact they both belong to the Dynazon Class, and his calling them this or that is simply a particularization of God, primarily for religious reasons.

Summary: When reinterpreting their world and man's place in the world—when doing theology—men use God words. These words are dynazonic. They designate the powers (or what are believed to be the powers) which cause and limit man's immediate existence, especially with reference to the non-manipulable critical, ultimate values of his existence.

⁶ See *Iliff Review* (Spring, 1970), "The Anthropocentric Definition: Religion—An Expression of Human Need."

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.