

Biser, Eugen: *Theologie und Atheismus*. Anstöße zu einer theologischen Aporetik (= Kleine Schriften zur Theologie), Kösel Verlag/München 1972; 94 S., kart. DM 11,80.

Dieses dem Andenken HERMAN SCHELLS gewidmete Büchlein versucht, den neuzeitlichen Atheismus als eine Gegenwehr gegen die zentralen Behauptungen der Theologie zu verstehen. Dies bedeutet nach BISER insbesondere, daß eine allzu gewaltig und erhaben aufgefaßte „Absolutheit Gottes“ den Widerspruch des Menschen geradezu herausgefordert habe. Damit wird ein Gedanke vorgebracht, der sehr wohl Beachtung verdient. Gegenüber manchen Formulierungen und Urteilen des Buches sind Vorbehalte anzumelden, so z. B. gegenüber der Verallgemeinerung „das christliche Gemüt“ (14), dem Ausdruck „unüberdenklich“ in Bezug auf ANSELMS Argument in *Proslogion* (19), der Rede von einem „atheistischen Affekt“ bei CAMUS (52). Nachdem Verf. drei fundamentale theologische Aporien aufgezeigt hat, auf die im Kontext der Atheismus-Problematik einzugehen ist, nämlich die Aporien der „Absolutheit“, der „Kontingenz“ und der „Vermittlung“ (vgl. S. 68–84), handelt er im Schlußabschnitt — leider recht knapp — über den „Ausweg des Wortes“ (85–90): „... nichts wird die Theologie so sehr zu einer Neubesinnung auf ihre Voraussetzungen und ihren Weg bewegen wie der Anblick der Aporien, in die sich der spekulative Gedankengang verstrickt“ (90). Dieses Urteil ist sicher nicht ganz unbegründet (ob SCHELL ihm zugestimmt hätte?); es fragt sich jedoch sehr, ob der Satz: „Die Grenze des Denkens ist der Anfang des Wortes“ (88), der nach BISER auch für das Wort der Offenbarung gilt, nicht zwangsläufig zu einem Neofundamentalismus führt. Es mag heute schwer sein, diese Position zu vermeiden, aber wenn dies nicht mehr möglich sein oder werden sollte, müßte das Christentum erst recht in dem zur Zeit wieder häufiger beredeten Ghetto verbleiben.

Bonn

H. R. Schlette

Chemparathy, George: *An Indian Rational Theology*. Introduction to UDAYANA's *Nyāyakusumāñjali* (= Publications of the De Nobili Research Library, ed. by Gerhard Oberhammer, I), Indologisches Institut der Universität Wien 1972; 202 p. — Commission Agents: E. J. Brill/Leiden—Gerold & Co/Vienna—Motilal Banarsidass/Delhi.

In India today seminary professors, bishops and even a few thoughtful Christian lay men regretfully speak of the lack of Indian-Christian thought and of the innate Indian inclination to beg and to borrow. The theology we teach in our seminaries and scholasticates is nothing but a digest, often second hand of the works appearing in the West. Yet very few of us realise that a genuine Indian-Christian thought can arise only (a) from a deep, prayerful and sympathetic study of our double heritage, Indian and Christian and (b) above all from a harmonious and creative way of life and praxis that spring from and synthesize both these legacies.

Secondly, even after 26 years of independence we Indians have done little research into our past. Unless we can discover our authentic past, its repercussions on the present and its thrust towards the future, we will not be able to discover ourselves or our task. It is from these two angles, one Christian the other national we should examine and evaluate the present work.

In the Preface to the book, Dr. CHEMPARATHY formulates the purpose of his book thus: "The present work is a modest attempt to give a brief introduction to the doctrine of God as found in Udayana's works in general and in *Nyāyakusumāñjali* in particular. The writers's aim has been to give as faithful an interpretation of Udayana's ideas as possible in the given amount of space" (p 8). The objective the author sets to himself is perhaps limited, but he has creditably achieved it.

The work is divided into two unequal parts. The first part with two chapters deals with UDAYANA, his life and works, especially with his 'magnum opus' *Nyāyakusumāñjali*. The second part with five chapters deals with his doctrine of God (*Īśvara*). Proofs for the existence of God; His relation to the world; Motives for His activity; His ontological determination and Concluding remarks from the five chapters of the second part. — An exhaustive bibliography, a list of the editions, commentaries and translations of *Nyāyakusumāñjali* and a detailed subject index enhance the value and easy use of the book.

While discussing the date of UDAYANA, the author at first gives a brief summary of the views of other scholars on the point; he shows an inclination to the view that UDAYANA wrote his major works in the first half of the 11th century. Dr. CHEMPARATHY writes: „It is on set purpose that I have abstained from a more approximate determination of the date of Udayana. The research which I have hitherto made on this point raised so many problems that I thought it advisable to carry on further study before making a definite statement about it" (p 21, Note 10). This cautious attitude is to be seen in the whole book. Apart from stating a explaining the main ideas of UDAYANA, Dr. CHEMPARATHY refrains from any personal comments or critical remarks.

The authors effort to make the text of UDAYANA intelligible by placing it in its historical context is something commendable. By any standard UDAYANA is a difficult author. His *Nyāyakusumāñjali* is the most difficult of all his works. The constant use of *Nyāya* technical terms make his works unintelligible to the uninitiated. Hence Dr. CHEMPARATHY's exposition of UDAYANA's *Īśvara*-doctrine, which is the result of long and accurate study of the basic texts and the detailed analysis of *Nyāyakusumāñjali* given at the end of the first part of the book are of great help to all students of Indian thought.

UDAYANA's principal preoccupation was to prove the existence of God by means of inference (*anumāna*). He adduces nine reasons (*hetu*) for the existence of God. By the dexterous use of the poetical ornament, *śleṣa* (double entendre) he has put in two significations into each of these reasons. In fact one or two reasons offer the possibility of more than two interpretations. Thus we have over 18 proofs for the existence of *Īśvara* in UDAYANA's works! The ingenuity and dialectical skill manifested in the exposition of the arguments and especially in the refutation of the objections raised by the opponents are astounding. But the proofs themselves seem to possess only questionable philosophical value. All the arguments either fully or at least partially are based on specific Hindu religious tenets and myths or on the doctrines of particular philosophical schools. The elaboration of the proofs manifest hardly any metaphysical depth. The other points of UDAYANA's teaching on God, Viz His relation to the world, His motives in acting etc. are to a large extent nothing more than skillful and elaborate restatements of traditional *Nyāya* tenets as found in his time.

While admitting the fact that the book offers a faithful digest of the *Īśvara* doctrine of UDAYANA and hence in one way helpful in the Indian-Christian

quest for an authentic indigenous theology and in our national search for our past, it must however be remarked that there is an absence of philosophical questioning and probing in the book. Philosophical and theological texts of the past to be understood and appreciated demand more than philological analysis. Apart from the analysis of their thought content, one must lay bare their philosophical presuppositions, study their implications and show their relevance for the present. For example UDAYANA's assertion that all schools of thought including materialism (*cārvāka*) accept the existence of a Supreme Being calls for a deeper questioning and analysis than the few remarks Dr. CHEMPARATHY makes (pp 81—82). That statement has a modern theological ring about it. UDAYANA's whole attitude to the proofs for the existence of God — "this study which is to be designated as reflection (*mananam*) is made as an act of worship (*upāsana*) that comes after listening to the scriptures (*śruti*)" — is very meaningful to us today. But when we take the proofs themselves we notice that they lack the depth and sharpness of these above remarks. The very first proof: „Earth etc have a maker as their cause, because they have the nature of effect“, for example raises innumerable philosophical problems. What is the idea of cause and effect underlying the proof? What are the philosophical implications of the argument? From what notion of being does this argument originate? Can we really prove the existence of a transcendent cause by means of this argument? The absence of such questions and analysis in the book may be because Dr. CHEMPARATHY's aim is very limited.

A more general remark about the book is that it is slightly repetitious. These two rather minor points have been mentioned with the sincere hope that we will in future get still better books from the erudite pen of Dr. CHEMPARATHY on classical *Nyāya*.

Kodaikanal-4/India

Ig. Puthiadam s. j.

Enomiya-Lassalle, Hugo M.: *Zen unter Christen*. Styria/Graz-Wien-Köln 1973; 78 S., DM 7,80

Wie unterscheiden sich die verschiedenen Schriften von ENOMIYA-LASSALLE? Der Autor gibt in einer ersten ausführlichen Fußnote selbst darüber Auskunft: *Zen — Weg zur Erleuchtung* (Wien 1960) vermittelt erste Eindrücke, „gibt eine erste Interpretation des Zen nebst genauen Anweisungen für den Vollzug“. *Zen-Buddhismus* (Köln 1966) ist die grundlegende Darstellung des Zen aufgrund von Erfahrungen und vergleichenden Studien der buddhistischen Methoden und der christlichen Mystik. *Zen-Meditation für Christen* (München 1969) faßt An- und Aussprachen mit Teilnehmern der mehrtägigen Zen-Übungen des Autors zusammen und arbeitet vor allem die Möglichkeit heraus, Zazen im Sinne einer christlichen Meditation zu verwenden. In *Meditation als Weg zur Gotteserfahrung*. Eine Anleitung zum mystischen Gebet. (Köln 1972) wertet ENOMIYA-LASSALLE überdies Erwägungen C. ALBRECHTS aus, die von der Tiefenpsychologie her das Geschehen während der objektlosen Meditation zu erhellen sucht (vgl. 77). Wer nach Anweisungen für die Praxis sucht, wird also vor allem nach der ersten und der dritten Veröffentlichung greifen. Die neue Schrift greift in die entstandene Diskussion im christlichen Raum ein. Es ist eine Bekenntnisschrift, die nachdrücklich Raum fordert für den Weg der objektlosen Zen-Meditation, wo „Pluralität in manchen, sogar wichtigen Fragen der Theologie“ (28) inzwischen selbstverständlich ist. Sie will vor allem jene bestärken, die unsicher