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The prayers of lament in The Psalter give a form

to the worst experiences of life which follows the
movement innate to human suffering and yet places
it in the presence of the one who alone can address
decisive word to those who suffer.

THE LAMENT PSALMS offer important resources for Christian faith and
ministry even though they have been largely purged from the life of the
church and its liturgical use. Such purging attests to the alienation between the
Bible and the church. This paper seeks to consider ways in which the lament
psalms might be appropriated for the life and faith of the church.1

I

The literary rhetorical-form questions about the laments of Israel are fairly
fixed and need no review here.2 The question of Sitz im Leben is less clear. Since

---

*To Allen O. Miller on his sixty-fifth birthday, with thanks.
1. This paper seeks to work out some implications of a previous statement, “From Hurt to
Joy, from Death to Life,” Interp., 28:3-19 (1974) and Claus Westermann, “The Role of the
2. Gunkel-Begrich, Einleitung in die Psalmen, (1933). See the summary statements of Hans
Joachim Kraus, Psalmen I, BK 15/1 (Neukirchen, Neukirchener Verlag, 1961) xxxvii-liv,
and Westermann, “Struktur und Geschichte der Klage im Alten Testamentum,” Forschung am
alten Testament, ThB 24 (München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1964) pp. 266-72. More specifically
on the elements of the standard form see Westermann, op. cit., p. 270; Kraus, op. cit., xlv-xlvi;
Brueggemann, op. cit., pp. 6-8; and Erhard Gerstenberger, “The Psalms,” Old Testament Form
Criticism, John H. Hayes, ed. (San Antonio, Trinity University Press, 1974) p. 200. The
fullest discussion we have is that of Westermann, The Praise of God in the Psalms (Richmond,
John Knox Press, 1965). The enumerations of elements differ in detail but agree in the primary
components.
Hans Schmidt it is widely assumed that the lament form for the individual has an institutional placement in a judicial process in the Jerusalem temple. It is used in the central shrine for an encounter concerning safety, innocence, acquittal and well-being of the suppliant. Several studies have moved beyond this consensus:

1. Westermann, presuming Begrich’s hypothesis of salvation oracle, has shown that the central movement of the lament is a sharp, discontinuous step from plea to praise, from brokenness to wholeness. He has stressed the function of the form, that is, the way Israel was restored to full life and affirmative faith.

2. Gerstenberger has (a) challenged the Jerusalem setting and has situated the form in the context of tribe or clan, and (b) has shown that its function is rehabilitation of a member to the life-world of the group. The form serves the function of rehabilitation.

3. James Ross in treating Job 33:14-30 and the speeches of Elihu, urges that this text provides the rubric and theological rationale for the lament, that is, it is a response to the action of God already taken. The decisive action is completed and this is thanks giving after deliverance. Verse 26b which Ross translates, “to restore to man his righteousness,” uses the term yashav to show the agenda of restoration. This is in general agreement with Gerstenberger, though not as sociologically concerned as he.

4. Rainer Alberz, in his dissertation prepared under Westermann, has made a shrewd and perceptive distinction:

   a) Traditions of the creation of the world have their setting in the official cult of the great sanctuary and are expressed as hymns, (b) traditions of the creation of man have their setting in the worship of small groups subordinate to official religion and are expressed in laments. The purpose of the lament is


4. The Praise of God in the Psalms.

5. Gerstenberger, Der Bittende Mensch (Habilitationschrift, University of Heidelberg, 1970).

6. E.g., p. 154.
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the creation and restoration of the member of the community by the action of the group. The function is rehabilitation/restoration and the form serves that function.

In considering the interaction of form and function, we are helped by the sociologists who see regularized language as the way a community created and maintains a life-world.11 Such regularized speech activity serves both to enhance the experience so that dimensions of it are not lost and to limit the experience so that some dimensions are denied their legitimacy. This suggests, applied to the lament form, that its regularized use intends to enable and require “sufferers” in the community to experience their suffering in a legitimate life-world. It is this form which enhances experience and brings it to articulation and also limits the experience of suffering so that it can be received and coped with according to the perspectives, perceptions, and resources of the community. Thus the function of the form is definitional. It tells the experiencer the shape of the experience which it is legitimate to experience.

All the uses of this form in Israel or elsewhere insist that grief is formful. It can be supervised according to community forms which make it bearable and manageable in the community. The griever is kept in community or returned to the community by having it articulated that this experience does not lie outside the legitimate scope of the community. It is not an abyss either anomie or chaotic.12 By the use of the form the grief experience is made bearable and, it is hoped, meaningful. The form makes the experience formful just when it appeared to be formless and therefore deathly and destructive.

Granted the common characteristics, the form has different nuances when used in Israel: (a) As Bergich has noted, in Israel there is no attempt to flatter the deity, as there was in Babylon. (b) An affirmative ending is characteristic in Israel. (c) The God of Israel’s laments himself may enter the pathos with

For the practice of ministry, there is room here to consider smaller units as centers of rehabilitation.


12. Robert Merton has provided a useful definition of anomie (Social Theory and Social Structure [Glencoe, Ill., Free Press, 1957], p. 162). I have used both terms, anomie and chaos, to affirm both dimensions: The crisis is mythic, but it is also psychic-social.

13. Westermann, concludes: “In the investigation of all the LI of the Old Testament, I found to my astonishment that there are no Psalms which do not progress beyond petition and lament” (The Praise of God, p. 74). Prof. Fretheim has called my attention to Ps. 88 as a possible exception. That however does not detract greatly from the importance of Westermann’s observation.
Israel. These distinctive nuances are linguistic acts by which this community insists on a specific and distinctive formfulness which defines grief in a different way and makes it an altogether different experience. Form permits the community to have a different experience: (a) No flattery means that Yahweh can be confronted directly and with bold confidence. (b) The affirmative ending shows it is a believable complaint, focused on fidelity and not primarily on anger. To address Yahweh, even in anger, is to make an affirmation about him. Gerstenberger has made the important distinction between lament (Klage) and complaint (Anklage). Israel characteristically complains and does not lament, that is she expects something. Israel hopes for an intrusion which will fulfill the petition. (c) The pathos of God in response to the trouble of the speaker is a theme not yet seriously explored. His response indicates his involvement and so makes an important assertion about the character of Yahweh:

... the lament of the nation contains a dimension of protest ... It is a protest directed to God to be sure, but it is nevertheless a protest; it does not endure absurdity submissively and patiently: it protests! ... It lays the matter out before God so that he will do something about it.

The function of the form is (a) to give a new definition of the situation and (b) to get some action which is hoped for because of this peculiar definitional


16. Gerstenberger suggests that a lament “bemoans a tragedy which cannot be reversed, while a complaint entreats God for help in the midst of tribulation” (“Jeremiah’s Complaints,” JBL 82:405 [1963], n. 50). The former accepts the way the situation is and the latter insists and expects that it will be changed. Though Gerstenberger does not do so, perhaps it can be argued that a lament is used by the apathetic who do not believe in a future, while those with pathos refuse to accept what is and so complain for change.
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world. The form not only describes what is, but articulates what is expected and insisted upon.

II

To further explore this form and function we will consider a contemporary attempt to characterize the formfulness of grief from the work of Elizabeth Kübler-Ross.19 As is well known, Kübler-Ross has observed (and urged) that the grief and death process tends to follow a fairly regular form. That discernment on her part is a remarkable achievement. Technical medicine, like urban consciousness generally, is resistant to form, denies the formfulness of experience, and resists the notion that grief or any other experience is formful. Thus it is important that Kübler-Ross has been able to establish the agenda that this human experience is inevitably formful and no technical claim to the contrary can deny that. The conflict between formfulness and the ideology of formlessness of experience in urban consciousness is a more urgent matter for form critics than we have often recognized.20 The issues of form are urgently current and not only of historical interest. That I consider more important than the specifics of Kübler-Ross's work. The death-grief process includes five elements, according to Kübler-Ross:

1. Denial and isolation: "No, not me, it cannot be true."21 Such denials lead to immobilizing isolation. This is a brief and temporary period.

2. Anger: Ross reports the deep humiliation and indignity at being at the disposal of others, of having to be victimized by institutional routines, of not being important and having to wait, of being object and not subject. A competent "I" reduced to a worthless "it." The final humiliation is in being dependent:

Patient: It isn't right. I can't beg somebody for something I need.

Chaplain: . . . The importance of one's dignity of the patient. Not having to beg and not being overwhelmed and manipulated.

19. Exclusive attention will be given to her most important study, On Death and Dying (New York, Macmillan, 1969). I regard her subsequent work as less germane to this study and in any case more problematic. Reference should be made to the earlier and parallel discernment of such formfulness by Granger Westberg, Good Grief (Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1962). Although religiously oriented, he also stayed exclusively with psychological categories of interpretation.

20. My colleague, Lionel Whiston, Jr., reminds me that modernity also has its forms. But the ideology behind them is that they are accidents or conveniences rather than shapers of experience. As a result, modernity leaves us with the notion that the shape of experience does not matter, or with a sense of the shapelessness of experience which prevents it from being experienced at all. Only forms let experience be experienced communally and meaningfully, formlessness must lead to apathy. Cf. Sölle, who sees the interrelatedness of inoperative speech, banal optimism, and blind worship of the status quo (op. cit., pp. 36-41). Presumed formlessness surely means the end of human freedom.

3. Bargaining: This is an attempt to postpone, to get parole for good behavior, usually related to religion or virtue. They are attempts to reduce life to *quid pro quo*. There is no bargaining power and not much is to be gained, because there is no *quid*.

4. Depression: This occurs when the deep encompassing sense of loss hits the sufferer. It is the sense of nothingness which makes one powerfully aware of lost opportunities, weakness, and inability to function as a provider. The final insight is the worthlessness of it all.

5. Acceptance: The patient accepts the radical, ultimate loss. It is a mood in which the fighting ceases. It is not chagrined resignation but an affirmation of the all-rightness of what is going on. It is a *surrender* of self-sufficiency, but it is also *reconciliation*. It is cessation of attempts at self-security and self-justification and an affirmation of the coherence and settledness of life in a context of larger meanings. In this stage, says Kübler-Ross, hope is strong, not grounded in medical possibilities, but in a sense of buoyance about the reliable context in which life is lived and given up. Kübler-Ross’s five elements may be correlated with the movement in Israel’s laments discerned by Westermann. She has discerned four stages that speak of *plea* and one of *affirmation*. There is a radical turn between numbers four and five, above, as radical as Beglich and Westermann have noted in Israel’s lament psalms.

Israel and Kübler-Ross begin at very different places. (In my comparison I will work from Kübler-Ross’s simpler form.):

III

1. Denial. In a modern technological hospital organized to deny reality, the form begins with a predictable denial, not only by persons but by the definitional world of the medical community. Israel’s form has no precise counterpart because Israel’s speech begins with an insistent covenantal address, identifying one who is

25. Westermann, *The Praise of God*, p. 75, has most helpfully structured the lament as movement from petition to praise: “In my opinion, this fact that in the Psalms of the O.T. there is no, or almost no, such thing as *mere* lament and petition shows conclusively the polarity between praise and petition in the Psalms. The cry to God is here never one-dimensional, without tension. It is always somewhere in the middle between petition and praise. By nature it cannot be *mere* petition or lament, but is always underway from supplication to praise.”
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expected to be present. The moods are contrasted between the *resignation* of aloneness and the *protest* of one whose world is covenantal partner to address. Israel's speech presumes a history of interaction, of speaking and hearing which gives life. In the urban consciousness, loss must be faced without history and so instead of covenantal address there is denial.

2. Kübler-Ross's second stage of *anger* offers a central parallel. Israel asserts indignation at being cheated, exploited, humiliated, betrayed, and abandoned. She articulates rage against all comers as does Kübler-Ross's form. Because of covenant, Israel had a context in which this could be received and contained, whereas Ross observed that family and staff cannot cope with it. The modern context lacks the resources to contain and receive such undisciplined, irrational assertions, because death as well as life is supposed to be much more managed and buttoned down. While the forms contain the same elements in Israel, the covenantal form can embrace the primordial sense of irrationality and does not need to be reduced to scientific rationality.

3. *Bargaining.* This is a minor motif for Kübler-Ross as it has been for form studies of Israel's lament. But in both cases the motif is the same. Form critics have called this "motivation" (*Begründigung*), giving God reason for change, and as for Kübler-Ross, Israel's reasons include good behavior, trust, faithfulness, and innocence. Israel is much bolder and more inventive because she is not constrained to be polite. She resorts to threats, intimidation, and appeals to Yahweh's pride and vanity. In both forms the bargaining is a last desperate attempt at self-sufficiency and self-justification (this is clearest in the protests of Job).

4. *Depression.* Kübler-Ross means by this a sense of worthlessness, impotence, and insignificance, and the behavior derived from it. That motif is hinted at in Israel through expressions of bitter helplessness:

> But I am a worm, and no man; scorned by men, despised by the people.
All who see me mock at me, they make mouths at me, they wag their heads (Ps. 22:6f.).

Such speech concerns being at the disposal of another who does not seem to care or value (Ps. 13:1-2; 6:67; Job 25:6, also "worm" theme). Israel knows about that sense of diminishment and self-deprecation, but it is differently textured. Kübler-Ross's subject has no one to address and so will finally be depressed. Israel, always by form, has a partner to whom to speak. For that reason, Israel's anger is much more healthy and buoyant. It is fundamentally hopeful because

there is always a chance that the other one will act. Depression is never full blown in Israel because there is in the form another one who listens and takes Israel's speech seriously.

In place of depression, Israel's form has petition, and here the forms are most to be contrasted. Depression is appropriate if the speech is finally monological. But Israel's form is boldly dialogical and the one who hears or is expected to hear is not addressed in hopeless despair but in passionate expectation.

5. Kübler-Ross's fifth stage, acceptance, correlates to Begrich's post-salvation oracle elements of praise. The decisive turn in the form is the same as Begrich noted, for Kübler-Ross between elements number four and five, and for Israel in the turn from petition to praise. In both there is a dramatic movement toward affirmation and readiness to rejoice. It is unclear concerning Kübler-Ross whether "acceptance" is affirmation or whether it is resignation. I believe she, herself, is not clear.

While the modern resolution may or may not be affirmative, Israel's conclusion is characteristically praise. The doxology rests on the conviction that the griever has been heard and the matter has been decisively dealt with.

IV

Again assuming Begrich's hypothesis, the movement to the praise element is accomplished by faithful speaking, precisely by the one who seems absent or unconcerned. The changed situation is not by a visible action, not by external transformation, but by a word spoken authoritatively which constructs and maintains a social reality which in the stress seemed to have slipped away or collapsed. It is the function of the form to reassert power and credibility of the words of this community, words which assert and express a reality only this community knows about but which are decisively powerful there. These words dramatize the claim of the entire form, namely that grief and loss are not formless but formful. Their form is dialogical and not monological.

In a much more timid way, Kübler-Ross makes the same point. The speech which moves the dying one to acceptance is not so potently and authoritatively

28. Again refer to Gerstenberger's comment, that in Israel the speech is most often hopeful complaint and not resigned moaning. Israel's lack of laments is not accidental. The covenantal life-world of Israel made such resignation inappropriate because Yahweh can and does intrude to transform.

29. Israel's capacity to say "Thou" is decisive both for the form and for her history. Martin Buber reports an old rabbinic song focused on "Thou." Cf. Hendrich Ott, God (Richmond, John Knox Press, 1974), p. 87; and H. W. Beck, Weltformel contra Schöpfungsglaube (Zürich, Theologischen Verlag, 1972), p. 209. Hans Walter Wolff, in an oral exegesis of Jonah 4, observed that Jonah's problem was his preoccupation with "I" at the expense of "Thou." Israel's covenantal speech kept "Thou" at the center of consciousness.
"Fear not, I am with you," as in Israel's form, but the form is similarly employed:

Chaplain: A certain sense of dignity she'd want to maintain as long as she could.
Patient: Yes, and I can't do this alone at times.\textsuperscript{30}

Kübler-Ross writes: "In the preparatory grief there is no or little need for words. It is much more a feeling that can be mutually expressed and is often done better with a touch of a hand, a stroking of the hair, or just a silent sitting together."\textsuperscript{31} Kübler-Ross makes two summary statements:

... we have found that those patients do best who have been encouraged to express their rage, to cry in preparatory grief, and to express their fears and fantasies to someone who can sit quietly and listen.

Our presence may just confirm that we are going to be around until the end.\textsuperscript{32}

\textit{Mutatis mutandis}, these are all variations on, "Fear not, I am with you." As in Israel the form affirms that it is faithful speaking and not technical medicine or jargon. In Israel it is the word of Yahweh. In Kübler-Ross it is the voice of human folk who will not be denied their human function by a technical institution which finally can neither give life nor prevent others from that function.

The form moves from "Fear not, I am with you," to "I will not fear, for thou art with me" (Ps. 23:4). It is the function of the form (and nothing else will do it) to deal with the elemental, even primordial fear of \textit{anomie}, chaos, death, abandonment. The problem of the situation may indeed be sickness, enemies, or death. But such experiences finally concern formlessness, the collapse of categories in which experience can be experienced in a universe of meaning. In Israel the formfulness of the experience centers in the presence of Yahweh who need not do anything but be there. The use of the form is an activity in the maintenance of this life-world which has at its center the abiding, transforming presence of Yahweh.\textsuperscript{33} No less so in Kübler-Ross, this form which requires a dialogue partner between numbers four and five is a form which technical medicine does not understand, surely does not sanction, but which it cannot prevent nor displace. This form also is a response to the yearning for assurance that the experience is not formless, that there is something outside the experience of loss which endures and that enduring reality is a faithful word.

The commonalities in the forms of Israel and Kübler-Ross are instructive. Most

\textsuperscript{30} On \textit{Death and Dying}, p. 70. Cf., pp. 68, 81.
\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., p. 87. Cf., pp. 106, 110.
\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., pp. 119, 113.
\textsuperscript{33} See Peter Berger on the meaning of world-maintenance by the management of symbols (\textit{The Sacred Canopy} [Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday and Co., 1967], pp. 29-51).
important of course is the movement in each from negation to affirmation. The movement of both these forms cannot be made by the sufferer alone, but depends on the presence of a voice which has history with the subject.

The *dissimilarities* are all the more striking: (a) Israel’s covenantal address instead of denial. (b) Israel’s expectant petition instead of depression. (c) In Israel the form itself centers in intervention, whereas Kübler-Ross must treat the intervention ambiguously and gingerly because the context of modernity must by definition screen it out. (d) In Israel the form of the rhetoric like the form of the event is undeniably covenantal. As such the form serves to set the experience of grief and suffering in a context of covenant which means that expected transforming intrusion by the covenant partner is a legitimate and intentional extrapolation from the form itself. This of course Kübler-Ross has not found in the parallel form and cannot. Modernity cannot anticipate a *Durchbruch*.

V

Because Kübler-Ross has so captured the imagination of caring people, it is appropriate to comment upon her work in light of Israel’s laments.

1. The form she presents is a yearning for covenant rather than an affirmation of it, which may be the most that can be articulated in the world of urban consciousness.

2. The responding partner in her form, that is, a friend, relative, medical personnel, of course means that the move to the affirmation is not full and buoyant, because such responding agents cannot powerfully intrude to transform. The formfulness of the event is essentially and necessarily humanistic. What is lacking is the presence of a sovereign God who can authorize.

3. Kübler-Ross appears to be ambivalent on the last stage of acceptance. At times this appears to be triumphantly affirmative and at other times serenely resigned. It is not clear if we have a resigned lament or an expectant complaint. Such a lack of convinced clarity of course diminishes the power of the form.

4. Kübler-Ross may well be bootlegging a view of death which does not rely on the form but seeks to go outside and beyond it. Thus death is not defeated as the last enemy but is embraced as the last home, or now, as the last growth point. The easy alliance of biblical theology with her view in popular practice must be doubted. The form as she has presented it is less amenable to the biblical form if the latter is powerfully covenantal. The modern counterpart is not clearly

---

covenantal and therefore cannot really be over-against an enemy as it is in Israel's form.

5. Branson has also suggested that Kübler-Ross at times is not descriptive. She urges acceptance of death with serenity. To the extent that it is true, the form she presents is quite at variance with Israel's perception of death as a conquered enemy. The fundamental conflict myth of Israel has thus been dissipated into stoic acceptance rather than an historical affirmation. The form discerned by Kübler-Ross has become an ideology which may serve well the interests of a death-denying production/consumption society. As such it can do nothing to close what Lifton calls the symbol gap concerning death.

6. Her more recent writing suggests that Kübler-Ross is not satisfied, as was Israel, with the discerned form and has moved far beyond the form to "religious" resolutions by researching patients who have "come back from death." Israel also grew curious and inventive when the forms no longer seemed to accommodate the extremity of experience.

VI

None of this is intended as a critique of Kübler-Ross, for that is not the point of the discussion. Rather it is a way of discerning Israel's reliance on form:

a. Israel affirmed covenant as the enduring context for grief and loss.

b. The responding partner is authoritatively Yahweh himself, and this is true from the "assurance of being heard" quite apart from Begrich's hypothesis. Death is dealt with in relation to the sovereignty and fidelity of Yahweh.

c. The tone is triumphant at the end. It is not resignation or acceptance but praise addressed to one who has made a difference. A decision has been made which alters Israel's situation.

d. Israel has, by the form, decided about loss, grief, and death. They are real. They are real dangers. But Yahweh deals with them. That statement is powerful and valid in Israel's life-world. Outside of that life-world the claim has no power or credibility.

e. This community form is neither descriptive nor prescriptive. It is a form in movement, task oriented to rehabilitate members to a life world in which transforming intervention is a live option.

36. See one recent summary of the evidence, Mary K. Wakeman, God's Battle with the Monster (Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1973).

37. Lifton and Olson, op. cit., p. 137, conclude: "Numbing occurs when what is experienced cannot be adequately symbolized, formulated and expressed in individual and communal activity. This symbolic gap . . . exists for us all."

38. Cf. Eberhard Jungel who characterizes life as "relatedness" and death as "unrelatedness" (Death: The Riddle and the Mystery [Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1974]).
f. The form is sufficient for Israel. No speculative probing beyond the form is needed. Perhaps later hints about resurrection in the apocalyptic literature may parallel Kübler-Ross's recent work, a grasping for assurance when the forms no longer carry the load.\textsuperscript{39} The correlation between apocalyptic inventiveness and Kübler-Ross's subsequent speculation may point to the crisis in both communities, Israel's and ours, when form collapses or loses credibility. Such a collapse of form may also be indicated by the pervasive, contemporary quest for formless religious experience.

Such a contrast should urge persons charged with primarily theological offices to avoid complete settlement for the frames of reference of the psychological disciplines which are insensitive to form and tend to be supportive of the ideology of urban consciousness.

In summary the function of this form includes the following:

1. In the use of the form, the community does a specific task which is rehabilitation of a member from a chaotic experience to a structured experience in this peculiar life-world.

2. The use of the form serves to maintain and reassert the life-world of Israel as a valid symbolic context in which experience can be healingly experienced. While the form is surely liturgic in some sense, it is to be sociologically understood. The community asserts that life in all its parts is formful and therefore meaningful. Attention to language is crucial for a community's certainty of meaning.

3. The function of the form is inevitably theological. It constructs and presents a covenantal view of reality in which life is characterized by faithful hearing and speaking. The form itself defines theological reality. Such a conclusion is strengthened by Begrich's hypothesis but does not depend on it, for the "assurance of being heard" indicates that the speaking has been responded to in ways that matter.

4. This form with its societal power is likely not simply one form in a vast repertoire, but is one of the constitutive forms of biblical faith.\textsuperscript{40} It affirms that the Holy God is moved by such address, that he is covenantally responsive to covenant claims laid on him and that Israel lives by his transforming word. He is not an apathetic God who is either silent or must be flattered.

5. Form critics might appropriately consider their work not simply as a part of historical research, but as a major issue in the formlessness and anti-form mentality of urban technological consciousness. Recent concern about anomie in

\textsuperscript{39} Paul Hanson has situated such explorations in a context of world-weariness (\textit{The Dawn of Apocalyptic} [Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1975]).
\textsuperscript{40} See my comments in "From Hurt to Joy, from Death to Life."
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the work of Merton, Berger, Luckmann\textsuperscript{41} and others is centrally about formlessness. The possibility of formfulness endures as a central question. Such formfulness will not be found in universal myths but in communities which have asserted their historical specificity. Perhaps it is the task of the theological community to recover confidence in historical specificity which is a precondition to speech and therefore to liberation.\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{41} See Robert K. Merton, \textit{Social Theory and Social Structure}. For more extensive discussions of the problem see Charles Hampden-Turner, \textit{Radical Man}, Chapter 4; and Gouldner, \textit{The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology}, pp. 224, 251, 425 and passim.

\textsuperscript{42} Martin Hengel has articulated the crisis of Judaism in the Hellenistic period as the survival of the \textit{ethnos} against the leveling, dehistoricizing claims of the \textit{polis} (\textit{Judaism and Hellenism} [Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1974] p. 74 and passim). While the church must never become an \textit{ethnos}, it is time for a reasserting of the claims of historical specificity against the \textit{polis} if the vision of liberation is to endure with power.
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