

THE PATTERN OF KARL BARTH'S CHALCEDONIAN CHRISTOLOGY AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR THE INTEGRATION OF THEOLOGY AND PASTORAL COUNSELING

Simon Y. Lee

Barth Reconsidered

Over the last decade, there has been a new generation of scholarship on the theology of Karl Barth,¹ bringing fresh insights to his innovative theology and new applications to contemporary issues. Among the many scholarly studies of Karl Barth in English-speaking world in the last decade alone are major works produced by George Hunsinger,² Bruce

¹ In the two decades before (the 1970s and 1980s), shortly after the death of Karl Barth in 1968, there were many theologians who wrote on Barth including prominent names in the English-speaking theological circle such as Donald G. Bloesch, Colin Gunton, Herbert Hartwell, David Mueller, to name just a few. The author has been interested in the theology of Karl Barth since the 1980's, and have completed a thesis entitled, *Justification, Sanctification and Vocation: An Interpretation and Critique of Karl Barth's Soteriology (with Special Reference to Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics, Vol. IV)* for Regent College, in April, 1984.

² George Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth: The Shape of His Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991); George Hunsinger, *Disruptive Grace: Studies in the Theology of Karl Barth* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000).

L. McCormack,³ Isolde Andrews,⁴ William Stacy Johnson,⁵ Gary W. Deddo⁶ and Gary Dorrien,⁷ to mention just a few that are published as books, not to mention the many other dissertations and journal articles.⁸ This is remarkable given the fact that many people think everything that needs to be said about Karl Barth has already been said. But many new Barthian scholars have challenged the longstanding conventional interpretations of Barth and moved beyond the traditional ways of reading Barth, re-evaluating his theology in the light of postmodernism and contemporary thinking.

At the beginning of this decade a new wave of studies has been earmarked by George Hunsinger's book, *How to Read Karl Barth*. Hunsinger now heads up research on Karl Barth at the Center for Karl Barth Studies at Princeton Theological Seminary. In the past, scholars had strived to find the overriding theme in his creative theology,⁹ but this has proved to be inadequate and limited in understanding the innovative theology of Barth. Hunsinger proposes instead we may study the many recurring "motifs" such as "actualism," "particularism," "objectivism," "personalism," "realism," and "rationalism" found in Barth's theology.¹⁰ Thus Hunsinger points us to a new way of studying

³ Bruce L. McCormack, *Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology: Its Genesis and Development, 1909-1936* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).

⁴ Isolde Andrews, *Deconstructing Barth: A Study of the Complimentary Methods in Karl Barth & Jacques Derrida* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., 1996).

⁵ William Stacy Johnson, *The Mystery of God: Karl Barth and the Postmodern Foundations of Theology* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997).

⁶ Gary W. Deddo, *Karl Barth's Theology of Relations: Trinitarian, Christological and Human: Towards an Ethic of the Family* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., 1999).

⁷ Gary Dorrien, *The Barthian Revolt in Modern Theology: Theology Without Weapon* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2000).

⁸ One of the most extensive and up-to-date bibliography is provided by Bruce L. McCormack, including primary and secondary literature up to the mid-90s in his book. The authors mentioned here are chosen because they have some bearing on the subject of this paper. No attempt is made to be exhaustive in reviewing the ever-growing literature on Barth's theology as a result of the renewed interest in Barth in the last decade.

⁹ One example that comes to mind immediately is G.C. Berkouwer's *The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956).

¹⁰ George Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth*, 4. This in fact is the approach the author took in his thesis in 1984, identifying both the positive and negative motifs in his theology such as implicit universalism, pervasive objectivism, and unwarranted optimism.

Barth: "by specifying the formal patterns which these motifs comprise, and by tracing their interrelations within Barth's theology."¹¹ The result of doing theology in this manner is to find "a flexible but unmistakable repertoire of 'thought forms,' a repertoire implicitly and explicitly brought to bear throughout Barth's argumentation in his great dogmatic work."¹² Thus Hunsinger has laid the groundwork in studying Barth afresh by discerning the theological patterns that Barth used in his theology.

Bruce L. McCormack, Weyerhauser Associate Professor of Systematic Theology at Princeton Theological Seminary, in his systematic and thorough study of the genesis and the development of Barth's theology from 1909 to 1936, concludes that there was not a "turn" to a "neo-orthodox" form of theology in his *Church Dogmatics* which allegedly happened in 1931 to 1932, and maintains that when Barth broke away from "liberalism" in 1915, he became what McCormack calls "a critically realistic dialectical theologian" and he remained as such throughout his life.¹³ This overturns the thesis of Von Balthasar that Barth took a second turn, from "dialectic" to "analogy," which is the foundation of "neo-orthodoxy," a thesis held for over forty years in the interpretation of Karl Barth. Having done that convincingly, McCormack outlines the early dialectic theology of Karl Barth and recovers for us the paradigm of dialectic as a way of understanding the implication of Barth's theology. For the purpose of this paper, the important point is to underscore the dialectic nature of Barth's theological method.

Along the same line as McCormack is the most recent work by Gary Dorrien who likewise does not consider Barth in the "neo-orthodox" tradition, but comes to several different conclusions.¹⁴ Dorrien believes that "the key to the possibility and character of Barth's theology was his commitment to the primacy of the Spirit-illuminated Word," and he also asserts that "Barth's epistemological nonfoundationalism, his dialecticism, and his insistence on doing theology without weapons all flow from this fundamental interpretive assertion."¹⁵ However Dorrien's position should not be viewed as a total rejection of McCormack's, merely

¹¹ George Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth*, 5.

¹² George Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth*, 5-6.

¹³ McCormack, *Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology*, vii.

¹⁴ Dorrien, *The Barthian Revolt in Modern Theology*, 5-6.

¹⁵ Dorrien, *The Barthian Revolt in Modern Theology*, 5.

stating differences on some important points of emphasis and interpretation. Likewise, Dorrien points out that although Hunsinger discards several neo-orthodox interpretations of Barth, he then puts forth a "multiple pattern" of his own.¹⁶ However, our examination of Hunsinger's thesis shows that the "pattern" is actually what he discerns as Barth's approach in doing theology rather than "neo-orthodox" motifs.

This stance frees us to consider Barth's theology in relation to the question of "modernity." In the English-speaking world two works stand out. The one by Isolde Andrews is entitled, *Deconstructing Barth: A Study of the Complementary Methods in Karl Barth and Jacques Derrida*,¹⁷ in which he focuses on understanding Barth's theology of salvation, using the postmodern concepts of deconstruction of Derrida. The other is William Stacy Johnson's *The Mystery of God: Karl Barth and the Postmodern Foundations of Theology*.¹⁸ Here Johnson, writing from the reformed perspective, applies the issue of foundationalism/nonfoundationalism of theology to Barth's theology, and brings out the theme of "the mystery of God." He does so by what he calls the "triadic pattern" of three reference points: "a beginning, an ending point, and a midpoint suspended between them,"¹⁹ and he demonstrates this by examining the patterns in creation (*CD III*), reconciliation (*CD IV*), redemption (projected in *CD V*), as well as the triadic pattern in Barth's soteriology: justification (*CD IV/2*), vocation (*CD IV/3*), sanctification (*CD IV/2*) and so on.²⁰ In order to understand Barth, we need to study the balance and movement in his theology and understand each doctrine in the light of the total architecture of his theology. An example of this is an earlier study by the author demonstrating that Barth's soteriology can only be fully appreciated in the context of the three parts of Barth's doctrine of reconciliation.²¹

¹⁶ Dorrien, *The Barthian Revolt in Modern Theology*, 6.

¹⁷ New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc., 1996.

¹⁸ Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997.

¹⁹ Johnson, *The Mystery of God*, 6.

²⁰ "CD" is used as the abbreviation of Karl Barth's multiple volumes of *Church Dogmatics* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956-1969).

²¹ Simon Yiu-chuen Lee, *Justification, Sanctification and Vocation: An Interpretation and Critique of Karl Barth's Soteriology (With Special Reference to Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics, Vol. IV)*, (Unpublished Master of Theology thesis for Regent College, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, 1984), 21ff.

Another most recent and interesting piece of work on Barth is Gary W. Deddo's book entitled, *Karl Barth's Theology of Relations: Trinitarian, Christological, and Human: Towards an Ethic of the Family*.²² Deddo's stated purpose is three-fold: First, to study Barth's theology of relations (the *analogia relationis*) – the close interconnections between the trinitarian doctrine of God, the doctrine of humanity (the incarnation of Christ) and Christian ethics (right relationships between people). Second, to study Barth's section on "Parents and Children" to show how Barth's theology of relations provides the foundation for his special ethics generally. Third, to demonstrate the relevance of Barth's theology of relations in understanding relationship between parent and child, both theologically and non-theologically.²³ The significance of this for us is to show that the use of analogy is still relevant to certain doctrines in the study of the theology of Karl Barth. Applying the trinitarian intra-divine character of personal being-in-relation to human parent-child-relation is an innovative way of doing practical theology. Hopefully, Deddo's study will encourage more theological reflections in other areas, which is also the intention of this paper.

Interestingly, Deborah van Deusen Hunsinger,²⁴ assistant professor of pastoral theology at Princeton Theological Seminary, has produced an innovative and integrative study on applying the theological method of Karl Barth to pastoral counseling, bringing her many years of interest in Barth's theology to bear on her rich experience as a pastoral counselor. Deborah Hunsinger believes that the Chalcedonian pattern in the theology of Karl Barth is a useful way of "becoming bilingual" (theologically and psychologically) in the practice of pastoral counseling. According to Deborah Hunsinger, the "Chalcedonian pattern" involves the elements of "differentiation," "unity," and "order."²⁵ She admits that she has applied the Chalcedonian pattern far beyond anything found in Barth in order to illumine theoretical and practical issues in pastoral counseling.²⁶ The

²² New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc., 1999.

²³ Deddo, *Karl Barth's Theology of Relations*, xiii.

²⁴ Deborah van Deusen Hunsinger, *Theology and Pastoral Counseling: A New Interdisciplinary Approach* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995).

²⁵ Deborah Hunsinger, *Theology and Pastoral Counseling*, 61-104. These are the categories used by Deborah Hunsinger, which will be explained later on in this paper.

²⁶ Deborah Hunsinger, *Theology and Pastoral Counseling*, 8.

way she applies what she perceives as a Barthian theological method, the Chalcedonian pattern, to the study of the practical theology of pastoral counseling is very interesting and worthy of careful scrutiny. Since she acknowledges the influence of her husband, George Hunsinger,²⁷ in her understanding of the theology of Karl Barth, we shall study his presentations on Chalcedonian doctrine and pattern in his earlier work²⁸ as well as his latest work,²⁹ where he fully articulates "Karl Barth's Christology: Its Basic Chalcedonian Character,"³⁰ to critique his exposition and her understanding in this area. We will then study the way Deborah Hunsinger applies "the Chalcedonian pattern" to her integration of theology and psychology in the practice of pastoral counseling. The purpose of this enquiry is to find out the implications of this theological method for the integration of theology and psychology in the practice of pastoral counseling.

The Pattern of Karl Barth's Chalcedonian Christology

The Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) declared that the person of Christ was to be understood as "complete in deity and complete in humanity" (asymmetry or order) and these two natures are "without separation or division" (unity) and yet at the same time "without confusion or change" (differentiation).³¹ According to George Hunsinger, the Chalcedonian pattern is a pattern of unity, differentiation, and asymmetry, which is "the unqualified conceptual precedence of the divine over the human nature of Jesus Christ."³²

In tackling the question of double agency (divine and human), George Hunsinger discerns the use of the Chalcedonian pattern by

²⁷ Deborah Hunsinger, *Theology and Pastoral Counseling*, xi; Deborah Hunsinger refers to George Hunsinger's earlier work six times: 63, 64, 70, n.9, 93, n.28, 94, n.30, 204, n.40.

²⁸ George Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth*, 185-88, 197, 201-18, 223, 228, 230, 237, 239, 261, 272-73, 291, n.5.

²⁹ George Hunsinger, *Disruptive Grace*.

³⁰ George Hunsinger, *Disruptive Grace*, 131-47.

³¹ The Chalcedonian definition can be found in *The Oecumenical Documents of the Faith*, eds. T.H. Bindley and F.W. Green (London: Methuen & Co., 1950). The descriptions in parenthesis are the terms used by Deborah van Deusen Hunsinger in her work which will be considered later in this paper.

³² George Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth*, 85, 286, n.1.

Barth.³³ He illustrates that with an analysis of Barth's *Church Dogmatics* (IV/3, 63 rev.).³⁴ The three formal aspects of the Chalcedonian pattern – asymmetry or order ("It is God who absolutely precedes and humanity which can only follow."), intimacy or unity ("Even as sovereign acts and words of God, as his free acts of rule, judgment, salvation and revelation, these events are also human actions and passions, works and experiences, and *vice versa*."), and integrity or differentiation ("their coexistence and coinherence, of their basic unity, though without any confusion or mixture of the two elements, or transformation of the one into the other") are all present in Barth's discussion of "fellowship as the goal of vocation."³⁵

George Hunsinger believes the strategy of dialectical usage is implicit in that the Chalcedonian pattern that Barth uses and is found throughout the *Church Dogmatics* from beginning to end.³⁶ This is especially evident in Barth's exposition of double agency, as George Hunsinger points out, "The Chalcedonian pattern is used to specify counterpositions that would be doctrinally incoherent ..." He goes on to explain, "'Without separation or division' means that no independent human autonomy can be posited in relation to God. 'Without confusion or change' means that no divine determinism or monism can be posited in relation to humanity. Finally, 'complete in deity and complete in humanity' means that no symmetrical relationship can be posited between divine and human actions."³⁷

Barth's exposition of Christ as the center and the two life acts (divine and human) united in him has been used to further illustrate the Chalcedonian pattern in the following quotation. Barth says, "As Jesus lives, there takes place in him both creative actualization of being, yet also in and with it creaturely actualization; creative and creaturely life together, without the transformation of the one into the other, the admixture of the one with the other, or separation or division between them. This is how Jesus Christ is seen and attested in Scripture" (*CD IV/3, 40*).

³³ George Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth*, 185-88.

³⁴ George Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth*, 186.

³⁵ Lee, *Justification, Sanctification and Vocation*, 90-91.

³⁶ George Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth*, 200-201.

³⁷ George Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth*, 204. George Hunsinger elaborates on this in subsequent discussions, 205-18.

George Hunsinger also views the trinitarian concept within the rubric of the Chalcedonian pattern. He states, "Inscribed within this 'Chalcedonian' mystery is yet another *formal* pattern – the one previously designated as 'trinitarian,' namely the (mysterious) pattern of 'dialectical inclusion.'³⁸ He also regards the relations described by the Chalcedonian pattern are explicitly active relations, and underscores the fact the being of Jesus Christ is to be a "being in a spontaneous actualization."³⁹ Finally, George Hunsinger concludes that "When conceived along Chalcedonian lines, the mystery of his (Christ) person thus implies the further mystery that he himself is the source on which all other truth is dependent, the norm by which all other truths is judged, and the center to which all other truth testifies and points."⁴⁰

George Hunsinger has successfully isolated a theological principle that Barth uses in maintaining a dialectical strategy in doing theology. The examples he has identified illustrates this dialectical usage by Barth. However, the claim that Barth uses this principle, the Chalcedonian pattern, from beginning to end in his *Church Dogmatics* remains to be demonstrated fully. Nevertheless, we can say with confidence that our study has shown more fully that Barth is dialectical in his theological method.

Karl Barth's Chalcedonian Christology

In his most recent work, rather than emphasizing the Chalcedonian pattern in Karl Barth's theology, George Hunsinger concentrates on elaborating Barth's Chalcedonian Christology. He begins by stating "it will be a great day when Barth is at least rejected for positions that he actually held instead of for positions that he didn't take."⁴¹ Barth's critics have either assessed Barth's Christology as "Docetism" (Alexandrian type), or the very opposite, as "Nestorianism" (Antiochian type). Hunsinger believes that both sides have missed the point of Barth's dialectical strategy for describing the mystery of the Word made flesh. He points out "Rather than conforming to the one-sided, if mutually corrective, procedures of Alexandria or Antioch, Barth conceptually

³⁸ George Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth*, 238.

³⁹ George Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth*, 239.

⁴⁰ George Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth*, 273.

⁴¹ George Hunsinger, *Disruptive Grace*, 9.

re-describes the identity of Jesus Christ in a dialectical way that 'actualizes' the great ecumenical Definition of Chalcedon."⁴²

George Hunsinger devotes a whole chapter to the Chalcedonian character of Karl Barth's Christology.⁴³ He starts off by employing the dictum of George Herbert: "*In Christ two natures met to be thy cure*."⁴⁴ Chalcedonian Christology is largely soteriological in nature – the saving work of Christ ("*to be thy cure*"), is the guiding intention behind the Chalcedonian definition of Christ's person. But at the same time, the definition of Christ's person ("*in Christ two natures met*") is the crucial premise of Christ's saving work.

"Docetism" stresses Jesus' deity at the expense of his humanity, so that Jesus' humanity is in effect no longer real but merely apparent. "Nestorianism," on the other hand, stresses Jesus' humanity at the expense of his deity. George Hunsinger points out that Barth moves back and forth deliberately between an "Alexandrian" and "Antiochian" idiom.⁴⁵ He believes what makes Barth's Christology different from Alexandrian and Antiochian Christologies is that it avoids the tendency "to resolve the incarnational mystery into something more nearly conceivable on the basis of ordinary experience and history."⁴⁶ Barth himself stated that the Christologies of Alexandria and Antioch "mutually supplement and explain each other and to that extent remains on peaceful terms" (*CD I/2*, 24). Hunsinger as well as this research has shown that Barth's critics have failed to appreciate his use of dialectical juxtaposition. If we consider Barth's discussion of Christology in the total context of the three parts of Volume IV of *Church Dogmatics*, where the "Alexandrian" idiom dominates IV/1 (The Obedience of the Son of God) and the "Antiochian" idiom dominates IV/2 (The Exaltation of the Son of Man), and both idioms are emphasized more or less equally in IV/3 (The Glory of the Mediator), we will be able to appreciate the fact that Barth Christology is truly Chalcedonian.

⁴² George Hunsinger, *Disruptive Grace*, 9.

⁴³ George Hunsinger, *Disruptive Grace*, 131-47.

⁴⁴ George Herbert, "An Offering," in *The Life and Works of George Herbert*, vol. 2, ed. G.H. Palmer (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1905), 393, italics added. Quoted by George Hunsinger, *Disruptive Grace*, 131.

⁴⁵ Herbert, "An Offering," 135.

⁴⁶ Herbert, "An Offering," 136.

Therefore George Hunsinger concludes that Karl Barth is most innovative in his Chalcedonian Christology in at least three ways. "First, he actualized the traditional conception of the incarnation. Second, he personalized the saving significance of Christ's death. Finally, he contemporized the consequences of Christ's resurrection."⁴⁷

George Hunsinger points to the asymmetry of Barth's Chalcedonian Christology only in the last paragraph of his chapter, where he states "no symmetry between the two natures that met in Christ was possible."⁴⁸ Chalcedonian Christology can be stated in two terms ("complete in deity" and "complete in humanity") and a relationship (deity intrinsic to Christ's person with asymmetrical precedence over his humanity). Thus we can say that in this light, from a Chalcedonian perspective, the relative superiority of Alexandrian ("complete in deity" and asymmetrical) over Antiochian ("complete in humanity") Christologies becomes apparent. George Hunsinger concludes, "...that Barth's Christology of dialectical juxtaposition makes this kind of discrimination possible even as it attempts so ingeniously to do justice to all three of the essentials is yet another tribute to its basic Chalcedonian character."⁴⁹

We applaud the clear exposition of Barth's Chalcedonian Christology by George Hunsinger, which has given us a new appreciation of Barth. However, one wonders why the concept of "asymmetry" that he emphasizes so much in his first work is relegated to only one last paragraph in his treatment of Barth's Chalcedonian Christology, and why he does not extend his study to include a discussion on the "Chalcedonian pattern."

Deborah Hunsinger's Use of the Chalcedonian Pattern

At the outset we need to first of all recognize that Deborah Hunsinger's interest in Barth is entirely practical, as she believes that Barth's theology "could shed light on the question of how to conceive the relationship of the two disciplines."⁵⁰ The two disciplines that she

⁴⁷ Herbert, "An Offering," 140. George Hunsinger goes on to discuss these points in details in pages 141-46.

⁴⁸ Herbert, "An Offering," 146.

⁴⁹ Herbert, "An Offering," 146-47.

⁵⁰ Deborah Hunsinger, *Theology and Pastoral Counseling*, 9.

has in mind are "theology" and "pastoral counseling," as she seeks to develop an approach to relate psychotherapeutic and theological interpretation from a Barthian perspective. Deborah Hunsinger carries out her task first by outlining the formal elements of the Chalcedonian pattern, then moving on to show how the pattern offers significant categories of discernment and assessment, and finally, demonstrating the use of pattern.

In discussing the Chalcedonian pattern, Deborah Hunsinger moves very quickly from outlining the important points of Chalcedonian Christology to outlining the formal elements of the Chalcedonian pattern in Barth.⁵¹ The single most important element that Deborah Hunsinger highlights is the concept of "asymmetry" (as opposed to "hierarchy"), with reference to the two natures of Christ, complete in deity and complete in humanity. She draws support for her stance from George Hunsinger's commentary: "Although there is a divine priority and human subsequence, their asymmetry allows a conception which avoids hierarchical domination in favor of a *mutual ordering in freedom*."⁵² She quickly applies the asymmetrical element of the Chalcedonian pattern to modifying the concept of "bi-lingual competence" (theologically and psychologically) that pastoral counselors need in their practice. She believes that "the stipulation of asymmetry, however, implies that no such material equivalence exists between theology and psychology, for their essential subject matters are fundamentally different."⁵³

Deborah Hunsinger demonstrates her understanding of Barth's Chalcedonian pattern by pointing to examples of its use, such as, the relationships between the body and the soul, or between God's grace and human gratitude, or between God's command and human obedience, or between God's promises and human faith. The most elaborate example she uses is the relationship between the body and the soul. Barth uses the terms "embodied soul" and "besouled body" (*CD III/2*, 327) to illustrate the relationship of the soul to the body, showing therefore the well being of the soul and the body are intricately tied together. But Deborah Hunsinger is quick to underscore the fact that "in the conceptual ordering of this differentiated unity, the soul is first and the body is

⁵¹ Deborah Hunsinger, *Theology and Pastoral Counseling*, 62f.

⁵² Deborah Hunsinger, *Theology and Pastoral Counseling*, 63. Quoting from George Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth*, 286-87, n.1.

⁵³ Deborah Hunsinger, *Theology and Pastoral Counseling*, 64.

second, " and she also supports her stance with a quote from Barth himself that a human being is "soul and body totally and simultaneously, in dissoluble differentiation, inseparable unity and indestructible order." (*CD III/2*, 437)⁵⁴ We can see that Barth is clearly using the three elements of Chalcedonian Christology in his presentation of man as soul and body.

We see that Deborah Hunsinger has successfully highlighted the three main formal elements of the Chalcedonian pattern, namely, the "indissoluble differentiation" (without confusion or change), the "inseparable unity" (coincide in an occurrence without separation or division), and the "indestructible order" (in and with their differentiated unity, are asymmetrically related, with the having logical precedence over the other). With this in mind, she examines Barth's commentary on Jesus' healing of the paralytic, showing how the Chalcedonian pattern explains the relationship between "forgiveness" and "healing."⁵⁵

In the story of the healing of the paralytic by Jesus, Jesus first says to the paralytic, "My son, your sins are forgiven" (Mark 2:5), and after the bewildered response of the scribes, Jesus proclaimed to them that his pronouncement of forgiveness prior to healing the paralytic was to demonstrate that the Son of man has authority on earth to forgive sins. Deborah Hunsinger points out that Barth interprets the relationship between healing and forgiveness as a relationship between "the sign" and "the thing signified," and that healing and forgiveness are seen as a differentiated unity, not identical and yet cannot be separated from each other.⁵⁶ Barth states, "The forgiveness of sins is manifestly the thing signified, while the healing is the sign, quite inseparable from, but very significantly related to, this thing signified, yet neither identical with it, nor a condition of it" (*CD I/2*, 189).

Again, we may note from the above example that there are three elements of the Chalcedonian pattern – the "unity" of forgiveness and healing, the "differentiation" between them, and the "asymmetrical ordering." Deborah Hunsinger explains this pattern in terms of "logical precedence" and "logical subsequence" and she believes that "this pattern suggests how theological and psychological concepts can be brought

⁵⁴ Deborah Hunsinger, *Theology and Pastoral Counseling*, 64.

⁵⁵ Deborah Hunsinger, *Theology and Pastoral Counseling*, 65-70.

⁵⁶ Deborah Hunsinger, *Theology and Pastoral Counseling*, 66.

into formal relationship from a Barthian standpoint.⁵⁷ She then applies this to two sets of concepts between theology and psychology, namely, between "salvation" and "health," and between "sin" and "neurosis."⁵⁸ Finally, she extends the use of the pattern further to the concepts of "sinner" and "victim." In an extensive comparison of the two (as applied to victim of childhood abuse or deprivation) she demonstrates how the three elements of the Chalcedonian pattern may function well in relating the two concepts theologically and psychologically as a differentiated unity, asymmetrical to each other.⁵⁹

Next, Deborah Hunsinger examines and critiques, at a theoretical level, the positions of three thinkers, each on a point of the Chalcedonian pattern, to demonstrate that their failures to adhere to the position of the pattern results in a less than satisfactory understanding of the relationship of theology and psychology in the practice of pastoral care and counseling.⁶⁰ First, in order to illustrate problems of not holding onto the principle of "inseparable unity" – "without separation or division," the thought of Eduard Thurneysen, a Swiss pastoral theologian who was a contemporary of Karl Barth at Basel, is examined.⁶¹ She concludes that Thurneysen, "in his zeal to distinguish them [pastoral care and psychotherapy], failed to account adequately for the nature of their conceptual unity."⁶² Then, to exemplify the problems of not maintaining the position of "indissoluble differentiation" – "without confusion or change," the thoughts of Edward Edinger, a prominent Jungian analyst and thinker, are examined.⁶³ She concludes that Edinger "systematically translated and reduced distinctly theological meanings into psychological meanings, thus failing to observe the 'indissoluble differentiation' between them."⁶⁴ Thirdly, a short essay entitled "The Relation of Religion and Health" by Paul Tillich is studied to explore questions related to the "asymmetrical (indestructible) ordering" of the concepts, showing the problems when Tillich orders them psychological and theological

⁵⁷ Deborah Hunsinger, *Theology and Pastoral Counseling*, 67-68.

⁵⁸ Deborah Hunsinger, *Theology and Pastoral Counseling*, 69-70.

⁵⁹ Deborah Hunsinger, *Theology and Pastoral Counseling*, 71-75.

⁶⁰ Deborah Hunsinger, *Theology and Pastoral Counseling*, 76-95.

⁶¹ Deborah Hunsinger, *Theology and Pastoral Counseling*, 77-83.

⁶² Deborah Hunsinger, *Theology and Pastoral Counseling*, 95.

⁶³ Deborah Hunsinger, *Theology and Pastoral Counseling*, 83-88.

⁶⁴ Deborah Hunsinger, *Theology and Pastoral Counseling*, 95.

concepts symmetrically.⁶⁵ Finally, Deborah Hunsinger demonstrates more explicitly how other pastoral theologian like Shirley Guthrie uses the Chalcedonian pattern implicitly,⁶⁶ and concludes with discussing the hypothetical case presented.

Our study has shown that Deborah Hunsinger has tried to present clearly at a theoretical level, the usefulness of the Chalcedonian pattern as an analytical tool in the discourse between theology and psychology. She has successfully showed how theology and psychology can remain distinct in their own right, while psychological concepts can be interpreted as being related analogically and asymmetrically to theological concepts. She also illustrates well that at a practical level, understanding how to apply the so-called Chalcedonian pattern to psychological and theological concepts which is very important for the pastoral counselor.

The Implications of Using the Chalcedonian Pattern in Pastoral Counseling

In this paper, we have reviewed the recent surge of interest in Karl Barth and his theology and the different approaches in these new investigations. Our review has reaffirmed the overall dialectical character of Barth's theology. Our investigation of Barth's Christology has also established its Chalcedonian character, especially the three elements of inseparable unity, indissoluble differentiation, and indestructible ordering (asymmetry) in the relationship between the divine and human nature of Jesus Christ. Following Hunsinger and Hunsinger, we have further studied the applications of Chalcedonian Christology as a theological method in understanding other doctrines or issues, in what the authors refer to as "the Chalcedonian pattern," as found in its repeated use by Barth himself in his *Church Dogmatics*.

Indeed, Hunsinger and Hunsinger have amply demonstrated the usefulness of using the Chalcedonian pattern in understanding the different doctrines selected. However, one should note that in all these examples there is always a divine as well as a human aspect, such as double agency, Christ as the center and the two life acts, soul and body, forgiveness (salvation) and healing, and so on. In all these instances, the

⁶⁵ Deborah Hunsinger, *Theology and Pastoral Counseling*, 88-95.

⁶⁶ Shirley C. Guthrie, Jr. "Pastoral Counseling, Trinitarian Theology, and Christian Anthropology," *Interpretation* 33 (Apr. 1979): 130-43.

Chalcedonian pattern holds true because there is a Christological correspondence and therefore also a "logical precedence" in God and a "logical subsequence" in man that is at work. The pattern breaks down for example in anthropology when we consider how in Christ the basic form of humanity relates to the goal of actual humanity.⁶⁷ Here the Christological pattern is the "being of Christ" – Jesus "with" humanity, related to the "act of Christ" – Jesus "for" humanity and "for" God; and so in the same way, in anthropology, "human being" should be "for" God. But we know that in reality there is a gap between Jesus's humanity and the humanity of all others. Johnson points out: "Arguably in that case, Jesus would be a superman or demigod rather than a 'true human being.' Consequently, his role as divine-human mediator would be destroyed. The human side of the Chalcedonian two natures formula would thereby have been abrogated."⁶⁸

However, like George Hunsinger, Johnson also recognizes Barth's intention to move beyond Chalcedon to formulate a Chalcedonian pattern.⁶⁹ Johnson concurs with Hunsinger in the interpretation of Barth's treatment of the double agency of the divine and human as "asymmetrical."⁷⁰ He elaborates on the recognition of the pattern in Barth's treatment of the divine-human covenant, where justification is the indicative of the covenant, "I will be your God", and sanctification is the realization of the imperative, "You will be my people."⁷¹ He again sees the Chalcedonian pattern as the answer to the question of how the history of Jesus – a history that occurred apart from us (*extra nos*) becomes an effective history "in" and "among" us (*in nobis*), by stating that "the Christian life is the concurrence of a dual agency that is both one hundred percent human and one hundred percent divine."⁷²

The above discussion shows that there are many valid places to apply the pattern of Chalcedonian Christology in theological interpretations. However, it would be a mistake to think that it can be applied to all areas of interpretations irrespective of whether they

⁶⁷ Johnson, *The Mystery of God*, 88-89.

⁶⁸ Johnson, *The Mystery of God*, 88.

⁶⁹ Johnson, *The Mystery of God*, 91, 104, 121, 135-36, 140, 168.

⁷⁰ Johnson, *The Mystery of God*, 135-36. He refers to George Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth*, 85, 286 n.1, and especially ch. 7.

⁷¹ Johnson, *The Mystery of God*, 140.

⁷² Johnson, *The Mystery of God*, 168.

somehow correspond to Chalcedonian Christology of divine and human natures.

Deborah Hunsinger has taken one step further in the application of the Chalcedonian pattern to the relationship between theological and psychological discourses especially in the practice of pastoral counseling. What in fact she has done is to use the Chalcedonian pattern as a methodological principle in relating the two disciplines of theology and psychology, using the principle of unity, differentiation and asymmetry. Naturally, the examples she has chosen illustrate her case. But there is an inherent danger in extracting a methodological principle from a doctrinal pattern, and applying it outside the context from which it was formed. Also, in a sense, the pattern of unity-differentiation-asymmetry could be formulated quite apart from considering the Chalcedonian character of Christology. Furthermore, a humanistic psychologist can use the same formula to give logical precedence to psychology and logical subsequence to theology. The pattern itself is simply a presupposition to which we adhere.

In fact, the Christian application of this pattern (that is, giving priority to theology, and doing theology from the top down), is similar to the emphasis that Thomas Oden discerns in Barth's use of *analogia fidei*, the analogy of faith, (versus *analogia entis*, the analogy of being) in his theological method. Oden draws on this distinction in applying it to the relation between theology and psychology (or, counseling) by moving from the self-disclosure of God to the therapeutic experience, rather than from the therapeutic experience to the theological analogies.⁷³ The direction of the discourse is from the divine to the human, and from the Christ event to the healing process and the believer's response. Actually Deborah Hunsinger is fully aware of Oden's position, but is critical of him because she thinks that "he doesn't seem to have a clear grasp of the material reasons Barth has for rejecting the *analogia entis*."⁷⁴ She goes on to elaborate on her understanding of this distinction.⁷⁵ What Deborah Hunsinger has in fact done is then to go on to provide what she regards as the theological basis of this type of

⁷³ Thomas C. Oden, *Kerygma and Counseling* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966), 48, 80.

⁷⁴ Deborah Hunsinger, *Theology and Pastoral Counseling*, 38.

⁷⁵ Deborah Hunsinger, *Theology and Pastoral Counseling*, 118-19.

approach of giving priority to theological considerations before the psychological in the discourse between the two related but distinct disciplines. While the Chalcedonian pattern does serve that purpose, the force of the Christology is lost when it does not deal with Christological and Christologically related issues, and is in effect being used just as a theological method.

Nevertheless, the methodological principle of unity-differentiation-asymmetry (called the Chalcedonian pattern) is a good way of thinking theologically about therapeutic issues, and is certainly useful in the practice of pastoral counseling. In the words of Deborah Hunsinger, "Being able to sort through the issues, to discern which language to speak and why, to keep them conceptually distinguished and ordered, but not to divorce them from one another in one's interpretation: all these skills are seen to be important in practice as well as in theory."⁷⁶ This we can affirm without reservation.

⁷⁶ Deborah Hunsinger, *Theology and Pastoral Counseling*, 102.

ABSTRACT

A brief review of the last decade scholarship on the theology of Karl Barth is undertaken to highlight new ways of reading Barth in the post-modern era. Among the many studies, systematic theologian George Hunsinger and pastoral theologian Deborah Hunsinger have focused on the use of the pattern of Chalcedonian Christology in Barth. This pattern, as expounded by George Hunsinger, is presented and analyzed. Next, the application of this pattern in the integration of theology and pastoral counseling by Deborah Hunsinger is examined and critiqued. The paper concludes with studying the implications of this approach in the practice of pastoral counseling.

撮 要

本文首先簡單回顧過去十年研究巴特神學的成果，並指出在這後現代時代要重讀巴特的方法。在眾多的研究中，系統神學家喬治·韓聲格和教牧神學家迪波拉·韓聲格把焦點放在巴特對迦克墩神人二性之基督論的應用上。前者從神學的角度帶出此迦克墩神學模式的特點，而後者則嘗試從教牧神學的角度作神學與教牧輔導的整合。最後，本文討論此模式對教牧輔導的含義。