

For published version: See Pastoral Psychology 46 (4): 301-4.

Theology and Pastoral Counseling: A New Interdisciplinary Approach by Deborah van Deusen Hunsinger. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995. xiv. 242 pp. (Paperback) \$19.00.

In recent years, scholars in religion have moved Karl Barth off the historical shelf of outdated neo-orthodoxy and onto the scene of post-modern theology. In rejecting every kind of philosophical foundationalism, it is argued, Barth provides a vision for our time. In Theology and Pastoral Counseling, Deborah van Deusen Hunsinger, Assistant Professor of Pastoral Theology at Princeton Theological Seminary and experienced pastoral counselor, also asserts Barth's relevance. However, Hunsinger uses Barth to answer a specific quandary about the relationship of psychological and theological knowledge in pastoral theology and counseling and avoids complicated questions about his significance in a postmodern context.

Hunsinger searches for an adequate response to a commonly asked question: what is "pastoral" or "theological" about pastoral counseling? Captivated by the psychology of C. G. Jung in the 1960s, she encountered Barth's theology at Yale Divinity School in the early 1970s. How, she wonders, can she use Jung's interpretation of myths, symbols, and dreams as projecting divine imagery, and yet agree with Barth that "no way exists from our religious experiences to God" since all knowledge of God is "mediated through Jesus Christ as attested by Scripture"? Was she "destined always to be split between two opposed universes of discourse?" (p. ix).

The acute dissonance is ultimately resolved by the Barthian idea of "asymmetry" or "logical" difference between psychological and theological knowledge. While existentially related, they exist in different thought and language worlds. Theological terms cannot be translated into psychological terms and vice versa. Theology can inform psychology through analogy (analogia fidei) guided by God's ultimate preeminence, but

not the reverse (analogia entis). Not surprisingly, the rest of the book devotes more space to Barth's theology than to Jung's or anyone else's psychology.

A more satisfying answer comes with Hunsinger's development and application of Barth's "Chalcedonian pattern" as a "formal conceptual device" to structure pastoral theological inquiry. The resolution to question of the relationship of the divine and human natures of Jesus Christ at the Council of Chalcedon in A.D. 451, read through Barth, offers an elucidating three-fold model by which the relationship between psychology and theology can be understood--"without separation or division [unity], without confusion or change [differentiation], and with the conceptual priority of theology over psychology [order]" (p. 10).

After an overview of four other attempts to employ a Barthian approach in pastoral theology (S. Guthrie, D. Martyn, T. Oden, and D. Price), Hunsinger moves from an explanation of the "Chalcedonian pattern" in Chapter 3 to an exploration in the remaining three chapters of its relevance for theoretical and practical issues in pastoral counseling. In pastoral practice, the pattern suggests two sorts of care which are "closely related and yet distinct": psychological evaluation and spiritual care. Pastoral counselors must become fluent in distinctive languages, that of faith and that of depth psychology. Clinical studies of God representation (ch. 4) and the case of Eva's "black despairs" (ch. 5) provide wonderful instances of careful psychological and theological analysis, examples to which professors and supervisors might point students.

A problem arises at the theoretical level. The book reflects a limited understanding of answers to her question within pastoral theology, current conversations among postliberal, revised correlationalist, and liberationist theologians, and current work on the psychology of gender (especially on depression). The choice in method, as Hunsinger portrays it, is between an approach that sees psychology and theology as two distinct discourses (Barthian) and one that collapses the differences, seeking an integration of interpretation (everyone else). Although she characterizes those who prefer

a Tillichian model as seeking a "unified system" that does not take God's otherness seriously, this is inaccurate. Neither Tillich nor contemporary pastoral theologians who employ correlational method collapse the two disciplines or see their terms as interchangeable. Revisionists, such as Don Browning and Charles Gerkin, and liberationists, such as myself, James Poling, and others (all of whom receive little or no attention), suggest a variety of ways to refine the relation between the disciplines.

In some places, Hunsinger sounds more Tillichian than she may realize: the "pastoral counselor is required to reflect critically on the aptness of her psychological perspective from a theological standpoint and vice versa. . . . a kind of ad hoc internal conversation begins where one's psychological and theological perspectives enter into dialogue" (p. 8). Elsewhere, she notes that psychologically dysfunctional images of God provide an occasion to question the received tradition. In practice, Hunsinger's separation of theological and psychological language sometimes gets her into trouble. For example, the recipient of child abuse is innocent psychologically but guilty theologically, she argues, making no distinction between the sinfulness of the perpetrator and that of the abused. Do they stand theologically "on the same plane" (p. 101)?

The real difference between Hunsinger and other approaches comes over the question of asymmetry. I wish Hunsinger had struggled a bit longer with her own exasperated question at Yale--"How does [Barth] think he can speak of God as he is in himself?" I wonder, can the "theological significance of salvation be stated without reference to healing" (p. 75) or the significance of sin be understood without understanding victimization, and so forth. No classic text, David Tracy argues, "comes to us either pure or autonomous." Every classic, even or especially the gospel that tells us about the norm of Jesus Christ, "bears with it the history of its own conflictual history of reception" (Plurality and Ambiguity, 1987, p. 14).

In one sense, her contribution to a field sorely needing distinct foundational approaches is immense. The model of Chalcedon is extremely elucidating. On the other

hand, she does not go far enough in updating Barth's relevance either in a post-modern context or within the pastoral theological conversation. With few changes, this text could have appeared in the 1970s as much as the 1990s, alongside Thomas Oden's Kerygma and Counseling. It is less a "new" interdisciplinary approach than a creative advancement of an approach to pastoral theology suggested by Oden, successfully correcting Oden's tendency to collapse psychological and theological concepts, encouraging the use of theological language in counseling, and extending the reflection to pastoral cases. Fortunately, this does not diminish the book's academic strength and cohesion as a rich and reliable resource for pastoral counseling and theology.

Bonnie J. Miller-McLemore, Ph.D
Associate Professor of Pastoral Theology
Vanderbilt University Divinity School
Nashville, TN 37240