

THE WOUNDED HEART OF
GOD

THE ASIAN CONCEPT OF HAN AND THE
CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SIN

Andrew Sung Park

ABINGDON PRESS
Nashville

THE WOUNDED HEART OF GOD:
THE ASIAN CONCEPT OF HAN AND THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SIN

Copyright © 1993 by Abingdon Press.

All rights reserved.

No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by any information storage or retrieval system, except as may be expressly permitted by the 1976 Copyright Act or in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission should be addressed in writing to Abingdon Press, 201 Eighth Avenue South, P. O. Box 801, Nashville, TN 37203, U.S.A.

00 01 02 - 10 9 8 7

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Park, Andrew Sung

The wounded heart of God: the Asian concept of han and the Christian doctrine of sin. / Andrew Sung Park.

p. cm.

ISBN 0-687-38536-9

1. Han (Psychology) 2. Sin. I. Title.

BF75.H26P37 1992

92-32182

241'.3-dc20

All biblical quotations are from the Revised Standard Version of the Bible, copyright © 1946, 1952, 1971, 1973 by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, and are used by permission.

Excerpt from "Recalling Swallowed-Up Worlds" by Elie Wiesel, copyright © 1981 Christian Century Foundation, reprinted by permission from the May 27, 1981, issue of *The Christian Century*.

Excerpt from report on Bu-Nam Kim, copyright © 1991 *The Korea Times* LA, Inc., reprinted by permission from the February 23, 1991 issue of *The Korea Times*, LA edition.

The extracts from *Father-Daughter Rape* by Elizabeth Ward, first published by The Women's Press Ltd, 1984, 34 Great Sutton Street, London EC1V 0DX, reprinted on pages 28-29, are used by permission of The Women's Press, Ltd. U.S. edition copyright © 1985 Grove Press, Inc., reprinted by permission of the publisher.

Printed in the United States of America on recycled, acid-free paper.

The Wounded Heart of God

Can God suffer? The church has long debated whether God can suffer like a human being. The passibility of God was condemned as heresy in the orthodox tradition of the church. In the early third century, patripassianists such as Praxeas, Sabellius, and Noetus advocated the birth, suffering, and death of God in the person of Jesus Christ. Their intention was to stress the unity between God and Christ. Against this idea, orthodox theologians emphasized the trinitarian distinction of God and Christ. Tertullian, in his *Against Praxeas*, refuted the idea of patripassianism by asserting that God the Father cannot suffer with the Son on the cross. This denial of God's suffering was due to the influence of Stoicism, whose highest virtue was to achieve the state of *apatheia*, being above passion or emotion. Tertullian was influenced by Stoicism. Clement and Origen, the Alexandrian Fathers, supported the idea of divine impassibility through the method of the *via negativa*, and Augustine and most scholastic theologians followed suit.¹

There have been, however, many theologians who have held to the idea of God's passibility, even though they have denied patripassianism. Among them, I would single out Saint Anselm, Luther, Kitamori, and Moltmann as strong advocates of the concept that God can suffer. Their ideas concerning God's pain will be briefly discussed, and then I will present my understanding of God's "han." The notion of God's han implies a further dimension of God's reality, the issue of whether even God needs salvation.

I support the idea of God's passibility, although I too reject patripassianism. The focus of my argument will be the suffering of

God manifest on the cross of Jesus Christ, as well as in Jesus' whole life. The meaning of the cross must not be exclusively construed as God's suffering *for* humanity, but also as God's protest against the oppressor.

ANSELM OF CANTERBURY

In his monumental work *Cur Deus Homo?* (Why Did God Become Human?), Anselm investigates the purpose of the incarnation, which he explained as follows: Sin is an offense against the honor of God. In spite of God's almightiness, mercy, and goodness, God could not pardon sin without compromising God's honor and justice. It was equally impossible for God to demand that humanity compensate for the offense of sin, for the degree of offense against an infinite God is itself necessarily infinite. Since sinful humanity could not compensate for its sin and make restoration to the infinite, offended honor of God, God should punish humanity with eternal condemnation. This would defeat God's own purpose, the happiness of creation. Anselm held that there was only one way to escape the dilemma without affecting God's honor: some kind of "satisfaction" must be made. Since the offense of humans was too great for any finite human being to redeem the sin of humanity, an infinite being who represents the human race to God was necessary. Thus, God became a human being in Jesus Christ; Christ suffered and died on humanity's behalf and made satisfaction to God by restoring God's injured honor.²

One of Anselm's outstanding notions of sin is that sin injures someone else. Beyond the violation of laws or regulations, it hurts somebody. By breaking God's law, we dishonor and injure God: "He who does not render this honor which is due to God, robs God, robs God of his own and dishonors him; and this is sin."³ Anselm's "deprivation of required justice" as original sin involves dishonoring God. Sin is "nothing other than not to render to God what is due."⁴ We owe to God undivided and full honor. Dishonoring God is sin.

Anselm, however, insisted on God's impassibility as well. Since God's *existence* is the same as God's *essence*, God cannot suffer injury. Suffering implies imperfection: "Nothing can be added to or taken from the honor of God. For this honor which belongs to him is in no way subject to injury or change."⁵

Although God's honor is perfect, immutable, incorruptible, and infrangible, and even though nothing can be added to or subtracted from God's honor, humans dishonor God; they disturb the order and

the harmony of God's creation by refusing to subject their will to God's governance.⁶ Human sin somehow injures God:

Therefore man cannot and ought not by any means to receive from God what God designed to give him, unless he return to God everything which he took from him; so that, as by man God suffered loss, by man, also, He might recover His loss.⁷

Although Anselm affirmed the impassibility of God, he also acknowledged that God was dishonored and suffered by sin, for sin creates anguish and injury in God.⁸ Anselm's Platonic presuppositions could not admit the suffering of God, while his biblical understanding of God allowed for the divine passibility on humanity's behalf. God is compassionate. To the sinner doomed to eternal torments, God uttered: "Take my only begotten Son and make him an offering for yourself"; or: "Take me, and ransom your souls."⁹ The God who is impassible is compassionate toward the sinner! That is the gospel, the good news. Anselm's incarnate God is compassionate, and thus passible:

How, then, art thou compassionate and not compassionate O Lord, unless because thou art compassionate in terms of our experience, and not compassionate in terms of thy being.

Truly, thou art so in terms of our experience, but thou art not so in terms of thine own. For, when thou beholdest us in our wretchedness, we experience the effect of compassion, but thou dost not experience the feeling. Therefore, thou art both compassionate, because thou dost save the wretched, and spare those who sin against thee; and not compassionate, because thou art affected by no sympathy for wretchedness.¹⁰

Here lies the *han* of God, that the impassable and invulnerable God suffers for humanity! To Anselm, the ontological aspect of God is incapable of being passible for human wretchedness, but the soteriological aspect of God is capable of being passible for the wretched. Here we see the struggle between Anselm the philosopher and Anselm the theologian. The latter seems to win out when he asserts that at least within the boundary of our experience, God is passible.¹¹

Anselm was the first prominent theologian to mention the reality of *the han of God*. Human sin had dishonored God, *which caused the wounded heart of God*. The dishonor requires satisfaction and the injury demands healing. Anselm finds the satisfaction of the divine dishonor in the atoning work of Jesus Christ. The injury Anselm describes is the deep anguish of God. In a sense, the cross of Jesus Christ is both

the satisfaction for as well as the expression of the wounded heart of God. Anselm knew the reality of *han* caused by the pang of sin. The anguish incurred by sin either in God or humans must be resolved through restoring the victim's honor and satisfying the victim's dishonor. He also mentioned the necessity of the resolution of *han* at a human level: "For as one who imperils another's safety does not enough by merely restoring his safety, without making some compensation for the anguish incurred; so he who violates another's honor does not enough by merely rendering honor again, but must, according to the extent of the injury done, make restoration in some way satisfactory to the person whom he has dishonored."¹² He applied this principle of *resolving han* to the divine level. The idea of this *divine wound* is the key to Anselm's theology, particularly his soteriology. Anselm made a great contribution to theology by highlighting the divine injury, God's *han*, in relation to human sin. But unfortunately he claimed that God could be satisfied only through the work of Jesus Christ. He missed an important point: *through the repenting work of the sinners who have injured God*, God could be satisfied. He thus reduced the significance of human work in the drama of salvific history by focusing solely on the work of Christ.

MARTIN LUTHER

After Anselm, Luther was the first major theologian to address the issue of the pain of God. In speaking of the wrath of God, Luther said that sin is the enemy of God, since God loves righteousness; every sin *insults* and *wounds* God, whose very existence is righteousness.¹³ Toward sin, God responds with wrath. Using an Old Testament term, Luther presented God as the God of jealousy. God's nature, however, is nothing less than pure love; he is not a God of wrath but a God of grace.¹⁴ He indicates that the wrath of God is not an expression of God's essence but the undeniable relational entity existing between God and sinners. For him, wrath is God's "alien work" against God's "proper work"; through a dialectical operation wrath prepares the proper work as in law and gospel.¹⁵ The injury of God by human sin coincides with the idea of *han*. Wrath is not essential to God, but is rather an existential expression of God's *han*. Yet God's *han* is different from what Luther understands as the divine wrath, which sinners perceive as divine reality. God's *han* arises from divine love, not from divine wrath.

Luther treated the issue of God's injury (divine han) in his "theology of the cross." He employed the terms *theologia crucis* and *theologia gloriae* (theology of the cross and theology of glory) to describe the knowledge of God.¹⁶ In the Heidelberg Disputation of 1518 he regarded *theologia crucis* as the essence of true theology and *theologia gloriae* as its opposite.¹⁷ A *theologia gloriae* characterizes the knowledge of God attained from the basic philosophical principle of scholastic theology, while *theologia crucis* refers to the knowledge of God derived from the crucified Christ. The theology of the cross delineates *Deus crucifixus* (the crucified God) and *Deus absconditus* (the hidden God). In the biblical references Romans 1:20ff. (God's invisible nature in creation) and I Corinthians 1:21ff. (God's visible foolish side in the cross), the theology of glory and theology of the cross can be seen respectively. Romans 1:20 shows a human effort to grasp the invisible nature of God from the works of creation through reason. From this attempt, one can only know the *Deus gloriosus*, the glorious God, in such divine metaphysical attributes as omnipresence and omnipotence.¹⁸ First Corinthians 1:21ff. shows God's wisdom and power in the cross of Jesus Christ.

The theology of glory perceives God from the divine works in creation, while the theology of the cross understands God from "divine sufferings." The former directly seeks God in divine power, wisdom, and glory; the latter paradoxically finds God in the divine weakness, foolishness, and suffering. The theology of glory makes humans stand before God on the foundation of their moral righteousness, whereas the theology of the cross destroys human self-righteousness and leads humans to pure receptivity.¹⁹

The theology of the cross is a main subject of Luther's thought. For him, the "wisdom of the cross" is the standard of all genuine theology.²⁰ The cross is the symbol of divine judgment over human beings which declares the culmination of all human efforts to have fellowship with God. It destroys both natural theology and self-righteous moral theology. The cross hides God, yet reveals the hidden God not in might, but in lowliness and helplessness.²¹ God's power is God's helplessness, God's life is God's death.²²

In his *Table-Talk* Luther rejected the argument that, because the Godhead can neither suffer nor die, in Christ only the human nature suffered. Against this he contended that not only the human nature but the divine nature had suffered and died for us.²³ Luther furthermore affirmed that "To be born, to suffer, to die, are characteristics of the human nature, of which characteristics the divine nature also

THE WOUNDED HEART OF GOD

becomes sharer in this Person."²⁴ For Luther, we cannot know God except through the cross.²⁵

The knowledge of God is not theoretical knowledge but involves the entirety of human existence. It is impossible for us to view the cross as an objective reality in Christ without knowing ourselves as crucified with Christ. The cross signifies God's meeting us in the death of Jesus Christ only when we experience Jesus' death as our own.²⁶

To Luther, the cross is the expression of the divine injury. To unbelievers, God appears to be wrathful and angry, but to believers, God reveals Godself in "weakness" and "suffering." The cross ends all speculation about the divine character, including the wrathfulness of God. It enables people to know God in experience. The cross, the expression of the divine han, cannot be understood in the absence of the human experience of han. Only the victims of sin would know the hiddenness of God in the cross, which is the divine pain caused by human sin and the divine participation in human suffering.

Nevertheless, there is a problem in Luther's approach to divine knowledge. He overemphasized the cross of Jesus Christ as the only way to the knowledge of God. In reality, not only through Christ's death, but also through Christ's life do we come to know God. Even in the event of the incarnation, we find the *agony* and *wound* of God. The divine helplessness is shown throughout the life of Jesus Christ. It is impossible to separate Jesus' life from his cross. They are interpenetrated in suffering. Our knowledge of God must derive from a balance between the life and the cross of Jesus Christ.

Jesus' life—his birth and ministry—reveals parts of the divine "helplessness" and "suffering." Even before the event of the cross, Jesus daily bore his cross and suffered in life. When he said, "If any man would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me" (Mk. 8:34), he indicated that he lived the life of bearing his cross. Jesus' life was a cross-bearing, a han-ridden one.

KAZOH KITAMORI

Kitamori, a Japanese pastor and theologian, is a Lutheran thinker who conspicuously spoke about the suffering of God in his *Theology of the Pain of God*. In 1946, after the painful defeat of Japan in World War II, he articulated the essence of God as pain.²⁷ People related the motif of the book with the defeat. To a certain extent, he wrote this book in response to the tragedy of the war—a fact which he mentioned

in his preface to the third edition.²⁸ Kitamori, however, asserts that the theme of the pain of God is the “heart of the gospel.”²⁹ Using Luther’s concept of the wrath and love of God, “God fighting with God” at Golgotha, Kitamori united God’s wrath and love within a “tertiary”—the pain of God.³⁰

To him, the essence of God is the divine pain and is revealed at the cross: “*The essence of God can be comprehended only from the ‘word of the cross’.*”³¹ For him, the essence of God means the heart of God, which is pain.

Kitamori found the term “pain of God” in Jeremiah 31:20 (“My heart is pained”) in a Japanese translation. The Hebrew verb *hamah* means anguishing, moaning, groaning in the painful condition of the human heart. He extends this state of heart to God.³²

Kitamori was critical of Western Christianity’s preservation of the idea of divine impassibility influenced by Greek philosophy. One of his theological tasks was to “win over the theology which advocates a God who has no pain.”³³ His task was twofold: to advocate the all-embracing nature of God and to include the pain of God in the all-embracing divine nature. The all-embracing God is “God embracing completely those who should not be embraced”—that is, ‘God in pain!’³⁴ Through God’s pain God resolves human pain and through God’s own pain Jesus Christ heals human wounds.³⁵ How does God heal human pain? Kitamori believes that God heals us through our own service of God’s pain. To him, “Take up your cross and follow me” means “Serve the pain of God through your own pain.”³⁶ By serving God through our pain, our pain is healed in sharing divine salvation.³⁷

Kitamori, however, held that pain as God’s essence cannot be interpreted as substance. It is a mode of understanding God in relationship. In the preface to the fifth edition (1958), he says: “The theology of the pain of God does not mean that pain exists in God as *substance*. The pain of God is not a ‘concept of substance’—it is a ‘concept of relation’, a nature of ‘God’s love’.”³⁸ In suggesting this relational model, he rejects the accusation of patripassianism by accusing his detractors in turn of asserting a non-relational model of God. Furthermore, pain as “the essence of God” should be comprehended in historical contexts: “I myself do not find the necessity of using the ‘pain of God’ as a theological term any longer, since this term has served its purpose adequately in stressing the mediatory and intercessory love of God over against the immediate love of God.”³⁹ When we understand the pain of God which leads to the love of God, the term “pain of God” is not indispensable in our theologizing.

Kitamori's pain of God speaks to the issue of the han of God. Without understanding the pain of God, we would not understand the cross of Jesus Christ. Without understanding the cross of Jesus Christ, we would not understand the heart of God. Surely human sin hurts God and God's pain is understood in the event of the cross.

Nevertheless, unlike the term "pain of God," "God's han" will not have any moment in history when its existence will abolish itself. As long as people commit sin, the idea of the han of God will be used to describe the injury done to God by human sin. Kitamori was ambiguous when he said that the use of the term "pain of God" was no longer necessary. I wonder whether this means that he need not use this term in his understanding of God, or God's "pain" is no longer "essential" in relation with God's creation.

The han of God is not God's *essence*, but God's *existence*. God's han is produced by the tension between God's essence in divine nature and God's existence in the world. It is fully revealed in the incarnation and crucifixion.

JÜRGEN MOLTSMANN

Moltmann attained his eminent theological reputation with the publication of *Theology of Hope* in 1964. This volume concerns the meaning and hope of history found in Christian eschatology. Moltmann's book began with the *resurrection* of Christ. Some accused him of being one-sided with Christ's resurrection, regarding it as a kind of medieval theology of glory, neglecting the aspect of Luther's theology of the cross. The publication of *The Crucified God* in 1972 balanced the one-sidedness of his previous work by stressing the *crucifixion of Jesus Christ* in conformity with the *theologia crucis*.

For Moltmann the cross of Jesus Christ is the center of all Christian theology, for all theological themes have their focus in the crucified God.⁴⁰ It reveals who God really is and who Jesus is. At the cross, "Jesus died abandoned by God."⁴¹ The cross exposes God's self-abandonment and self-identity.

Moltmann bases his theology on the cross and the resurrection of Jesus Christ. The event of the crucifixion, particularly Jesus' loud cry, is the center of his theology and life: "Jesus died crying out to God, 'My God, why hast thou forsaken me?' All Christian theology and all Christian life is basically an answer to the question which Jesus asked as he died."⁴² In the godforsakenness of Jesus, we see God crying out against God, the true identity of God. Moltmann understands the

death of Jesus on the cross as God's active suffering. That is, "God not only acted in the crucifixion of Jesus or sorrowfully allowed it to happen, but was himself active with his own being in the dying Jesus and suffered with him."⁴³ Moltmann's concept of God allows Godself to be crucified in Jesus. God takes upon Godself the judgment for human sin and shares humanity's destiny.⁴⁴ Along with other theologians he criticizes the traditional insistence on the impassibility of God and defends the idea of God's suffering. To some his approach seems to be a kind of patripassianism or Sabellianism.⁴⁵ He does not, however, equate Jesus' suffering with God's. Jesus' death was not God's death as believed in patripassianism: "Jesus' death cannot be understood 'as the death of God', but only as death *in* God."⁴⁶ By positing that Jesus suffers dying and God suffers Jesus' death, Moltmann circumvents patripassianism.⁴⁷ The reason God suffers is due to God's love for the Son. "God's being is in suffering and the suffering is in God's being itself because God is love." God is not compassionless power, but "is known as the human God in the crucified Son of Man."⁴⁸ God is affected by the human situation.

Following Luther's theology of the cross, Moltmann avoids using the epistemology of natural theology.⁴⁹ He advocates the true knowledge of God only through Christ the crucified, while not rejecting the possibility of the indirect knowledge of God manifest in the world. "Christ the crucified alone is 'man's true theology and knowledge of God'. This presupposes that while indirect knowledge of God is possible through his works, God's being can be seen and known directly only in the cross of Christ; knowledge of God is therefore real and saving."⁵⁰ Moltmann contends that we cannot reach the true knowledge of the Trinity, the heart of the reality of God, through the indirect knowledge of God in God's works. Christ is the true way to the reality of the Trinity: "The place of the doctrine of the Trinity is not the 'thinking of thought', but the cross of Jesus."⁵¹

But a question arises: how do we know God through the event of the cross? Both Luther and Moltmann hold that we first understand the event of the crucifixion by our participation in Christ's death, which provides us the knowledge of the suffering of God. How, then, do we participate in Christ's death and suffering? While it is clear that we cannot experience Christ's suffering directly, we can have an indirect experience of Jesus' suffering by taking part in the suffering of the downtrodden. The direct knowledge of God through the Cross which is so important to Moltmann is impossible, unless he presumes it to be found in mystical experience.⁵² Without knowing the suffering of people in the world, we cannot understand the cross of Jesus Christ

nor the reality of God nor the knowledge of the Trinity. We will find Christ's crucifixion *in the world* through the oppressed. If we fail to encounter the crucified God in the hungry, the naked, the oppressed, and the imprisoned, we will never meet God crucified. Thus, Moltmann's insistence on the vertical knowledge of the cross of Jesus Christ needs to be modified in light of the horizontal revelation of God in the history of the suffering world. God's direct revelation through the cross must be understood in terms of our indirect experience of the divine revelation through the crucified of the present world.

Furthermore, Moltmann's understanding of the cross as the divine passion for sinners needs to be seen from the other side. For him, ". . . what happened on the cross must be understood as an event between God and the Son of God . . . He is acting in himself in this manner of suffering and dying in order to open up in himself life and freedom for sinners."⁵³ Moltmann overlooks the other side of the cross: the side that epitomizes pain, the agony of the victims of sinners. The cross should not be seen as freedom for the oppressors only, but as the oppressed's decisive defiance of sin and evil. The cross means not only that God passes judgment on the sin of people upon Godself,⁵⁴ but also that God passes judgment upon the oppressors.

THE WOUNDED GOD

Divine impassibility is problematic. Influenced mostly by Stoicism, patristic and medieval theologians asserted that God is perfect and thus cannot change, for any change for the perfect God means a move to an inferior position.⁵⁵ This conclusion is solely the outcome of their own speculation on the reality of God. It does not say anything about the reality of God revealed in the Christ-event. They produced their own image of perfection by saying that the perfect God suffers nothing. But how do we know what the perfection of God is? Is it not true that whatever God does is perfect (William Occam)? We know that what God did on the cross was perfect, provided that Christ is the ultimate manifestation of God. Thus, we can say that the perfect God can suffer.

Human Sin and Divine Pain

Sin hurts God and one's fellow human beings. Every sin which is committed against others wounds God, for God created and has loved

those against whom we have sinned. As Anselm asserted, God is not passible, yet God suffers with human beings. God suffers not because sin is all powerful, but because God's love for humanity is too ardent to be apathetic toward suffering humanity. No power in the universe can make God vulnerable, but a victim's suffering breaks the heart of God. For Moltmann, God's suffering in Christ on the cross is due to God's love for the Son. To me, God suffers for the Son on the cross not only out of God's love for the Son, but also God's love for humanity. God's love for humans suffers on the cross. The cross represents God's full participation in the suffering of victims. That is, Jesus's death was the example of an innocent victim's suffering in which God was *fully* present. Yet every victim's suffering also involves God's presence.

As Luther stated, God meets us in suffering and death. The cross is the meeting place between God and us. Another way to say this is that han is the point of encounter between God and humanity. The cross is the place where God experiences human suffering and the place where humans understand God's agony. Sin forced Jesus Christ to be crucified on the cross. Sin forces people to suffer the anguish of han. The divine agony which brought forth the Incarnation can be identified with han. The Incarnation was an expression of the divine han, which was fully manifested at the crucifixion-event.

Does God Need Salvation?

God's han, the wounded heart of God, is exposed on the cross. Here an important issue is not whether God is passible, but what is the meaning of Jesus Christ's suffering on the cross. The cross of Jesus Christ can be interpreted from a human perspective and a divine perspective. It is not only the symbol of God's intention to save humanity (human perspective), but also the symbol of God's need for salvation (divine perspective).

The cross of Jesus is a symbol of God's crying for salvation (*Eli, Eli, lama sabach-thani?*),⁵⁶ because God cannot save Godself. If salvation is relational, then one cannot save oneself. *God needs salvation!* This sounds ridiculous and blasphemous. But if we understand salvation from a holistic perspective, God yearns for salvation because God relates to human beings.

This idea is biblical. The divine han can be seen in the Old Testament, where, in contrast to Aristotle's notion of a god who is metaphysically immutable, the God of Israel suffers sorrow and affliction. God is "grieved at his heart" because God has created a

race that has morally corrupted itself (Gen. 6:6); the soul of the Lord is described to be "grieved for the misery of Israel" (Jud. 10:16).⁵⁷ The most poignant image of God in the Old Testament appears in Deutero-Isaiah, where the prophet portrays God as a woman in labor: "For a long time I have held my peace, I have kept still and restrained myself; now I will cry out like a woman in travail, I will gasp and pant" (Is. 42:14). This image of God as a woman in travail strongly depicts God in tremendous pain, groaning, gasping, and panting. In the midst of the turmoil of ancient empires, God suffers the plight and darkness of Israel. Israel's suffering was not the true will of God. While Israel suffered under the exceedingly heavy yoke of the Babylonians, God restrained Himself (Is. 47:6). But the time of the restrained silence is over and God cries out like a woman in birth pangs. God as "a woman in travail," the boldest figure employed by any prophet, conveys a sense of the deep intensity of God's suffering.⁵⁸ This is the clear biblical image of God who suffers with humanity and craves for salvation.

Another prominent image of God in the Old Testament is God as husband. Hosea compared God to a loving husband, while he compared Israel to an unfaithful wife. In the book which bears his name Hosea's wife has deserted him. Hosea realizes that if he forgives and loves his deserting, unfaithful wife, God is even more loving and forgiving of God's people. Like Hosea, Jeremiah employs the analogy of the marriage relationship between God and Israel: "Surely, as a faithless wife leaves her husband, so have you been faithless to me, O house of Israel, says the Lord" (Jer. 3:20). God agonizes and grieves over her unfaithfulness and wantonness. As the betrayal of a woman pierces the heart of her lover, so suffers God the betrayal and disloyalty of Israel.

The prominent Jewish philosopher Abraham Heschel has argued that in the prophets God reacts with pain and sorrow to the Hebrews' breaking of the covenant, and that the prevalence of anthropomorphic descriptions of God in the prophetic writings are central to the entire biblical message.⁵⁹ God does not impassively judge the deeds of humans in an attitude of cool detachment. God's judgment is imbued with a feeling of intimate and loving concern. God's love or anger, God's mercy or disappointment is an expression of the profound divine participation in the history of Israel and all the nations. Heschel believes that this is the essential message of the biblical prophets.⁶⁰

As life is a partnership between God and humanity,⁶¹ so is salvation. Creation is God's covenant with humans and indicates the divine

commitment to the well-being of humanity. Until humanity is made whole, God will be restless. God cannot be detached from the griefs and suffering of humanity. The Old Testament, especially the prophets, bespeaks the indivisible covenantal relationship between God and Israel: "In all their affliction he was afflicted" (Is. 63:9). When the people of God rejoice, God rejoices too. The destiny of God involves the destiny of humanity. The salvation of humanity is interpenetrated with the salvation of God.

In the New Testament, the picture of the prodigal son's father who waits for his lost son day and night depicts the divine han (Lk. 15:11-32). In the parable, the father's heart is broken on account of his younger son and yearns for his return. The father's heart is crucified by his son's departure. In this image of the waiting father, we can see the passive dimension of the divine han, while in most of the prophets' image of God, we find its active aspect. The crucified heart of God is the divine han revealed through the Christ-event and history. In this parable, we see Jesus' image of a God who desires the repentance of sinful humanity. Until the prodigal returns, God is restless. This biblical God is never a God of aseity⁶² or self-complacency. The parenthood of God suggests that God is not well when God's children are not well. Until the last prodigal returns home, God's mind and body are nailed to the cross.

Our speculative image of an almighty, impassible God has been shattered by the Incarnation and crucifixion.⁶³ The all-powerful God was crucified. The cross is the symbol of God's han which makes known God's own vulnerability to human sin. The cross and the parable of the Prodigal indicate that God desires full human participation in divine salvific history. On the cross, God demands the healing of the wounded heart which has been inflicted by sinful human beings. The healing involves the repentance of sinful people. The cry of the wounded heart of God on the cross reverberates throughout the whole of history. God shamefully exposes the vulnerability of God on the cross, demanding the healing of the han of God.

The cross is God's unshakable love for God's own creation. Like parents who give birth to and then love their children, God is wrapped up in a creational love with humanity. The divine love of creation is much more profound than the parental love of childbearing. God's *agape* toward both the han-ridden and sinners will not be fulfilled without their healing and return. In other words, God cannot save Godself apart from the salvation of humanity. God needs human beings if God's salvific history initiated with creation is to be fulfilled. God's creation was the divine declaration of God's relationship with

humans. God's participation in history connotes that God is in a vulnerable relationship with humans. The ultimate symbol of God's need for salvation is manifest in the Incarnation and the cross of Jesus Christ.

The Cross as the Symbol of God's Protest

The cross is not only the expression of God's love for humanity, but also the protest and wrath of God against oppressors. Jesus' suffering epitomizes God's love made available to sinful people and God's historical determination to save them. The crucifixion-event shows God's full participation in the suffering history of the oppressed—which is not a superficial involvement but a true incarnation in the innermost part of human agony. The divine involvement in human suffering is the beginning of the healing of the oppressed. Hope may flow from the future eschatological event of the general resurrection (Pannenberg) or from the Promissory Word of God (Moltmann). But from the perspective of man, the actuality of divine participation in human suffering is the fountainhead of human hope in history.

The cross is the center of God's *han* erupted in the middle of history, telling the oppressors "Enough is enough." Unlike Peter Abelard's "moral influence theory," which presents the cross as persuading and luring sinners into voluntary repentance, a *han* perspective perceives the cross as God's strongest protest against oppressors. To Jesus Christ, calling the Pharisees "children of vipers" was a harsh challenge to them. In like manner the cross is the ultimate challenge to oppressors to make their choice between repentance and eternal death (Jn. 3:18-20).

In brief, the cross of Jesus Christ commands oppressors to repent of the sins which have caused God's *han* and the *han* of others. It is the ultimate divine negation of human evil. When the cross of Jesus Christ is seen from the perspective of the oppressed, it signifies God's suffering *with them*; seen from the perspective of oppressors, the cross means God's suffering *because of them*.

God's Han in Jesus' Life

It is not right to limit the crucifixion of Jesus Christ to the three hours of suffering on the cross. The crucifixion of Jesus must be understood as extending to his whole life. Jesus lived the life of taking up his cross everyday. It was not only Jesus' suffering that caused God's *han*; all human beings' pain is engraved in God's suffering.

Even a sparrow's falling is remembered by God. Whitehead attributed God's unforgettable memory of all sufferings to the consequent nature of God.⁶⁴

Not only did the cross express the han of God; so also did the thirty-three years of Jesus' living.⁶⁵ We have concentrated on the cross of Christ as God's suffering. But we have neglected the suffering aspect of Jesus' life. Jesus' birth bespeaks of the han of God for the children of the poor. According to the birth story, there was no room at the inn and Mary delivered the baby in a manger (Lk. 2:7).⁶⁶ Even in the present world, there is no room in hospitals for the babies of the poor. The han of God persists in the fact that there is no room available in the world for thousands of babies whom God has created. Every minute thirty children die for want of food and inexpensive vaccines around the world.⁶⁷ Every day more than 25,000 persons, most of them children, die for lack of clean drinking water.⁶⁸ Every baby's death causes the implosion of God's han. The act against God's creation of new lives crucifies the heart of God.

Jesus was born poor, worked as a carpenter (Mk. 6:3),⁶⁹ and journeyed as a preacher. He taught the crowd, healed the sick, and protested the injustice of religious leaders. As a man of sorrows, he underwent grief, crying with the bereaved. He was a friend of the friendless, the untouchably unclean, and the despised. He was mocked as a drunkard, was measured by his association with friends of low status, was called a Samaritan, was accused of being a lunatic possessed by the Devil (Jn. 8:48), and was excommunicated by his religion (Jn. 9:22). He was acquainted with the deep han of human beings.

Furthermore, Jesus, the Lord of freedom, had to live under the law of Moses. The human regulations and traditions almost suffocated him and obstructed his work. Jesus' suffering for three hours on the cross was one thing; his many years' suffering with smothering religious stipulations was another. The latter was a profound source of Jesus' han. Compared with at least three years' suffering from humiliation, mockery, false accusation, religious inquisition, the three hours' suffering was rather light. The church has overemphasized Jesus' suffering on the cross, for Jesus' crucifixion signifies God's redemptive power. But Jesus' teaching, preaching, healing, and serving were redemptive as well. The unbalanced stress on the suffering of Jesus on the cross is one of the reasons why the church has encouraged "worshipping Jesus" over "following Jesus." We need to maintain a balance in the way we value these two types of Jesus' suffering.

The Knowledge of God

A crucial issue in this theological discussion is the knowledge of God. My premise is that we come to know the reality of God only in the midst of experiencing han in the world. Hearing this, one might well ask: "Is it necessary to experience han to know God?" While I do not believe that one should intentionally seek the experience of han in order to know God, in our participation in the han-ridden life of the oppressed, we come to know God with the crucified Christ and the downtrodden. All our speculative knowledge of God crumbles down before the deep human agony of han in the life of Jesus and the downtrodden. Han is the point of contact between Jesus Christ and suffering humanity and between Jesus Christ and God. Christ represents the han of the downtrodden to God and the han of God to the downtrodden. Christ is the expression of the divine han and the epitome of the han of the oppressed.

The wounded heart of God can be glimpsed when the impassible God suffers for the pain of humanity (Anselm). The wounded heart of God is shown when God embraces those who cannot be embraced (Kitamori). We can meet the wounded God at the cross through participating in Christ's death (Luther, Moltmann). In the life of Jesus, God exposes God's wound which requires salvation. The divine wounded healer makes God's own wounds available as the source of healing.⁷⁰ This wound of God is the true strength of salvation in history.

The traditional knowledge of God's attributes such as "omnipotence," "omnipresence," and "omniscience" needs to be reevaluated in light of the han-ful life of Jesus Christ. These attributes are quite meaningless to us, unless they speak to our lives. They are abstract, for we are not in the position of judging the actuality of omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience. They are beyond our comprehension and experience.

Christ sheds new light on the attributes of God through his actual divine life (theo-praxis). Jesus Christ has taught us that God is crucified everywhere we are oppressed (omnipresence); God knows our deepest sorrow (omniscience); God's vulnerable love shown on the cross and in the death of Jesus is more powerful or persuasive than anything known to us (omnipotence). Christ's teaching and life have revealed to us the wounded heart of God, which feels with the han of the oppressed and suffers the sin of the oppressors. This wounded God in Jesus Christ is truly powerful, wise, and salvific. This wounded

God shapes and reshapes the course of history in the form of the hungry, the imprisoned, the naked—the *han-ridden*.

The salvation of the wounded God and of the oppressed and of the oppressors is the crux of the knowledge of God. To know God is to have an intimate relationship with God. In the past God has been the object of knowledge. But God does not exist apart from our living. Knowledge is not for just contemplating (Aristotle), nor understanding (Hegel), but for living (Kierkegaard). Only by living in God do we come to know God. For Christians, God is not an abstraction, but the God of *han* in history, Jesus Christ. By participating in the life of Jesus Christ and his historical mission, people come to know the true meaning of life; in such true knowledge of life, the oppressed dissolve their *han* and the oppressors eliminate their sin; human participation in actualizing the purpose of the Creation and Incarnation accomplishes the healing of God's wounded heart.

15. David E. Roberts, *Psychotherapy and a Christian View of Man* (New York: Scribner's, 1950), p. 125.
16. *Ibid.*, pp. 125-28.
17. Erich Fromm, *Man for Himself* (New York: Rinehart, 1947).
18. David Roberts, *Psychotherapy and a Christian View of Man*, p. 138.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 129.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 132.
21. Fred Alan Wolf, *Taking the Quantum Leap* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981), pp. 3-6.
22. Werner Heisenberg, *Physics and Beyond* (New York: Harper & Row, 1971). Richard L. Liboff, *Introductory Quantum Mechanics* (San Francisco: Holden-Day, 1980), pp. 51-53.
23. John S. Dunne, *The Way of All the Earth* (New York: Macmillan, 1972), p. ix.
24. Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, trans. Joel Weinsheimer and Donald Marshall (New York: Crossroad, 1989), p. 302. The italics are mine.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 305.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 306. The italics are Gadamer's.
27. *Ibid.*, pp. 358-62.
28. Kant classifies all moral laws as either *hypothetical* or *categorical imperatives*. For him, "If the action would be good solely as a means to *something else*, the imperative is *hypothetical*; if the action is represented as good *in itself* and therefore as necessary, in virtue of its principle, . . . then the imperative is *categorical*." Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals*, trans. and analyzed H. J. Paton (New York: Harper & Row, 1948), p. 82.
29. Kant believes that we do not know beforehand what a hypothetical imperative will be. But we know at once what a categorical imperative contains, for it is a universal law. For him, there is only "a single categorical imperative": "*Act only on that maxim through which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law.*" *Ibid.*, p. 88.

Chapter 7

1. J. K. Mozley, *The Impassibility of God: A Survey of Christian Thought* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1926), pp. 28-52.
2. Anselm of Canterbury, *Saint Anselm: Basic Writings*, trans. S. W. Deane, intro. Charles Hartshorne (La Salle: Open Court, 1962), p. viii.
3. Anselm of Canterbury, *Cur Deus Homo* I:xi, *ibid.*, p. 202.
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Ibid.*, I:xv, p. 208.
6. *Ibid.*
7. *Ibid.*, I:xxiii, p. 232.
8. *Ibid.*, I:xi, p. 202.
9. *Ibid.*, II:xx., p. 286.

10. Anselm of Canterbury, *Proslogium* VIII; *ibid.*, pp. 13-14.
11. I do not know how he knows that God does not experience the feeling in being. That conclusion is too speculative to be cogent.
12. *Ibid.*, I:XI, p. 202.
13. *Luther's Works*, ed. H. T. Lehmann, 55 vols. (St. Louis: Concordia, 1955-1986; hereafter abbreviated as LW), 14:316.
14. LW 12:336.
15. LW 2:134.
16. Gerhard Ebeling, *Luther*, trans. R. A. Wilson (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972), p. 226.
17. Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther*, trans. Robert C. Schultz (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966), p. 25.
18. Gerhard Ebeling, *Luther*, p. 227.
19. LW 31:55.
20. LW 14:305, 309.
21. Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther*, p. 30.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 34.
23. J. K. Mozley, *The Impassibility of God*, p. 122.
24. *Ibid.*
25. LW 31:55.
26. Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther*, p. 28.
27. Kazoh Kitamori, *Theology of the Pain of God* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1965).
28. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 19.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 21.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 47. The italics are Kitamori's.
32. *Ibid.*, pp. 8, 151-52.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 22.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 20.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 52.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 53.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
39. *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.
40. Jürgen Moltmann, *The Crucified God*, trans. R. A. Wilson and John Bowden (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), p. 204.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 69.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 190.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 193.
45. Sabellianism flourished in the early third century. It stressed the unity of God without the distinction of the Trinity. Such terms as "Father," "Son," and "Holy Spirit" simply refer to three modes of divine action; there are no substantial distinctions within the divine. Thus, Sabellianism was virtually indistinguishable from patripassianism which held that God suf-

fered on the cross because the crucified Jesus was none other than God Godself.

46. Moltmann, *The Crucified God*, p. 207.

47. *Ibid.*, p. 243.

48. *Ibid.*, p. 227.

49. *Ibid.*, pp. 212-14.

50. *Ibid.*, p. 212. These two sentences are his interpretation of Luther's position, and he supports Luther's idea on the exclusive manifestation of the knowledge of God through the crucified Jesus.

51. *Ibid.*, p. 240.

52. He disparages medieval mysticism. *Ibid.*, p. 213.

53. *Ibid.*, p. 192.

54. *Ibid.*, p. 193.

55. Mozley, *The Impassibility of God*, p. 38.

56. Mk. 15:34. For Moltmann, this outcry expresses Jesus' agonizing death marked by a deep sense of being abandoned by God: Godforsakenness. *The Crucified God*, pp. 126-53.

57. J. K. Mozley, *The Impassibility of God*, p. 3.

58. Abraham J. Heschel, *The Prophets* (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), p. 151.

59. *Ibid.*, p. 11.

60. Abraham J. Heschel, *The Insecurity of Freedom: Essays on Human Existence* (New York: Schocken, 1959), p. 160.

61. *Ibid.*

62. In scholastic and especially in Thomistic thought aseity denotes the identity in God of existence and essence, since God is the ground of God's own being, and thus marks God out as "pure act." R. A. Norris, "Aseity," in *The Westminster Dictionary of Christian Theology*, ed. Alan Richardson and John Bowden (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983), p. 47.

63. Some may raise a question on the resurrection of Christ as the proof of God's almightiness. But that is not the final triumph of God in history. St. Paul indicates that the Holy Spirit of God worries and grieves over human affairs. Symbolically we are living between the "Third day" (resurrection) and the "Seventh day" (sabbath).

64. For him, there is another aspect of God: the primordial nature of God. It primarily dreams of the future of the world, while the consequent nature reaps the harvest of the "tragic Beauty" of the past. Alfred North Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas* (New York: Free Press, 1933), p. 296.

65. This does not indicate that Jesus never had joy, peace, and pleasure in his life.

66. There was room only on the cross for Jesus.

67. Jack Nelson-Pallmeyer, *The Politics of Compassion* (New York: Orbis, 1986), p. 99.

68. *Ibid.*

69. The readings of *tektion* diverge on whether carpenter was Jesus' or his father's occupation. Hans Conzelmann, *Jesus*, trans. J. Raymond Lord, ed. John Reumann (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973), p. 28.

70. Henri J. M. Nouwen, *The Wounded Healer* (New York: Doubleday, 1972), p. xiv.

Chapter 8

1. Paul Knitter, "Preface" to *The Myth of Christian Uniqueness*, ed. John Hick and Paul Knitter (New York: Orbis, 1988), pp. vii-xii. I am greatly indebted to John Cobb for the following discussion.

2. John Hick, "The Non-Absoluteness of Christianity," *The Myth of Christian Uniqueness*, p. 34

3. *Ibid.*, p. 23.

4. *Ibid.*

5. *Ibid.*, pp. 23-27.

6. John Cobb, Jr., "Beyond 'Pluralism,'" *Christian Uniqueness Reconsidered*, ed. Gavin D'Costa (New York: Orbis, 1990), p. 81.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 85.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 84.

9. Marjorie H. Suchocki, "In Search of Justice," *The Myth of Christian Uniqueness*, p. 160.

10. Raimundo Panikkar, "Metatheology as Fundamental Theology," *Myth, Faith, and Hermeneutics* (New York: Paulist, 1979), p. 325.

11. John Hutchison, *Paths of Faith*, pp. 454, 493. In Islam, *thar*, the vendetta, is similar to the concept of active han. It was a tribal ordinance of great antiquity. Its content is that *wali*, the male next-of-kin of a slain person, has the right to avenge the killing on the actual murderer. The Koran is explicit about it; the same book, however, recommends mercy on the murderer. H. A. R. Gibb, "Islam," in *Living Faiths*, ed. R. C. Zaehner (Boston: Beacon 1959), p. 189. The Koran also emphasizes the relief of the poor and needy, the freeing of slaves and prisoners and other charitable work.

12. Mircea Eliade, *Shamanism*, trans. Willard R. Trask (New York: Pantheon, 1964).

13. According to Lester Brown, we have passed the first natural threshold—the limit of the stress of nature. If we cross the second one, there is no way we can avoid a catastrophic ecological disaster.

14. The late Dr. Asish Mondal told me this story at Berkeley, California, in 1983. He was professor of church history at Bishop's College in Calcutta, India.

Chapter 9

1. Since human beings cause the pain of the world, the resolution of human han is a way to resolve the han of the world.

2. Judith Plaskow, *Sex, Sin and Grace*, p. 151.