

Barth and Whitehead: Transforming and Reinterpreting Barth's Theology in a Process Perspective*

Tokiyuki Nobuhara

Introduction:

It is famous that at the outset of *Science and the Modern World* (1925) Whitehead speaks of two ways of social transformation that have been taking place in the West since the sixteenth century. One is the Protestant Reformation and the other is the rise of modern science. As you see, Whitehead's view of the Reformation is one that sounds rather cynical and reserved as compared with his high evaluation of the rise of modern science. Whitehead writes:

The Reformation, for all its importance, may be considered as a domestic affair of the European races. Even the Christianity of the East viewed it with profound disengagement. Furthermore, such disruptions are no new phenomena in the history of Christianity or of other religions. When we project this great revolution upon the whole history of the Christian Church, we cannot look upon it as introducing a new principle into human life. For good or for evil, it was a great transformation of religion; but it was not the coming of religion. It did not itself claim to be so. Reformers maintained that they were only restoring what had been forgotten. ⁽¹⁾

It is quite otherwise, in Whitehead's view, with the rise of modern science. Whitehead explicates: "In every way it contrasts with the contemporary religious movement. The Reformation was a popular uprising, and for a century and a half drenched Europe in blood. The beginnings of the scientific movement were confined to a minority among the intellectual elite" (SMW, 2).

Specifically, Whitehead attends to the way in which the persecution of Galileo has been remembered, which, actually, is "a tribute to the quiet commencement of the most intimate change in outlook which the human

race had yet encountered." And he emphatically reminds us: "Since a babe was born in a manger, it may be doubted whether so great a thing has happened with so little stir" (SMW, 2).

What I am engaged in in this article is a comparative study of the Reformation theology of Karl Barth and Alfred North Whitehead's process philosophy which, of course, is philosophically expressive of the second motif of Western transformation, modern science. As is clear in the above, the two motifs of Western transformation are vastly different so much so that their respective contemporary heirs, dialectic theology and process theology, are in many ways contrastive to and opposed to each other with the consequence of a certain degree of mutual repugnance.

For instance, in Japanese theological circles dialectic theology has been overwhelmingly influential during World War II, in the post-war years, and until now, whereas process philosophy/theology has been attracting the attention of limited number of philosophically-minded scholars (such as those interested in the philosophies of Nishida and Takizawa) within and outside the walls of the Church. However, this situation may change drastically because of the recent Japanese translations of Whitehead's complete works⁽²⁾ and of John Cobb's works on theology,⁽³⁾ inter-religious dialogue,⁽⁴⁾ ecology,⁽⁵⁾ and bio-ethics⁽⁶⁾ that have been enthusiastically welcomed and read by an interested Japanese (especially Buddhist) audience even beyond philosophical circles.⁽⁷⁾

It is in view of this situation involving a new possibility for change that I take up the theme of "Barth and Whitehead: Transforming and Reinterpreting Barth's Theology in a Process Perspective" in this article. As is evident in the table of contents of my manuscript under the title of *Christ As the Problem of Analogy: Transforming and Reinterpreting the Theology of Karl Barth*,⁽⁸⁾ I began my theological career by studying "Prayer, Christ, and Analogy in the Theology of Karl Barth" (see Part One) first at Doshisha University (1956-62). This theme was then deepened and combined with the problems of theological analogy (as espoused by Thomas Aquinas) and process thought at Claremont School of Theology (1976-78) and at Claremont Graduate University (1978-81), thus finally giving rise to my dissertation entitled *God and Analogy: In*

Search of a New Possibility of Natural Theology.⁽⁹⁾

Thus, what I want to do here, basically, is an intra-theological reflection in search of the bridge between Barth's theology and Whitehead's philosophy. This bridge is to unify the above-mentioned two modern motifs of social transformation in the West, the Reformation and modern natural science, from a viewpoint of an analogical theology. In my vision of analogical theology, "analogy" in the Barthian sense of *Analogia Fidei* is acknowledged within the purview of Christology (or the doctrine of reconciliation), and yet is transformed and enlarged so as to incorporate into its scope the problems of the historical Jesus and the "saying gospels," thus and only thus to be reinterpreted as commensurate with "process" or "appearance" in Whitehead's scheme of thought.

In what follows, accordingly, let me first consider the problems of prayer and Christ from the viewpoint of Barth's idea of *Analogia Fidei*. Second, I will reconsider and transform the idea of *Analogia Fidei* using my own idea of *Analogia Actionis* in order to incorporate into the scope of theological analogy the problems of the historical Jesus and of Q/the Gospel of Thomas. Third, based upon the intermediary process of reconsidering and transforming Barth's idea of *Analogia Fidei* with my own idea of *Analogia Actionis*, I will reinterpret Barth's theology as commensurate with Whitehead's conceptuality of "process" or "appearance." Fourthly and finally, I will make some concluding remarks.

I. Prayer and Christ in Barth's Analogical Theology

A. *Analogia Fidei*

If I am correct, what is at the heart of Barth's theology is prayer as it is related to the Christ of faith in terms of *Analogia Fidei*. The content of *Analogia Fidei* was already implicit in Barth's earliest work, *Der Römerbrief* (1919), although it is said that his theological method shifted, concomitant with the publication of *Fides Quarens Intellectum. Anselms Beweis der Existenz Gottes* in 1931, from a dialectical one to an analogical one.⁽¹⁰⁾ In the exegesis of Rom. 8:26, "... but the Spirit with pre-eminent power makes intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered," Barth poses his dialectical method in terms of the

"justification of prayer," as in the following:

The justification of our prayer is not that we have attained some higher eminence on the ladder of prayer; for all ladders of prayer are erected within the sphere of the 'No-God' of this world. The justification of our prayer and the reality of our communion with God are grounded upon the truth that Another, the Eternal, the Second Man from Heaven (Cor. 15:47), stands before God pre-eminent in power and—in our place.⁽¹¹⁾

Here prayer, as human piety, is once totally negated and yet is restored on the basis of the intercession of the living Christ. This is because for Barth Christ, being the end of history or the pre-history, is the origin of time.⁽¹²⁾ Christ, as the *finis orationis* or the radical negation of human religiosity, is the origin of prayer (*principium orationis*). Thus he is the justification of our prayer, which constitutes the depth of Barth's theology at its earliest stage.

We can then compare this notion of the justification of prayer with Barth's later definition of Analogia Fidei in *Church Dogmatics*, I/1 (1932). There Barth understands "analogia" or what he calls "man's conformity with God which takes place in faith, and the 'point of contact' with the Word of God posited in this conformity" as "the sole work of the actual grace of God [such] that the only final word left us at this point is that God acts in His word on man," but not as "an inborn or accessory attribute of man."⁽¹³⁾ By so saying Barth has rejected the Thomistic idea of Analogia Entis, together with Emil Brunner's idea of the "point of contact" between God and human beings and Rudolf Bultmann's idea of "pre-understanding" of God by human beings, inasmuch as these ideas presuppose an independent and isolated human reasoning apart from God's self-disclosure in Jesus Christ. Hence, Barth's notion of Analogia Fidei is expressive of the divine, gracious univocity with us as we are in faith, the fact which is commensurate with his notion of the justification of prayer mentioned above.

Barth himself does not use the term "univocity," though. It is my own interpretation of his Analogia Fidei to find in it the element of univocity, the element which was totally negated by Aquinas in his Analogia Entis.

In including the element of univocity (which I prize here only insofar as it obtains its significance in the ontological order [*ordo essendi*] of God's self-disclosure to us, rather than in the epistemological order [*ordo cognoscendi*] of our human faculty of knowing God) in the notion of analogy implying the knowability of God, I am in line with Duns Scotus and William of Ockham⁽¹⁴⁾

However, I think I can find some rationale for my standpoint in Barth himself. He regards *Analogia Entis* as theologically untenable because it is the analogy to which we resort only in a situation in which "we do not have to consider the being of God in His work and activity, but only as such and in abstracto."⁽¹⁵⁾ In other words, for Barth it is essential to include the salvific activity of God for us in the notion of analogy. If so, analogy is not a mere issue of predication of qualities in reference to the Deity. In this sense, another of Barth's definitions of *Analogia Fidei* as "*ein schon gelungenes, seinem Gegenstand entsprechendes Werk* (an already inherently meaningful work in correspondence to the Partner)"⁽¹⁶⁾ is really to the point. As will be discussed later in Section III, what Barth means by "the Partner" (*der Gegenstand*) seems to be profoundly akin to Whitehead's idea of "Reality" (as developed in *Adventures of Ideas*) while what Barth refers to as "an already inherently meaningful, corresponding work," is intriguingly in parallel with Whitehead's idea of "Appearance" or "concrecence."

B. *Analogia Relationis*

Now, we have to turn to the problem of *Analogia Relationis* which, I think, is important in articulating "the Partner" in Trinitarian conceptuality. Strangely enough, however, when it comes to accounting for *Analogia Relationis*, Barth's use of the term "analogy" tends to be metaphorical rather than univocal. *Analogia Relationis* is a sort of analogy of metaphorical proportionality.

What is the reason for this strange fact? My explanation is as follows. For Barth, God as he is in himself is relational (in the sense of his notion of "*die primäre Gegenständlichkeit Gottes*" which I might render in English as "the primary personhood of the Deity") because he is, as Father, related to Son and vice versa (and this in terms of the

communication as love of Holy Spirit) (KD, III/2, 260-262); and humanity is also relational because it consists in the male-female relationship, the most visible feature of the *imago Dei* (KD, III/1, 220).

The divine and human relationalities are combined analogically, the former providing the ontological basis for the latter and the latter corresponding to the former. As Eberhard Jüngel rightly points out, for Barth the doctrine of the Trinity, by virtue of the proposition of the *perichoresis* (Lat., *circuminsessio*; Ger., *Kreislaut*, Eng., circulation or interpenetration) of the three divine modes of being, is the ontological basis for Analogia Relationis between God's being for himself and his being for us (CD, II/1, 297). However, Barth does not want to speak of the divine-human relationship as "datum" but as "dandum," that is, something to be given to us by the Holy Spirit in the midst of our act of faith. Thus, Analogia Relationis is fundamentally conditioned by Analogia Fidei (cf. KD, III/1, 220; KD, III/2, 262; KD, III/3, 57-59, 490-492, 515-516).

However, this implies a problem: Barth has not fully articulated the difference between the ontological relationship between God and humanity and our knowledge of it. It is true to say that we need faith in order fully and responsibly to come to realize the divine-human relationship. But it is also true to say that the divine-human relationship itself is the Reality which exists before our knowledge of it emerges in faith in response to the Divine call. From this new perspective, it appears that the divine-human relationship as "datum" or the primary, given Reality precedes faith in and through which the divine-human relationship is to be given to us as "dandum" in the Holy Spirit in response to the Divine call.

This is the issue which has been critically raised by one of Barth's Japanese pupils, Katsumi Takizawa. Takizawa's contention is, in short, that the fundamental contact between God and humanity lies at the bottom of the coming into existence of each and every human person prior to the Incarnation of the Word of God in Jesus of Nazareth which is one of the ways, although truly definitive, in which God calls us creatures while we respond to the Divine call faithfully. Hence, Takizawa calls this contact the *Proto-factum Immanuel*, God with us, or

the primary divine-human contact while regarding it as identifiable with the Logos, and he calls the problem of "the Divine call and our human response" the secondary divine-human contact whose most manifest case is the Incarnation of the Word of God in Jesus of Nazareth. Barth's error, according to Takizawa, is that he views the *Proto-factum* Immanuel as first initiated by the Incarnation. ⁽¹⁷⁾

Takizawa's charge is basically right, but it should be consolidated in more precise terms in view of the fact that Barth himself speaks of the pre-history as the being of Jesus in the beginning with God (CD, 11/2, 104).⁽¹⁸⁾ In my own view, Barth's reference to the pre-existent God-man still lacks the ontological motivation of the unity of God with all creation, not merely with the man Jesus, which is the reason why Takizawa's motif of the *Proto-factum* Immanuel is theologically tenable.

However, it seems to me that Takizawa does not probe into the real, or more serious, weakness in the theology of Karl Barth, his theology of the intra-trinitarian Godhead (cf, CD, 11/1, 297).⁽¹⁹⁾ The intra-trinitarian Godhead is not conceived of as both immediately and internally related to the inner composition of creatures, including humans. Metaphysically, what is important now is not the pre-existent Christ or the Logos but some kind of an immediate ontological relationality of the Godhead and creation which is pre-cognitive but real, and of which the Logos is the supreme embodiment. This is the area of philosophical theology that is discussed neither by Barth nor by Takizawa, but is explored by Whitehead, some leading Whiteheadians, including John B. Cobb, Jr., and Buddhists, including Masao Abe, in terms of what they respectively call "creativity" and "Emptiness *qua* dependent co-origination."⁽²⁰⁾

II. Transforming Barth's Theology

A. Analogia Actionis: *A New Proposal for Christology "From Below"*

In 1984 I wrote an article entitled "Analogia Actionis: A New Proposal for Christology From Below" for *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* (39/4, 1984; now contained in Part Two). In this article I discussed the problem of Christology "from below" in my own unique way by putting forward and articulating my idea of Analogia Actionis

while transforming Barth's idea of *Analogia Fidei*. Christology "from below" is the thesis presented by Wolfhart Pannenberg in *Jesus-God and Man*.⁽²¹⁾ Pannenberg claims that Christology is concerned not only with unfolding the Christian community's confession of Christ, but with grounding this confession in the activity and fate of Jesus in the past. Pannenberg opposes traditional Christology that begins "from above," from the divinity of Jesus, in which the concept of the incarnation stands in the center. "A Christology 'from below,' rising from the historical man Jesus to the recognition of his divinity, is concerned first of all with Jesus' message and fate and arrives only at the end at the concept of the incarnation." (JGM, 33)

In the above-mentioned article, I present "analogia," as a theological method, which was employed in the Christian tradition as a way to express the possibility of the knowledge of God by human reason. It is used here, *mutatis mutandis*, to indicate the relationship between "Jesus" and "the Christ." I take Jesus' action as the key to understanding the identity of the Christ. Thus, what matters is Jesus' action. The question is: Why and how did Jesus' action make it possible for the early church to confess Jesus as the Christ? My thesis is that Jesus' action may be considered as an *analogia* of Christ. Thus, the copula "is" in the confession, "Jesus is the Christ," means "is analogous to."

I retained in my understanding of analogy the Barthian element of "univocity," in the sense of "the sole work of the actual grace of God" as this inheres in the depths of "man's conformity with the Word of God." Yet, I found that there was one problem with Barth's idea of *Analogia Fidei*. This idea absorbs what Paul Tillich calls "Jesus who is Jesus" into the "Word of God" as such.

There is no possibility of referring to an analogical relationship existing within the object (*Gegenstand*) of faith, Jesus Christ—namely, one between the historical Jesus and the Christ of faith. If the Partner of our faith is analogically related to us and Jesus alike, as I contend, we can present a new formula of interpreting the rise of what Burton Mack calls the "Christian myth": the Partner: Jesus' message::the Partner: the fulfillment of the intention implied in Jesus' message in us, including the early Church and Christians of today. This is my next issue.

B. Christ As the Problem of Analogy: Concerning the Theological-Analogical Significance of Q and the Gospel of Thomas

In my 1997 article entitled "Christ As the Problem of Analogy: Concerning the Theological-Analogical Significance of Q and the Gospel of Thomas"⁽²²⁾ (now contained in Part Two), I put the whole discussion of the historical Jesus and the Christ of faith, or the rise of the Christian myth, into the scope of one of the Thomistic types of analogy: analogy of attribution *duorum ad tertium* (two to the third). I wrote:

I have thematically studied this type of analogy in order to find ways in which we can use it in a transformatively creative fashion for contemporary comparative philosophy of religion in an article entitled "Portraying 'Autentic Existence' by the Method of Analogy: Toward Creative Uses of the Analogy of Attribution *Duorum Ad Tertium* for Comparative Philosophy of Religion."⁽²³⁾ Here suffice it to say that this type of analogy is creatively usable within the context of the New Testament problem of the relationship between the historical Jesus and the Christ of faith insofar as we can find the common ontological ground that goes beyond and above the two actualities of the "Jesus movement (s)" and what Mack refers to as "the Christ cult" while subsuming both of them under it. ("CAPA," 36)

At the core of my new thesis mentioned above is the understanding that the two actualities in question constitute the analogy of attribution *duorum ad tertium*, that is, two to the third. "The Kingdom of God" that Jesus proclaimed in Q and, accordingly, in the Synoptic Gospels, or the "Wisdom" in the case of Thomas, and "the risen Jesus as the Christ of faith" proclaimed by the primitive Church, the Christ cult, in Mack's terms, can be conceived as analogically in reference to the same Ultimate Reality. The parables of the lost sheep (Luke 15: 4-7; Q 15:4-7) and Gal. 2:20 can be selected as examples testifying to the truthfulness of this analogy. In the first case, the evocation "Rejoice with me" shows the arrow of intentionality of God's reign as it happens in the language of Jesus' parables as reality's true possibility. How is it related to Paul's

case? I came up with this grasp of the matter:

Inherent in the arrow of intentionality at issue here (which, incidentally, constitutes the "power" of what Mack calls "mythmaking" in his books, *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q and Christian Origin* ⁽²⁴⁾ and *Who Wrote the New Testament?: The Making of the Christian Myth* ⁽²⁵⁾) is the message that the more one dies to one's own ego-entirety in cor-respondence and response to the "voice of being" that comes from God's reign in the case of the historical Jesus who speaks in Q and Thomas, and who acts in the Synoptic Gospels in a narrative manner, the more one is vivified by the "power of God" manifest in Jesus as the Christ in the case of the kerygmatic theology of Apostle Paul (Rom. 1:16) to confess: "Christ lives in me." It is precisely in this spirit of analogy, in the creatively re-used sense of the analogy of attribution *duorum ad tertium*, that I would like to affirm the theological-analogical significance of Q and the Gospel of Thomas in relation to the Christ of faith, as confessed, for instance, by Paul as living "in me." ("CAPA," 43)

III. Reinterpreting Barth's Theology in a Process Perspective

Given my intermediary argument for the revisory transformation of Barth's analogical theology as in the above, I think I might be able to look back upon it afresh from a process perspective. Now, mine is the enterprise of reinterpreting it. But how can I proceed in this new enterprise?

Recently, I was reading Whitehead's *Adventures of Ideas* ⁽²⁶⁾ anew. And I came across the following passage:

Truth is a qualification which applies to Appearance alone. Reality is just itself, and it is nonsense to ask whether it be true or false. Truth is the conformation of Appearance to Reality. This conformation may be more or less, also direct or indirect. Thus Truth is a generic quality with a variety of degrees and modes. In the Law-Court, the wrong species of Truth may amount to perjury. For example, a portrait may be so faithful as to deceive the eye. Its very truthfulness then amounts to deception. A reflection in a mirror is at once a truthful appearance and a deceptive appearance. The smile of a hypocrite is deceptive, and that of a

philanthropist may be truthful. But both of them were truly smiling. (AI, Mentor, 240)

This passage reminded me anew of Barth's definition of *Analogia Fidei*, analogy of faith, as "*ein schon gelungenes, seinem Gegenstand entsprechendes Werk* (an already inherently meaningful work in correspondence to the Partner) " as a meaningful expression at a long interval since I had written my 1997 article mentioned above. I clearly noticed some affinities between Whitehead's process thought and Barth's analogical theology. Let me argue for the affinities in my own words as follows.

First, they both attend to the fact that any and every subject, i.e., the Appearance for Whitehead here, truly accomplishes himself or herself only in correspondence or conformity with the Reality. In this sense, the act of self-accomplishing is analogical for Barth; and it is processive, in the Whiteheadian sense of "concrecence." Second, what one corresponds or conforms to is the totality or reality which includes all past experiences as they are absorbed into the bosom of the Partner.

At this juncture one can notice that Barth does not explicitly talk about past experiences. But, since what he finds in the Partner is, basically, the praying existence of Christ which is the essence of the reconciliation as the obedience of the Son of God (*der Gehorsam des Sohnes Gottes*), which is the inner element of the Incarnation, in the midst of his suffering, which is the outer element, I can say that "all past experiences" are absorbed into his bosom, thereby constituting the totality or reality by way of his prayer to the Father.

This whole state of affairs must be the content of what Whitehead speaks of as the Reality. But, as you know, Whitehead here does not refer to what I designate "the praying existence of the Partner." Why not? Probably because he is more concerned here with depicting the mode of Appearance in relation to Reality—namely, conformation which is Truth—than with scrutinizing its Christological basis in theological terms.

What interests me in this conjunction is the fact that Whitehead speaks of Truth or conformation as "a generic quality with a variety of

degrees and modes." For it seems to me that by so saying Whitehead is manifesting that the field of analogy or correspondence or conformation is not specifically limited to the problem of faith, but is inclusive of all experiences in our creaturely lives, which I can subsume under the general concept of "action," as in my thesis of *Analogia Actionis*. What corresponds or conforms to the Partner or the Reality is, generally, the action or Appearance; and is, specifically, faith.

This, I believe, is very crucial in ascertaining the locus theologicus of the historical Jesus. Jesus is unique only insofar as he corresponds or conforms to the Partner or the Reality rightfully—that is, by virtue of his truthful *Analogia Actionis*. He is not unique apart from this mode of conformation or correspondence. In a word, Jesus is unique analogically, but not substantively in terms of his ego-entity as divine by nature.

A second passage that is truly intriguing to me is the following one:

In considering the process which constitutes the existence of an occasion of experience, the perception of the enduring individuals must belong to the final Appearance wherein the occasion terminates. For in the primary phase, the past is initiating the process in virtue of the energizing of its diverse individual occasions. This is the Reality from which the new occasion springs. The process is urged onward by operation of the mental pole providing conceptual subject-matter for synthesis with the Reality. There finally emerges the Appearance, which is the transformed Reality after synthesis with the conceptual valuations. (AI, Mentor, 280)

It is clear in the above that Whitehead thinks of two steps in process: one is the primary phase where the past is initiating the process in virtue of the energizing of its diverse individual occasions, namely, the Reality from which the new occasions spring; and the other is the process which is urged by operation of the mental pole providing conceptual subject-matter for synthesis with the Reality.

And here the question arises: What in terms of Christian faith is the name of that which coordinates the process of Reality consolidating past occasions into the primary, dative phase of the nascent concrescence to

the process of the nascent concrescence itself which Whitehead now calls Appearance? To this question I want to reply by reference to Barth's idea of the Partner, *der Gegenstand*, meaning the One who prayerfully stands in relation to the Father.

That is, the name of that which coordinates the Reality to the Appearance is Christ who everlastingly prays for us to the Father, the supreme One whose entire existence is, in the words of P. T. Forsyth, "*pros ton theon*" (Ger., *gegenüber dem Gott*) for us (John 1:1). In order to complete Whitehead's discussion of the two processes, Reality and Appearance, we need Barth's idea of *der Gehorsam des Sohnes Gottes*, the obedience of the Son of God, as the mediating and coordinating mode of existence that lies and works between them—and this on the condition that we can read Barth's said idea anew from the perspective of the *Proto-factum* Immanuel, i.e., God-with-us-here-now, of Takizawa's.

Then, what in terms of Christian faith is the name of the Urge onward by operation of the mental pole providing conceptual subject-matter for synthesis with the Reality? Let me answer: the name is God the Hearer who responds to God the Everlastingly Praying One by providing initial aims to each and every creature, thus urging it to accomplish its task of self-transformation. Thus, we have come to know that the Everlastingly Praying Coordinator in the universe and the Hearer work together in their mutual personhood as Spirit in encouraging our creaturely self-transformation in a dipolar manner.⁽²⁷⁾ It does this by taking into account our contingent, earthy existence to the full while at the same time necessarily and definitely urging us to be transformed from "what we have been"⁽²⁸⁾ into "what we might be able to be."⁽²⁹⁾

Concluding Remarks:

A creature's self-transformation can only happen in correspondence to the Partner who prays for us that we might realize the Hearer's urge to go onward creatively. I have learned from both Barth and Whitehead this grasp of the matter. From Barth I have learned the doctrine of reconciliation which is shot through with the vision of Christ who prays for us. This vision I might call the Christology of prayer. From Whitehead I have learned two processes, the Reality and the Appearance.

Combining the two lessons we can better understand not only the Church's doctrine of Christology but the scientific knowledge of the way in which each and every creature accomplishes itself. ⁽³⁰⁾ Is it thus possible to unite the two methods of social transformation, the Reformation and the modern natural science?

It is my sincere hope that that will be the case on the threshold of the new millennium when we need a wide scope of philosophizing, like Whitehead's, as tightly knit together with the depth-theology of the Reformation type as it is represented by Karl Barth in our time. The twenty-first century is beckoning Christians to proceed to this end in the matter of transforming Christianity and the world. We can be preparing ourselves in this manner for an inter-religious understanding of the similar and parallel pursuit of self-transformation which is under way in the East, and whose articulation I have attempted to show in two of my recent papers on Zen Master Ryokan. ⁽³¹⁾

In the case of Ryokan, it is noteworthy that he lived up to the vision of the totality or the reality as embodied in the bodhisattva-figure of the Never-Despising-Anyone who everlastingly aspires after everyone's Enlightenment despite his or her stubborn ignorance. This has meaningfully reminded me afresh of Whitehead's idea of "envisagement" in *Science and the Modern World*. There he espouses the idea to the effect that the underlying activity, coterminous with his later notion of "creativity," sees into "the actual matter of fact which must enter into the total situation which is achievable by the addition of the future[i.e., the nascent concrescence]" (SMW, 105). I have been deeply moved by this parallelism between Ryokan's life-long poetical-cum-religious/religious-cum-poetical immersion in the figure of the Never-Despising-Anyone and Whitehead's profoundly inspiring idea of "Divine envisagement of us." This parallelism truly has been playing the role of a background music resonating behind my whole reflection upon Barth and Whitehead in this article. My thoughts end here. Yet, their foreground and background will be continuously alluring me into a further consideration of the theme of self-transformation as it matters on a global scale involving both East and West in our new millennium.

Appendix:

**CHRIST AS THE PROBLEM OF ANALOGY:
TRANSFORMING AND REINTERPRETING THE THEOLOGY OF
KARL BARTH**

Tokiyuki Nobuhara

Table of Contents:

Preface

Part One:

Prayer, Christ, and Analogy in the Theology of Karl Barth

Introduction: The Method of Confrontation

Ch. I The Beginning

1. Barth's Criticism of Prayer
2. The Dialectic of Prayer

Ch. II Christology of Prayer

1. Kitamori's Criticism of Barth
2. Criticism of Kitamori from the Perspective of Barthian Theology
3. Barth's Concept of God: The Obedience of the Son of God
4. Prayer is the Act of Obedience
5. The Father as the Hearer; the Son as the Eternally Praying One
6. Critical Comments: Katsumi Takizawa et al.

Ch. III Prayer in the Knowledge of God: Analogia Fidei

1. The Actuality of the Knowledge of God
2. Criticism of Barth's Concept of Analogia Fidei

Ch. IV Conclusions

1. God's Togetherness with All Creation:
The Metaphysical Reality of God
2. Analogia Actionis: Its Actual Immediacy
3. Bipolar Analogy: Natural and Revealed
4. The Analogical Nature of Jesus' Cry

Part Two:

**The Perspective of Analogia Actionis: Transforming the Theology of
Karl Barth**

Ch. V. *Analogia Actionis*: A New Proposal for Christology "From Below"

1. The Problem
2. The Intention of "*Analogia Actionis*"
3. The Verification of "*Analogia Actionis*"
4. The Dynamics of Jesus' Action
5. Conclusions

Ch. VI Re-defining *Analogia Actionis* in Terms of a Study of Son-of-Man Christology

1. The Problem
2. *Analogia Actionis* and the New Quest of the Historical Jesus in Relation to the Son of Man
3. The Present-Future Structure/Dynamics Essential to Jesus' Understanding of Existence, As This Shifts to One Inherent in the Understanding of Existence by the Primitive Community
4. The Suffering "Son of Man"
5. Conclusions

Ch. VII Christ As the Problem of Analogy: Concerning the Theological-Analogical Significance of Q and the Gospel of Thomas

1. John Hick, *The Metaphor of God Incarnate*
2. Burton L. Mack, *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q and Christian Origins and Who Wrote the New Testament?: The Making of the Christian Myth*
 - A. The Problem of Q
 - B. The Problem of the Gospel of Thomas
3. James M. Robinson, "Jesus' Parables As God Happening"
 - A. The New Hermeneutic
 - B. The Analogical Significance of Jesus' Parables
4. Concluding Remarks

Part Three:

Systematic Theological Issues: Reinterpreting the Theology of Karl Barth

Ch. VIII The Problem of *theologia naturalis* in Dialectic Theology

1. The Problem
 2. Tillich and Barth on Paradox
 3. Brunner and Barth on *theologia naturalis*
 4. Conclusions: Toward a New Possibility of Natural Theology
 5. Appendix on Bultmann
- Ch. IX Katsumi Takizawa's Approach toward a World Theology:
A Critical Exposition from a Process Perspective
1. The Problem
 2. Takizawa's Career
 3. Takizawa's Topological Interpretation of Jesus as the Christ
 4. Takizawa's Idea of The-anthropology
 5. The *Proto-factum* Immanuel and Emptiness: A Critical Reappraisal of Takizawa's The-anthropology from a Process Perspective
- Ch. X Portraying "Authentic Existence" by the Method of Analogy:
Toward Creative Uses of the Analogy of Attribution *duorum ad tertium* for Comparative Philosophy of Religion
- Introduction
1. A Critical Survey of the Thomist Doctrine of Analogy
 2. A Christological Reinterpretation of the Analogy of Attribution *duorum ad tertium*: Luther, Barth, and Pannenberg
 - A. Martin Luther: Justification and Prayer in the Lecture on *Romans* (Römerbriefvorlesung) As a Hint
 - B. Karl Barth: Analogia Fidei and Analogia Relationis
 - (1) Analogia Fidei
 - (2) Analogia Relationis
 - C. Wolfhart Pannenberg: Doxological Analogy
 3. A Metaphysical Reinterpretation of the Analogy of Attribution *duorum ad tertium*: Whiteheadian Process Thought and the Nishida School of Buddhist Philosophy
 - A. Alfred North Whitehead and Kitaro Nishida: Their Visions of "God and the World"
 - B. Charles Hartshorne: The Mind-Body Analogy
 - (1) Hartshorne and Langer
 - (2) Hartshorne and Emmet

(3) Hartshorne's Method of Analogy

4. Concluding Remarks

A. Topology and Metaphysics of Creativity: The Metaphysical Reinterpretation of the Analogy of Attribution *duorum ad tertium*

B. Analogical Exemplification: Analogia Entis in the Sense of the Analogy of Proper Proportionality

C. The Initiation of Aims

D. The Fulfillment of Aims

Appendix to Ch. X: A Critical Review of Saburo Ichii,

Whitehead no Tetsugaku (Whitehead's Philosophy)

Ch. XI Barth and Whitehead: Transforming and Reinterpreting the Theology of Karl Barth in a Process Perspective

Introduction

1. Prayer and Christ in Barth's Analogical Theology

A. Analogia Fidei

B. Analogia Relationis

2. Transforming the Theology of Karl Barth

A. Analogia Actionis: A New Proposal for Christology "From Below"

B. Christ As the Problem of Analogy: Concerning the Theological-Analogical Significance of Q and the Gospel of Thomas

3. Reinterpreting the Theology of Karl Barth in a Process Perspective

4. Concluding Remarks

Ch. XII Epilogue

NOTES

*This text is based on my lecture delivered on August 17, 2000 at Center for Process Studies, Claremont School of Theology, 1325 North College Avenue, CA 91711, U.S.A. In completing the text I am indebted to Professor Allan Blondé, my colleague at Keiwa College, for his critical suggestions.

(1) Alfred North Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World* (New York: The Free Press, 1953), pp. 1-2. (Hereafter cited as SMW.)

(2) All of the following fifteen works were translated into Japanese by Seisaku Yamamoto et al. and published by Shoraisha in Kyoto since 1981 until 1989: *The*

- Aims of Education* (1929). New York: The Free Press, 1967; *Adventures of Ideas* (1933). New York: The Free Press, 1969; *The Concept of Nature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1920; *Essays in Science and Philosophy*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1947; *The Function of Reason* (1929). Boston: Beacon Press, 1958; *Interpretation of Science* edited by A.H. Johnson. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1961; *Modes of Thought* (1938). New York: The Free Press, 1968; *The Organisation of Thought*. London: Williams and Norgate, 1917 ; *Principia Mathematica*. Cambridge University Press, 2nd edition, 1927; *An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Natural Knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1919; *Process and Reality* (1929). Corrected Edition, edited by David Ray Griffin and Donald W. Sherburne. New York: The Free Press, 1978; *The Principle of Relativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922; *Religion in the Making* (1926). New York: Meridian, 1974; *Symbolism: Its Meaning and Effect*. New York: Macmillan, 1927; *Science and the Modern World* (1925). New York: The Free Press, 1967.
- (3) *Process Theology: An Introductory Exposition* (co-authored by David Ray Griffin). Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1978; translated by Tokiyuki Nobuhara. Tokyo: Shinkyu Shuppansha, 1978. *Praying for Jennifer: An Exploration of Intercessory Prayer in Story Form*. Nashville: The Upper Room, 1985; translated by Tokiyuki Nobuhara and Nobuko Nobuhara. Tokyo: Jordan Press, 1990.
 - (4) *Beyond Dialogue: Toward a Mutual Transformation of Christianity and Buddhism*. Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1982; translated by Tokiyuki Nobuhara. Kyoto: Kohro Sha, 1985.
 - (5) *Is It Too Late?: A Theology of Ecology*. Revised Edition. Denton, Texas: Environmental Ethics Books, 1994; translated by Yoshitaka Goh. Tokyo: Jordan Press, 1999.
 - (6) *Matters of Life and Death*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991; translated by Tokiyuki Nobuhara. Tokyo: The Board of Publications, UCC, Japan, 2000.
 - (7) Incidentally, after the present lecture was delivered I published a Japanese book entitled *Between Whitehead and Nishida-tetsugaku: The Idea of a Buddhist-Christian Philosophy* (Kyoto: Hozokan, 2002), which is my own contribution to the development of process thought in Japan in dialogue with the Kyoto school of Buddhist philosophy founded by Kitaro Nishida (1870-1945).
 - (8) See Appendix.
 - (9) Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S. A. & London, England, University Microfilms International, 1982. This work is now contained in "Books in the Jacques Maritain Center at Notre Dame: Thomist Dissertations or Dissertations on Aquinas" <http://www.nd.edu/Departments/Maritain/thomist.htm>
 - (10) See Batista Mondin, *The Principle of Analogy in Protestant and Catholic Theology* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1968), p. 148.
 - (11) Karl Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, translated by Edwyn C. Hoskyns (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), p. 317.
 - (12) Karl Barth, *The Resurrection of the Dead*, translated by H.J. Stenning (New York:

- Fleming H. Revell, 1933), p. 104.
- (13) Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, I/1, translated by G.W. Bromily (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975), p. 280.
 - (14) Duns Scotus holds that the relation of creatures to God is formally distinct from, but really identical with, God. This view of Scotus's is confirmed by William Ockham. See Julius R. Weinberg, *Abstraction, Relation, and Induction: Three Essays in the History of Thought* (Madison and Milwaukee: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1965), p. 103.
 - (15) Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, II/1, translated by T.H.L. Parker, W.B. Johnson, H. Knight, J.L.M. Haire (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1957), p. 81.
 - (16) Karl Barth, *Kirchliche Dogmatik*, I/1, p. 257. (Hereafter cited as KD.)
 - (17) Katsumi Takizawa, *Bukkyo to Kirisutokyo* (Buddhism and Christianity) (Kyoto: Hozokan, 1964), p. 49.
 - (18) Barth at times seems to be thinking of the pre-history, i.e., the being of Jesus in the beginning with God, as the ontological relationship between God and humanity, that is, as "eternal covenant" (CD, II/2, 105; cf. Eberhard Jüngel, *The Doctrine of the Trinity: God's Being is in Becoming*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1976, p. 74; hereafter cited as DT). However, in my view, this contradicts his idea that the intra-trinitarian relationship is in proportion to the intra-mundane (e.g., male-female) relationships, because the pre-history cannot be intrinsically explicable of the intra-mundane relationships. In my opinion, the divine-human bond or covenant must be such a notion as is capable of explicating intrinsically both the intra-trinitarian Godhead and intra-mundane relationships. Such a notion of bond can be found in Whitehead's creativity. Then, the formulation of proportionality is thus: The Godhead as creativity is the creativity of creatures. In this formulation the "is" is the bond between the two creativities and is in itself creativity. My conviction is that this relational idea of creativity must be at the base of Whitehead's vision of "the four creative phases in which the universe accomplishes its actuality" appearing in the final pages of *Process and Reality*.
 - (19) According to Jüngel (DT, 68), for Barth the doctrine of the Trinity, by the proposition of the *perichoresis* of the three divine modes of being, is the ontological basis for the analogia relationis between God's being for himself and his being for us. Interestingly enough, Jüngel refers in this connection to Hegel's notion of the "concrete" unity of God's being as "*concrecere*" (to grow together) (DT, 32). For a different exposition of the *perichoresis*, see Jürgen Moltmann, *Trinität und Reich Gottes: zur Gotteslehre* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1980), pp. 191-195.
 - (20) See John B. Cobb, Jr., "Buddhist Emptiness and the Christian God," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, XLV (1977), 11-25.
 - (21) Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Jesus-God and Man*, translated by Lewis L. Wilkins and Duane A. Priebe (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1968). (Hereafter cited as JGM.)
 - (22) Tokiyuki Nobuhara, "Christ As the Problem of Analogy: Concerning the Theological-Analogical Significance of Q and the Gospel of Thomas," *Bulletin of*

Keiwa College, No. 6, February 28, 1997. (Hereafter cited as "CAPA.")

- (23) *Bulletin of Keiwa College*, No. 1, February 28, 1992, 61-83; No. 2, February 28, 1993, 27-50; No. 3, February 28, 1994, 1-19.
- (24) New York: Harper Collins, 1993.
- (25) New York: Harper Collins, 1995.
- (26) New York: A Mentor Book, The New American Library, 1933. (Hereafter cited as AI, Mentor.)
- (27) Cf. Paul Davies, *The Mind of God* (New York: Touchstone, 1993), pp. 181-193; esp.: "For those, such as process theologians, who chose to see God's guiding hand rather than genuine spontaneity in the way the universe develops creatively, then stochasticity can be regarded as an efficient device through which divine intentions can be carried out. And there is no need for such a God to interfere directly with the course of evolution by 'loading the dice,' a suggestion I mentioned in passing in chapter 5. Guidance can be through the (timeless) laws of organization and information flow" (p. 192).
- (28) Cf.: "Usually, to be sure, man considers only the stubble field of transitoriness and overlooks the full granaries of the past, wherein he had salvaged once for all his deeds, his joys and also his sufferings. Nothing can be undone, and nothing can be done away with. I should say having been is the surest kind of being" (Viktor E. Frankl, *Man's Search for Meaning*, Revised and Updated, New York: Washington Square Press, 1959, 1962, 1984), pp. 143-144.
- (29) Cf.: "We [John and Elizabeth Sherrill] commented to her [Corrie Ten Boom, a courageous Christian woman who became a militant heroine of the anti-Nazi underground] about the practicalness of everything she recalled, how her memories seemed to throw a spotlight on problems and decisions we faced here and now. 'But,' she said, 'this is what the past is for! Every experience God gives us, every person He puts in our lives is the perfect preparation for the future that only He can see'" (John and Elizabeth Sherrill, the Preface to Corrie Ten Boom, *The Hiding Place*, New York: Bantam Books, 1971), p. viii.
- (30) Precisely in this connection I attend to the following profoundly meaningful question of Whitehead's in *Adventures of Ideas*: "But we have to ask whether nature does not contain within itself a tendency to be in tune, an Eros urging towards perfection" (AI, Mentor, 251). This question seems to have to do with the following observation of nature by Whitehead: "We enjoy the green foliage of the spring greenly: we enjoy the sunset with an emotional pattern including among its elements the colours and the contrasts of the vision. It is this that makes Art possible: it is this that procures the glory of perceived nature. For if the subjective form of reception be not conformal to the objective sensa, then the values of the percept would be at the mercy of the chance make-up of the other components in that experience" (AI, Mentor, 250). The word "conformal" in this passage, in my view, can be read as implying the cooperative work of the Coordinator and the Hearer in the Spirit of Love giving rise to our enjoyment of the green foliage as "greenly." This intra-Trinitarian cooperative work taking place in nature in coordinating "what we have

been" (the Reality) to "what we might be able to be" (the Appearance) is in tune with what Paul Davies calls "the (timeless) laws of organization and information flow." Actually, it is the creative Urge towards perfection of the (timeless) laws of (self-realizing) organization and information flow inherent in nature.

- (31) See Tokiyuki Nobuhara, "Ryokan's Interpretation of the Never-Despising-Anyone in *Hokke-san* and Whitehead's Idea of 'Envisagement'," for The International Conference on "the Lotus Sutra and Process Thought" held at Bandaiso, Fukushima, Japan, July 13-18, 2000 under the leadership of Dr. Gene Reeves, academic advisor, Rissho Kosei Kai; see also Tokiyuki Nobuhara, "Ryokan in a Global Age of East-West Dialogue: What We Can Learn from Ryokan about Aging and Dying," for The Society for Buddhist-Christian Studies 2000 Conference "Buddhism, Christianity and Global Healing" hosted by Pacific Lutheran University, August 4-12, 2000, Tacoma, Washington, U.S.A. These papers are now contained in my book *Ryokan in a Global Age* (Niigata: Kokodo, 2001) as chapters 11 and 12.