

Preface

Who is God? And what is God? (*Qui sit et quid sit Deus*). These are the questions of an entire lifetime. Nothing reaches so deep into the purpose of human life, nor demands the full scope of the human intellect as do these two brief queries. They stand at the head of Thomas Aquinas's majestic *Summa Theologica*, and by right they belong to the capital and the footing of any systematic theology. This book offers one answer to these haunting and demanding questions in the doctrine of God.

Most properly, these are *two* questions, and not one. This may appear to be a trivial point—a truism, really—but in fact, much in dogmatics turns on this point. Modern Christian theology has shown an allergy to questions about Deity—what God is.¹ *Deitas*, “Godness” or Deity, is a rare word and concept in Holy Scripture, and many Protestant dogmaticians consider it both “abstract” (not a compliment in this lexicon) and philosophical (scarcely better.) Much to be preferred, in systematic work, both Catholic and Protestant, has been the question of Divine Identity—who God is. Indeed, the impulse of much modern theology is to assimilate the question of Deity into the question of identity: Almighty God just is, in length and breadth, height and depth, altogether who He is.² Such compression and assimilation of *quiddity* into identity seeks to head off what many

modern theologians consider to be a foreign invader: “substance metaphysics.” “God is not an Object,” we hear said often in these circles; nor should God be examined under metaphysical instruments, they say, measuring out divine qualities, properties, natures, and essences. The Living God of Holy Scripture, modern dogmatics tells us, is personal or better, a Person, the True Subject, and declares through His own sovereign self-disclosure who He is.³ Theology is *encounter*, we are told, and proper dogmatics listens to the Lord’s speech and receives the Lord’s working. From this spring the marvelous dynamism and singularity of Karl Barth’s remarkable doctrine of God.

Now, this book says otherwise. I should be quick to say that I do not reject the question of who God is! Most certainly this belongs to any Christian doctrine of God! But this theology does not minimize or set aside or rebuke the initial question of what God is. Indeed, one fundamental axiom of this book is that the searching and searing question about God is properly twofold: always the Reality of God presses us to set forth and praise God’s Deity—His Nature and His Identity. Almighty God, we say, is *both* Object and Subject; *both* What and Who. In just this astonishing truth lies the surpassing humility of God, that He will come within our roof, appear to heart and mind as Spiritual Substance, lie open to our investigation and praise. Deity will “receive predicates,” be described and set out as a Nature with Attributes. Divine Objectivity will invite us—a great wonder!—to explore the Unique Reality that is Deity: Omnipresence, Omnipotence, Omniscience, Infinity. God not only visits this poor earth, not only stoops down to sustain and guide, not only looks down on the children of earth, and knows each heart and rein, but *also* just is Substantial Presence, Power, and Knowledge itself. Deity is unique and measureless Holiness, Humility, and Spirit; God is the perfect Wholeness that is Eternity

itself. Deity is itself immutable, impassible, yet in such a surpassing manner that mutability and passibility are caught up in its own Perfection. Deity is Goodness itself: all the Attributes of Divine Objectivity are ethical, through and through. For this reason alone, every property of Deity is most properly called a Perfection. In all this, and beyond all this, Deity is Mystery: hidden, invisible, transcendent Mystery. The Objectivity of God closes the intellect up in wonder. The richness of this Mystery is inexhaustible, and we study it only in prayer.

But this is not all that should be said; not by a great measure! For God is also Subject, also Person and alive. Who God is can never be eclipsed, nor set aside, nor undermined in proper Christian dogmatics. Though these foundational questions are properly twofold, their referent is altogether One, simply God. Almighty God does not “possess” Perfections, nor “have” a nature: His Objectivity is not under the aegis of His Subjectivity. The Lord God, rather, is simply personal, Person, in all His Nature and Substance: He is *this Living One*, this Identity altogether in His full Reality. Indeed, we are right to *order* these questions, for the Subjectivity of God appears first in Holy Scripture: He speaks, commands, beholds, and blesses. Always we stand before a Living God who gives Himself to be known and loved. All the Perfections of God are properly “ethicized,” yes. But even more properly, they are personalized. God is Knowledge itself that knows; Humility and Dynamism that lowers itself; Presence and Love that invites, heals, exalts. The Holy One is not a character, an individual, for all that! This theology joins its modern compatriots in their vigorous rejection of God as “another object in the cosmos,” as Karl Rahner often expressed this point. When we bow our intellects down before the Almighty Lord, we do not worship an I AM who is a heavenly being, picked out and rendered supreme over other rivals. God’s Identity does not

individuate! Rather, in all His unsearchable and infinite Mystery, God is Person and Nature, Subject and Substance: One God.

Once more we must pause before a seemingly anodyne, wholly biblical phrase: *the One God*. Perhaps nothing so marks out the modern in systematic theology as the aversion to the scholastic treatise, *De Deo Uno*. It belongs not to the preface but rather the body of the dogmatic work to lay out the broad movement in present-day dogmatics that has pressed the treatise *De Deo Trino* to the fore;⁴ indeed, it crowds out and supplants the exposition of the One God. But even here we must say that the doctrine of the Trinity, however central to the Christian mystery, must not be allowed to replace or silence the Oneness of God. God is supremely, gloriously One; surpassingly, uniquely One. Nothing is more fundamental to the Reality of God that this utter Unicity. Such is God's Nature; such His Person: One. Oneness governs the Divine Perfections: all in the doctrine of God must serve, set forth, and conform to the transcendent Unity of God. Now, to say all this aligns the Christian doctrine of God with the faiths of Abraham, Judaism, and Islam; indeed of all monotheisms—for *monotheism* is not a shame word! The Christian affirmation of divine Unicity opens it, like the merciful and welcoming Lord it serves, to the peoples and faiths of the good earth. But this cannot serve as *ground* for such a fundamental axiom in dogmatics. Rather, we must appeal to Holy Scripture.

Nothing, we say, is so close to the heart of Scripture as is the Oneness of God. The people of God, the people Israel, worship the One God, and the everlasting covenant between this people and its Lord, is affirmed, honored, and kept by the teaching that the Lord God is One, Unique. There is no form nor likeness, no visible presence in temple or cult—no “idol”—no consort nor rival, to this One God. From the First Commandment to the Shema, from the prohibition of idolatry to the prophetic call for purity in Israel's

cultus, from Moses to the Maccabees, nothing is so adamant, so relentless, so holy as the call to honor the Oneness of God. Just this we learn from the lips of our Lord, Jesus Christ: that we are to love the One God with all our heart, with all our soul, with all our mind, and with all our strength. This is the first and great commandment. We follow the prophets and apostles as we teach, worship, and study the One God. Indeed, we must say that the Mystery of the Trinity must in itself be a form of Oneness: here too the ineffable Unicity of God must govern, conform, and set forth the Triune Reality of God. Just so, this volume of the systematic theology that is before you sets forth the Oneness of God; the Mystery of Trinity will follow in the next volume.

In all this ordering of the Divine Perfections and Unicity, we quietly set out how Holy Scripture is to be heard and honored and leaned upon in this theology. This book is biblical theology; just that. It may appear odd—even self-contradictory—to affirm in such flat-footed a manner that this systematics aims to be biblical theology in the midst of all this talk of Attributes and Substance, metaphysics and foundational predicates. Indeed, the very supersession of *De Deo Uno* by *De Deo Trino* is considered by its advocates to be a mighty victory for Holy Scripture in the camp of foreign philosophy and culture. But we must say simply, not so. There is no place here within a preface to “defend” such a claim; indeed there is, properly, no defense possible of such a primary allegiance. Rather this book itself must be the *demonstration* of the principle loyalty, an unfolding of life lived before the unique and holy book of Scripture. In this place we can only say that this theology does not consider the doctrine of the Divine Perfections to be anything other than a scriptural setting forth and hallowing of the Lord God. The aim, here, is not to incorporate “tradition”—scholastic or otherwise—into a ranked order, where primacy of place is reserved for Holy Writ. To be sure, we

do not scorn the aid of the great schoolmen, or of the tradition of the doctors of the church: we are grateful for these witnesses and their instruction. We stand within the church, without hesitation or reserve. But this is not because the great church tradition finds its home in this theology as “source” of some parallel or lesser kind. Nor is it because we shun novelty (there is much here that I believe to be new), or pray that the sturdy walls of the church will withstand and repel all criticism (not the church but God is perfect). No! Rather the doctrine that follows in this volume seeks to listen to Holy Scripture, to feed on it, and from its riches, bring forth the Divine Perfections of the One God. We seek to confess who and what God is in biblical idiom, guidance, and subject matter. To this end we give pride of place to the scriptural language of the Perfections.

God is invisible and hidden; that is His Omnipresence. In this section, an exegesis of Isaiah and the Elisha cycle is complemented by a wide-ranging reading of the Invisibility of God in Romans and Philippians, and throughout by the gospel accounts of the Hidden Lord. God is humble and living; that is His Omnipotence. This section finds its moorings in the wonder of the burning bush and in the anguish of the prophet Jeremiah, followed by a reading of the book of Numbers and the creation narrative in Genesis. God is Eternal Spirit and Lady Wisdom; that is Divine Omniscience. Here we are led and sustained by the Wisdom literature, by an extended reflection upon the face of Moses and of Christ, as they mirror and succeed one another, in 1 and 2 Corinthians and in the wilderness narratives within the Pentateuch. God is Love; that is His very Nature and Goodness. Here we lean upon the texts that treat Divine Love directly, but not only those. An exegesis of the Jonathan and David cycle instructs us in the Aseity that is Love.

In all this, we do not aim to provide merely a pious livery for philosophical abstraction! It will require a long excursus on the fiery

polemic of Karl Barth against all “natural theology” to defend with some dignity the fittingness of this endeavor. But the underlying conviction of this systematics—the prayer and faith of the whole—is that a theologian is most highly honored and most ably put to use when named as a doctor of the sacred page. Indeed, it is my conviction that the great doctors of the church have been nothing less than this; and this is their glory.

Now it may seem odd—troubling, perhaps—that in all this appeal to Holy Scripture the Lord Jesus Christ is mentioned only in passing, hardly at the center of this reading or reasoning. In one way we must acknowledge that this dogmatic volume cuts against the grain of modern Protestant dogmatics: unlike most nineteenth- and twentieth-century systematic work, this theology is neither Christomorphic nor Christocentric.⁵ A repeated refrain in this work must be that not all is Christology! Like the decision to begin the doctrine of God with the Divine Oneness, this move away from Christological grounding and concentration marks a sharp break from the contours and method of most Western theology, Catholic and Protestant alike.⁶ So pronounced is the Christological turn in modern theology that a doctrine of God shaped and set forth in other forms must appear to many readers as hardly biblical at all—nonbiblical in truth. Now, it will be the aim of this dogmatics to honor Christ throughout a doctrine of God that is nevertheless not grounded nor derived from His incarnate life. Only the work as a whole can exhibit, or confound, my belief that Jesus Christ, and His Lordship, can be properly honored in this way and by this doctrine. But even here we must sketch out how Jesus Christ will appear and live and be praised in this doctrine of the One God.

We must say, first, that it is the *Deity* of Christ we seek to honor in this opening volume of a systematic theology. In my view, the Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ has received far too little attention,

praise, and adoration in modern Christological dogmatics. Indeed, the focus upon *narrative*, so pronounced in post-Barthian dogmatics, appeals in often straightforward ways to the “human story” of Jesus, His ways among us as Son of Man.⁷ So, too, the modern schools of theology, in themselves so sharply distinct, of liberation theology and kenotic theology, share this taste in Christology: that the full human nature of Jesus should be set before our eyes, be found credible, worthy, radical, inspiring. Even the striking theopassionism of much modern theology draws our attention, even in Christ’s Deity, to His *suffering*, His bodily and spiritual agony in an altogether political and pitiless torment and death.⁸ The pronounced distaste for metaphysics, for “speculation” and “abstraction” in Christian doctrine finds its parallel—and its source—in the lowly Lord of Bethlehem, the human Christ who shares our lot, is buried deep in our sorrow and shame. There is a time for all this, I hasten to say! Nothing could make acceptable to Christian doctrine a Christology that did not fully share our ways and lot. But in this book, I seek to honor Christ as God, just that: in His Divine Nature, invisible, humble, wise, the One God. In His Divine Nature, omnipresent, omnipotent, omniscient, the One God. In His Deity, Christ is Love, eternal, surpassing, glorious Love. It is by setting forth the Divine Perfections, by allowing ourselves to glimpse how Scripture tells us *Quid sit Deus* that we recognize and bow down before the One God, incarnate. This is our first aim in the honoring of Jesus Christ within the doctrine of the One God.

But there is a second, more “methodological” reason for our theocentrism than the first. (Just here we see the formal axiom of this dogmatics: “method” *follows* doctrine, and rises up out of it.) Christology proper honors a particular *relationship* and *connection* between Deity and humanity, Divine Nature and the human. This is the “Chalcedonian relation or pattern,” named from the great fifth-century conciliar definition of the Person of Christ, and characterized

by four adverbs: Christ's Natures are joined in His Person—"hypostatically"—without change, without confusion, without separation, without division. Now it has been the deep conviction of many modern dogmaticians that this fourfold *relation* should govern all doctrine. We should see the God-world relation, these Christological theologians say, as conforming to or as an instance of the Divine and human Natures of Christ, each whole, entire, integral, and joined without mixture or division. The Chalcedonian pattern governs sacraments, creation, ecclesiology, providence and in an especially Christological way, election, each "making all things captive" to the Lord Jesus Christ.⁹

Now, all hail, Chalcedon! But this theology affirms that the God-world relation is both unique and *sui generis*; indeed it is this very claim that allows Incarnation to be, in its own sphere, both unique and *sui generis*. The Hypostatic Union is not more greatly honored, I say, by becoming the pattern or genus into which all Creator-creature relations are subsumed. Rather, I believe that Christ is fitly honored by recognizing and reserving for His alone the personal relation of Deity and humanity in the Mystery of His own personal Life. He will serve as our Representative, the Face we behold when the Perfect comes. But His own distinct Mystery, His exceeding Holiness and Deity, joined to perfect flesh, will take command and majestically hold the volume dedicated to His Person and work.

So in this place, in the doctrine of the Divine Perfections, we range alongside this unique Christological *Relatio* the God-world relation we broadly term *compatibilism*. Deity is not repugnant to the cosmos, nor paradoxical to it. We do not find a *contradiction* or opposition between the One Lord and all that He has made. Rather, the Divine Reality is *compatible* with the cosmos: God has a "positive" relation to

the world. The thornbush burns with divine fire, and the bush is not consumed.

Now, such theological compatibilism will be set out in varying forms, each governed by the Divine Perfection fit to it. Doctrine governs and generates method, not the converse! (For this reason even the “negative” predicates are forms of positive attribution, a positive relation to the world and to thought.) The Lord God *communicates* His Perfections; He sheds them abroad, lavishly, invisibly. Such communication does not exhaust or contain or diminish the Divine Fullness; rather the One Lord remains transcendent, incommunicable, unique even and especially in His humble communication of Wisdom, Perfection, Love, and Power. Such Divine Aseity within the world of creatures we will term the *Transcendental Relation*: the One God will descend from the realm of lights down into the world of things and thought, to sustain, mingle with, and give the Life and Love and heavenly fire that is Divine Goodness itself. Again, we witness the Lord’s unique relation to the world in the Divine Reality that *mixes* itself down into the earth, the Life of all who live, the Truth of all our little truths, the Wisdom of all our human ways. So humble is this God that He will lay Himself down in our knowledge, making our paths straight, illumining our darkness, raising up the creature in His own ineffable Light. We know God in His Aseity in our poor words and thoughts. The Lord will radiate His own Light in our Scripture, dwelling there, invisible and mighty, the treasure of great price, hidden in the earthen field of the Word. A doctrine of illumination lies at the heart of the Divine Perfection of Omniscience. As Eternal Spirit, the One Lord interleaves even into our own subjectivities, the Spirit mingled with our own, interceding, sighing, plunging the depths of God. This is the exceeding Goodness of our God, His Lowliness, that He will come to us, and make His dwelling there.

So in the end, we must say that a doctrine of God cannot but take the wings of prayer. There is no study, no examination nor understanding, without a heart seared by intercession, by repentance, by worship and praise. The Objectivity of God—this Beauteous Light—brings forth from the creatures who behold it a wonder that lies beyond saying. The Subjectivity of God—this Living One—kindles the fiery love that is the Lord’s own gift, set ablaze in the creature’s heart. This is the proper dogmatic form of the doctrine of God: the intellect, bent down, glorified, in prayer.

Notes

1. This “allergy” to investigation of Deity begins early. Already in Calvin’s *Institutes* (bk. 1, ch. 2) we see Calvin denounce “bare speculation” on “quid Deus sit/ what God is,” holding up instead a piety joined with reverence for God’s will for us. Calvin’s distrust of “speculation” cast a long shadow. In as sturdy a mediating theologian as Herman Bavinck we see a strong commitment to Divine Incomprehensibility and Mystery joined to the emerging attention to a doctrine of revelation that alone can guide knowledge of the Personal God. (See Bavnick, Herman. *Reformed Dogmatics, Vol. 1: Prologomena*. John Vriend, trans. John Bolt, ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2003), with much historical bibliography.) Among liberal academic theologians, these emphases only deepen and sharpen. The “antimetaphysical” bent of Albrecht Ritschl and Adolf Harnack became a kind of school banner, identifying a radical form of Kantianism with Reformation doctrines of *sola Scriptura*. (See Ritschl, *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, H. R. Mackintosh and A. B. Macaulay, eds. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1900), volume 3, and Harnack, *What is Christianity?: Lectures delivered in the University of Berlin during the Winter-Term 1899-1900*, Thomas Bailey Saunders, trans. (New York: G.P. Putnam’s sons, 1901). These trajectories find their natural home in Wilhelm Hermann (see *The Communion of the Christian with God: Described on the basis of Luther’s statements*. 1903. J. Sandys Stanyon, trans. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2002), one of Barth’s early teachers whose influence and charisma he never

wholly cast off. Karl Barth made a full methodological and theological program from the rejection of a “bare, speculative, abstract and inert” Deity (See *Church Dogmatics* II.2, Doctrine of God, G.W. Bromiley and T.F. Torrance, eds. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1957), and his legacy has been received in full by Robert Jenson (*Systematic Theology: Vol. 1 The Triune God*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.), Eberhard Jüngel (*God as the Mystery of the World: On the Foundations of the Theology of the Crucified One in the Dispute between Theism and Atheism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1983.) and Colin Gunton. (See, among many, *The Triune Creator: A Historical and Systematic Study*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1998).

2. As the reader will be quick to note, this doctrine of God retains the traditional language and titles for God: He, the Lord, the Almighty. This is *not* a repudiation of feminist theology or its sophisticated analysis of creaturely language for God. Indeed, feminist questions arise directly in part III, on Divine Omnipotence, and in part IV, on Divine Omniscience. Rather, feminist analyses and aims can best be prosecuted, I say, by retaining personal language for God (both He and She, as laid out in §6a), and by confidently asserting and assuming that the broad tradition of the church, its creeds, confessions, and scriptural idiom, is ours, male and female, by baptism, by call, and by gracious gift of the One, Holy Lord of the whole earth.
3. The doctrine of revelation stands behind much of the personalism in modern dogmatics. For theologians schooled in Kantianism, revelation came to be seen as the place where God alone could be known, and that as the One who *speaks, discloses* Himself. Karl Barth develops this *via* to knowledge of God with single-minded intensity (see *Church Dogmatics*, I.1) and from this spring his pronounced event-centered ontology and personalism. Rudolf Bultmann’s focus on the coinherence of revelation and human decision is another variant (See *Jesus and the Word*. L.P. Smith and E.H. Lantero, trans. New York, Scribner. 1980); Paul Tillich’s account of faith as ultimate concern or concern with the Ultimate a third. (See *Dynamics of Faith*. New York: Harper, 1957) Roman Catholic personalism arises from different headwaters: Husserl and Scheler above Kant and Schleiermacher. But an emphasis upon a living relationship, embedded in concrete forms of life join the two streams. Encounter through personal exchange was not confined to Christian sources, however. In the interwar years, both Martin Buber and Franz Rosenzweig developed religious landscapes in which “address, encounter and living speech” became main actors. See for example the much-studied Martin Buber. *I and Thou*. Walter Kaufman, trans. New York: Scribner, 1970,

- and Franz Rosensweig. *The Star of Redemption*. Elliot R. Wolfson, trans. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2005, part III.
4. The “Trinitarian revival” has been traced to twin geniuses: Karl Rahner and Karl Barth. Rahner’s remarkable essay for his encyclopedia, *Mysterium Salutis*, now published separately as *The Trinity*. Joseph Donceel, trans. New York: Herder, 1970. (New York: Crossroad, 2003) provides the template for considering much Christian piety as “sheer monotheism”—see p. 42, note 43. Karl Barth announced the Trinity as a form of revelation in his *Church Dogmatics*, I.1, thereby joining the modern doctrine of revelation to the Triune God as proper and sole Subject of dogmatics. Because of the Christological concentration of these doctrines of the Trinity, they remain distinctly modern, belonging to the pronounced Christological focus of modern theology, and not simply as variants on Peter Lombard’s Sentences and early Trinitarianism in the doctrine of God.
 5. To “take a Christological shape”—Christomorphism—or to focus principally on Christology—Christocentrism—is to follow the pattern Richard Niebuhr sets out in his influential essay on Schleiermacher, *Schleiermacher on Christ and Religion: A New Introduction*. (New York: Scribner, 1964). Schleiermacher, he argues, begins a long trajectory in academic theology in which Christ’s own Reality—His Person or work or consciousness or piety—grounds, orders, and gives shape to Christian doctrine. German academic theology is Christomorphic in just this sense: the faith of Jesus Christ orders and molds dogmatic teaching, even in areas devoted to other *loci*. In Wilhelm Herrmann we see a radicalization of this pattern: Jesus Christ becomes both the content and the form of Christian teaching. In *this* sense (and not in others) Karl Barth remains faithful to his nineteenth-century inheritance. In my view, nothing excels the dissertation of Hans Frei for clarifying and assessing Barth’s “break with liberalism.” (*The Doctrine of Revelation in the Thought of Karl Barth, 1909 to 1922: The Nature of Barth’s Break with Liberalism*. Yale University PhD dissertation, 1956, Religion.) My own conviction is that the God-world relation cannot be wholly exhausted or reduced to a Christomorphic one—a Chalcedonian pattern, for example—nor is Christology the sole ground or *via* in the doctrine of God.
 6. The Christological concentration of the modern era has not passed by the Roman Catholic dogmaticians, both in systematic work and in liturgical renewal. The *ressourcement* associated with Henri de Lubac and Maria Laach made Christology the centerpiece of sacramental theology and of worship. This bore fruit in the major constitutions of Vatican II, *Lumen Gentium*

and *Gaudium et Spes*, both distinctly Christological in character. Theological method in the Catholic world took a Christological turn in the debate over analogy conducted in the interwar years. The *analogia fidei*, an analogical relation strongly scriptural and Christomorphic in form, played an increasingly prominent role in the piety and doctrine of Erich Przywara, despite his long association with the “dynamic polarity” of the *analogia entis*. His interlocutors went further. Gottlieb Söehngung ordered the analogy of being to the analogy of faith, marking the Christological turn more sharply in Catholic dogmatics. The great systematic theologians of European Catholicism, Karl Rahner and Hans Urs von Balthasar, place Christology at the heart of Catholic teaching; both show deep respect for Karl Barth.

7. We might note this turn toward the human story of Jesus in theologians as varied as Rowan Williams (see his *On Christian Theology*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell, 2000, chs.7, 16, 17; *Resurrection*. Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 2003), James Cone (see now his *The Cross and the Lynching Tree*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2011.); William Placher, *Narratives of a Vulnerable God: Christ, theology, and scripture*. (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994); Hans Frei, *The Identity of Christ*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2013
8. Long considered an article of faith in the doctrine of God, Divine Impassibility has been thrown in the shade in our era by a direct affirmation of Divine suffering. Jürgen Moltmann is widely known for his daring development of Divine Passibility (see *The Crucified God*. R.A. Wilson and John Bowden, trans. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993), itself inspired by liberation theology in Latin America and Asia. The Christocentric element in modern theology has schooled a generation of Christians to accept as gospel the claim that God suffers on Golgotha. Taken as a “new orthodoxy,” Thomas Weinandy and Paul Gavrilyuk have devoted monographs to divine suffering, offering some of the few defenses for traditional impassibility. (See Thomas G. Weinandy. *Does God Suffer?* South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2000 and Paul L. Gavrilyuk. *The Suffering of the Impassible God: The Dialectics of Patristic Thought*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.)
9. The great exemplar of this Christological form in dogmatics is Karl Barth. His *Church Dogmatics* has been analyzed using the “Chalcedonian pattern” by George Hunsinger in *How to Read Karl Barth: The Shape of his Theology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993. But we can see this patterning in other Christocentric theologians as well: Kathryn Tanner’s noncompetitive

relation reflects the two-nature doctrine (see *Jesus, Humanity, and the Trinity*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2001.), as does Eberhard Jüngel's analogy of faith. (See *God as the Mystery of the World*.) Another example from a quite distant region of the theological landscape is William Temple, esp. in his Gifford Lectures, *Nature, Man, and God*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1934 and his early treatise, *Christus Veritas: An Essay*. London: Macmillan, 1954.