

**UNIVERSITATEA BABEȘ-BOLYAI DIN CLUJ-NAPOCA  
FACULTATEA DE TEOLOGIE REFORMATĂ**

**THE CHANGING POSITION OF WOMEN AND THE  
PASTORAL-THEOLOGICAL REFLECTIONS TO IT**

**DISSERTATION ADVISOR:**

**PROF. DR. JÁNOS MOLNÁR**

**DOCTORAL CANDIDATE:**

**SZABÓ ILDIKÓ**

**CLUJ-NAPOCA**

**2014**

## Table of contents

Preface – Acknowledgements

|             |                                                                                       |     |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>1.</b>   | <b>Introduction and presuppositions</b>                                               | 1   |
| 1.1.        | 1.1. The used terminology and the theological, congregational context of the question | 2   |
| 1.2.        | Methodology                                                                           | 6   |
|             | 1.2.1. Anthropological questions                                                      | 6   |
|             | 1.2.2. Antecedents in the history of science                                          | 8   |
| 1.3.        | Miscellaneous suppositions                                                            | 10  |
| 1.4.        | A look forward                                                                        | 11  |
| <b>2.</b>   | <b>The changed role of women</b>                                                      | 13  |
| 2.1.        | Women's movements, women's emancipation, clarification of the term feminism           | 13  |
|             | 2.1.1. Two different approaches to the feminist theories                              | 15  |
| 2.2.        | A framework of interpretation for the women's emancipation (and feminism)             | 21  |
|             | 2.2.1. Feminism as the trial of modernism                                             | 22  |
|             | 2.2.2. Feminism as a special emancipation struggle within the general emancipation    | 27  |
| 2.3.        | Theories of the philosophers of the enlightenment on women                            | 33  |
|             | 2.3.1. The myth of female irrationality                                               | 37  |
|             | 2.3.2. The myth of motherhood                                                         | 40  |
| <b>3.</b>   | <b>The consideration of women in the history of theology</b>                          | 47  |
| 3.1.        | The tradition of the Torah and Jesus' view on women                                   | 47  |
| 3.2.        | Paul – a return to socially accepted morals?                                          | 49  |
| 3.3.        | Augustine – the consequences of the teaching of the original sin                      | 52  |
| 3.4.        | The Aristotelian roots of the image of the woman in Thomas Aquinas                    | 56  |
| 3.5.        | The image of the women in the Lutheran reformation                                    | 59  |
| 3.6.        | Calvin's image of the woman                                                           | 61  |
| 3.7.        | Summary, points forward                                                               | 65. |
| <b>4.</b>   | <b>Kerygmatic theology and pastoral care</b>                                          | 68  |
| <b>4.1.</b> | <b>The development of pastoral care as a science</b>                                  | 68  |
|             | 4.1.1. Kerygmatic pastoral care                                                       | 70  |
| <b>4.2.</b> | <b>Karl Barth's teachings on the anthropology of the sexes</b>                        | 74  |
|             | 4.2.1. Mann und Frau                                                                  | 75  |
|             | 4.2.1.1. Rejections                                                                   | 77  |
|             | 4.2.1.1.a. Rejection of mythologizing                                                 | 77  |
|             | 4.2.1.1.b. Rejection of demonizing male-female relations                              | 79  |
|             | 4.2.1.1.c. Rejection of centralization                                                | 81  |
|             | 4.2.2. What does it mean to be man or woman?                                          | 83  |
|             | 4.2.2.1. The first misunderstanding – grasping the                                    | 83  |

|             |                                                                                  |            |
|-------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
|             | masculine and feminine characteristics by definitions                            |            |
|             | 4.2.2.1. The second misunderstanding – dismissing the androgyne myth             | 87         |
|             | 4.2.2.3. The third misunderstanding – the emancipation of gender                 | 88         |
| 4.2.3.      | The typology of male-female relations                                            | 90         |
| 4.2.4.      | Barth's definition of marriage                                                   | 93         |
| 4.2.5.      | Critical observations                                                            | 95         |
|             | 4.2.5.1. Observations on the criticism of symbols                                | 98         |
|             | 4.2.5.1./a A and B not logical order                                             | 98         |
|             | 4.2.5.1./b Man as the image of God                                               | 99         |
|             | 4.2.5.2. Similarities to Buber                                                   | 101        |
|             | 4.2.5.3. Criticisms of Scriptural interpretation – exegetic shortcomings         | 103        |
|             | 4.2.5.4. Question marks in connection with covenant theology                     | 104        |
|             | 4.2.5.6. The problem of the connection to reality                                | 106        |
| 4.2.6.      | Summary                                                                          |            |
| <b>4.3.</b> | <b>The pastoral theologian of dialectic theology – Eduard Thurneysen</b>         | <b>110</b> |
| 4.3.1.      | „The study of pastoral care” versus „Seelsorge im Vollzug”                       | 110        |
| 4.3.2.      | The softening of Thurneysen's concept of pastoral care                           | 112        |
| 4.3.3.      | Thurneysen's sensitivity to problems                                             | 115        |
| 4.3.4.      | The practicing pastor                                                            | 120        |
| 4.3.5.      | Counseling in questions of marriage                                              | 122        |
| 4.3.6.      | Critical observations                                                            | 133        |
| 4.4.        | Summary – points forward                                                         | 136        |
| <b>5</b>    | <b>An anthropological approach to feminist theology</b>                          | <b>138</b> |
| 5.1.        | The emergence of feminist theology, its attempt to modify the image of humans    | 138        |
| 5.2.        | The basic notions used by feminist theological anthropology                      | 141        |
|             | 5.2.1. Patriarchy                                                                | 141        |
|             | 5.2.2. Sexism                                                                    | 144        |
|             | 5.2.3. Adrocentrism                                                              | 145        |
| 5.3.        | The anthropological concepts of R. Rosemary Ruether                              | 146        |
|             | 5.3.1. The methodological preconditions of feminist theology                     | 146        |
|             | 5.3.1.1. The basic principle of experience                                       | 146        |
|             | 5.3.1.2. The basic principle of criticism                                        | 147        |
|             | 5.3.1.3. The Biblical sources of feminism – the prophetic basic principle        | 149        |
|             | 5.3.2. The relation of feminist theology to the statements of classical theology | 151        |
|             | 5.3.2.1. Human existence as man and as woman                                     | 153        |
|             | 5.3.3. Anthropologies in ecclesiastical history aiming for equality              | 154        |
|             | 5.3.3.1. Eschatological feminism                                                 | 155        |
|             | 5.3.3.2. Liberal feminism                                                        | 157        |
|             | 5.3.3.3. The romantic feminism                                                   | 159        |

|             |                                                                                                                 |             |
|-------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 5.3.4.      | Feminist anthropology beyond liberalism and romanticism                                                         | 163         |
| 5.2.5.      | Can a male savior be the savior of women?                                                                       | 166         |
| 5.3.5.1.    | The image of the Messiah in the Hebraic tradition                                                               | 167         |
| 5.3.5.2.    | Jesus' view on the rule of God                                                                                  | 168         |
| 5.3.5.3.    | How did the Jesus of Nazareth become the Pantocrator?                                                           | 170         |
| 5.3.6.      | Alternative Christologies – Is there a feminist Christology?                                                    | 172         |
| 5.3.8.      | Critical observations                                                                                           | 174         |
| 5.3.9.      | Summary – thoughts pointing forward                                                                             | 179         |
| <b>6.</b>   | <b>The school of therapeutic pastoral care</b>                                                                  | <b>181.</b> |
| <b>6.1.</b> | The cause and background of the appearance of therapeutic pastoral care                                         | 182         |
| <b>6.2.</b> | <b>Dietrich Stollberg</b>                                                                                       | 185         |
| 6.2.1.      | „Wahrnehmen und Annehmen" – pastoral theological basics                                                         | 186         |
| 6.2.2.      | 6. Partnerial commitment of men and women in the pastoral concept of Stollberg                                  | 190         |
| 6.2.2.1.    | Seelsorge praktisch – practical exposition of theoretical questions                                             | 192         |
| 6.2.3.      | Nach der Trennung                                                                                               | 198         |
| 6.2.4.      | Critical observations                                                                                           | 199         |
| 6.2.5.      | Summary                                                                                                         | 201         |
| <b>6.3.</b> | <b>Joachim Scharfenberg</b>                                                                                     | 205         |
| 6.3.1.      | Einführung in die Pastoralpsychologie                                                                           | 206         |
| 6.3.2.      | The foundations of pastoral psychology in the history of science                                                | 207         |
| 6.3.3.      | Pastoral psychology in a social context                                                                         | 208         |
| 6.3.4.      | Scharfenberg's anthropological context                                                                          | 210         |
| 6.3.4.1.    | The anthropological concept of the Paul-Augustine-Luther procession                                             | 212         |
| 6.3.4.2.    | Modern theological anthropologies                                                                               | 214         |
| 6.3.5.      | An attempt to bring in accordance the empirical anthropologies and the observations of theological anthropology | 217         |
| 6.3.5.      | Direct references to feminist struggles                                                                         | 220         |
| 6.3.5.1.    | Prayer as the nurturing of desire                                                                               | 221         |
| 6.3.5.2.    | Confrontation with family therapy                                                                               | 222         |
| 6.3.6.      | Summary                                                                                                         | 226         |
| <b>6.4.</b> | <b>Michael Klessmann: Pastoral-psychologie</b>                                                                  | 229         |
| 6.4.1.      | Pastoral care in a changed cultural and social environment                                                      | 230         |
| 6.4.2.      | Pastoral care in the tension between humanist psychology and the image of human in the Christian tradition      | 232         |
| 6.4.3.      | The image of human in the changed academic postulations                                                         | 235         |
| 6.4.4.      | Individual development and the expectations of society                                                          | 238         |
| 6.4.5.      | The necessity of rethinking identity development                                                                | 241         |
| 6.4.6.      | The consequences of the conditions of identity work for                                                         | 244         |

|                      |                                                                                                                                        |            |
|----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
|                      | ecclesiastical communication and pastoral psychological thinking                                                                       |            |
| 6.4.7.               | Gender-approach pastoral care of men and women                                                                                         | 246        |
| 6.4.8.               | A pastor's example                                                                                                                     | 255        |
| 6.4.9.               | Critical analysis – Summary                                                                                                            | 256        |
| <b>7.</b>            | <b>Summary – final conclusions</b>                                                                                                     | <b>259</b> |
| 7.1.                 | Theses                                                                                                                                 | 259        |
| 8.2.                 | Conclusions                                                                                                                            | 261        |
| 8.2.1.               | Conclusions for theological anthropology                                                                                               | 262        |
| 8.2.2.               | A female model of autonomy                                                                                                             | 265        |
| <b>8.</b>            | <b>An examination of the changes of self and role examination of women in the mirror of several generations – Questionnaire survey</b> | <b>269</b> |
| 8.1.                 | The goal and environment of my survey                                                                                                  | 270        |
| 8.2.                 | The theoretical basics of the survey method                                                                                            | 273        |
| 8.3.                 | The questions and their reasons                                                                                                        | 273        |
| 8.4.                 | Evaluation                                                                                                                             | 278        |
| 8.4.1.               | The characteristics of the participants according to age, family status, number of children, occupation and worldview                  | 278        |
| 8.4.2.               | The changes in the attitudes towards masculine and feminine traits                                                                     | 281        |
|                      | 8.4.2.1. According to age                                                                                                              | 281        |
|                      | 8.4.2.2. According to the correlation of certain patterns                                                                              | 283        |
| 8.4.3.               | Exemplary personalities – coveted roles                                                                                                | 285        |
| 8.4.4.               | The attitude towards women's emancipation – divided to age groups                                                                      | 288        |
| 8.4.5.               | Women about women – opinions on female success, cleverness, sexual attractiveness and leading roles from different aspects             | 295        |
| 8.4.6.               | The textual analysis of role patterns to be handed over and to be corrected                                                            | 301        |
| 8.4.7.               | Summary of the survey results                                                                                                          | 312        |
| References           |                                                                                                                                        | 315        |
| Appendix             |                                                                                                                                        | 328        |
| List of publications |                                                                                                                                        | 331        |

## Theses

- 1. The struggles of the emancipation of women are inseparable from modern processes of social and political history. They were born as their organic developments, debating and more than once in opposition to them.**<sup>1</sup>

The Latin expression of emancipation means: 'to get further from the Father's property'. We use this notion in connection with the material, ideological, cultural or political rise of individuals or groups, forgetting that in the 18<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> centuries it was used to mean the emancipation of the bourgeoisie and the Jews, and later the proletariat. The notions of the emancipation of women and feminism are often blurred together. In our case we use the term for all the struggles and efforts of women that was aimed at the acknowledgement of their individual social status (in the right to work, education, and participation in politics), and in connection to that the realization of social justice. In another sense the term signifies a social theory, a worldview and academic point of view that is connected to the other great social and emancipation theories of modernity and the women's movements.

The word 'feminism' have only appeared in the everyday vocabulary in the wake of the emancipation efforts of the 60's. I would prefer to use the term 'feminism'

---

<sup>1</sup> A tézishez használt fontosabb szakirodalmak: Dr. ADAMIK Mária (szerk.): *Bevezetés a szociálpolitika nem szerinti értelmezésébe*. Gendering Social Policy", Elektronikus kiadvány. ELTE TáTK, 2012.; GÖSSMANN, Elisabeth et. al.: *Wörterbuch der Feministischen Theologie*. Gütersloh, 2002. 2. vollständig überarbeitete und grundlegender weiterte Auflage. Feminismus címszó; KÉRI Katalin: *Magyar nők a dualizmus korában*. (1867-1914 között) PhD értekezés. JPTE-BTK, Pécs, 1997. Konzulens: Dr. Majoros István; SHAHAR, Shulamit: *A negyedik rend*. Nők a középkorban, Budapest, 2004. Osiris Kiadó; HADAS Miklós: *Férfikutatások*. TÁMOP online-szöveggyűjtemény. 2011. Budapesti Corvinus Egyetem. Szociálpolitikus és szociális munkás képzés.; ACSÁDY Judit: „*Emancipáció és identitás*.” ELTE Szociológia PhD Disszertáció, 2005. Témavezető: Neményi Mária; CONNELL, R. W. : *Férfiak*. Eltűnő szerepek. Budapest, 2012. Noran Libro; MATTHIAE, Gisela: *Clownin Gott*. Eine feministische Dekonstruktion des Göttlichen. *Praktische Theologie heute* 45, 1999.; BEAUVOIR, Simone de: *A második nem*. Budapest, 1971. Gondolat Kiadó; GERHARD, Ute u.a. (Hg.): *Differenz und Gleichheit*. Menschenrechte haben (k)ein Geschlecht. Frankfurt a.M. 1990.; GÜNTER, Andrea (Hg.): *Feministische Theologie und postmodernes Denken*. Zur theologischen Relevanz der Geschlechterdifferenz. Stuttgart/Berlin/Köln 1996.; FOUCAULT, Michel: *A szexualitás története*. A tudás akarása. Budapest, 1996. Atlantisz Kiadó; LAFONT, Ghislain: *A katolikus egyház teológiatörténete*. Budapest, 1998, Atlantisz Kiadó; METZ, Johann Baptist: *Az új politikai teológia alapkérdése*. Budapest, 2004. L'Harmattan; PIEPER, Annemarie: *Van-e feminista etika?* Budapest, 2004. Áron kiadó; PLÓTINOSZ: *Az Egyről, a szellemről és a lélekről*. Válogatott írások. Budapest, 1986.; COLLINS, John J.: *A feminizmus és a gender szerinti kutatás [genderstudies] hatása a bibliatudományra*. Pannonhalmi Szemle. 2008/2 (XVI) 40-62.; SULLEROT, Evelyne: *A női munka története és szociológiája*.(ford. Dr. Kecskeméti Györgyné) Budapest, 1971. Gondolat Kiadó; SCOTT, Joan Wallach (szerk.): *Van-e a nőknek történelmük?* Budapest, 2001, Balassi Kiadó

to consistently describe an academic and social movement that strives to define and realize a more just and fuller human existence for women (and men) with the realization of the social determinedness of gender roles, but the literature in the field usually mixes the terms 'feminism' and 'emancipation of women'. A justified basis of this mixing lies in that only after the success of the efforts of the emancipation of women could the deeper analysis of the phenomena that we know today as femininity and masculinity begin.

The efforts of the emancipation of women – although traces of them were present in pre-capitalistic societies – only with the appearance of modernity and by its effect on the changes of society could turn into the formative force that by the 20<sup>th</sup> century has significantly changed the position of women and consequently our notions about gender roles. The question I posit is what forces were playing their parts in the largely unforeseen appearance of the feminist movement – meaning especially the efforts of the 60's and 70's – and what insofar unnoticed or neglected movements in the history of ideas, or lack thereof, were preparing the changes that the feminist efforts were aiming for and partially achieved.

Instead of a detailed idea- and social historical description I am offering two frameworks of interpretation for the explanation of the phenomenon.

a./ My first attempt at interpretation is based on the analysis of the hierarchical approach of the European epistemology. In this the lower level receives justification for its existence from the higher level, and the distinguished form of cognition is the rational mind. As the equality of rationality and the male principle has been basically an axiom of the European tradition in modernity, it is understandable that the victory of reason following the enlightenment did not, could not bring the acknowledgement of the other gender as different, but equal. The enlightenment was able to fight for the real equality of men (equals), but stemming from its epistemology it was unable to fight for the freedom of the different other (women). Subsequently, this was only possible for the feminist movement, similarly consisting of equals (women).

On this basis I consider the emergence of the feminist movements the trial of modernism, the criticism of modernity which could not reach developing the notion of the otherness yet equality of women, (not even) on the level of epistemology.

b./ My second attempt at interpretation is of a historical point of view. A common criterion of the patriarchal cultures of pre-capitalistic societies is, on the one

hand, the unquestionable leading role of men, and on the other, that it is always men that legitimize women. Only after several hundred years, with the emergence of the idea of “*liberty, equality, fraternity*”, when every sort of inequality seemed to be eliminated, did the question intensify: will the inequality between men and women disappear as well? It soon became clear that many inequalities were eliminated, but women’s being legitimized by men did not cease.

For centuries the life of women was revolving around the trinity of work, husband, family. In the age of the industrial revolution this has changed. The division between male and female work that linked women organically into productive work, and which has kept the two sexes in common interdependence was gone. This change has affected the balance of town and village, industrial and agricultural production and also the balance of the division of labor between the sexes. The strength of economy, and a large portion of jobs has shifted from agriculture to industry, from village to town, from the home to factories. Due to this, many women have lost their work that had bound them to agricultural production and managing the household and provided their individual livelihood. They could only fill jobs that required no special training and provided low wages. The differentiation between the value of female and male work and the privileged status of the better paid skilled work for males has led – among several other results – to the formation of the working class women’s movements, as a ‘side product’ of the birth of modern industrial societies.

This is the age of general emancipation. The emancipation of the bourgeoisie, which aimed for the elimination of the system of privileges by birth, the emancipation of Jews, which brings them gradually out from the ghettoed existence and begins integration into the whole of society. The emancipation of the working class, which, slowly becoming self-aware, begins through the unionization movements to demand better working conditions and higher wages. This provides the framework for the birth of the women’s emancipation movement, which is led by the gradually emerging realization that the notion of women’s legitimization by men and their subjected status has not been questioned by the general emancipation efforts. Men’s power over women, which was institutionalized by society and was ideologically reinforced with the age of industrial and political revolutions, has become more and more questioned with the radical change of the traditional social structure.



The process where a given social group, while continuing an emancipation struggle, is attempting to keep the women belonging to the same social group fully or in part, within the framework of male legitimization, is observable. This process can be found among the bourgeoisie, the Jews and among the proletariat as well. This is why I interpret the process of the emancipation of women an individual struggle within a general process of emancipation, with juncture points with the progressive tendencies of the given social group, however within, and sometimes separate of those, they present special tendencies in connection with the life possibilities of women.

**2. Modern ideological and social processes cannot provide women freedom and rights to liberty that equals that of men. The position of women in private life has been identified as being by their children. This half-turn in emancipation did bring certain steps forward, but it was neither satisfactory nor fair, and served to further deepen the polarized nature of the relations between men and women.<sup>2</sup>**

I am taking a look at two myths that have determined the modern thought in the nature of the role of men and women.

a/ During the course of the modern age a new myth emerges, the myth of male rationality and female irrationality. In her paper Catherine Newmann shows that this traditional, even more, traditionally transmitted imprint of the characteristics of the sexes is mostly the product of the age of the emergence of the bourgeoisie. Emotions as characteristics were feminized by the 19<sup>th</sup> century as an effect of bourgeois ideology. Newmann examines whether an allocation of emotions to genders – even on the level of connotations – has existed before bourgeois societies. She describes the ideological contexts of the main theoretical teachings on passion in order to be able to debate the

---

<sup>2</sup> A tézishez használt fontosabb szakirodalmak: FROMM, Erich: *Férfi és nő. Szexuálpszichológiai tanulmányok*. Budapest, 1996. Akadémiai Kiadó; ROUSSEAU, Jean Jacques: *Emil, avagy a nevelésről*. Budapest, 1957, Tankönyvkiadó., HELL Judit: *Nő és férfi viszonya az újkori filozófiában: a kanti (fél)fordulat*. Világosság, (XLVI. évf.) 2005, 2-3. szám; NEWMARK, Cathrine: *Weibliches Leiden – männliche Leidenschaften*. Zum Geschlechtinälteren Affektenlehren. Feministische Studien. Zeitschrift für interdisziplinäre Frauen- und geschlechterforschung. 2008/1. 7-18.; KENDE Anna (szerk.): *Pszichológia és feminizmus*. Hogyan alakította át a pszichológia elméleteit, kutatási kérdéseit a társadalminem-kutatás, Budapest 2008, L'Harmattan Kiadó; NORRIS, Pamela: *Éva története*. Budapest 2001 Holnap Kiadó; BADINTER, Elisabeth: *A szerető anya*. Az anyai érzés története a 17-20. században. Debrecen, 1999. Csokonai Kiadó; SHAHAR, Sulamith: *Gyermekek a középkorban*. Budapest, 2000. Osiris Kiadó;

explicitly or implicitly marked gender differences and to present the change in meaning following the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

According to her observations, the Scripture-based hierarchical differences gave place to another, more radical difference in qualities, based on nature. This way the biological and cultural differences were placed on an anthropological basis, and in this dissimilarity men were represented as the worker of the civilizational-cultural emergence of the human race, while women represented the race, biology, family and instinct.

b/ The other modern myth I examine is the myth of motherhood. In my research I rely heavily on the sections of Badinter's work, which analyses the theoretical and practical position of the enlightenment towards children and women from the 18<sup>th</sup> century. At the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century significant changes took place in the approach towards children. A common characteristic of these is that the role of mothers was greatly emphasized in the care of their children. There was a significant rise in the number of writings that urged mothers not to hand their children to nannies but breastfeed them themselves. Raising small children became the noble calling of women. A myth was formed that is still very much alive today, that idolized motherly love. Obviously, the instinctive nature and significance of motherly love have existed before that, but this is the historical moment where it was given social legitimization and gradually turned into an expectation of society.

Contemporary literature encouraged women to turn towards their children in several ways. Nature was increasingly alluded to, emphasizing that it has created women (females) to care for the young ones. Those who forget or neglect this, are basically acting against nature, that is, unnaturally. With the development of ethnography descriptions of the women of different indigenous peoples appeared, followed by treatises on the why and how females of different animal species are good mothers. According to this message the refinement and polished nature of a society is damaging for women, a woman becomes a better mother the more simple, close to nature (and uneducated) she is. Meanwhile the world of men was putting efforts into conquering nature, colonization and building a more perfect technical civilization.

With the short overview of the modern history of motherhood my goal was to demonstrate that what was posted as a social – in ecclesiastical circles emphatically as a Divine – expectation towards women by the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and which

women – as is my conviction – have largely internalized, was mainly the result of historical processes. From the 18<sup>th</sup> century the changed image of mothers had one more important emancipatorical role: it liberated women to more fully live the truly significant joys of motherhood and childcare. They were given the possibility to educate themselves in the interest of their children.

However, negative outcomes were the following:

- Fathers were more disengaged from childcare, their tasks were to stand their ground in the outside world and to be an example.
- Suffering was once again connected with women's fate, and even though women were praised, only as long as they kept silent. As long as their lives were forfeit for the sake of their children, as long as they removed themselves from their own selves everyday, to the extent that no individual part of their personality, independent of their children remained.
- It became considered a sin if a woman had other intellectual or self-realization intentions beside caring for her children.

Amid the changed social conditions of the 20<sup>th</sup> century women were and are forced to struggle with these notions.

**3. The existence and growing scientific embeddedness of the efforts of the emancipation of women provoked the emergence of general anthropological, particularly theological anthropological and pastoral-theological examinations. It forced them to include in their questions – directly and indirectly – women's insofar unheard and unseen experiences of being.**

The two wars of the 20<sup>th</sup> century on the one hand decimated the male populace, on the other made it necessary that women fulfill positions they were unable to attain previously. The rise of the expertise and competence of women and the social, economical and political demand has created the irreversible situation which we are facing in practice today. The feminist efforts of the 60's and 70's – embedded in the general social and ideological movements – made the classical idea of gender roles fundamentally questionable. Sensitive to social changes, Erwin Metzke<sup>3</sup>, in a 1954

---

<sup>3</sup> METZKE, Erwin: *Anthropologie der Geschlecht*. Philosophie Bemerkungen zum Stand der Diskussion. Theologische Rundschau. 1954. (22. Jg.) 211-241. 211-214.

study already gave voice to the realization that the contemporary theological discussions have reached a point where we have to rethink anthropological questions from the point of view of gender roles. He considered Barth's then quite recently published expositions in this topic a new and in-depth examination.

**I traced the 20<sup>th</sup> century development of theological anthropology through the examination of several authors.**

- 4. Karl Barth thematized the relations of men and women in a pioneering way, providing new argumentations anthropologically, but was unable to renew it theologically. Although he acknowledged the historical and social embeddedness of the issue, but with reference to the Revelation he referred it to a sterile theological reality which, on the hypothetical level could not mean anything else than the legitimization of the historically customary relations, further widening the rift between theory and practice.<sup>4</sup>**

Barth's work was widely acclaimed even at the time of its publication and since that several evaluations and analyses were created. Nevertheless, in spite of all criticism it must be stressed that Barth gave a theological analysis of the relations of men and

---

<sup>4</sup> A tézisehez használt fontosabb szakirodalmak: BARTH, Karl: *Kirchliche Dogmatik*. Die Lehre von der Schöpfung, III/4, Zollikon – Zürich, 1951.; WINKLER, Klaus: *Seelsorge*. 2. verbesserte und erweiterte Auflage - Berlin; New York, 2000. de Gruyter De-Gruyter-Lehrbuch.; KOCSEV Miklós: *Külső és belső megtermékenyítő hatások a gyakorlati teológiában a teória és a praxis vonatkozásában*. In: ÓDOR Balázs, XERAVITS Géza (szerk): *Elmélet és gyakorlat a zsidó-keresztény gondolkodás történetében*. Budapest, 2005. L'Harmattan. 180-190. ; NITZSCH, C.I.: *Praktische Theologie*. 3 Bde. Bonn, 1847; TÖRÖK, István: *Barth Károly teológiájának kezdetei*. Pápa, 1931, Főiskolai könyvnyomda. ; NÉMETH Dávid: *Isten munkája és az ember lehetősége a lelkigondozásban*. A pszichológia helye a lelkigondozásban. Budapest, 1993. Kálvin Kiadó; BUBER, Martin: *Én és Te*. Budapest, 1999, Európa Kiadó; PFÄFFLIN, Ursula: *Frau und Mann*. Ein symbolkritischer vergleich anthropologischer Konzepte in Seelsorge und Beratung. Gütersloh, 1992. Güterslohet Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn.; MEYER-WILMES, Hedwig: *Zwischen lila und lavendel*. Schritte feministischer Theologie, Regensburg, 1996. Verlag Friedrich Pustet.; SCHNEIDER, Theodor: „*Mann und Frau – Grundproblem theologischer Anthropologie*“, (QD 121), Freiburg, 1989. Verlag Herder; ASKANI, Hans-Christoph: *Karl Barth und Martin Buber*. In.: LEINER Martin, TROWITZSCH Michael (Hg.): *Karl Barths Theologie als eropäisches Ereignis*. Göttingen, 2008. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.;

women with singular detail and thoroughness that – to my knowledge – has not been matched by anyone since, apart from feminist theoreticians. The authors cited in the following parts of my paper have mainly only referred to the issue, drawing our attention to one or two segments. The reason why I scrutinize Barth's theses in detail is to be found in the unique nature of his analysis.

First and foremost, I consider Barth's views new and ahead of their time in that he does not consider men and women on their own, in a sterile way, but in the dialectics of the relationship of the two. He does not only analyse male-female relations in connection with marriage, but with a look to every other relationship systems. Even when talking about marriage, he emphasizes its relationship to the whole of the community. With his approach Barth places the question on the whole palette of the male-female system of relations, connecting it to the congregational, social, even historical systems of relation – despite the fact that he himself fails to consequently see this approach to the end.

Barth engages many of his contemporary thinkers, analyzing their works thoroughly with intellectual honesty, pointing out not only what he disagrees with, but also what he considers positive, in accordance with his system of thought, in part or whole. Reading the first part of his writing the reader feels that the author removes the issue from its usual biological, historical and theological templates and makes an attempt to gather information from as many sources as possible, with unbiased objectivity, and formulate his theological statements in the light of this knowledge.

He can sense the great amount of suppression and prevarication in the church about this topic before the beginning of the sexual revolution. Eg. in the passage where he writes that as a legacy of reformation in his age – the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century – the married lifestyle became the norm and the single became peculiar. In other cases he is unable to distance himself or to make historical outlooks. By distancing himself away from the ecclesiastical views of sexuality, either considering it of divine origin or connecting it with sin – as elements of public speech in the society of his age – he opens up the possibility for the church for open and holy discussion of sexuality, which is as difficult as is necessary.

Barth is not only aware of the women's movements of his age, but reflects on them in a critical way. He acknowledges how much the role and judgment of women have been historically determined. He understands that the women's movements are

largely adequate responses to the social and political changes set in motion by men. It appears that he understands that the emancipation struggles of women are necessary countermeasures against a historically constructed situation. His appearing criticism raises positive, often noteworthy questions, such as asking what sort of image of the future does one support or oppose by supporting or opposing the women's movements.

I consider it highly positive that he reflects in a theological way upon one of the most determining works of his age, the book of Simone de Beauvoir. In his critical analysis he notices Beauvoir's nouvelle and accurate thesis, that is, that men either handle women as objects or mystify them. This also implicitly contains the acknowledgement of the fact that this is how facing the position, the problems, the questions and the demands of women is being avoided. In his criticism of Beauvoir Barth points out that the image of the human proposed in her work has a masculine character. Thus long before the second wave of the feminist movement, Barth points out one of the possible misdirections of this school of thought. The essentialist feminists formulated very similar realizations decades later.

After all these positive aspects one would rightfully expect a new, theologically expansively established evaluation of male-female relations. After Barth removed the question from the usual framework of examination, by referring to God's command – admittedly, via new forms of argumentation in the history of theology – he designates a radically subjugated and passive role for women. He places the two sexes in a sterile theological reality, presenting an ideal that is, in my view, not only impossible to realize, but also unrealistic. The Christian image of woman presented by Barth is the same classic mystification or objectification of women as described by Beauvoir.

Barth is aware of the social and historical determinedness of the male and female roles and makes a conscious effort to distance himself from it. At the same time at a later point he deems these historically evolved gender roles appropriate as the constant order of the essence of being of the two sexes. Even though he questions the struggles of women to demand a status and rights equal to men, his view is that there is not one point of social life where the appearance and participation of a woman would be ethically questionable. At the same time he assigns an essentially passive role for women in every relationship with men, even if, on the level of theological theory, he considers this the active obedience of the Christian faith.

The critics of Barth condemn the lack of epistemological basis of the symbols he uses, the over-emphasis of the man-God parallel, the one-sidedness of the use of Buber's I-Thou model, or the exegetical shortcomings. Despite all its positive points, in my analysis, the greatest fault of his work is the problematic nature of the relation to human reality.

It becomes a direct divine command for women to be forced to remain in the wrongful structures, even if that means extra suffering, as violation of this would equal turning against God. Thus the reality of everyday life and the theological reality represented by Barth is opposed to the extent where, on the one hand, taking it to its logical conclusion would result in a disfigured image of the self and of God, on the other it is impossible to reconcile with the entirety of the Holy Scripture.

As a homo intellectus, Barth is touching upon and analyzing several of the important problems that his Christian and non-Christian contemporaries found intriguing in connection with the relation of the sexes, where theological thought was justly expected to give a Biblical, honest and liveable answer. As a homo theologicus he was not able to provide such answer.

Even though Barth interpreted the primacy of man as the primacy of service, as the order of God that does not serve man himself but a higher order, he was not able to see what this have distorted itself into by practice. The need he describes is to exempt humans from every bad human order and that men and women should step under a higher, qualitatively different order, the order of God. At the same time he does not leave behind the unjust structures of order created by humans, but presents it as naturally existing, considering the historically formed structures as a principle willed by God. Even though he questions the struggles of women to demand a status and rights equal to men, his view is that there is not one point of social life where the appearance and participation of a woman would be ethically questionable. At the same time he assigns an essentially passive role for women in every relationship with men, even if on the level of theological theory he considers this the active obedience of the Christian faith.

In his ending conclusions Barth removes human from its biological, historical and theological reality and places it in a theoretical theological reality, in a theological reality that is only liveable in certain rare circumstances. In his faithfulness to this

theological idea he became unfaithful to the created reality, at least in laying the anthropological foundations of male-female relationship.

Barth – being true to his own hermeneutical basic assumption – attempts to transplant the reformist Calvinian truth to the conditions of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. But can we presume that every theological truth can only have the effect of a revelation if it in some way correlates with the conditions of the contemporary society? What in the age of reformation was liberating, essentially emancipating, as it suddenly liberated women from the situation in which they have been for centuries forced to bear responsibility for the original sin, now, in the 20<sup>th</sup> century has lost this liberational character due to the change in social conditions. At the same time at the beginning of *Mann und Frau* Barth opened up paths of thought such as humans' embeddedness in relationships, in connection with man and woman, and also in connection with the relation to fellow humans, which can be considered the beginnings of the expression of a theological anthropology with a wider perspective in the following.

**5. Eduard Thurneysen understood the reality of gender (Geschlecht) being socially determined, and acknowledged its distorting effect on both men and women. As he was unable to move away from Barth's terminology, he was unable to reflect on what he has empirically grasped in a theologically reformatory way.<sup>5</sup>**

Neither the general concepts in "*Seelsorge im Vollzug*", nor its observations on women were followed by a strong response similar to "*Mann und Frau*". I consider the reason for this partially in that at the time of its publication an entirely different thinking in theology and poimenics was emerging, which in the harshness of the criticism in "*The Study of Pastoral Service*" was unable to listen to Thurneysen's decidedly more delicate voice that appears in this book. On the other hand – in his observations regarding women – only through familiarity and analysis of the entirety of the book can

---

<sup>5</sup> A tézishez használt fontosabb szakirodalmak: THURNEYSEN, Eduard: *Seelorge im Vollzug*. Zürich 1968. EVZ-Verlag; <sup>5</sup> DEBRECENYI KÁROLY István: *A spiritualitás mint a hospice ellátásban megtanulható közös nyelv*. Kharón - Thanatológiai Szemle, 1999. III (3) 16-31.; THILO, Hans Joachim: *Die therapeutische Funktion des Gottesdienstes*. Kassel, 1985. Johannes Stauda Verlag. BOHREN, Rudolf: *Prophetie und Seelsorge*. Eduard Thurneysen, Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag, 1982.



we see the side of Thurneysen's statements that diverge from Barth and is more faithful to human reality.

In my view Thurneysen is moving along the fine border between ideality and reality. He is unable to let go either what is thought ideal, or what has been experienced in reality. In many cases he is able to bridge the two by sending ideality to the area of the pastor's creed, and incorporate reality into the pastor's behavior and the teachings concerning the pastor's behavior. However, he is unable to do the same between his theoretical stance and practical experience regarding women. Even though he can see the deeply contradictory nature of the male-female structure of power, he fails to create a bridge. His attempts at reconciliation are either lacking or more than clumsy. His (I am convinced) unconscious evasions mostly become apparent from his examples, but detailed analysis of this would fall within the scope of psychoanalysis.

The difference between Barth and Thurneysen (which Thurneysen also failed to notice) is that while Barth is unable to see women in the more powerful (fuller) position, Thurneysen, based on his practical experiences is able to make that comprehension and presents the rule of men over women as sexism and as sin. In Barth's work the key to male-female relations is obedience at any cost to a solid divine order, however in Thurneysen's this order is much more the order of life than the order of existence. From his book it appears that he fails to see the questions raised by women's emancipation. Thurneysen observes the age he lives in, but fails to see the search for the changing role of women among the contemporary problems. He sees and understands that the clichés of gender roles are on the one hand social, on the other are a source of relationship problems. Still, the solution is not open talk about this, or the acknowledgement of the realities of life. Can there be a non-social solution to the socially formed? Thurneysen does not reach the formulation of this question.

The question that Barth and Thurneysen neglect is that God's rule must be fundamentally different from every sort of mundane power, since if the system of symbols that express the reality of God's rule itself stays within the paradigm of the interpretation of power of the world, this interpretation must be historically limited and particular. Thus both in the case of Barth and Thurneysen the question as to what sort of rule and what sort of obedience we should be talking about regarding man-woman relations remains unanswered. Where are the limits of this power? Barth's answer is that in Christ. But with this he gave an undebatable answer, which is contradicted by

practical experience. Thurneysen admitted that this rule is mixed with sin and sexism, but unable to let idealism go, on the one hand he was not able to step out of the image drawn by Barth, on the other the I-Thou paradigm offered by this was also unable to break up this structure of rule. The language of dominance and its structure was not let go, the writers talked about it as belonging to God and not as a historical-human structure of sin.

**6. Rosemary R. Ruether, an essential theoretician of feminist theology reached the observation that neither the classic nor the alternative Christologies, thus not even anthropologies are sufficient for the establishment of a feminist anthropology. In its place she suggested a hermeneutical shift based upon legitimate biblical prophetic traditions.<sup>6</sup>**

By presenting the theological anthropological observations of Rosemary R. Ruether I have touched an author who is one of the best known thinkers of feminist theology and whose influence extends much further than simply ecclesiastical or feminist circles. I chose her because, in spite of the fact that feminist ideas have obviously undergone much diversification in the course of the decades that have passed since the publication of her book, her work is still so much essential that the – by our days – established feminist theological thinking considers her one of the most significant, founding theoreticians. Ruether herself emphasizes that in her book she does not present feminist theology but one possible approach towards feminist theology.

---

<sup>6</sup> A tézishez használt legfontosabb szakirodalmak: RUETHER, R. Rosemary: *Sexismus und die Rede von Gott. Schritte zu einer anderen Theologie*. Gütersloh, 1990. Gütersloher Verlagshaus; MAGYARI-VINCZE Enikő: *Feminista antropológia elvek és gyakorlatok között*. Egyetemi jegyzetek sorozat 1. Kolozsvár, 2006. Desire Kiadó; GÖSSMANN Elisabeth (hsg.): *Wörterbuch der Feministischen Theologie*. Vollständig überarbeitete und grundlegend erweiterte Aufgabe. Gütersloher, 2002. Gütersloher Verlagshaus. Anthropologie cimszó; NOLLER, Anette: *Feministische Hermeneutik. Wege einer neuen Schriftauslegung*, Neukirchen-Verlag, 1995.; SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA, Elisabeth: *Das Schweigen brechen — sichtbar werden*. Concilium. (21. Jg.) 1985. (387-398).; STRAHM, Doris: *Aufbruch zu neuen Räumen*. Eine Einführung in feministische Theologie. Reihe Theologie aktuell, Bd. 7, Freiburg 1989.; MOLTMANN-WENDEL, Elisabeth: *Das Land wo Milch und Honig Fließt*. Perspektiven einer feministischen Theologie. Gütersloh, 1987. Gütersloher Verlagshaus; ADORJANI Zoltán: *A terapeuták kontemplatív kegyessége*. Doktori értekezés. Témavezető: dr. Marjovszky Tibor. Kolozsvár, 2004.; MCGRATH, Alister E.: *Bevezetés a keresztény teológiába*. Budapest. 1995, Osiris Kiadó; SZABÓ Ildikó: *Galata 3,28 interpretációja a hagyományos keresztény írásestelmezés és a feminista teológia feszültségében*. In: HUBAI Péter, MAJSAI Tamás (szerk.): *A te könyvedbe mind ezek beirattattak*. Szimposzion a Bibliáról 2009. Wesley Konferenciai Kötetek. Budapest, 2010. Wesley János Lelkészképző Főiskola, 297-307.; SLENCZKA, Notger: *Feministische Theologie*. Darstellung und Kritik. Theologische Rundschau (58.) 1993. 396-436.

Ruether reaches the understanding that her Christological – and together with it, anthropological – examinations have reached a dead-end. The classic Christology, starting out from the fact that the historical Jesus was a man, necessarily got to the point that the norm of human existence is man and that the divine logos has a masculine nature. A logical consequence of this is that women were not only excluded from the office of priesthood but also from working in the creation and redemption. Alternative Christologies were marginalized and the insights of classical Christology were insufficient when seeking theological answers regarding to the new life possibilities of women.

When feminist theology have turned towards the way the historic Jesus of the synoptic Gospels relates to women, it does not wish to claim in an unhistorical way that Jesus was a feminist, but to claim instead that Jesus renewed the prophetic concepts, did not justify the social and religious hierarchy of his age, but turned towards society's condemned and marginalized groups, including women. According to Ruether's views the fact that Jesus was a man has no theological significance whatsoever. It has much more of a symbolic-social significance to the society where being a man meant a privileged status. In this sense does the Christ manifest in Jesus, as the representative of the delivered humanity and God's delivering word.

None of the empirical, critical, prophetic principles are exclusive characteristics of feminist theology. They were born partly out of the method of criticism of history, partly out of the observations of the theology of deliverance, but by their common use the diversity of the observations of theology, dogmatics and the hermeneutical tradition regarding to women became clear, and it opened the way for formulating different observations.

The empirical principle, although cannot form the exclusive basis of Biblical studies, cannot be dismissed with reference to the sufficient nature of the Revelation. As a matter of fact – as we could see it in the case of Barth – the overly wide gap between empirical reality and theological reality is alienating. With the help of the critical and the prophetic principle we may gain insights into a layer of the Messianic tradition, Jesus' self-interpretation, the being of the Son of God that makes it possible that the actual Congregation may relate to social issues in a progressive manner.

The critics of feminist theology accuse it with one-sidedness, and the charge is true. But isn't the theological thinking that is not open to facing this sort of issues and

referring to a finalized and closed dogmatic reality fails to hear the just questions regarding to the anthropological consideration and social position of women equally one-sided?

**7. Parallel to the development of feminist theology but independent of it, pastoral theology also underwent a hermeneutical and methodological turn, and referring to the observations of classical theological anthropology and empirical anthropology (psychology), attempted to renew theological anthropology.**

**7.1. Dietrich Stollberg said yes to the emancipation struggles with the triple slogan of freedom, responsibility and autonomy. However, because of motherhood he was unable to grant autonomy to women, and connected women's freedom with motherly responsibility, while connecting men's freedom with the struggle for rightful autonomy.<sup>7</sup>**

In the trinity of freedom, responsibility and autonomy Stollberg mostly sees the perspective of men. It's no wonder, as the great figures of psychology, from whom he takes so much were unable to do that as well. He does not debate the rightfulness of the emancipation of women but at the same time he mentions the phallic nature of some contemporary feminists. He is not aware of the fact that the exaggerated reactions of feminism in many cases express protest against a questioned socialization and social expectation, nor that how much the behavior of women in the cases he presents could still be determined by their upbringing. He draws up the image of a maturity that is also alien to human reality. The everyday life of women and children in many different cultures is determined by support, care, togetherness, mutual protection, bodily contact, warmth and closeness. Can the Stollbergian interpretation of autonomy be expected from a woman socialized this way?

---

<sup>7</sup> A tézishez használt legfontosabb szakirodalmak: STOLLBERG, Dietrich: *Wahrnehmen und Annehmen*. Seelsorge in Theorie und Praxis, Gütersloh, 1978.; STOLLBERG, Dietrich: *Nach der Trennung*. Erwägungen für Geschiedene, Entlobte, Getrennte - und Verheiratete, München 1974; STOLLBERG, Dietrich: *Seelsorge praktisch*, Göttingen 1970; TILLICH, Paul: *Rendszerezés teológia*. Osiris Tankönyvek. Budapest, 2000, Osiris Kiadó; SPRENGNETH, Madelon: *Felforgató nőiség*. In: KENDE Anna (szerk.): *Pszichológia és feminizmus*. Hogyan alakította át a pszichológia elméleteit, kutatási kérdéseit a társadalminem-kutatás. Budapest 2008, L'Harmattan (46-67) 47-48.

In the case of women from the above mentioned trinity – referring to the biological determinedness of women – he emphasizes responsibility. Women, as they are given a biological advantage in motherhood, are, due to this advantage, forced to choose motherhood with the limitation of their freedom and autonomy. Not denying that motherhood for many women is an empowering experience, Stollberg uses the historically well-documented cliché that the work of women serves the aim to relieve men from the duty of supporting of themselves (their bodies) and their environment (their lodgings), thus making it possible for them to deal with the world of abstract ideas.

This work of women remains invisible for men and does not surface in society as a production value either. Because of this invisibility men can stay by abstractions and activities acknowledged by society. This is how the work of women becomes an unreal, natural activity, the instinctive manifestation of love, or work guided by emotions; as opposed to the visible, measurable, consciously – and not, due to biological characteristics, inevitably – chosen, real work of men.

In spite of the observations of Pfäfflin, who claims that Stollberg not once presents a negative image of women, especially in the criticism of the exclusivity of marriage, in my view it is not a negative image, but more of a not-seeing stemming from precedents from the history of science. When Stollberg presents the utopia of the partnership of kindred spirits instead of the blood relative bond of civil marriage, and puts his trust in humans' maturity, ability to withstand frustration and fidelity, he merely opens up a way before men. We could ask the question, where could a “mature” woman find her starting point in this structure if femininity for Stollberg is defined against independent behavior and calls girls and women to caring and being with minors?

**7.2. Joachim Scharfenberg made an attempt to bring the statements of empirical and theological anthropology in accordance, without damaging the independence of either field of study. With this attempt he removed male-female dualism from anthropology's system of thinking, placing in its stead – faithful to Lutheran theology – the basic experience of God and humans being in community and separation at the same time. Scharfenberg, faithful to the whole of his system of thinking, did not solve, but opened up an anthropological problem, while in practice**

**he appointed the road of liveability and maturity as a point of reference for pastoral psychology.<sup>8</sup>**

Interestingly, while in his self-definition Scharfenberg considers himself a man influenced by the feminist movement and feminist theories, in his theoretical work he does not deal with this issue, or only indirectly. And while he admittedly struggles with the multi-perspective nature of family therapy, his view of pastoral psychology is very much multi-perspective and has a systemic view. However, it is the analysis through this systemic view is that makes it possible to develop a model of human into which, indirectly, the observations of feminist theology may be incorporated. I believe that Scharfenberg is open to the feminist questions, but not in the way that would turn the traditional theological tradition upside down, but by creating the possibility for developing a multi-perspective human image through finding common points between the observations of social sciences and classical theological tradition.

His intention to find possible similarities between theological and psychological human image, and between the basic tenets of Lutheran theology and the observations of humanistic psychology can be incorporated into this course of thinking. He is a thinker 'who brings out of his treasure things new and old' (Matt 13,52). He is devoted to theological understandings and is devoted to the empirical insights of psychology, while formulating critical reflections towards both. His anthropological theses do not limit, but establish frameworks for the theological, pastoral-theological and feminist thinking as well.

By emphasizing that knowing God and knowing humans is inseparable, and that the image of man cannot be finalized, just as the image of God cannot be finalized, he opens up space for the experience of feminine existence without questioning the experience of masculine existence or decreeing it one-sided. If neither human's nor God's image is final, then the knowledge and experience of God must have yet undiscovered or, should we rather say, unheard areas that are concealed from us by our lack of perspective, the one-sidedness of our epistemology.

Scharfenberg handles the crisis of marriage in our age with a very delicate approach. Just as women's roles and the mother's role, marriage is embedded in history

---

<sup>8</sup> A tézishez használt legfontosabb szakirodalmak: SCHARFENBERG, Joachim: *Einführung in die Pastoral-psychologie*. Göttingen, 1985. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht; LASCH, Christopher: *Az önimádat társadalma*. Budapest, 1984. Európa Könyvkiadó; MASZNYIK Endre Dr.: *Evangélikus dogmatika*. Theologiai Szakkönyvtár. Pozsony 1888;

as well. Different ages interpreted and regulated these issues in different ways. The challenge in the question of marriage is not to believe certain solutions to be eternal but to search for what is eternal, is based on the Bible, compels humans but is merciful to them at the same time, or, in different wording, searching for the ideal that gives space for the liveable.

**7.3. Michael Klessmann accepted the doctrine of postmodern deconstruction and gave space to a pastoral theory and practice of this perspective, and in its framework, a gender-approach pastoral service.<sup>9</sup>**

Klessmann's work, originally intended to be a textbook, attempts to incorporate the achievements of psychology into theological, pastoral-theological thinking. He is essentially attempting to find what and how may be utilized from the anthropological observations of the last century's natural and social sciences in practical theology.

In the areas I examined he analyses the challenges before the people living in postmodern, multicultural society, appointing the role of interpreter and nurturer for the church and the Christian congregation. From the point of view of my topic it is emphasized that he evaluates the changes of female identity and its development separate from men in a positive manner, providing an explanation and a connection point for the pastoral care of women.

By presenting the definition of gender-approach pastoral care, Klessmann outlines the theoretical and practical basics of a type of pastoral care that, both in theory and practice is yet alien to Eastern European pastoral-psychological thinking.

---

<sup>9</sup> A tézishez használt legfontosabb szakirodalmak: KLESSMANN, Michael: *Pastoral-psychologie*. Ein Lehrbuch. 2. Auflage, 2004. Neukirchener Verlag; KIERKEGAARD, Sören: *A halálos betegség*. Budapest, 1993. Göncöl Kiadó, II. JÁNOS PÁL (pápa): *A test teológiája*. Budapest, 2008. Kairosz Kiadó; RENÖCKL, Helmut: *Identitás és tájékozódás egy áttekinthetetlen korban*, *Vigilia*, (62.) 1997/10. 742-751.; KLESSMANN, Michael: *Pfarrbilder im Wandel*. Ein Beruf in Umbruch. Wuppertal, 2001, Neukirchner Verlag, KLESSMANN, Michael: *A klinikai lelkipozás kézikönyve*. Debrecen, 2002,

## Ending conclusions:<sup>10</sup>

### a/ Conclusions for theological anthropology

The important observation of theological anthropology, that humans are beings in relationships appears in Barth. We can consider this the *first dimension of a renewed theological anthropology*.

Relationship may only be established by way of a dialog where two different realities of being converse with the mutual intention of understanding what is concealed by the system of relationships of their own reality of being, but is revealed in that of the other. Thus *the second dimension of our theological anthropology may be dialog*.

Every anthropological theology must take into consideration the reality of sin, but it is not irrelevant how we grasp the essence of sin. The *third important dimension of theological anthropology* may be the hamartiological perspective that *the most basic temptation of human being is silencing or not hearing the other*. This has several ways of manifestation. As we have seen, classical theological anthropology does not listen to women, or only in certain aspects, along the lines of their biological characteristics. But of course the same is possible on the other side as well, a woman can silence a man, the reality of male existence. Silencing the other is, in the end, silencing the entirety of the created reality, the rejection of the fullness of God.

We cannot discuss theological anthropology without redemption and the experience of being redeemed. The cross connects God with humans, but also humans with other humans as well. In the Great Friday story even the perturbation of nature appears. *The reconciliation of God/humans-humans/created world may be the Christological dimension of theological anthropology*. Where this is realized and lived, imaged, is the contemporary Congregation of the age. But this may only be realized in a congregation that knows and accepts that humans are at the same time beings of relationships and individuals, capable of creating free dialogs. We must agree with Peter Schmid in that for this aim it is extremely important to create and develop a new notion of authority. The dismantling of the pyramidal structures of society – even on the level

---

<sup>10</sup> A végköveteltetéshez használt legfontosabb szakirodalmak: ORBÁN László: *A férfi és nő különbözőségének antropológiai jelentősége*.(1-6) Keresztény szó. Keresztény kulturális havilap. 2008/12-2009/6, <sup>10</sup> SCHMID, Peter F.: „Az ember az első és alapvető út.” Párbeszéd a humanisztikus pszichológia és a lelkigondozás között. MÉRLEG (40. évf.) 2004/2, (172-181); KOLBENSCHLAG, Madonna: *Búcsúcsók Csipkerózsikának*. Debrecen, 1999. Csokonai Kiadó. Artemisz Könyvek, KIERKEGAARD, Søren Aabye: *Vagy-vagy*. Budapest 2001. Osiris Kiadó



of the relationship of man and woman – must not be followed by the culture of disrespect.

In the interest of this, following Dorothee Sölle, I would include as *a fifth dimension the rethinking of the notion of holiness*. Next to the experience of sexuality the experience of the holy is the other ancient, deepest experience of humans. Thus, especially the perspective, and then the language of theological anthropology must develop the aforementioned dimensions in protection of this holiness.

#### b/ Conclusions for a female model of autonomy

It was Madonna Kolbenschlag who, using the thoughts of Kierkegaard and Tillich worked on the development of such model. In this, she pairs Kierkegaard's categories of aesthetic, ethic and moral being to Tillich's notions of heteronomy, autonomy and theonomy.

Based on my own experiences as a pastor I share Kolbenschlag's observation that many women today have been stuck at the border between heteronomy and autonomy. According to their internal sense of life, their upbringing, their set of roles deemed feminine, they live in a heteronomous existence. However, due to a strange inconsistency it is the set of external expectations, the pressure to enter a job, the pressure to make a career, thus to learn, the changes of the course of life of their children, the proliferation of the Internet, and the pressure to tackle the plurality present there and in society, they need to acquire life techniques that require growing autonomy. Perhaps the ambivalence of this has appeared in the responses given to my questionnaire regarding women's emancipation. This is how they were able to grasp the tension that they experience due to the social expectations towards their sex and the external obligations of life, but also because of their internal aspirations.

This sort of autonomy is not an existence that is independent of anyone, not a self-centered self-realization, but rather taking our human existence seriously. Acknowledging that we have some sort of task on this world. This is where self-transcendence of humans begins. Every work in which we contribute with joy and creativity to the unraveling (or protecting) of this world is essentially stemming from human autonomy. This realizes the Biblical command to "dress it and keep it" and at the same time contributes to overcoming ourselves, or, in the language of psychology, in unfolding our potential.

In my view the pastoral model of the Christian congregations of today, both in the actual practice and in the suggestions of the sermons aims for reaching the level of theonomical/moral being for both men and women. Devoting ourselves to something that is bigger and more than our own small individual path and possibilities – this thought can be found in many sermons. But what happens when we try to move a person living on the level of heteronomy to the stage of theonomy without passing the stage of autonomy? The result will most likely be a hard struggle or disappointment.

In the Kierkegaardian/Tillichian terminology the stage of theonomy can only be achieved after living the stage of autonomy. Tillich's notion of theonomy – similar to Kierkegaard's notion of religious existence – sets a balance between self-sufficient and self-transcendence. In the language of pastoral theology this is the image of mature religious being. But the path towards this, for both men and women, can only lead to this conclusion by the way of achieving personal autonomy.

**Keywords:** theological anthropology, feminism, women's emancipation, gender study, otherhood, marriage, pastoral care