Therapeutic Turn: Pastoral Care in Finnish Lutheranism Before and After the 1960s

This paper offers a systematic and critical exploration of contemporary theology of pastoral care in the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland in light of history of practice of care and Western cultural change. Currently pastoral care is characterized by therapeutic approach that aims to offer sincere help for earthly suffering and to promote the goods the individual chooses to reach for. This has been a drastic change from historical models from Luther to the early twentieth century that were spiritual and paternalistic in nature. The therapeutic turn connects to the therapeutic culture that has set self-actualization as a central idea to determine Western cultural ethos. The therapeutic approach calls into question how the spiritual task of the church is carried out. The currently prevailing pastoral psychological theology of pastoral care proves to be problematic. The spiritual task of pastoral care should be relied on basic Lutheran theology of God as objective and not to be conditional on human mind. Yet the therapeutic aim should still be held as the basic approach of care.
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1 Introduction

Not much attention has been paid to Finnish Lutheran pastoral care in systematic and historical theology: there is little discussion in Finnish and even less in English for international audience. This is despite the fact that pastoral care within the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland (hereinafter the [Finnish] church) has changed radically in the recent decades. The currently common therapeutic approach of dialogical and non-directional discussion aiming to offer earthly relief is far removed from earlier practices based on preaching, moral discipline and normative spiritual guidance.
The task of this article is to offer systematic description and analysis of the contemporary theological model of pastoral care in the church and to explain it in light of the history of Lutheran theology, practice of pastoral care and cultural change in Finland. Secondly, this article discusses critically the theology of the current pastoral care approach and proposes for a standpoint on which to form the theology of pastoral care in the church. Yet, any closer exploration of what practical implications the proposed theological standpoint would have, are out of the scope of this article.

The origin of the therapeutic approach, that is the currently prevailing approach of pastoral care in the church, can be traced to hospital chaplain Irja Kilpeläinen’s theory, presented in her book on pastoral care methods, published in 1969. I introduce her approach, its theological standpoint and direct background in American pastoral care movement (Section 2). To present the historical change in the practice of care I introduce the prior schemes of pastoral care within the church (Section 3). In Section 4, I briefly introduce the main developments in Western society and ideas, to put historical models of pastoral care in historical and theological context. I settle for a general outline as my focus is on why and how the therapeutic approach changed. Methodically, I present the theological understanding behind each pastoral care scheme by exploring (1) how pastoral care is carried out in practice, (2) the model of communication used, (3) the philosophical nature of the practice of care, and finally (4) the assumptions on which the theological understanding is based.

The therapeutic approach of pastoral care is linked to what sociologists call therapeutic culture (Section 5). In Section 6, I ask how the religious task of conveying the gospel is understood to be carried out in the therapeutic approach, which in Finnish discussions derives from Paavo Kettunen’s pastoral psychological presentation. I present the prevailing interpretation in the church that is based on Kettunen’s theology, expose its theological presumptions, and finally suggest a constructive solution based on historical and systematic exploration. Also, along with fundamental Lutheran theology about the nature of God, ideas by Carmen Schuhmann and Annelieke Damen, and Tor Johan S. Grevbo are exploited in discussing the way for the Finnish pastoral care.
2 Therapeutic turn in pastoral care

In 1969 Irja Kilpeläinen, a hospital chaplain, introduced the neighbour-centred method of pastoral care. The method is, in principle, simple. The chaplain’s task is to concentrate on the person in distress and enable them to share anything they want to about the distress and its causes. Thus, a chaplain should put aside all assumptions and ambitions of his or her own and avoid giving any quick solutions or explanations. Only the person in distress can find true healing and answers; a chaplain helps them in this process by non-directive and dialogical discussion.

Within the neighbour-centred method, the one in distress chooses the goods and goals he or she aspires to. The aim is to relieve suffering as it is experienced without the chaplain giving any interpretation. The philosophical foundation is empowerment; the aim is to help the philosophical object of pastoral care, to achieve what this individual chooses to, through dialogical and reciprocal communication between the actors. In this way, pastoral care is shaped as therapeutic. This has become the prevailing approach within the church, as it was later adopted as the common model for pastoral care.

Since the story told by the neighbour as such is supposed to be the focus of the neighbour-centred approach, the actual subject is typically secular. Nevertheless, Kilpeläinen argued that her method communicates gospel, not despite, but precisely because suffering is encountered as such; pain is not interpreted in spiritual terms, which means the neighbour is not guided to consider his or her issues on a spiritual level. Kilpeläinen argued that in this way, the chaplain follows the example of Jesus who accepted people in need as they were without judging them. In his manner of encounter, Jesus made the gospel true in practice, and this is the fundamental task of pastoral care.

Kilpeläinen’s method is linked to Clinical Pastoral Education (CPE), founded by Anton Boisen in the 1920s. CPE laid the foundations for the therapeutic approach by determining that pastoral care should be aim to offer sincere help, relief and comfort to the suffering as such. CPE came to define the American pastoral care movement, which adopted psychological reflection as a theoretical tool to evaluate care and justify the best method. This reflection was named pastoral psychology and has become as an established field within theology. The practical approach,
psychotherapeutically oriented pastoral care, is called pastoral counselling.  

How is the spiritual task of the church to proclaim the gospel carried out in a therapeutic approach to pastoral care? Seward Hiltner was the most influential theologian within the movement to form the basic theology of pastoral counselling and the therapeutic approach. The basic theological answer Hiltner gave, which coheres with Kilpeläinen’s understanding, was that a chaplain’s sincere effort to relieve suffering is itself proclamation of the gospel. Unlike Kilpeläinen, who did not aim to give psychological explanations, Hiltner also applied psychological examination to healing in pastoral care.  

3 Turn from what? – Historical pastoral care

Before the therapeutic approach was introduced, pastoral care literature and practices in Finland rested on radically different theological schemes. Historically, two main pastoral strands influenced the Finnish church: old-Lutheran and pietistic traditions. For both, the task of pastoral care was to guide the soul to salvation, and practices were formed to carry out this task.

Old-Lutheran pastoral care, grounded in the Lutheran orthodoxy of the seventeenth century, remained the main pastoral understanding of the Finnish church until the twentieth century. In practice the old-Lutheran pastoral model was about guiding the soul to salvation by communicating religious truths through preaching and liturgical means. The form of the message was to some extent adapted to the situation of the person in distress, but the message itself was formed beforehand and conveyed as truth, in the form of proclamation. Pastoral practice was also characterized by strict church discipline. Philosophically, the old-Lutheran scheme was based on general paternalistic proclamation of absolute truth, which highlights the basic Lutheran understanding of God’s gift as absolutely objective.

Johann Gerhard’s extraordinarily influential book Meditationes Sacrae provided the theological basis for the old-Lutheran scheme. Gerhard’s theology was characterized by serious religious devotion. There is no space for levity in the life of a Christian who, by default, should be driven by endless concern for his or her fate after death. Within this scheme, earthly suffering itself is not an object of pastoral care but it is given a spiritual interpretation and response. Gerhard’s mysticism was
largely neglected, however, as personal religious experience was not a priority in old-Lutheran pastoral practices.\textsuperscript{24}

In its purest form, old-Lutheran pastoral communication was modelled as preaching and use of liturgical elements but, by the late nineteenth century at the latest, mainstream pastoral care meant little more than moral discipline. The task of pastoral care was to bring about a proper Christian character. Theologically, suffering was connected to sinful moral behaviour through not having fully accepted the gift of justification, which led to drifting away from the parish community. In this view, pastoral care was the practice of bringing the Christian back to the life of the parish and church, and thus back to the only true religious connection.\textsuperscript{25} Tor Johan S. Grevbo explains the pastoral emphasis on moral behaviour with the concentration on pedagogical teaching and upbringing of the Enlightenment. In addition, the distinction of general and special pastoral care was an important development in the nineteenth century understanding of pastoral care.\textsuperscript{26}

Pietistic pastoral theology was introduced into the Finnish church in the late eighteenth century when the first revivalist movements were established.\textsuperscript{27} Pietistic pastoral practices emphasized personal faith through spiritual rebirth, which primarily arises in the mental domain, so it should lead to emotional expression of faith.\textsuperscript{28} Spiritual rebirth was achieved through penitence, so guidance to repentance was central to pastoral practice. On these principles, pastoral care was personal and dialogical training of the soul that aimed at personal faith through repentance and at emotional experience of faith.\textsuperscript{29}

Pietistic pastoral care was based on normativity, but the process was dialogical. In terms of philosophical nature of action, the one in distress was expected to contribute to the interaction. Although pietistic theologians did not explicitly deny the objective nature of God’s gift, pietistic pastoral practice and spirituality were subjective and anthropocentric, which was condemned as a serious threat to mainstream Lutheran theology.\textsuperscript{30}

In effect, both old-Lutheran and pietistic pastoral theologies and practices paid little attention to addressing earthly suffering in pastoral care. Instead, suffering was interpreted as a spiritual matter requiring a spiritual response of some kind: preaching, moral discipline or spiritual guidance. The explicit aim was salvation of the soul, although understanding of how to achieve this aim varied.\textsuperscript{31}
Modern psychology, namely psychodynamic theory, influenced the church from the first decades of the twentieth century, and impacted on theories of pastoral care by the 1960s. Interest in human psychology during the era of Enlightenment philosophy laid the ground for the present therapeutic approach that concentrates on personal mental and social issues. Nevertheless, before the therapeutic turn, the new knowledge of human mind and the psychodynamic theories were only used as a tool to explain spiritual matters; the task was still understood paternalistically, as explicitly guiding the soul to salvation and offering spiritual relief. This only changed when Kilpeläinen introduced her neighbour-centred method. The focus turned to countering earthly suffering by empowerment through interaction. I call this change from historical pastoral care to a therapeutic approach the therapeutic turn.

4 Background assumptions: secularism, liberalism, enchantment and disenchantment

By adopting the therapeutic approach, the church has followed a long societal development. The fundamental function of a society can be explained by how and why public power is used on people. Public power has developed from absolute paternalism and use of cruel public violence in medieval times, via normative moral authority without arbitrary violence in the nineteenth century, to contemporary society that aims to empower its citizens to reach the ends they themselves choose. Governments in the Western world use public power only to secure every citizen’s right to seek what they individually regard good. Contemporary society, in other words, is based on the fundamental liberal principle that was, philosophically, a product of Enlightenment.

The grand theological change in the history of pastoral care can be understood in relation to the question of who determines the goods for which we strive. Until the twentieth century the authority of the church to determine moral norms was not questioned. This changed from the nineteenth century to the 1960s, which was due to secularization. Western secularization sought to establish a public society on a rational basis, without assuming a transcendental reality as the source of social order.

Concretely, secularization affected pastoral care in hospitals, the first sites of the therapeutic turn in pastoral care. Until the end of the nineteenth century, the church was still in a position to dictate the normative moral goods, but in the 1960s hospital chaplains were not self-evidently part of
the hierarchy in hospitals.\textsuperscript{37} Along with re-formation of the role of the church within society, developments in medical care increased pressure on pastoral care in hospitals to leave behind paternalistic practices of preaching and moral or spiritual guiding.\textsuperscript{38} Also, the Second World War had a significant impact on pastoral practices and the church as a whole. During the war, creating social coherence and offering comfort for earthly suffering with psychological means were acknowledged as tasks of the church.\textsuperscript{39}

The grand change from the old-Lutheran pastoral care of the seventeenth century to therapeutic approach in the 1960s cannot be explained merely by modern secularization and societal development. Instead we have to look into the assumptions behind Lutheran orthodoxy and old-Lutheran pastoral care.

Historically, chaplains represented authority in two ways. Besides holding church office and thus representing spiritual power, chaplains were attorneys of the crown, or the secular power, in their diocese.\textsuperscript{40} This was probably not just a practical arrangement but inherited from the medieval social imaginary\textsuperscript{41} that understood societal order as a representation of cosmic authority, which also gave the church authority over morality and behaviour.\textsuperscript{42} Within this social order, it was impossible to imagine individuals choosing what to strive for; instead, pastoral theology was authoritative conveying of truth.

Theologically, old-Lutheran pastoral care was not just about the use of church authority, but about a theological scheme shaped by the medieval imaginary. The pastoral theology of Lutheran orthodoxy was based on an understanding of the world as \textit{enchanted}. Transcendent forces were real in the medieval imagination: God, the devil, angels and sacraments were actors or tools transmitting cosmic powers in earthly life. Natural order and events were seen as governed by magical cosmic forces, so every member of society needed to commit to serving the good, sacred, forces.\textsuperscript{43}

Within this enchanted world, old-Lutheran pastoral care sought to communicate spiritual truths, which can be understood as having had therapeutic effects. For people who held eternal glory and eternal damnation to be self-evident, conviction of salvation after death had therapeutic meaning. If, in pastoral practices, earthly suffering was interpreted with spiritual terms, this applied to the general culture;
everything was given a spiritual meaning and interpreted within the spiritual realm.

In the light of the medieval social imaginary, the contemporary secular Western world is *disenchanted*. There is no general belief in cosmic forces and, even for people who believe in them, they have much less explanatory power than before. Therefore, pastoral care that concentrates on spiritual issues alone has lost much of its therapeutic effect. In the light of disenchantment, the therapeutic turn was inevitable. A new understanding of suffering and how to counter it was needed, and this was based on prevailing cultural ideas of liberalism and secularism, and on modern psychological understanding of the human mind.

Reformation can be explained as one of the roots of the process of disenchantment. Through Luther’s objection to the Pope’s authority, the Vatican was stripped of the Western Christian monopoly on interpreting spiritual and transcendent forces. Luther’s ideas of earthly life as sacred and all Christians answering their spiritual calling through roles in ordinary life led to a perception of self that was not only vulnerable in the midst of transcendent forces but in control of events in life. As a result, with the Enlightenment project of rationality as the basis to justify social order and human life in general, the understanding of the world as enchanted dissolved.⁴⁴

Disenchantment was an essential assumption behind Pietism and pastoral theology at the end of the nineteenth century. Pietism connects to the development of the Reformation social imaginary in two ways. Although Pietism objected to the Enlightenment philosophical project and thus to the process of disenchantment itself, it followed the same social imaginary that Enlightenment was based on.⁴⁵ The basic idea was that the self controls events. Enlightenment thinkers used this idea to argue that human beings are in control of morality and rationality. Similarly, Pietism argues that people are in control of their own spiritual reality.

Nevertheless, the Enlightenment emphasis on rationality was adopted as the mainstream theological method within the church.⁴⁶ The late-nineteenth-century pastoral theological scheme mirrors the process of disenchantment and Enlightenment philosophy. The turn to moral discipline and away from communicating the gospel was a result of the dissolution of the magical world and the adoption of reason as a measure for spirituality and Christian life.
5 Therapeutic culture

By adopting the therapeutic approach, the church has based pastoral care theory and practice on the liberal ideal: the goal is to set people free to achieve the goals and goods they have chosen themselves. But we need to look more closely at the origins of the assumptions behind therapeutic pastoral care. I argue that the therapeutic turn was based on a larger development of therapeutic culture that came to define many important aspects of the contemporary Western cultural ethos. The methodical choice of handing over the power of interpretation to parishioners took place in the context of certain suppositions adopted from modern psychology.

One central assumption behind the therapeutic pastoral approach was that people are inherently morally good; a human being always strives for good but his or her attempts fail because of psychological shortcomings. Carl Rogers, the founder of humanistic psychology, was the most important figure to shape the practical approach – and directly influenced pastoral care theory – of emphatic and dialogical non-directivity, which aims to help the one in distress to find his or her own answers to the given problem. This way human beings are only able to overcome personal mental adversities by finding solutions for themselves and that the emphatic, supportive, appreciative and non-directional therapeutic encounter is the way to offer help in this process.

Ultimately, in terms of therapeutic culture, in seeking ways to deal with mental difficulties, a human being seeks to find his or her true self. This true self is narrated as the idea of self-fulfilment, that is, to make oneself what one can ideally be, to make the most of what one is as a person. The goal is a person who can cope with psychological issues and problems as well as possible. Achieving this goal is a process, because it is assumed that every human being suffers from psychological issues of some kind; the self is inevitably a pathological self. In principle, and this is essential, the psychological scheme of self-fulfilment is an understanding of suffering, particularly mental suffering. Thus, the humanistic psychology is a therapeutic scheme, and, as it has been adopted on a broad cultural scale in the West, the culture is essentially therapeutic. In the therapeutic culture, suffering plays a paradoxical role. The therapeutic narrative is about the self in a process of overcoming mental difficulties and adversities on the road to self-fulfilment. So, although the explicit target is a well
coping and true self, suffering has become a key element in how the self is narrated and experienced.\textsuperscript{55}

As was noted, the idea of human as a creature who aims to find his or her true self, derives from the liberal ethos of secular imaginary: the idea is that human is free from religious and moral authorities to define the goods themselves. The challenge imposed to pastoral care then is how to convey the Christian message and beliefs while realizing the therapeutic task to relieve suffering, because the therapeutic approach is inevitably based on the liberal idea of individual freedom. Carmen Schuhmann and Annelieke Damen have offered an answer to this challenged with the idea that pastoral care is about representing the Good.\textsuperscript{56}

The Iris Murdoch’s concept the Good refers to the ultimate – and necessarily transcendent – fundament that determines how one orient him or herself to life in deepest sense. With Taylor’s concept of moral space as the “space of questions about the good”, that are the fundamental existential questions of how to live our life and what the normative purpose behind the answers given is, Schuhmann and Damen explain the spiritual task of pastoral is about representing the Good. This way pastoral care is about engaging with people in how they orient themselves to fundamental existential questions\textsuperscript{57}, which is strongly related to what Grevbo advocates. Grevbo has defended an idea of therapeutically oriented pastoral care as a meditative task of supporting the one who suffers by asking questions and standing by him or her.\textsuperscript{58}

6 Theological shortcomings of the currently prevailing theory of pastoral care

Kilpeläinen’s theological interpretation provided the theological basis for the therapeutic approach in the church. The basic idea is that gospel is proclaimed by countering earthly suffering as it is, as was explained in the Section 2. For Kilpeläinen, there is no need to interpret experiences with Christian concepts and in the light of Christian spirituality because, as she claimed, people already do it although they would not explain it that way.\textsuperscript{59} But this view is problematic; there is no reason to assume that members of the church in twenty-first-century Finland would generally interpret their experiences in a spiritual or, moreover, in a Christian spiritual framework.\textsuperscript{60} The challenge of the spiritual task in pastoral care has been met with pastoral psychological theorization.
Pastoral psychological theory influenced within the pastoral theology concerning the church mainly after the 90’s through works of Paavo Kettunen. Since then Kettunen’s pastoral theological understanding has prevailed as the theological explanation of how the spiritual and religious task of the church is carried out in and by the therapeutic approach. Kettunen’s theory illustrates how contemporary theory of pastoral care is shaped by the therapeutic culture. Namely, modern psychology is not only used as a method in the task of pastoral care, to respond to and counter earthly suffering. Today, the spiritual task of pastoral care and spirituality as a whole is explained as a psychological phenomenon.

To explain how therapeutic pastoral care carries out the spiritual task of the church to proclaim the gospel, Kettunen views spirituality as working only in the psychological domain. Although he does not deny the possibility of a transcendent realm outside of human experience, he claims spirituality to be bound to mental experience based on the argument that the transcendent cannot be examined by objective and empirical means.61

The logical conclusion of this view of spirituality is to argue that consolation itself conveys the divine gifts. This is based on the traditional Lutheran understanding of God’s mercy as the true source of joy.62 The argument is that mercy is received by leading to joy through consolation. This is substantiated by examining the link between mercy and mentally experienced joy as a psychological phenomenon. For Kettunen, God is implicitly present in pastoral care relations, and spirituality is explained by the individual’s inner concept of God. Thus, consolation and leading to joy are, at least potentially, about reforming or correcting the personal concept of God.63

The theological problems with Kettunen’s theory are obvious. His central misconception regards how spiritual reality is understood theologically. Although spiritual reality cannot be empirically examined outside mental experience of an individual, this does not mean that the church should justify its practices with empirically observable evidence alone. On the contrary, the church is essentially based on its knowledge of a transcendent reality and church practices are designed to convey this spiritual reality to people.64
7 Discussion: fundamental Lutheran pastoral theology

By confining spirituality to the psychological domain, Kettunen’s pastoral psychological theory has, clearly unintentionally, followed a basic theological scheme equivalent to that of Pietism. Although the therapeutic approach explicitly denies the kind of pietistic model that requires faith and a certain expression thereof as the aim of pastoral care, the central idea in pastoral psychology is that faith necessarily produces and is equivalent to certain emotional content. In other words, faith is understood as a matter of subjective mental experience.

To reduce faith and thus spirituality to a matter of mental experience, I claim, is a key reason why spirituality is such a problematic issue for the theory and practice of contemporary pastoral care. In an era of secularization, when the number of devoted Christians is declining and Christian teaching is increasingly less well known or less often used to explain spiritual experience, it is problematic to ground faith on emotional and psychological experience.

Yet, my criticism should not be understood as criticism towards the therapeutic approach as such. To be clear, therapeutic approach should not be ditched in favour of a scheme based on the task of explicitly conveying mercy. There is no going back to a medieval enchanted world where suffering could be understood and interpreted only within religious reality and to restricting care only to the spiritual task of salvation of souls. In secular world, the church has to hold on to the idea that its task is to counter suffering as it is. This means keeping to an approach based on appreciation, empathy and understanding, not on normativity and paternalism. Disenchantment and secularization, as presented in the Section 4, provide historical and philosophical reasons why the empowering therapeutic approach is needed and the paternalistic approach can no longer have the needed therapeutic power.

Instead of psychological interpretation, the spiritual task of pastoral care should be based on the fundamental theological understanding that God exists, acts and touches life regardless of human spiritual experience. This is based on the elementary Lutheran theology that sees God as the absolute and objective power and human as passive in relation to God. In terms of spirituality, human is not the actor but only God is. This means that Christian spirituality should not be bound to a personal emotional or any other kind of experience.65 In other words, in light of the basic
Lutheran theology of God’s nature as objective and absolute, pastoral psychological explanation of spirituality as a psychological matter, is proved not to be in line with Lutheran teaching.

Therefore, the pastoral psychological assumptions that the therapeutic approach in Finnish discussions is currently based on need to be reformed. The ideas of pastoral care as task of representing the Good, by Schuhmann and Damen, and Grevbo’s meditative pastoral care are helpful in facing the Finnish theological challenge I have described. With these ideas, pastoral care could be built as an open process that concerns how one orients him or herself to the fundamental transcendence, while holding on to the basic Lutheran belief that the fundamental transcendence is not bound to human experience. But what implications this theological reform would have in terms of practice of pastoral care, is another question that is outside of the scope of this article.
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This idea has affected not just pastoral care but the whole church, which has given up on church discipline in general, in all its practices.

Kilpeläinen explained that CPE was influenced by humanistic psychology, Irja Kilpeläinen, *Psykoottisten sielunhoito*, 51–53.


Bozarth, “‘Nondirectivity”, 266. Joseph & Murphy, “Person-Centered Approach”, 159.


So, although seen as good in terms of morals, psychologically, human beings are failing.

Moskoqwitz, *In Therapy We Trust*, presents self-fulfilment as “therapeutic gospel” and explains how it has become essential to understanding in virtually every context of Western society and culture. See Illouz, *Saving the Modern Soul*, 171–176.
The idea that the self is pathological is political, too, setting the scene for contemporary identity politics, Furedi, *Therapy culture*, 196. The therapeutic scheme was exploited by great social movements in the 1960s, Moskowitz, *In Therapy We Trust*, 178–217.

Illouz, *Saving the Modern Soul*, 173. In the therapeutic narrative of the self, personal suffering is instrumentalized, given a certain therapeutic meaning and purpose. Unreasonable or unexplained events have no place; everything has to be integrated into the narrative of the true self. Suffering without a reason, like in the story of Job, has no place: instead suffering is always connected to personal psychological growth towards the true self. This is morally problematic because it implies suffering is fundamentally good, Pihlström, *Taking evil seriously*. Modern popular culture is full of stories of how serious illness made somebody grow as a person; e.g. people who recovered from cancer are called cancer survivors.
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Kettunen, *Auttava kohtaaminen* is at the moment the basic textbook used in pastoral theology and pastoral education in the church.

Another more obvious critique is her illustration of Jesus as a healer, on which I make two short comments. The means of communication which Jesus generally used was not dialogue, but encountering people in need. Also, the effectiveness of Jesus’ healing cannot be said to have been due to the method he used.
Kettunen also interprets the evolution of Christian tradition and doctrine in terms of pastoral psychology, arguing that the early church fathers and other theologians were shaped by their own psychological experiences, Kettunen, *Auttava kohtaaminen*, 32–33.

For Luther, the liberating force of God’s work of salvation through grace by justification was a great joy for the people who received this gift. A Christian was called to follow Christ by taking up their cross and humbly accepting God’s wrath towards their sinfulness. Thus, the spiritual process went through suffering to joy, Kolb, “Luther”, 33–58. The Catholic Church responded to Luther’s critique of scholastic theology by describing grace as received in a somewhat mechanical process through liturgical practice, namely confession. In early Catholic Reformation theology, grace was understood as the basis of being of a Christian who seeks to love God and to manifest that in their actions, Byrne & Houlden, *Companion Encyclopedia of Theology*, 611.

Kettunen used Matti Hyrck’s psychoanalytical theory of five psychological images of God, Kettunen, *Suomalainen rippi*, esp. 467–476. The five images of God are analogical to psychological development in psychoanalytical theory: God as Healer is seen as the “healthiest” version, Hyrck, *Ihmismieli ja Jumala*.

On theological problems in Kettunen’s theory, see Juntunen, ”Teologian ja psykologian korrelaatio”, 463–473. Kettunen extends pastoral psychology to determine a (doctrinal) theological basis of pastoral care, giving rise to methodological problems. I follow the more common understanding that pastoral psychology is primarily (theory of) practice, not a theological basis of pastoral care, e.g. Louw, *A pastoral hermeneutics*, 8; Burbach, “Zum Probrium der Seelsorge”; Ziemer, *Psychologische Grundlagen der Seelsorge*, 58–61. This being said, pastoral psychology was needed to create a theology of pastoral care and reflect theory on practical level; thus my critique is not aimed at pastoral psychology in general but strictly at Kettunen’s interpretation. Recent Finnish debates have centred around the theological basis of pastoral psychology, its role as a field and in relation to pastoral theology (Vähäkangas, “Pastoraaliteologia tutkimusalana”; Kettunen, “Pastoraaliteologia ja pastoraalipsykologia tutkimusaloina”).