

5-1-1988

## Preservation and salvation: the significance of eschatology for the mission of the church

Robert A. Kelly

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholars.wlu.ca/consensus>

---

### Recommended Citation

Kelly, Robert A. (1988) "Preservation and salvation: the significance of eschatology for the mission of the church," *Consensus*: Vol. 14 : Iss. 1 , Article 4.

Available at: <http://scholars.wlu.ca/consensus/vol14/iss1/4>

This Articles is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Consensus by an authorized editor of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact [scholarscommons@wlu.ca](mailto:scholarscommons@wlu.ca).

# Preservation and Salvation: The Significance of Eschatology for the Mission of the Church

Robert A. Kelly

*Assistant Professor of Systematic Theology,  
Waterloo Lutheran Seminary, Waterloo*

One of the last study documents from the Lutheran Council in Canada was "War and Peace: A Theological Study Statement."<sup>1</sup> Much of this document makes use of the distinction of two kingdoms in a manner typical of conservative American Lutheranism and separates history and eschatology in an attempt to protect both the central doctrine of justification *solo Christo* and the doctrine of divine providence. Especially in North America any attempt to maintain the *sola gratia* nature of salvation is to be commended, but the document also seems to try to justify the current nuclear status quo. Such a position cannot be accepted precisely for reasons outlined in paragraphs 7, 10, and 19 of the document itself.<sup>2</sup> The problem of such a position becomes clear in the last two sentences of the document: "[God] is yet Lord of the universe and of all history and nations. Though human life may be destroyed by nuclear power with divine permission, God still reigns and will bring all things to His desired results."

It is difficult to find any characterization of the idea that God might give permission for humans to destroy themselves with nuclear weapons other than heresy—pernicious false doctrine. If one were to take "divine sovereignty" as the central doctrine for theology perhaps such a view would be tenable, but in Lutheran theology the God who has redeemed creation in the crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth is not the sort of God who would grant permission for nuclear holocaust. The history of the human species might be ended by nuclear weapons, but any such action will be caused and directed by the military-industrial establishment of the United States and the Soviet Union, not by God. God's work is to preserve and redeem

creation, not destroy it. This study document has a seriously deficient eschatology if it cannot recognize the preservation of creation as essential to God's eschatological work.

At the same time that "War and Peace" was being prepared Gordon Kaufman was proposing a new *Theology for a Nuclear Age*.<sup>3</sup> Kaufman takes the opposite tack:

However, in the religious eschatology of the West the end of history is pictured quite differently than we today must face it. For it is undergirded by faith in an active creator and governor of history, one who from the beginning was working our purposes which were certain to be realised as history moved to its consummation. The end of history ... was to be God's climactic act ...

In contrast, the end of history which we in the late twentieth century must contemplate—an end brought about by nuclear holocaust—must be conceived primarily not as God's doing but as ours.<sup>4</sup>

Kaufman sees the nuclear crisis as the catalyst for a fundamental religious change. Because we now have the capability to destroy ourselves and all future generations of the race, theology must be reconceived and new meaning found for the central Christian symbols "God" and "Christ". Kaufman sees theology as an activity of the human imagination interpreting reality to provide orientation for life. Specifically, theology is not the interpretation of tradition, but imaginative construction.<sup>5</sup>

To Kaufman God is the symbol for that reality which expresses and fulfills itself through the evolutionary (understood both biologically and culturally) processes which have produced life on this planet, and especially human life. God symbolizes those factors which have made human life possible, sustain human life, and draw life toward fuller humanity. As the only known creatures who incarnate this mode of being, humans have a special responsibility: we are responsible for God's fate. If we use our ability to give birth to a life more characterized by the humane qualities of love, justice, freedom, and creativity, then God's being is enhanced. If we use our ability to create a nuclear holocaust or ecological disaster, then we will have dealt God an enormous setback.<sup>6</sup>

Within the context of this new image of God Kaufman turns to a reconstruction of the images of Christ, salvation, and Christian existence. Christ is primarily the person for others, the one who went to the cross rather than defend himself against his enemies. Since our problem today is the steady

erosion of the possibility for meaningful and fruitful life, salvation must address the conditions which make such life possible. Saving activity happens wherever creativity, healing, reconstruction, liberation, and reconciliation happen. Christian existence is giving myself completely to the struggle against the evils in modern life. This results in a spirituality which does not focus on the cultivation of inner consciousness but on a way of life that emphasizes work for liberation, reconciliation, and community.<sup>7</sup>

Like "War and Peace," Kaufman sets traditional formulae against contemporary reality, but in each case sides against what he considers to be the tradition.<sup>8</sup> Theologians with confessional commitments and/or concern for the continuity and apostolicity of Christian tradition will find it difficult to agree with Kaufman's presuppositions or many of his conclusions. Nonetheless, the anomaly that "War and Peace" uses traditional formulae to arrive at what seems to be a most un-Scriptural and un-Lutheran conclusion while Kaufman attacks tradition at every turn and yet comes to a spirituality very much like Luther's<sup>9</sup> cannot be denied. If the distinction of two kingdoms can be so misused, perhaps we ought to examine it again so that it helps rather than hinders us in efforts to develop a Canadian Lutheran theological and ethical response to the potential for nuclear holocaust. The purpose of this study is to suggest five theses that might assist in such a reassessment.

*Thesis One: The distinction of two kingdoms is about the distinction between God's eschatological salvation and God's preservation of the world through history.*

Luther's great theological concern was to free justification from its captivity to human self-justification and to assert the free grace of God. He rightly saw that it was not our obvious sins but our great achievements which obscure our dependence on God.<sup>10</sup> In our attempts to make ourselves immortal, we undo God's salvation. Thus Luther wanted to protect justification from human works. From this point he developed his *theologia crucis* which crucified religious immortality projects.

At the same time Luther recognized that we are God's co-workers in preserving creation and caring for the world as the context for human life. In the task of stewardship of the cosmos our works and efforts are of great importance. Luther believed that the use of coercive power was a necessity because of human



sin.<sup>11</sup> Rather than working in weakness as in the cross, God preserves creation through the power of the sword. Luther feared that translating the theology of the cross into political life would result in chaos and threaten God's preservation. In addition, in Luther's mind, making justification by faith into a social program threatened the more important religious gains of the Reformation.<sup>12</sup> Luther's solution to these problems was to distinguish God's eschatological salvation of the world in the cross of Christ from God's historical preservation of the world through social order. He combined and adapted Augustine's idea of the two cities and the distinction of the two swords (which dates back at least to Pope Gelasius in the fifth century) into the distinction of two kingdoms.<sup>13</sup>

What gives Luther's distinction a theological significance it did not have in its previous forms was its connection to the prior distinction of Law and Gospel.<sup>14</sup> Insofar as preservation through the kingdom of the left hand was connected with the civil use of the Law, it became a pure command.<sup>15</sup> Thus justice, for example, came to be seen as word of alienation rather than word of reconciliation, a binding word rather than a freeing word. This attitude was only intensified in later Lutheranism as the distinction of two kingdoms became the Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms and the wall between history and eschatology became stronger. What had, with Luther, been a noetic distinction was given ontological status. This movement reached its culmination in nineteenth century Germany and was transplanted from there to North America, where it was attached to the deistic and Baptist idea of the separation of church and state.<sup>16</sup>

*Thesis 2. The nuclear age has produced a situation in which preservation must be understood eschatologically.*

No matter how we understand salvation, if the world is to be saved, it must be preserved until that salvation is accomplished. God uses people to do God's work, but the initiative must remain with God. If we manage to destroy the world ourselves, we will have thwarted God's purposes as effectively as Adam and Eve did in Eden when they ate the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. There is a significant parallel between our present situation and that story. Before eating, Adam and Eve were innocent. They did not make moral decisions, but let God decide for them what was right and wrong.

But they were not satisfied—they wanted to come of age and make their own decisions; so they did, and God's plans were thwarted.<sup>17</sup> Before August 1945, we lived in a different situation. We were incapable of destroying the world. Even Adolf Hitler had to resort to conventional methods. Genocide was possible, cosmicide was not. We had to depend on God to determine the end of our history. But we were not satisfied; we wanted more destructive force. We ate of the fruit of nuclear fission and gained the power to end history. We have come of age and now carry in our hands the means to thwart God's plans on a scale that Adam could not have imagined in his most egocentric fantasies.

Without accepting Gordon Kaufman's entire theological proposal, it seems true that our theology must now take into account this new order of reality. We can no longer afford a theology formulated as if the world is the same now as it was before the atomic destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. God remains God, but nuclear weapons have created an historical context fundamentally different from any ever before faced. With the capability to destroy the world, we are not talking about a difference of degree but an absolute difference.

One area where this difference expresses itself is in the importance of preservation, not the preservation of the *status quo*, but preservation of God's work of creation. Certainly, God's preservation of the world through human stewards has always been an important topic for theology,<sup>18</sup> but we now face a situation in which the cause of our stewardship has brought us to the brink of total destruction. In this situation preservation must be elevated toward the very top of the theological and missionary agenda of the church. In the past we could take God's preservation of creation for granted, and perhaps even leave the task solely to the institutions of social order. We no longer have that luxury. It seems that the best way to see the importance of preservation in its current significance is to understand it in the same light that we have always understood redemption: as part of God's eschatological work. Preservation and redemption are two indivisible parts of God's one mission.

We need to examine how this affirmation impacts the heart of Lutheran theology. At our best, we Lutherans understand ourselves as a confessional movement within the catholic

church. The gift that we bring to the whole church is our insistence on the free grace of God for all in the cross of Christ. The church continues to need our confession of God's affirmation of persons apart from achievements as much today as it did in the sixteenth century. It is difficult to draw any sure conclusions on how Lutheran theology can affirm both the eschatological significance of preservation—which elevates the necessity of our cooperation with God to part of salvation—with a proper understanding of justification *solus Christus*—which maintains the necessity of our salvation being dependent entirely on God rather than our own achievement. Somehow, the eschatological significance of both justification and preservation must be affirmed.

A solution to this problem might lie in a better understanding of the paradigm of the *theologia crucis* which takes more seriously the work of the Holy Spirit in using us in the eschatological mission of God. Without becoming semi-Pelagians or synergists, Lutherans need to look more carefully at the Spirit's role in justification and regeneration. The resources for such an effort already exist in Luther's own theology of the Spirit<sup>19</sup> and in parts of Lutheran Pietism. This task should be a central part of our theological agenda into the twenty-first century.

One recent attempt to move somewhat in this direction has been made by Gerhard Forde, who tries to maintain the distinction of the two kingdoms while freeing it from previous problems.<sup>20</sup> For Forde, justification is an eschatological event which is promised only to faith and cannot be confused with any human political or religious project. Eschatological rule must be sharply distinguished from historical forms of rule so that the Gospel remains unconditional and so that we do not use pseudo-eschatological programs as tools to oppress and tyrannize others. Any attempt to synthesize the rule of Christ with the rule of this age can only lead to disaster. The separation of the two kingdoms is equally problematic, leading to the identification of the church and the kingdom and the use of the church as an escape from life in the world. Both synthesis and separation are the results of a false eschatology. Says Forde, "Before rashly plunging into political adventure, we must get our eschatology straight, lest we just add to the tyranny."<sup>21</sup> In the light of unconditional grace, the church is to be involved in



politics so as to care for God's creation, but recognizing that "God's kingdom comes by God's power alone in God's good time."<sup>22</sup>

There is much that is appealing about Forde's thinking on justification, and his efforts to develop a true *theologia crucis* are to be lauded, but it does not appear that he has yet fully considered the consequences of the nuclear age. It is precisely the character of this age that we are on the verge of eliminating the concept of "God's good time" altogether and usurping God's power over the end of the world forever. Preservation does not attempt to bring God's kingdom by human means, but simply to preserve the world so that the kingdom can come by God's power alone.

*Thesis 3. The eschaton is God's reconciliation and liberation of the entire cosmos.*

In the nuclear world, what is a proper eschatology? There are certainly enough different eschatologies available in the theological marketplace today. Most of those operate as if the pre-nuclear world still existed, though the dispensationalists have managed to work nuclear holocaust into their scheme and sold their heresy to many in the United States, who now believe that nuclear war is inevitable because it is the biblical Armageddon. This makes an orthodox and timely eschatology even more important. Hans Schwartz has suggested four ground rules for formulating eschatology that might prove helpful: (1) We cannot simply extrapolate present conditions and project them into the future; (2) We must remember that eschatological talk is necessarily symbolic, in a Tillichian sense of "symbol"; (3) All Christian eschatology is grounded in and critiqued by the death and resurrection of Jesus; (4) The starting point of eschatology is not the world and its possible futures, but God, who has opened an otherwise inaccessible future to us in Christ.<sup>23</sup>

Keeping these ground rules in mind, it would seem that the proper place to begin eschatology is at the beginning, not at the end. Creation is an eschatological act, the first act of God's work which will be consummated at the end. We can see this if we look at creation as a trinitarian act: the Father created the world by the Son in the Spirit. In this formula we can see two aspects of creation that are often overlooked. First, insofar as creation is by the Son, it is an act of promise which looks



forward to its fulfillment in Christ. Creation is already part of the event of salvation. Thus the goal of salvation cannot be the violent destruction of God's work. Second, insofar as creation is in the Spirit, God's future is already present in the origin and draws creation toward consummation. In the Spirit our origin in creation is both part of our past and part of our future—and in this way part of our present. If this is true, a proper eschatology cannot focus on a return to pristine purity. Creation is the beginning of future possibility, not final perfection. In the Spirit, change is not an evil to be deplored, but God moving history toward creation's fulfillment. Eastern theology has long understood that history is creation involved in the movement of God's triune being by the Spirit.<sup>24</sup>

We cannot assert that creation has already arrived, or that it contains within itself that which is necessary to reach ultimate fulfillment. The eschaton is not just the far end of a process of biological, cultural, and technological progress, as the nineteenth century thought—or as American optimism thinks today. Thus, preservation alone is not a sufficient eschatology. Eschatology assumes that God enters creation, bringing in a new paradigm radically different from any that we might have thought up on our own.

Here is where Lutheran theology—insofar as it remains a *theologia crucis*—must take issue with Kaufman. While his theological proposal concludes with a piety very much like a *pietas crucis*, he does not arrive there by a *theologia crucis*. Rather Kaufman assumes that the purpose of God is to provide “a viable symbol for orienting human life.”<sup>25</sup> His horizon remains that which serves humanity and that which is humanly possible. What Kaufman suggests is not really a new Christianity but a new version of Western civil religion.

A *theologia crucis* cannot rest content with reconstructing the cultural religion but by its nature subverts such a religion and the ideology which it symbolizes. Any ideology promotes the building of towers of Babel, and it is precisely the ideology of late capitalism which has produced the present nuclear Babel. The cross enters into this situation as a radical new possibility which confronts our ideology, un-builds our Babel, and makes liberation and reconciliation historically concrete. By the cross the humanly impossible is revealed as possible.

Learning from Eberhard Juengel<sup>26</sup> and Liberation Theology, we can see reconciliation and liberation not just as theological and ethical ideas, but as concrete expressions of the inmost being of God. This reconciliation and liberation, which are both eschatological and worked out in history, are centered in the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth and come to consummation as the goal of history.

Within the current context it is important to be quite clear that reconciliation and liberation as the historical and eschatological expression of God's being came as the goal of history, not at some point after history is finished. Thus preservation is essential to salvation as the continuing context of history being drawn towards God's goal in Christ by the Spirit. While the eschatological goal is not the destruction of creation or extra-historical paradise, it does involve such a radical reorientation of existence that it can only be seen as cosmic crucifixion and resurrection. The goal of history is that a risen creation will live reconciled to God and to itself in complete *shalom* and *tsedeq* in its risen Lord Jesus. Like the origin of eschatology in creation, the goal of eschatology in the resurrection is trinitarian: the Father brings history to its goal in the Son by the Spirit.

This applies to the whole cosmos, not only to humans. All of creation awaits its fulfillment with eager anticipation. God's work is not directed only toward us, but to all our fellow creatures. The writer of Genesis already knew this when s/he included the curse of the earth in the Fall narrative—alienation and death affect the cosmos. Paul also knew this when he wrote Romans. Eschatology focuses broadly on all creation, so that preservation would be crucial, even if our own survival and salvation did not depend on it.

Here we run up against the bondage of the will—or more accurately, the limitation on human choice. As human stewards of God's creation, we cannot by our own reason and strength bring in the kingdom. But we do now have within our grasp the ability to prevent the kingdom from coming. Thus it is absolutely essential that such ability not be used. The prevention of nuclear holocaust should be one of the highest priorities on the church's agenda. The mission of preservation cannot cause the final resurrection, but it is essential to the work of the Spirit which will result in the final resurrection.

*Thesis 4. The Church is the means by which the Holy Spirit draws creation into the eschaton.*

It is a truism of Lutheran theology that the Holy Spirit works by means of Word and Sacrament. While it must be said that the church is the creation of the Spirit by Word and Sacrament, we perhaps need to widen our understanding a bit. The church has dialectical existence both as the creation of the Spirit and as the means of the Spirit. The community of Word and Sacrament is the Spirit's means for moving history towards its goal. This is not to say that the Spirit never works outside of the institutional churches or that the church here is already the kingdom, but it is to say that the community of faith gathered around Word and Sacrament is itself a word to and sacrament for the world.<sup>27</sup> The mission of the church is eschatological; the church is the means by which the Holy Spirit preserves, reconciles, and liberates the world in Christ.

The distinction of two kingdoms can be a help in understanding the place of the church and the churches in the Spirit's work of mission. The churches—those local, regional, national, and international organizations in which persons hold membership—belong to both kingdoms. That is, within the churches is the church, the communion of saints. It is hidden, but its presence can be recognized.<sup>28</sup> Because the church must be public<sup>29</sup> its presence depends on the churches for expression. Thus we can say that the church is the Body of Christ and belongs to the "spiritual" kingdom. At the same time churches are human organizations which fall under the legal codes, hold property, and have constitutions. Thus the churches also belong to the "secular" kingdom. The church's mission includes working under the Spirit for preservation, reconciliation, and liberation in both kingdoms.

We cannot afford a low view of the mission of the church in the present. God has made the church central to God's purposes. This collection of sinner-saints is the body of Christ, the presence of Christ in the world by the Spirit, working in the power of the Spirit to draw the world toward its final reconciliation and liberation. Its mission includes both proclaiming the presence of the kingdom of God and demonstrating the social and political meaning of the nearness of God's kingdom. In Lutheranism, in fact in Christianity in general, these two



aspects of the church's mission have been seen as different activities, as two parts that need to be held in balance. The significance of eschatology for the mission of the church in a nuclear age is that proclamation and demonstration are not two, but one eschatological mission carried out in history for creation.

*Thesis 5. Preservation of creation is part of the Church's eschatological mission.*

Our world is like a patient that is both psychotic and suicidal. The psychiatrist will, of course, want to deal fully with the psychosis that is at the root of the problem, but the first task is to keep the patient alive. If the patient self-destructs, there will be no cure now or ever. Analogously, the fundamental work of the church is now, as it has always been and will be, reconciliation and liberation in Christ. But if we ignore preservation of creation there will be nothing left to reconcile or liberate. The church cannot allow humanity to commit suicide through nuclear war.

Lutheran theology has traditionally seen preservation as the province of social institutions other than the church. There is truth in that position, but it does not tell the whole truth for the nuclear age. Today, governments are among the greatest dangers to preservation as well as a tool for preservation. If preservation is of eschatological concern, the church cannot leave the task to others, but must take up the preservation of the world as a primary item on its own agenda. Peace-building and justice-seeking are not just important ethical concerns in the political arena, but are at the heart of *the church's* mission of eschatological preservation.<sup>30</sup>

The church plays a two-fold role in the preservation of creation. On the more passive side, the very presence of the church in the world is a sign of God's promise—something like Noah's rainbow. Christ promised that his church would remain until the end, so the presence of the church symbolizes God's faithfulness to and preservation of creation. On the more active side, God uses the church in the work of promise-keeping. The church is taken into the Spirit's work of actualizing the promise which the church symbolizes. The church is called in the power of the Spirit to become the vanguard of the Kingdom of God, preserving creation and preparing the world for its fulfillment in Christ.



The church has not always answered this call, so we can ask how we might renew the church for its mission in the present. Here the historical situation is again important. The age of Christendom is dying—in most places is already dead. Christianity is no longer primarily the established religion of the dominant countries. Not only have the European and North American nations become secularized, but the energy of the church has shifted from the northern to the southern hemisphere. In this situation the church must find new forms for expressing its mission. As Douglas John Hall has pointed out, we will need to give up being the national religion and find ways to be the church that are not based on “Christendom” thinking.<sup>31</sup>

At least part of the problem is that we still define ourselves primarily as chaplains to the status quo rather than as prophets of God’s future. The time has come when the powers of this world must be confronted for the sake of the survival of the world. In this confrontation we will need to leave behind the Constantinian/Christendom model for mission. On the other hand, a so-called apocalyptic model is not very helpful either. Thomas Muentzer is not a good example for us to follow. What is needed is a renewal of a third paradigm, the *theologia crucis* which, though it stands as fundamental to the Pauline and also Lutheran tradition, has been sadly neglected in our church.

One important aspect of the change needed will be for Lutherans to find a way to discipleship and commitment. How can we be the means which the Spirit is using to preserve the world and draw creation toward reconciliation and liberation if we can barely get twenty per cent of our people to show up on Sunday morning? Something is radically wrong when less than a quarter of the vanguard of the Holy Spirit can even drag themselves to hear the Word and celebrate the Sacrament which are supposed to be empowering them for eschatological service. In order for Christian people to take their proper role as instruments of the power of God’s future, they need to be molded and formed by the Gospel in Word and Sacrament.

In bringing our people to an understanding of mission, there is a great need for pastoral concern and realism. Many Lutherans have not been taught to think of themselves as an eschatological vanguard, and so they do not. In addition there are those Christians who for one reason or another find such a

role difficult, if not impossible. One cannot ride roughshod over these Christians. God's purposes are achieved by loving people, not by demeaning them. Yet it does people no good to leave them in ignorance. It is as unloving to assume that persons will never learn and so give up on them as it is to criticize unthinkingly. The task of the ministry today is lovingly to help people develop a theology and spirituality that will enable them not only to adopt, but to embrace a new paradigm for the mission of the church. As the church takes up a mission which involves confronting the destructive powers, pastors and people will need a depth of theology and spirituality almost without parallel in the church's history.

The spirituality that we need will, at a minimum, have these characteristics suggested by Kenneth Leech: it will be a spirituality of the cross which enables us to feel the world's pain as God's pain and our own pain. It will be rooted in the witness to God's holiness and justice in the history of Israel. It will be a Christocentric spirituality which is faithful to Jesus' proclamation of the Kingdom. It will be an apostolic spirituality which springs from faith in the crucified and resurrected Jesus. It will avoid easy answers to deep questions. It will arise from the waters of Baptism and the daily renewal of Baptism. It will be nourished by worship in Word and Sacrament in the celebration of the Eucharist. It will see God as the ground of all being and our stewardship of the earth as a special gift and call from God. It will seek to deepen a personal relationship with God in Christ by the Spirit. It will take seriously the experience and insights of the marginalized. It will be a spirituality of justice and peace.<sup>32</sup>

Contrary to the conclusions of both "War and Peace" and Gordon Kaufman, the traditions of catholic Christianity and Lutheran theology do not prevent the Lutheran church in Canada from being an instrument in global peace-building and the preservation of creation. Certainly our traditions must be renewed and interpreted again in the light of nuclear reality. It is the proposal of this study that just such an interpretation should occur around the significance of preservation. But Lutheran theology is not imaginative construct *de novo*, Lutheran theology is confessing the Gospel in continuity with the whole history of confessing the Gospel. The materials that we need to enable our church to be a peace-building church are

present in our tradition and ought to be used so that Lutheran people in Canada can play their proper role in the work of the Spirit bringing all creation to its goal in Christ.

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> Division of Theology, Lutheran Council in Canada, *Issues* (September 1985).
- <sup>2</sup> Cf. Richard C. Crossman, "Creative Justice in a Nuclear World," *Consensus* 11/1 (January 1985) 24-26.
- <sup>3</sup> Manchester: Manchester University Press and Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1985.
- <sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 3-4.
- <sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* 26, 32.
- <sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* 42-43.
- <sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* 55-57.
- <sup>8</sup> While this is Kaufman's self-perception, it is not always the case. For example, his criteria for a concept of God, relativization and humanization, are drawn from Scripture and tradition, not from imaginative construction.
- <sup>9</sup> Cf. "Treatise on Good Works," *LW* 44:15-114; also George Forell, *Faith Active in Love* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1964) and Donald C. Ziemke, *Love for the Neighbor in Luther's Theology: The Development of His Thought, 1512-1529* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1963).
- <sup>10</sup> *LW* 26:39-42.
- <sup>11</sup> *LW* 7:190, 30:74-76, 45:91.
- <sup>12</sup> Cf. Luther's response to the peasants. *LW* 46:3-85.
- <sup>13</sup> For the development of the distinction prior to Luther, cf. Ulrich Duchrow, *Christenheit und Weltverantwortung: Traditionsgeschichte und systematische Struktur der Zweireichelehre* (Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Verlag, 1970).
- <sup>14</sup> This assessment is based on Gerhard Ebeling, "The Necessity of the Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms," in *Word and Faith*, James W. Leitch, tr. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963) 387-391. Gerhard Forde places the distinction of the two kingdoms prior to the distinction of Law and Gospel in Carl Braaten and Robert Jenson, eds., *Christian Dogmatics* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984) vol. 2, 456.
- <sup>15</sup> *LW* 30:74-76, 25:109-111, 45:63, 2:64-65, 4:29.
- <sup>16</sup> For a review of these trends, cf. Karl H. Hertz, ed., *Two Kingdoms and One World* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1976).
- <sup>17</sup> Cf. Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Ethics* E. Bethge, ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1965) 17-20.
- <sup>18</sup> Cf. Douglas John Hall, *The Steward: A Biblical Symbol Come of Age* (New York: Friendship Press, 1982). As Hall points out in his more recent book, *Imaging God: Dominion as Stewardship* (Grand Rapids:

Wm. B. Eerdmans and New York: Friendship Press, 1986), stewardship is given renewed importance by the threat of a nuclear end to human history: "Under these conditions... Christians... are required to declare themselves with respect to this world" (40).

- 19 Cf. Regin Prenter, *Spiritus Creator*, John M. Jensen, tr. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959).
- 20 Braaten and Jensen, vol. 2, 455-460.
- 21 Ibid. vol. 2, 459.
- 22 Ibid.
- 23 Ibid. vol. 2, 555-556.
- 24 Alasdair I.C. Heron, *The Holy Spirit* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983) 85.
- 25 Kaufman, 39.
- 26 *God as the Mystery of the World*, Darrell L. Guder, tr. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1983) esp. 299-396.
- 27 Here the theology of Karl Rahner can be helpful. Cf. Rahner, *Theological Investigations* 2:97-98, 4:240-242 and 272-278, 14:179-180, 20:104-106.
- 28 *LW* 41:143-178.
- 29 Note that all of Luther's signs are public; cf. *ibid.*
- 30 While such is not the focus of this study, stewardship of the environment is also important here. For proposal of an ecological *theologia crucis*, cf. Douglas John Hall, *Lighten Our Darkness* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976).
- 31 Douglas John Hall, *Has the Church a Future?* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1980).
- 32 Kenneth Leech, *Experiencing God: Theology as Spirituality* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1985).