

justification, or righteousness before God? But even though they could not agree over the interpretation of the Lord's Supper, Luther and Zwingli acknowledged a consensus in the understanding of the righteousness of the believer before God. The consensus on justification demanded further consequences. But the desired result was not possible in Marburg at that time.

The fact that Rome was well aware of this issue can be seen in the Vatican's response to the *JDDJ*, which mentions the criteriological problem as a second point to be clarified. The document calls for the integration of the message of justification into 'the fundamental criterion of the "*regula fidei*", that is, the confession of the one God in three persons, christologically centered and rooted in the living Church and its sacramental life.'³⁶

In the winter of 1998/99, a short 'Annex' to the *JDDJ* was developed and adopted by the Vatican and the Lutheran World Federation.³⁷ This document, which Jüngel welcomed as a significant breakthrough,³⁸ corrected, in a definitive way, the obvious weaknesses of the *JDDJ*. In his response to the 'Annex', Jüngel does not mention the criteriological argument. Rather, he confines his remarks to the fact that progress has been made in regard to the narrow understanding of the doctrine of justification, upon which the two sides are now able to agree. He thus mentions, for instance, the Reformation *sola fide*, which is discussed in the 'Annex', as well as the Roman Catholic adoption of the idea of *simul justus et peccator*, even if this formula is employed not to refer to the *true* renewal of those who are justified, but rather to say that even the justified are not immune from the power of sin, and must ask for forgiveness daily.

It remains a fact that the 'Annex' adds nothing new concerning the criteriological meaning of the message of justification. Thus, following the adoption of the *JDDJ*, the question tarries: can we truly speak of a consensus on the justification so long as Catholics and Lutherans have yet to completely agree on the hermeneutical function of this message? The clarification of this issue, towards which, as we have seen, Jüngel has done much to contribute with his persistent criticisms, remains a necessary task for the international Lutheran-Roman Catholic dialogue.

36. 'Official Response of the Catholic Church to the *Joint Declaration of the Catholic Church and the Lutheran World Federation on the Doctrine of Justification*', *PE* 7:4 (1998), p. 399, §2.

37. 'Annex to the Common Statement', in *JDDJ*, pp. 43-7.

38. Jüngel, 'Ein wichtiger Schritt. Durch einen »Anhang« haben Katholiken und Lutheraner ihre umstrittene Gemeinsame Erklärung verbessert', in *Deutsches Allgemeines Sonntagsblatt* 4 (June 1999), p. 25.

Chapter 2

THE SPIRIT OF FREEDOM: EBERHARD JÜNGEL'S THEOLOGY OF THE THIRD ARTICLE

David W. Congdon

I

The occasion of Eberhard Jüngel's eightieth birthday provides an opportunity to look back at a remark by Karl Barth from 1964, the year of Jüngel's thirtieth birthday. On March 2, Barth met a group of students from Tübingen at the Bruderholz Restaurant for another one of his famous conversations. During the course of the discussion, an unknown student raised the topic of Jüngel's recent interpretation of Barth's *analogia fidei*.¹ The student wished to know whether Jüngel's understanding accorded with Barth's own. Barth responded by saying that he had read the essay but no longer remembered the details. He instead changed the topic to address Jüngel himself as an interpreter of his theology:

I know only one thing that I remember for sure: Jüngel is one of those – and really not one of the worst, but rather a good representative of those who are terribly eager to learn the essentials from me . . . and then comes an 'and'! With him it is the 'and' of Ernst Fuchs. It's well known that one can also say: Barth 'and' Bultmann. Here in Switzerland we have [Gerhard] Ebeling, so that one can also say: Barth 'and' Ebeling. I like to compare this theology to a garden of paradise, at the entrance to which stand, on the left and the right, two heraldic stone lions that bear these names. . . . There are many contemporaries in search of such combinations.²

Apart from his dubious recommendation to avoid all 'such combinations',³ Barth was not at all wrong in this evaluation of Jüngel. We see the 'and' in many of

1. Eberhard Jüngel, 'Die Möglichkeit theologischer Anthropologie auf dem Grunde der Analogie: Eine Untersuchung zum Analogieverständnis Karl Barths [1962]', in *Barth-Studien* (Zürich-Köln: Benziger Verlag, 1982), pp. 210-32.

2. Karl Barth, *Gespräche 1964-1968*, ed. Eberhard Busch, Gesamtausgabe 4 (Zürich: TVZ, 1971), p. 86. The first ellipsis is in the original.

3. Later in the conversation, he then asked the students: 'Do you seriously believe that the way into paradise actually goes through this gate? . . . Beware of what you're doing!

his writings. It appears, for example, in his exegetical mediation in the dispute over Romans 5,⁴ in his claim that 'analogy itself is in an eminent sense a *speech-event*,'⁵ and most famously in *Gottes Sein ist im Werden*, where he proposes unifying Barth and Rudolf Bultmann around the notion of responsible God-talk.⁶ In almost every case, the 'and' is also a 'beyond', and this is particularly evident in his recent development of a doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

Towards the end of his career, Barth reflected on the possibility of a 'theology of the third article', that is, a theology of the Holy Spirit. He first proposed this idea in a 1952 letter to Bultmann as the condition under which he could understand his old friend and adversary.⁷ He returned to the notion repeatedly in the years following. In 1957, he applied the notion to nineteenth-century theology in general; in October 1962, he discussed the idea with the editors of *Evangelische Theologie* and in 1968, he suggested it as a way to interpret Schleiermacher.⁸ Despite these suggestions, we find the following remark in his *Table Talk*: 'I personally think that a theology of the Spirit might be all right after 2000 AD, but now we are still too close to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It is still too difficult to distinguish between God's Spirit and man's spirit!'⁹

I would really advise everyone: choose! It is better to choose! Then go this one way consistently to the end! And see which way to the end is worth it! But not through these eternal mediations, the eternal "both-and", "yes-but". Rather go through it [on one side]! Even at the risk that it will perhaps become a little one-sided, whether one chooses one way or the other' (ibid., p. 124). Is it really preferable to be 'a little one-sided' in error, rather than to carve out a mediating position between alternatives? Even if this were sage advice, it is somewhat ironic that Barth of all people should be making such a recommendation, since he changed his mind repeatedly; he rarely followed anything consistently to the end, and he frequently opposed any strict method that would constrain the freedom of God and theology to hear the subject-matter of the gospel anew. It thus seems as if Barth's advice is really about gaining clarity regarding who is on his side and who is on Bultmann's side – a game that Jüngel (rightly) refused to play.

4. Eberhard Jüngel, 'Das Gesetz zwischen Adam und Christus: Eine theologische Studie zu Röm 5,12–21 [1963]; in *Unterwegs zur Sache: Theologische Bemerkungen* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1972), pp. 145–72.

5. Eberhard Jüngel, *Gott als Geheimnis der Welt: Zur Begründung der Theologie des Kreuzigten im Streit zwischen Theismus und Atheismus* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1977), p. 395.

6. Eberhard Jüngel, *Gottes Sein ist im Werden: Verantwortliche Rede vom Sein Gottes bei Karl Barth: Eine Paraphrase*, 4th edn (Tübingen: Mohr, 1986), pp. 23n34, 33–4.

7. Karl Barth to Rudolf Bultmann, 24 December 1952, in Karl Barth and Rudolf Bultmann, *Briefwechsel 1911–1966*, ed. Bernd Jaspert, 2nd edn, Gesamtausgabe 5 (Zürich: TVZ, 1994), p. 197.

8. See Karl Barth, *Evangelische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert*, Theologische Studien 49 (Zollikon-Zürich: TVZ, 1957), p. 16; Karl Barth, *Gespräche 1959–1962*, ed. Eberhard Busch, Gesamtausgabe 4 (Zürich: TVZ, 1995), pp. 395–8; Karl Barth, 'Nachwort', in *Schleiermacher-Auswahl* (München: Siebenstern Taschenbuch, 1968), p. 311.

9. Karl Barth, *Karl Barth's Table Talk*, ed. John D. Godsey (Richmond: John Knox, 1963), p. 28.

Jüngel did not wait until 2000 to supply a theology of the third article. Over the last 30 years, he has published three sets of theses on the Spirit that reinterpret soteriology from the perspective of pneumatology: 'Zur Lehre vom heiligen Geist', 'Der Geist der Liebe als Gemeinschaftsgeist' and 'Der Geist der Hoffnung und des Trostes' – hereafter referred to as *Geist I, II* and *III*.¹⁰ These essays look at the Spirit in terms of truth, love and hope,¹¹ respectively, all under the rubric of a 'theology of freedom'. The last of these is explicitly in dialogue with Barth and Bultmann, as we will see. This pneumatological development in his theology is particularly interesting given that Jüngel is not generally associated with a theology of the third article. Indeed, in his highly regarded introduction, John Webster says that 'if there is a weakness to be detected in Jüngel's account, it is in the area of the doctrine of the Spirit'.¹² If that might have been true in 1986, it is no longer the case.¹³ While a thorough study of Jüngel's pneumatology will have to wait, in this

10. See Eberhard Jüngel, 'Zur Lehre vom heiligen Geist: Thesen', in *Die Mitte des Neuen Testaments: Einheit und Vielfalt neutestamentlicher Theologie*, ed. Ulrich Luz and Hans Weder (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), pp. 97–118; Eberhard Jüngel, 'Der Geist der Liebe als Gemeinschaftsgeist: Zur pneumatologischen Begründung der christlichen Kirche', in *Weg und Weite: Festschrift für Karl Lehmann*, ed. Albert Raffelt (Freiburg: Herder, 2001), pp. 549–62; Eberhard Jüngel, 'Der Geist der Hoffnung und des Trostes: Thesen zur Begründung des eschatologischen Lehrstücks vom Reich der Freiheit', in *Ganz werden. Theologische Erörterungen V* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), pp. 306–22.

11. According to *Geist II*, each mode of the Spirit relates the present moment to a different temporal mode – past, present and future: 'Just as the *Spirit of truth* relates the prevailing present to the historically identifiable history of Jesus Christ and the *Spirit of hope and consolation* relates the prevailing present to the future of the Christ who is coming again and the reign of God, so the *Spirit of love* relates the prevailing present to itself' (Jüngel, 'Der Geist der Liebe als Gemeinschaftsgeist', p. 549, thesis 1.211).

12. John B. Webster, *Eberhard Jüngel: An Introduction to His Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), p. 76.

13. It is questionable whether it was ever true. In a sense, the Bultmannian doctrine of the kerygmatic Christ that Jüngel learned from Ernst Fuchs and develops in his own work is the doctrine of the Spirit, given that, according to this school of thought, the Paraclete in John's Gospel is simply the abiding presence of Jesus himself within the community. Seen in this light, the division between christology and pneumatology proves to be a misleading one. But pneumatology appears explicitly in Jüngel's work in other ways as well. The most notable instance is at the conclusion to *Gott als Geheimnis der Welt*, where he proposes the radical idea of God as an 'event of the Spirit' (§24). According to Jüngel, the death of Jesus forced a differentiation 'between God and God', between Father and Son. But God, who is the unity of life and death in favour of life, relates to God anew, and this new relation between God and God 'is called, christologically, resurrection from the dead and, ontologically, the being of love itself'. Or put in more traditional dogmatic terms: 'the Holy Spirit' (Jüngel, *Gott als Geheimnis der Welt*, p. 513). In other words, the doctrine of resurrection and the doctrine of the Spirit are two aspects of the same event, the event that 'constitutes... the unity of the divine being' (ibid.). Jüngel concludes by presenting his account of God's being-in-coming, wherein God's being is the event of God's coming-to-Godself

essay we (a) compare his theology of the third article to Barth's theology of the second article in the fourth volume of *Die kirchliche Dogmatik*, (b) briefly examine the eschatology of embarrassment that he presents in *Geist III* as it pertains to the Barth–Bultmann relationship and (c) offer some concluding remarks about how this pneumatology advances and augments his larger interest in an excentric theology that frees the church for ever new ways of bearing faithful witness to Jesus Christ.

II

It is evident already in 1983 that Jüngel understands himself to be developing not merely a doctrine of the Holy Spirit but an entire theology of the third article. Thesis 10 in *Geist I* states as much: 'The doctrine of the Holy Spirit is essentially a theology of freedom'.¹⁴ Jüngel grounds this thesis textually in 2 Corinthians 3.17: 'Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom'.¹⁵ According to thesis 9, this theology of freedom takes the form of a threefold *Lehrstück* ('teaching'): 'a *Lehrstück* of the liberating [*befreienden*] God' (9.01), 'a *Lehrstück* of liberated [*befreiten*] human beings' (9.02) and 'a *Lehrstück* of the reign of freedom [*Freiheit*]' (9.03).¹⁶ These three *Lehrstücke* correspond to *Geist I, II* and *III*, respectively. Moreover, as these theses indicate, Jüngel's pneumatology is actually a soteriology, and he makes this explicit at the start of *Geist III*, where he speaks of 'soteriology (pneumatology)' and then recasts these three *Lehrstücke* as a threefold soteriology.¹⁷ Freedom within this

(*Zu-sich-selbst-Kommens*). Translated into trinitarian terms, God is the one who comes from God (Father), to God (Son), and as God (Spirit). Regarding this third point, he says that the fact 'that God therefore remains related to Godself as origin and goal, as Father and Son, and thereby does not cease coming from God to God – in short, that God is mediation in Godself – is God's third mode of being, God the Holy Spirit' (ibid., p. 531). One could thus argue that Jüngel's entire theology is a theology of the third article, in the sense that the third article brings to expression the essence and unity of God's very being.

14. Jüngel, 'Zur Lehre vom heiligen Geist', p. 104.

15. Ibid., p. 103, thesis 8.53.

16. Ibid., pp. 103–4. Or 'reign of liberty', to stay within the same family of words. One could, conversely, use 'freeing' and 'freed' for *befreiend* and *befreit*, respectively.

17. Jüngel, 'Der Geist der Hoffnung und des Trostes', p. 306, thesis 1. For example, 'As the *Lehrstück* of the liberating God, soteriology is the doctrine of the Spirit of truth' (ibid., thesis 1.1). Jüngel, of course, is not advocating that the Spirit has a saving work *additional* to the work of Christ. His theology of the third article does not complete or compete with a theology of the second article. Instead, given the unity of theology, the third article sees the same event of reconciliation *from a different perspective*. This is finally what Barth meant in suggesting that Bultmann or Schleiermacher should be understood as theologians of the third article, and there is certainly an element of truth in this claim. Bultmann and Schleiermacher do indeed see the work of Christ from the perspective of its effective operation in the life of the individual human person, which is where Barth locates the work

theology of the third article is a property of God that God then graciously shares with the creature as part of God's saving work. Or as Jüngel puts it in *Geist I*, 'freedom is a communicable attribute of God'.¹⁸ By the time he gets to *Geist III*, Jüngel has expanded this to include *every* attribute of God. God is essentially a self-communicating God whose very being is communicable.¹⁹

As we have already indicated, Jüngel connects the three *Lehrstücke* to truth, love and hope. These constitute the three articles within his pneumatocentric reconstruction of Christian theology. Along with freedom, he grounds each of these in the biblical text. In *Geist I*, Jüngel pairs the Pauline notion of the Spirit of freedom with the Johannine notion of the 'Spirit of truth': 'As a divine attribute, truth is appropriated in a special way to the Holy Spirit as the Spirit's mode of being and acting: the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of truth (John 14.17; 16.13)'.²⁰ He supports the connection between the Spirit and love in *Geist II* with reference to Romans 5.5, where Paul says that 'the love of God has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit'.²¹ In *Geist III*, he cites Galatians 5.5 and Romans 15.13 as the basis for understanding the Spirit as the agent of hope and consolation.²² Jüngel is thus able to flesh out a complete theology of the third article, which considers the freedom of God, humanity and the world under the terms of truth, love and hope. He lays out his project *in nuce* in theses 9.1–9.3 of *Geist I*:

- 9.1 The *Lehrstück* of the liberating God discusses
 - 9.11 the Spirit as the liberating Spirit of truth,
 - 9.12 the truth of God as the truth of faith,
 - 9.13 the word of God as the word of truth,
 - 9.14 sin as the untruth, unbelief and speechlessness of human beings,
 - 9.15 the justification of the sinner by faith alone.
- 9.2 The *Lehrstück* of the liberated human person discusses
 - 9.21 the Spirit given in the human heart as the Holy Spirit of love,
 - 9.22 the sanctification of the human person through the holiness of love,
 - 9.23 the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church as *creatura verbi* ['creature of the word'],
 - 9.24 sin as the spiritlessness, lovelessness and bondage [*Unfreiheit*] of human beings,
 - 9.25 baptism and the Lord's Supper as the two celebrations of one sacrament.

of the Spirit. The element of untruth, however, is that Bultmann and Schleiermacher see their work as genuine theologies of the *second* article, since they do not share Barth's strict distinction between the 'objective' and 'subjective' dimensions of soteriology.

18. Jüngel, 'Zur Lehre vom heiligen Geist', p. 105, thesis 10.41.

19. 'Eternity and immortality – like all divine attributes – are *communicable* attributes. Just as God in God's trinitarian self-relation is a communicable essence, so also is God in God's relation to us' (Jüngel, 'Der Geist der Hoffnung und des Trostes', p. 317, thesis 4.752).

20. Jüngel, 'Zur Lehre vom heiligen Geist', p. 105, thesis 10.6.

21. Jüngel, 'Der Geist der Liebe als Gemeinschaftsgeist', p. 550, thesis 1.24.

22. Jüngel, 'Der Geist der Hoffnung und des Trostes', p. 308, thesis 2.4.

- 9.3 The *Lehrstück* of the reign of freedom discusses
- 9.31 the Creator Spirit who consummates all of God's works and redeems the creature of God as the Spirit of consolation and hope,
 - 9.32 the assurance of the Christian as hope for the glory of God,
 - 9.33 the future *polis* as the judgement and goal of world history,
 - 9.34 sin as the self-realization, anarchy and hopelessness of human beings,
 - 9.35 the glory of God's reign as eternal life.²³

To fully appreciate the scope and scale of Jüngel's project, we can compare this outline to the one that Jüngel presents in *Barth-Studien* as an overview of KD 4.1–4.3²⁴:

Dogmatics	KD 4.1	KD 4.2	KD 4.3
Christology: Person:	The Lord as servant: <i>vere deus</i>	The servant as Lord: <i>vere homo</i>	The true witness
Office:	The judge judged in our place: the obedience of the Son of God = <i>munus sacerdotale</i>	The royal human person: the exaltation of the Son of Man = <i>munus regale</i>	Jesus is victor: the glory of the mediator = <i>munus propheticum</i>
State/Way:	The way of the Son of God into the far country = <i>status exinanitionis</i>	The homecoming of the Son of Man = <i>status exaltationis</i>	The light of life = the unity of both states
Hamartiology: Sin as:	Pride and fall	Sloth and misery	Falsehood and condemnation
Soteriology:	The judgement of God as the justification of humanity	The direction of God as the sanctification of humanity	The promise of God as the vocation of humanity
Pneumatology: The Work of the Holy Spirit in the community: in the individual:	Gathering the community: Faith	Up-building of the community: Love	Sending of the community: Hope
Ethics: KD 4.4 The Christian Life as an Invocation of God	Baptism – with water – as the <i>foundation</i> of the Christian life in prayer for the Holy Spirit	The Lord's Prayer – Our Father – as (instruction in) the <i>fulfilment</i> of the Christian life	(The Lord's Supper – Eucharist – as the <i>renewal</i> of the Christian life in thanksgiving

23. Jüngel, 'Zur Lehre vom heiligen Geist', p. 104.

24. Eberhard Jüngel, 'Einführung in Leben und Werk Karl Barths [1981]', in *Barth-Studien* (Zürich, Köln: Benziger and Mohn: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1982), p. 55.

Barth's unfinished fourth volume of *Die kirchliche Dogmatik* reorganizes the entirety of Christian theology within the elegant architectonic of a christocentric dogmatics, in which the entirety of the Christian life is interpreted and ordered according to the doctrine of Christ's reconciling work. While Jüngel has helped many readers of Barth over the years to make sense of Barth's mature theology, it has largely escaped notice that Jüngel has developed a similar architectonic for a *pneumatocentric* dogmatics. We can organize the earlier theses from *Geist I* into the following table:

Dogmatics	Geist I	Geist II	Geist III
Pneumatology: Person:	The Spirit of truth as the Spirit of the liberating God	The Spirit of love as the Spirit of the liberated human being	The Spirit of hope as the Creator Spirit of the reign of freedom
Work (in the individual):	The truth of faith	Sanctification through the holiness of love	Certain hope in the consummation of God's glory
Work (in the community):	The word of truth	The one, holy, catholic and apostolic church as the <i>creatura verbi</i>	The future <i>polis</i> as the judgement and goal of world history
Hamartiology: Sin as:	Untruth, unbelief, speechlessness	Spiritlessness, lovelessness, bondage	Self-realization, anarchy, hopelessness
Soteriology/ Ethics:	Justification of the sinner by faith alone	Baptism and Lord's Supper	Eternal life

I have taken the liberty of providing the dogmatic categories in order to make sense of Jüngel's theses. Even if some categories prove to be mislabelled, it is immediately clear that Jüngel's theology of the third article bears a striking resemblance to Barth's theology of the second article. Like Barth, Jüngel develops each doctrine from different vantage points, which gives the resulting theology a kind of three-dimensional or layered effect. It also gives the sense of being dynamic and unfinalized. Such a theology bears witness in its form to the true nature of Christian theology as *theologia in via*. According to my interpretation, Jüngel also follows Barth in differentiating between two works of the Spirit at the levels of individual and community. Like Barth, he defines the primary work of the Spirit according to the Pauline triad of faith (i.e. truth),²⁵ love and hope (1 Cor 13.13). This translates into a corresponding ecclesiology–eschatology, that is to say, the Spirit's communal work. Since Jüngel does not have the Chalcedonian logic of *vere deus/vere homo* at his disposal,²⁶ the way Barth does in his theology

25. 'The essence of Christian faith can only be understood if the correlation of truth and faith is understood', Jüngel, 'Zur Lehre vom heiligen Geist', p. 110, thesis 13.1.

26. Jüngel, like Barth, certainly does not have anything remotely like Reinhard Hütter's notion that the 'core practices' of the church 'subsist enhypostatically in the Spirit'.

of the second article, the Pauline triad becomes the logic ordering the entire dogmatics.

Certain aspects of Jüngel's theses demand comment. The individual and communal works of the Spirit under *Geist I* are conspicuously dissimilar to their counterparts in *Geist II* and *III*. Given that he identifies sanctification and assurance as the individual works of the Spirit under *Geist II* and *III*, one might expect him to place justification alongside them in *Geist I*. But he instead places justification in the final category, which I have named soteriology or ethics (i.e. the application or effect of the Spirit's work), alongside the sacraments and eternal life. In doing so Jüngel identifies justification as the *benefit* that human beings receive from the Spirit's work, rather than the work itself, which is faith. As he states in thesis 13, 'the Spirit of truth produces faith as the event that corresponds to the truth.'²⁷ Jüngel clarifies the operation of the Spirit in thesis 10.7 of *Geist I*:

- 10.7 The Holy Spirit acting as the Spirit of truth
- 10.71 effects faith in the sinful human person,
 - 10.72 speaks the word of truth in human words,
 - 10.73 convicts the person of sin and uncovers this sin as untruth, unbelief and speechlessness,
 - 10.74 accomplishes the sinner's justification by faith alone.²⁸

This overview of his pneumatology in *Geist I* gives a better sense of how Jüngel understands his theology of the third article. The individual work of the Spirit, at least within this first article, is faith, while the communal work is the declaration of the word of God – presumably through scripture and church proclamation – that provides the occasion for the event of faith.²⁹ Within this pneumatic event, the Spirit both judges and justifies the sinner, revealing one's dire condition while simultaneously declaring that person holy before God. In this way, Jüngel sustains Barth's priority of gospel before law. Justification is thus the final outcome of the Spirit's work of truth within *Geist I*, the practical payoff, so to speak. The same goes for *Geist II* and *III*, where the Spirit's work of love and hope reaches its conclusion in the ecclesial practices and eternal life, respectively.

If there is a place for criticism of Jüngel, it would have to be in the lack of attention to the *missionary* work of the Spirit as the agent that sends the disciples into the world as ambassadors of Christ. Given his explicit attention to the Johannine

See Reinhard Hütter, *Suffering Divine Things: Theology as Church Practice* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), p. 133. Cf. Bruce McCormack, 'Witness to the Word: A Barthian Engagement with Reinhard Hütter's Ontology of the Church', *ZDTh*, Supplement Series 5 (2011), pp. 59–77.

27. Jüngel, 'Zur Lehre vom heiligen Geist', p. 110.

28. *Ibid.*, p. 105.

29. Unfortunately, Jüngel only develops the person ('the Spirit of truth') and individual work ('the truth of faith') within the theses of *Geist I*, leaving the other doctrinal categories unexplored, including the communal work ('the word of truth').

identification of the Spirit as the agent of truth, this is an especially conspicuous oversight, since the actual sending of the Holy Spirit in John 20.22 is immediately preceded by Jesus telling his followers: 'As the Father has sent [πέσταλκέν] me, so I send [πέμπω] you' (John 20.21). Since Barth spends so much energy in the fourth volume of *Die kirchliche Dogmatik* explicating the life of both the Christian community and the Christian individual in missionary terms, the general absence of this theme in Jüngel's pneumatology³⁰ is felt all the more strongly.³¹

In what follows I wish to look at the work of the Spirit in *Geist III*. In particular, Jüngel makes a striking comment about the expectation for God's coming reign in which he positions himself against both Barth and Bultmann. The reason he gives illuminates one aspect of what makes his theology of the third article a constructive advance in contemporary Christian dogmatics.

III

Geist III represents one of Jüngel's most extensive discussions of eschatology.³² Due to the work of Barth and Bultmann in the first half of the twentieth century, the second half was dominated by debates over eschatology, ranging from Ernst Käsemann and Walter Kreck to Jürgen Moltmann and Wolfhart Pannenberg. Jüngel's theses on the topic thus have to be read in the context of the disputes over eschatology and apocalyptic that were dominant during his years as a student and young professor. Indeed, his 1962 dissertation, *Das Verhältnis der paulinischen Rechtfertigungslehre zur Verkündigung Jesu* (published as *Paulus und Jesus*), addressed this very topic, arguing for a continuity between Jesus's proclamation and Paul's doctrine of justification on eschatological grounds.³³

30. The theme is not completely absent. *Geist II* ends with Jüngel's explication of the four Nicene marks of the church, which obligates him to say something about apostolicity. But this is limited to the notion that the church must remain faithful 'to its sending [*Sendung*] and task, which is to proclaim the gospel in thoughts, words, and works, originally expressed in the early Christian apostolate' (Jüngel, 'Der Geist der Liebe als Gemeinschaftsgeist', p. 562, thesis 3.5). The rest of the material under this thesis is a Protestant interpretation of apostolic succession and the infallibility of the church.

31. Jüngel lectured on mission on 8 November 1999, around the time he was working on *Geist II* and *III*. This lecture draws heavily on the Gospel of John, but it too fails to connect the sending of the Spirit with the mission of the disciples. But Jüngel at least declares that 'the church cannot exist as the church moved by God's Spirit if it is not or does not again become a missionary and evangelizing church'. See Eberhard Jüngel, 'Mission und Evangelisation', in *Ganz werden*, pp. 115–36, here p. 116.

32. Another key writing of his on eschatology is Eberhard Jüngel, 'Die Ewigkeit des ewigen Lebens [2000]', in *Ganz werden*, pp. 345–53.

33. See Eberhard Jüngel, *Paulus und Jesus: Eine Untersuchung zur Präzisierung der Frage nach dem Ursprung der Christologie* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1962), especially the excursus on 'Eschatologie und Geschichte' (*ibid.*, pp. 285–9).

Immediately after providing the overview of his theology of the third article in thesis 1, Jüngel signals to the reader his intention to wade into the old debate over eschatology in thesis 2, where he says that the relation between the 'already now' and the 'not yet' cannot be understood on the basis of an experience of lack or deficiency [*Defizienzerfahrung*], but instead on the basis 'of the promise of future consummation'.³⁴ Eschatology does not reflect 'the uncertainty of an . . . ambivalent future, but rather the certainty of a definite future already guaranteed now in the being of Jesus Christ, but still pending'.³⁵ Jüngel thereby declares that true Christian eschatology is based on the content of the gospel itself and not on the historical experience of the delayed parousia. He appears ostensibly to be siding with Barth over Bultmann at this point. Like other New Testament scholars, Bultmann interprets the New Testament documents – particularly their divergent eschatological positions – against the background of the shattered hope in the imminent arrival of Christ in glory. Indeed, 'the problem of eschatology grew out of the fact that *the expected end of the world did not occur*'.³⁶ Paul and John solve the problem of the nonoccurrence of the parousia by primarily locating the eschatological event not in the imminent future but in the past and present, namely, in Jesus himself and in the believer's relation to him.³⁷ Bultmann derives from this the theological conclusion that the kerygma does not intrinsically demand belief in an apocalyptic end of history. Indeed, the kerygma, which Bultmann understands as God's destabilizing and deworldizing (*Entweltlichung*) demand upon our existence, calls such expectations radically into question. By contrast, Barth argues that the parousia of Christ has an inherent threefold form, in terms of Easter, Pentecost and future Advent. So, in addition to the resurrection and the Spirit's outpouring, the arrival of Christ will take place 'in another, final form . . . as the coming of Jesus Christ as the goal of the history of the church, the world, and each individual person'.³⁸ Barth consciously does not take the historical situation of the New Testament texts into consideration but seeks to develop his eschatology strictly on the basis of the narrative logic of the biblical witness, precisely what Jüngel seems to commend. The generation after Barth and Bultmann only furthered the divide. Moltmann argued that Barth did not go far enough; the eschatological future is not merely a necessary implication but the very ground of Christian faith.³⁹ Bultmann's students split between Käsemann, who argued on historical grounds that the early Christian belief in the imminent coming of Christ 'was the mother of all Christian theology', while Ernst Fuchs

34. Jüngel, 'Der Geist der Hoffnung und des Trostes', p. 306.

35. *Ibid.*, thesis 2.1.

36. Rudolf Bultmann, *Geschichte und Eschatologie* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1958), p. 44.

37. *Ibid.*, pp. 46–58.

38. Karl Barth, *Die kirchliche Dogmatik*, 4 vols (Zollikon-Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag A.G., 1932–1970), 4.3:338.

39. See Jürgen Moltmann, *Theologie der Hoffnung: Untersuchungen zur Begründung und zu den Konsequenzen einer christlichen Eschatologie* (München: C. Kaiser, 1964).

and Gerhard Ebeling defended Bultmann's position on eschatology, namely that apocalyptic expectations belonged to the world-picture of that time but are in no way ingredient in the kerygma itself.⁴⁰

While it would initially appear that Jüngel sides with Barth in this case, subsequent theses in *Geist III* indicate otherwise. Thesis 4 sets forth the general claim that he will then problematize: 'In that the Christian community proclaims the death of Jesus Christ in the power of his resurrection from the dead, it hopes and prays for his renewed coming in glory on the day of the Lord'.⁴¹ In theses 4.1–2 he develops this in terms of the 'passion' (*Leidenschaft*) of hope, which makes the Christian 'excentric' and brings her into solidarity with those in suffering (*Leiden*) and bondage (*Unfreiheit*).⁴² Thesis 4.3 then turns to the question of the parousia, since 'the passion of hope leads with material necessity to the expectation [*Erwartung*] that the arrival of Jesus Christ in glory . . . is *near at hand*'.⁴³ The claim that expectation of Christ's imminent arrival is necessary seems ostensibly to be in agreement with someone like Barth, and yet Jüngel immediately follows this by carving out a theological space against and beyond not only Barth and Bultmann, but also virtually everyone else in the contemporary conversation on eschatology:

- 4.31 The negative explanation of early Christian imminent expectation [*Naherwartung*] (cf. 1 Thess 4.15; 1 Cor 15.51; Rom 13.11f.; Mark 13.24ff.; Matt 24.3, etc.) as a mistake discrediting all future eschatology misses the essence of imminent expectation just as much as any positive explanation of the delay of the parousia (cf. 2 Pet 3.4ff.; Matt 25.5; Luke 12.45; 1 Clem 23.3; 2 Clem 11.2f.), which eliminates, through the positivity of its explanation, *the embarrassment* that the problem of imminent expectation poses and must pose. . . .
- 4.322 In contrast to a negative (Rudolf Bultmann) or positive (Karl Barth) way of explaining the problem of imminent expectation and the delay of the parousia, it is dogmatically essential to keep alive the theological embarrassment that is given with this problem and to put into perspective the passion of hope that generates this problem with material necessity.⁴⁴

Jüngel argues for the ongoing necessity of the church's imminent expectation of Christ's arrival, not because this gives the community a certain hope regarding

40. See Ernst Käsemann, 'Die Anfänge christlicher Theologie', *ZThK* 57 (1960), pp. 162–85, here p. 180; Gerhard Ebeling, 'Der Grund christlicher Theologie', *ZThK* 58 (1961), pp. 227–44; Ernst Fuchs, 'Über die Aufgabe einer christlichen Theologie', *ZThK* 58 (1961), pp. 245–67.

41. Jüngel, 'Der Geist der Hoffnung und des Trostes', p. 311.

42. *Ibid.*, pp. 311–12.

43. *Ibid.*, p. 312.

44. *Ibid.*, pp. 312–13.

the future that could serve as the basis for its present faith and existence. On the contrary, this expectation is necessary precisely because of the embarrassment it engenders in light of Christ's nonarrival. In a sense, then, the parousia's *delay*, rather than the parousia itself, is the essence of the early church's imminent expectation.⁴⁵ The attempt to solve the problem by either denying the imminence in favour of a present eschatology (Bultmann) or pushing the consummation into an indefinite future (Barth) ends up domesticating the arrival of Christ.⁴⁶ Jüngel declares instead that the problem of imminent expectation 'must . . . remain a living embarrassment, which has the liveliness of hope in the living Lord as its criterion.'⁴⁷

IV

Jüngel says very little about the Holy Spirit in this section of *Geist III*, but given the larger context of his remarks, we can draw some tentative pneumatological conclusions. If 'Christian hope is an experience of the future made possible by the Spirit of hope and consolation',⁴⁸ and if this hope is what sustains the experience of eschatological embarrassment, then it follows that the Spirit of freedom is the Spirit of embarrassment: the Spirit who liberates the creature is the Spirit who embarrasses the community of faith, and who thereby continually interrupts the church from becoming a stable worldly institution.

Jüngel's pneumatology thus supports his larger theological thesis regarding the excentricity of Christian faith. Faith in the word of God is a destabilizing faith, precisely because 'the truth of the divine word . . . interrupts human beings and calls them outside themselves.'⁴⁹ The certainty of faith (*Glaubensgewißheit*) is the very opposite of Cartesian certainty in the individual 'I think'. Since it is

45. According to Jüngel, the non-occurrence that historical scholars, such as Käsemann, argue was the death of early Christian eschatology was actually essential to it. This is because Jüngel sees a qualitative distinction between Jewish and Christian eschatology: 'In contrast to the imminent expectation attested in Old Testament prophecy and in Jewish apocalyptic and the question raised by them, . . . early Christian imminent expectation presents a case that is *sui generis*, since it does not expect an unprecedented new thing, but rather the new coming of the one who has already come' (ibid., p. 313, thesis 4.32).

46. 'Every chronological fixing of the . . . nonobjectifiable nearness of the reign of freedom existentially perverts imminent expectation into a remote expectation [*Fernerwartung*]' (ibid., thesis 4.324).

47. Ibid. (thesis 4.323).

48. Ibid., p. 308, thesis 2.5.

49. Eberhard Jüngel, 'Die Wahrheit des Mythos und die Notwendigkeit der Entmythologisierung', in *Indikative der Gnade – Imperative der Freiheit: Theologische Erörterungen 4* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), pp. 40–57, here p. 55.

the certainty of God (*Gottesgewißheit*), faith is always drawn outside of itself (*extra nos*). In a 1979 essay on this theme, Jüngel says that 'the certainty of God is always the human person's being-outside-of-oneself [*Außer-sich-Sein*].'⁵⁰ Or as he says in *Gott als Geheimnis der Welt*, the certainty of faith is at the same time the complete 'deseccuring' (*Entsicherung*) of ourselves.⁵¹ It is only appropriate, then, that he explicitly connects this excentric certainty to the work of the Holy Spirit. The being-outside-of-oneself that constitutes the certainty of God occurs, he says, through the 'elemental interruption' (*elementar Unterbrechung*) of one's life, in which the event of God's advent 'is experienced' at the core of one's existence. This existential interruption is precisely what it means to speak of the Spirit of God: 'Biblical and dogmatic talk of the πνευμα θεο means that the hitherto familiar continuity of a person's life is *elementally interrupted*.'⁵² The Spirit of freedom and embarrassment is the agent of each person's deseccuring – and for this reason, the agent of the church's deseccuring.

In a way, Jüngel's pneumatology and eschatology of embarrassment accomplishes dogmatically what Käsemann's analysis of 2 Peter accomplishes historically and exegetically. In a 1952 article, Käsemann describes this widely ignored epistle as an 'apologia for early Christian eschatology', which goes about defending the primitive Christian apocalypticism by way of assertions that are not only illogical but also spiritually pernicious – dispatching heretics through *ad hominem* attacks (2 Pet 2.10–15) and effectively binding the Holy Spirit to the institutional office of the church (2 Pet 1.19–21).⁵³ The 'disconnected' and contradictory claims indicate that 'the doctrine of last things has already placed the church in an emergency situation, and its apologia is actually evidence of an aporia'. Käsemann then adds that this internal aporia 'betrays embarrassment [*Verlegenheit*] rather than force', an embarrassment that the author of 2 Peter tries to avoid or dispel.⁵⁴ But Käsemann demands that his readers look honestly and intently at this embarrassment and what it means for the church. He concludes his article by asking the following questions:

What have we to say about an eschatology, which knows hope only for the triumphant march of believers into the eternal kingdom and the annihilation of the godless? . . . What have we to say about a church that is so concerned

50. Eberhard Jüngel, 'Gottesgewißheit [1979]', in *Entsprechungen: Gott-Wahrheit-Mensch. Theologische Erörterungen II* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), pp. 252–64, here p. 260.

51. Jüngel, *Gott als Geheimnis der Welt*, p. 227. The similarity to *Entmythologisierung* ('demythologizing') is hardly accidental.

52. Jüngel, 'Gottesgewißheit', p. 260.

53. Ernst Käsemann, 'Eine Apologie der urchristlichen Eschatologie', in *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, 2 vols (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960–1965), pp. 135–57, here pp. 152–5.

54. Ibid., p. 157.

with fending off heretics that it no longer differentiates between spirit and letter, which identifies the gospel with its tradition and indeed with a religious worldview, which regulates the interpretation of scripture through doctrinal law [*Lehrgesetz*] and makes faith into an assent [*Jasagen*] to the dogmas of orthodoxy?⁵⁵

Read in light of Käsemann, Jüngel's call for a pneumatic eschatology that embraces embarrassment is in fact the pursuit of a theology and church that does precisely what Käsemann says the author of 2 Peter fails to do. A theology of the third article in this sense will differentiate between spirit and letter, between gospel and tradition, between scripture and doctrine and between faith and orthodoxy. Jüngel states as much at the start of *Geist I*, where he says that 'the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is the doctrine of the *differentiation of the spirits*', since 'the Holy Spirit differentiates itself as the "Spirit from God" from the "spirit of the world."⁵⁶ 'In the differentiation of Spirit and flesh, the differentiation of God and world becomes concrete.'⁵⁷ A genuinely pneumatocentric theology will demonstrate that it is truly a 'theology of freedom' by refusing to operate out of the fear of heresy. It will instead explore new possibilities for thinking and speaking faithfully of God. This makes the emphasis on embarrassment all the more appropriate. In *Paulus und Jesus*, Jüngel refers to the minutes from a meeting of the old Marburgers, in which Bultmann argued that the embarrassment regarding the delay of the parousia 'was the agent for the development of christology'.⁵⁸ By constantly keeping the eschatological embarrassment of the church existentially alive, the Holy Spirit is the agent of ongoing doctrinal development. The Spirit sustains a space of freedom for new possibilities of appropriate God-talk. But not *only* God-talk, of course, since the freedom of faith is a truly *practical* freedom. If, as Jüngel says, 'the nearness of the reign of God appears as the nearness of the neighbor',⁵⁹ then the Spirit who sustains this situation of embarrassed expectation also propels the community of faith into solidarity with the neighbours in their midst.

* * *

Let me conclude on a personal note. I owe my theological existence to Eberhard Jüngel. After completing my undergraduate degree in English literature, I spent a year working at a local bookstore. During that time I stumbled upon translations of his essays. Reading those for the first time was a moment of near pentecostal significance: it was as if a tongue of fire had settled on me and ignited my mind. The next year I went off to study theology at Princeton Theological Seminary. I remember very little of what I read in my courses during that first year, but I

55. Ibid.

56. Jüngel, 'Zur Lehre vom heiligen Geist', p. 97, theses 1.2–3.

57. Ibid., p. 98, thesis 1.33.

58. Jüngel, *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 79n2.

59. Ibid., p. 195.

remember very well what I read *outside* of class. That fall semester I spent every day after class reading and annotating my copy of the 1983 translation of *Gott als Geheimnis der Welt*. Jüngel was (and in many respects, remains) my most formative theological teacher, and I am entirely in his debt. In honouring his eightieth birthday, I honour the man who, in his own fidelity to the Spirit of freedom, was the occasion for the liberation of my own mind and tongue in service to the gospel of Jesus Christ.



Caption: This image of Eberhard Jüngel was taken in the garden of the Evangelisches Stift Tübingen, where he was Ephorus from 1987 to the beginning of 2005. Used with permission from Eberhard Jüngel.

**INDICATIVE OF GRACE –
IMPERATIVE OF FREEDOM**

**Essays in Honour of Eberhard Jüngel
in his 80th Year**

Edited by
R. David Nelson

B L O O M S B U R Y
LONDON • NEW DELHI • NEW YORK • SYDNEY

Bloomsbury T&T Clark
An imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

50 Bedford Square	1385 Broadway
London	New York
WC1B 3DP	NY 10018
UK	USA

www.bloomsbury.com

Bloomsbury is a registered trade mark of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

First published 2014

© R. David Nelson, 2014

R. David Nelson has asserted his right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as Author of this work.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publishers.

No responsibility for loss caused to any individual or organization acting on or refraining from action as a result of the material in this publication can be accepted by Bloomsbury or the author.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN: HB: 978-0-567-15359-3
ePDF: 978-0-567-27949-1
epub: 978-0-567-49793-2

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

Typeset by Newgen Knowledge Works (P) Ltd., Chennai, India
Printed and bound in Great Britain

To Eberhard Jüngel

*habentes autem eundem spiritum fidei sicut scriptum est
credidi propter quod locutus sum
et nos credimus propter quod et loquimur*

– Second Corinthians 4:13

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ix
A Note on Translation	x
List of Abbreviations	xi
Contributors	xiii
Preface	xvi
R. David Nelson	
1 EBERHARD JÜNGEL AND THE INTERNATIONAL LUTHERAN-CATHOLIC DIALOGUE André Birmelé	1
2 THE SPIRIT OF FREEDOM: EBERHARD JÜNGEL'S THEOLOGY OF THE THIRD ARTICLE David W. Congdon	13
3 THE CRUCIFIED ONE Ivor J. Davidson	29
4 ON THE CONTRARY: THOMISTIC SECOND THOUGHTS ON ANALOGY AND TRINITY IN EBERHARD JÜNGEL Paul J. DeHart	51
5 'THE MYSTERY THAT GOD AND MAN SHARE': PETER LOMBARD, <i>SENTENCES, LIBER I, DISTINCTIO 17</i> Hans-Anton Drewes	71
6 METAPHORICAL TRUTH AND THE LANGUAGE OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY Paul R. Hinlicky	89
7 EBERHARD JÜNGEL'S SOTERIOLOGICALLY MINDED DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY: SOME COMMENDATIONS AND RESERVATIONS Christopher R. J. Holmes	101
8 A REFORMED THEOLOGY OF JUSTIFICATION George Hunsinger	115

9	LOVE AND DEATH: CHRISTIAN ESCHATOLOGY IN AN INTERRELIGIOUS CONTEXT Werner G. Jeanrond	131
10	THE RESURRECTION AS DIVINE OPENNESS Piotr J. Małysz	143
11	THE CAUTIONS OF JUSTICE: EBERHARD JÜNGEL'S ENGAGEMENT WITH POLITICS AND THE STATE Derek R. Nelson	155
12	EBERHARD JÜNGEL ON BAPTISM AND THE LORD'S SUPPER: TOWARDS A HERMENEUTIC FOR READING THE TEXTS R. David Nelson	167
13	MARTIN HEIDEGGER: ANSTOß FOR EBERHARD JÜNGEL'S THEOLOGY Arnold Neufeldt-Fast	187
14	LUTHER'S DANGEROUS ACCOUNT OF DIVINE HIDDENNESS Steven D. Paulson	203
15	MYSTERY OR SACRAMENT? AN ASSESSMENT OF EBERHARD JÜNGEL'S CRUCIFORM ONTOLOGY Roland Spjuth	219
16	EBERHARD JÜNGEL ON THE COMPATIBILITY OF EDUCATION AND THEOLOGY Markus Thane	231
17	GOD, THEOLOGY, UNIVERSITIES John B. Webster	241
18	SOME REMARKS ON CHRISTIAN FREEDOM Philip G. Ziegler	255
	Bibliography Compiled by Piotr J. Małysz	267
	Subject and Author Index	289
	Index of Works	293

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The editor acknowledges several individuals without whose help and support the present endeavour would not have been possible. David Ford, Wolf Krötke, Mark Mattes, Bruce McCormack, George Newlands, Paul Nimmo and Geoffrey Wainwright each offered suggestions during the developmental stages of the project. Among the contributors, David Congdon, Hans-Anton Drewes, Paul Hinlicky, Derek Nelson, Arnold Neufeldt-Fast and Phil Ziegler deserve special mention for invaluable conversations along the way. John Webster passed along editorial wisdom gained from his experience spearheading a collection for Jüngel two decades ago. Piotr Małysz has been a fount of encouragement throughout the lifetime of this volume, and laboured to prepare the fine bibliography herein. Finally, I am grateful to Anna Turton and Miriam Cantwell of T&T Clark for their enthusiasm, editorial support and patience.