

Consensus

Volume 33

Issue 1 *In Honour of Dr. Erwin Buck*

Article 2

11-1-2008

Schweitzer and a mystical ecology in Paul

Matthew R. Anderson

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

Recommended Citation

Anderson, Matthew R. (2008) "Schweitzer and a mystical ecology in Paul," *Consensus*: Vol. 33 : Iss. 1 , Article 2.
Available at: <http://scholars.wlu.ca/consensus/vol33/iss1/2>

This Article 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.

Schweitzer and a Mystical Ecology in Paul

Matthew R. Anderson

Concordia University, Montreal QC Canada

“We are always in the presence of mysticism when we find a human being looking upon the division between earthly and super-earthly, temporal and eternal, as transcended, and feeling himself, while still externally amid the earthly and temporal, to belong to the super-earthly and eternal.” So Albert Schweitzer opened his work (first draft 1906, English edition 1931) *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*. Certainly many teachers of the church — and a good many average Christians — have fit this description. Between the lines of Erwin Buck’s rigorous exegesis of texts, and throughout his careful mentorship of generations of the eager, the skeptical, and the foolish in the craft of testing the structure of New Testament writings, we who were privileged to be his students often glimpsed just such a far shore. Were there any doubt about his hermeneutic, Buck’s preaching was, and is, evidence: here is Biblical scholarship in service of proclamation. That proclamation, often enough, contains more than a tinge of the mystical and apocalyptic.

Schweitzer, the pioneer of the recovery of the apocalyptic view of earliest Christianity, was one of those grand masters of the Biblical academy to whom Buck introduced us. Many of us found studying the missionary exegete to be, in equal parts, gratifying and frustrating: gratifying because Schweitzer’s emphasis on the foreignness (and Jewishness, whatever that might mean) of earliest Christianity seemed somehow common-sense. Perhaps even more importantly, Schweitzer answered the nagging suspicion many of us harboured of those commentators — including many Reformers — whose ancient church looked uncannily like the working-out of their own polemics. However, he was equally frustrating because (like the Kümmel introduction that Buck inflicted on his introductory classes) Schweitzer’s grating Continental style was so far from the politeness of most North American scholarship. There was no “on the one hand, on the other” with the Alsatian academic, and therefore, little debate: Jesus and Paul were eschatological Jews whose conceptual world was a million miles from our own. *Punkt*. To Schweitzer, nothing else was worth discussing.

All of which makes the task of this present article, at the least, problematic. Rather than revisiting his analysis of Pauline thought in and for its own sake, my purpose here is to examine Schweitzer's classic text to see what, if any, aid it gives to identifying a specifically Pauline contribution to those theological currents developing in light of the present ecological crisis.¹ If Biblical theology has traditionally ignored, skewed or downplayed human relations to the natural world, is there an under-explored Pauline cosmology to which we might now appeal in joining the movement to rectify this situation? Can Tarsus (via Alsace) have anything to contribute to Kyoto?

Objections

So many different objections may reasonably be raised to the use of Schweitzer in developing an eco-theology that the answering of such criticisms threatens to overwhelm any positive application of his work. To deal fairly but succinctly with possible hurdles, I have grouped them into three basic categories. The first two categories deal with Schweitzer's work itself, and the third arises from the perceived nature of Biblical eschatology. In brief, the first possible set of objections arises from the content of Paul's theological concerns discerned by Schweitzer, while the second set arises not from his conclusions, but from Schweitzer's methods of research and how the results of such methods might legitimately be appropriated some hundred years later. The final objections derive from a more broad-based misunderstanding of apocalyptic's concern — or lack of it — for ongoing cosmology.

Firstly and most obviously, neither Biblical cosmology nor the more recently-popular term 'ecology' are themes, even minor ones, of Schweitzer's work. There is no 'theology of nature' or 'environmental eco-theology' delineated by Schweitzer.² The polymath theologian was explicitly engaged in a quite different task: an historical critique of commentary concerning the first generations of the development of the church. As in his famous work *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, Schweitzer's focus in *Mysticism* was on history, specifically, the history of interpretation: in this case, of Paul and his role in the adaptation of the church to the Greco-Roman world. His purpose was to debunk those whom he believed had got it wrong. This is clear from the fact that what Schweitzer had at first intended to be the introduction to *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*

became its own book, titled *Paul and his Interpreters, a Critical History* (*Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung*).

Briefly put, to Schweitzer the work of his forbears and contemporaries on Paul was an “assault”³ mounted by the proponents of comparative religion on Paul. The most grievous interpretative fault made by most interpreters, said Schweitzer, was laying at the apostle’s feet the responsibility for the Hellenization of Christianity: “So it was only at one moment and in a single personality that Christianity was receptive of the ideas of the Greek mystery-religions!” he writes.⁴ And yet while disagreeing with their conclusions about the “who” of Hellenization, Schweitzer seems to agree with his theological opponents on the “what”: specifically, that the Hellenization of Christianity should be considered tantamount to its corruption. Written in a period before a more nuanced appreciation for just how Greco-Roman culture had penetrated even the most remote corners of Jewish life well before Jesus’ day, Schweitzer seems to participate in the idealization of a ‘pre-contact’ Christian movement. The term “primitive” is intensely positive for Schweitzer. For all his scholarly acumen, in a manner parallel perhaps to some eco-theology, Schweitzer’s work is driven by a kind of romantic lament for an early, ideal period of time that cannot — indeed, could never — be repeated.

Rather than contributing to the Hellenization/corruption of the apocalyptic message of Jesus, for Schweitzer Paul was the one to safeguard the precious heritage of the early church: “The miracle that the Gospel of Jesus in entering the world of Hellenistic-Oriental thought is able to maintain itself against the syncretistic tendencies of the time is in part the work of Paul.”⁵

Of course, the pendulum of early Christian studies has swung several times since *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* was written. Decades of archaeological discoveries, and more importantly, a fundamental reappraisal of the history of the ancient near east after Alexander means we can no longer paint such polarized pictures of second-temple Judaism, nor of the Judaisms (including earliest Christianity) which came out of it.

That Schweitzer does not deal explicitly with ecology does not mean that his work cannot be brought to bear upon it now.⁶ It is my intent to show that both Paul’s concept of ethical action (as identified by Schweitzer and framed in eschatological terms)⁷ and, more

importantly, the conception of a mystical but still somehow physical participation (“indwelling”) of the cosmos, including the believer, in Christ,⁸ are vantage points where Schweitzer’s analysis of Paul may prove helpful to some of the streams of environmental theology.

A second possible objection to the use of Schweitzer for an eco-theology comes from the author himself, not in the work proper, but in his author’s preface to the 1931 English edition. Schweitzer, with characteristic succinctness, appears to dismiss just such projects as this paper undertakes:

My methods have remained old-fashioned, in that I aim at setting forth the ideas of Paul in their historically conditioned form. I believe that the mingling of our ways of regarding religion with those of former historical periods, which is now so much practiced, often with dazzling cleverness, is of no use as an aid to historical comprehension, and not much use in the end for our religious life. The investigation of historical truth in itself I regard as the ideal for which scientific theology has to strive.⁹

Yet the old pastor provides an answer to his own challenge. The point that he is making is not that contemporary theology should ignore its ancestors, only that historical investigation be as concerned as possible with the original meanings, contexts, and purposes of their subjects. A properly “scientific” — to use Schweitzer’s term — investigation, in this case of Paul, will yield more, not only for the academy, but also for the church, than any haphazard interpretation that runs roughshod over original context and meaning. In terms of the present investigation, this perhaps means that a so-called ‘Biblical’ theology of the environment must first find its solid ground in the texts.

In its specifics (i.e. global warming, oil use, emissions) our concern for ecology is tangential to Paul’s letters, indeed, arguably, to much of the scriptures.¹⁰ Attempts to somehow “make the Bible relevant” here, as elsewhere, risk the dangers of straying too far from the actual texts, or turning Jesus and others into advertising (sometimes literally)¹¹ for our own advocacies, legitimate as they may otherwise be. At the same time, this has forever been the essence of the hermeneutical problem. Schweitzer was a person of the church. He is not arguing for any isolation of the New Testament texts from an ever-changing world. He argues for integrity. His prefatory remarks conclude with the following: “A Christianity which does not

dare to use historical truth for the service of what is spiritual is not sound within, even if it appear to be strong.”¹²

A final possible set of objections to an eco-theology of Paul arises from the part of the apostle’s thought that Schweitzer was so concerned to recover: Paul’s pressing expectation of the *parousia*, the return of Christ. The apocalyptic desire that Schweitzer found so strong a theme in Paul comes, of course, with the expectation of a concomitant end to the present order. It is sometimes stated, as if self-evident, that eschatology cannot contain ecology within itself: that the two are, by purpose and definition, incompatible. Environmental theology concerns the maintenance, repair or strengthening of the cosmos, while eschatology — so the argument goes — is about its termination.

This objection to the thesis may be dealt with several ways. Firstly, properly understood, and insofar as a coherent picture of Pauline eschatology can be drawn, the apostle foresaw a God-directed reconstitution rather more than any final “end” to the created order.¹³ In this he participated in the wider understanding of eschatology prevalent in first century Judaism, including, as best we understand them, the apocalyptic hopes of those who produced the Dead Sea scrolls. Paul makes this view of the *eschaton* quite clear in his use of the phrase “a new creation.” Further, in Romans 8:18-23, a pivotal passage, the apostle underscores that God is firmly in control of the present situation of ‘subjecting’ the creation to futility, indicating again that the final act of redemption, for Paul, represents a completion — not an end — to the initial act of creation.¹⁴ Even the metaphor so prominent in Romans 8, the metaphor of pregnancy, implies continuity. Finally, the connection Schweitzer draws between Paul’s eschatological expectation of Jesus’ return, and the apostle’s mystical understanding of interconnectedness in the “being-in” Christ, is of fundamental importance for seeing how an environmental theology would fit Paul’s thinking. It is thus to this subject that we turn.

Eschatology and Paul’s “Resurrection Mysticism”¹⁵

Far from agreeing with those who derided Paul as perverting Jesus’ teachings,¹⁶ Schweitzer believed that Paul faithfully followed Jesus’ lead in the latter’s own apocalyptic expectations. Where Paul added anything original to Jesus’ teachings, he did so, according to

Schweitzer, simply to account for “the cosmic events”¹⁷ of Christ’s death and resurrection, and therefore the life in the Messianic kingdom Jesus foresaw but which had not yet come to pass: “Since Jesus expects the beginning of the Messianic Kingdom to take place immediately after his death, he does not presuppose any doctrine of redemption applicable to that period. When, in consequence of the delay of the Messianic Kingdom, such a doctrine had necessarily to be set up, others contented themselves with makeshifts.”¹⁸

It is in the context of this application of Jesus’ own apocalyptic thinking to the conditions of Paul’s congregations that the apostle developed his doctrine of apocalyptic, or “resurrection” mysticism. Schweitzer describes it this way:

The original and central idea of the Pauline Mysticism is therefore that the Elect share with one another and with Christ a corporeity which is in a special way susceptible to the action of the powers of death and resurrection, and in consequence capable of acquiring the resurrection state of existence before the general resurrection of the dead takes place.¹⁹

Both resurrection — that is, the apocalyptic hope that is common to humanity and, importantly, to the cosmos (Rom 8:22) — and the present, mystical appropriation of that resurrection are bound indissolubly together in Paul’s thought. There is no practical priority in the way these are experienced by the believer. But there is a logical priority, according to Schweitzer, in the sense that the eschatological action of Christ’s resurrection precedes the inclusion of the believer, through baptism, in the teleological process it has initiated. Note the two stages envisaged by the familiar Pauline quotation: “For if we have been united with him in a death like his, we will certainly be united with him in a resurrection like his” (Rom 6:5).

As Schweitzer takes pains to point out, there is nowhere in the Pauline corpus the use of the expression “the *mystical* body of Christ.” Rather, Paul simply states “the body of Christ.” Most times it is used, the phrase appears to refer to the church overall (some form of “the church universal”) or to individuals bound together within a congregation Paul is addressing. Sometimes the phrase appears to refer to the actual body of the earthly Christ. “The obscurity,” Schweitzer writes, “was intended.”²⁰ That is, by virtue of the Gospel proclamation, there is no longer, for Paul, any firm dividing line between the resurrected Christ’s body and the community

incorporated into that body through baptism, nor the world which houses the Elect destined for the Messianic Kingdom.²¹ In fact, within this understanding of mystical participation, there is no longer any independent existence for believer or, by extension, cosmos. The believer, and her or his community, is in Christ just as Christ is in the believer and in the community. Both partake in the new creation, as does the natural world, which “has been groaning in labor pains until now” (Rom 8:22). This, according to Schweitzer, is the internally-consistent “logic and speech of mysticism.”²²

It is important to note again the all-important corporeity of this mystical being-in-Christ. The vision Paul puts forward is hardly exclusive of the worldly and physical realities of his congregations — quite the opposite. Paul seems to understand being in Christ as being both a supernatural state and a very earthly one, one that affects actions as specific as what one eats and whom one sleeps with. Pauline mysticism, as expounded by Schweitzer,²³ is profoundly physical — especially in its ethical implications — as well as being metaphysical. Here we find a natural entry-point for dialogue with environmental theology and its similar emphasis on the physical corollaries of Christian belief.

As many New Testament commentators have noted, it is important that Paul works out some of his congregations’ crucial ethical and pastoral questions, not by recourse to either Torah or to Hellenistic morality, but by reference to this state of being “in Christ.” The first letter to the Corinthians provides the clearest examples, with Paul using participation in the physical body of Christ as the logical lynch-pin of his argument for both the continuity of marriages where one partner has become a believer and the other has not (1 Cor 7:12-14), and for the prohibition against having sex with prostitutes (1 Cor 6:13-19) where his argument is literally about the conjoining of Christ’s body with the prostitute’s body.

Despite Paul’s occasional use of the Hellenistic virtue and vice lists that Erwin Buck so readily identified to his students, Schweitzer holds that Pauline ethics is ultimately dependent on this apocalyptic mysticism inherited, and developed from, Jesus. Should Pauline theology be able to contribute to the emerging streams of environmental theologies, it will be because of this eschatological participation in the body of Christ, when that body is seen as including the entire created order.

Ecological Theology and Pauline Eschatological Mysticism

Quite a number of paradigms are put forward by contemporary environmental theologians as descriptors of past and possible future relations between human society and the cosmos. Larry Rasmussen lists “steward,” “master,” “partner,” and “priest,”²⁴ each term bearing its own constellation of meanings and its own proper ethical implications. Stephen Scharper’s listing contains “trustee” (Thomas Seiger Derr), “steward” (Douglas John Hall), “gardener” (Rosemary Radford Ruether), “caretaker” (Sally McFague) and “self-consciousness of the universe” (Thomas Berry and Brian Swimme).²⁵ One might add other labels: “manager” or “landlord,” or perhaps in light of recent events even “despoiler,” “thief,” or, according to some variants of Gaia theory, “blight” or “parasite.”

The question addressed by this paper is whether Schweitzer’s Paul — understood as apostle of an eschatological, mystical and corporeal Gospel of “being in Christ” — fits any of these categories or presents another paradigm entirely of humanity’s relationship to the cosmos. When viewed in light of western humanity’s relationship with the earth, the term ‘relationship’ is, of course, itself problematic — since it implies a separation of some sort. Alienation of human beings from the earth (attested or even promoted by the Biblical record as early as the story of the curse of Adam at the east end of the Garden) is rightly perceived as being at the root of the environmental crisis.²⁶

Several ecological theologians have tried to solve the problem of human-creation alienation by specifically addressing issues of ontology. Scharper proposed an “anthro-harmonic approach” to theology and cosmology, an attempt to retain human agency in “redeeming the time” (his book’s title) while adding a corrective emphasis to the abuse of the natural world that human agency has traditionally meant.²⁷ Peter Scott proposes a concept he describes as interconnected or “overlapping” socialities:

Sociality proposes, then, the presentation and development of a sacrificial ontology of relations that encompasses humanity and nature To affirm both humanity and nature as social is to make a first, and vitally important, point: humanity is ‘in’ nature. If we must think in special images, we have not a humanity alongside nature but rather a humanity placed, in its societies, in the societies of nature.²⁸

Of course there is an ontology also inherent in Paul's mystical preaching of the unity of both believers and cosmos in Christ. It is unique, and uniquely Pauline. There is nowhere in mysticism according to Schweitzer (and nowhere in environmental theology so far examined) where a thinker has proposed "this conception of the extension of the body of a personal being."²⁹

Similar to those new paradigms proposed above, Paul's ontology focuses on the location of human beings and human society within the created order, but in fact goes beyond them. It supersedes essence to discuss the unity in action and destiny, of one with the other. In this way, Paul's mystical view of the human place in the world differs fundamentally from those positions which posit a radical or even attenuated separation between human beings and the rest of the natural world. Although Paul's readers/listeners act ethically, they are not the first and foremost agents of change. Imbedded in an entire world of Christ's redeeming, they are subject to the same cosmic events that have, in Paul's view, and beginning with Christ, already begun to transform the natural world, together with its societies, powers and inhabitants, human and non-human, in new and irreversible ways. It is not sufficient, therefore, to argue that apocalyptic views such as Paul's contribute to the "disgracing of nature,"³⁰ since disgrace requires a relative evaluation of merit, and in the apostle's view it is precisely the universe as a totality that is both incorporated in Christ and changed "on the last day."

What a change in meaning is possible if the *somata* or "bodies" of Paul's following description apply to both human beings and their world: "We know that the whole creation has been groaning in labor pains until now; and not only the creation, but we ourselves, who have the first fruits of the Spirit, groan inwardly while we wait for adoption, the redemption of our bodies." (Rom 8:22-23)

This concept of co-corporality is by no means explicit in Schweitzer when applied to the natural order, but represents nonetheless only a modest extension of his thought about Paul's believing communities: believers "are not only one body with Christ, but themselves are a body...that is to say that they, with one another and with Christ, form a joint personality, in which the peculiarities of the individuals, such as are constituted by race and sex and social position, have no longer any validity."³¹

But does a theological framework in which human beings are subjects rather than authors of God's environmental action result

necessarily in quietism and an embrace of the unsustainable *status quo*? Schweitzer hints that this would not be the case: “Another significant point,” he writes, “to which far too little attention has been paid, is that Paul pictures the glory of the Messianic Kingdom not as repose but as action. The whole period of the Messiah’s reign is filled by a succession of victories over the God-opposing powers.” This, he notes “is an ethical value to action.”³²

Francis Bridger, in a 1990 article titled “Ecology and Eschatology,” describes two broad streams of ecological theological reflection. The initial and thus far most common paradigms for environmental theology, he notes, are based on the creation narratives and worked out in terms of Old Testament social legislation.³³ Although he does not share this paper’s emphasis on Schweitzer, Bridger also proposed an alternative ethics of environmental concern similarly based on the Pauline vision of the eschatological order. Significant in his work was the emphasis on Paul’s final vision of the cosmos as a vindication and planned fulfillment of God’s original creation rather than a termination of it.³⁴ Notably, Bridger also emphasized human ethical responsibility for creation, neither as stewards and masters of nature, nor as subjects of it, but rather as creatures waiting *in* and as part of, creation, for the final act of an apocalyptic transformation already begun in the resurrection of Christ.³⁵

Since the publication of Bridger’s article, the field of environmental theology has evolved considerably. Now a wide diversity of other approaches such as eco-feminism, which (despite its internal diversity) links oppression of the environment to the oppression of women, Eastern Orthodox ecologies seeing human responsibility as priest-like,³⁶ or Eucharistic ecologies, which although again diverse see care of the earth as sacramental, have broadened the spectrum of Christian responses to the environmental crisis.

But the basic problem of the separation of the human from the natural world remains operative in many, if not most, of these theological paradigms. As Scott writes “the distance between humanity and nature operative in Western sensibility must be challenged.”³⁷ A Schweitzerian approach to environmental theology avoids some of the tensions of the ‘above, in, or with’ relationship we humans have to our world.³⁸ We are certainly not above the world,

according to Paul, since we share with it in receiving the apocalyptic redemption begun in Christ's resurrection. We are in the world, yet not, as might be imagined, for the sake of our creatureliness or created status, but in the sense that we are part of the created order and likewise those being acted upon in eschatological redemption. We are in the world, not for its sake, but for the sake of our mutual co-corporality with Christ. And finally, we are with the world, insofar as that world is in Christ, and we, together with it, are part of the eschatological end of the new creation.

Conclusions

Celia Deane-Drummond writes: "While it is reasonable to suggest that environmental concern is not built into a traditional reading of the Bible, it is possible to read the texts in the light of these concerns and find insights that have been missed in the past. Such a reading is similar to feminist readings of the biblical text, though this time it is from the perspective of the earth."³⁹ Just as the Biblical text needs — in fact, by virtue of its status as canon *requires* — a hermeneutic that constantly re-appropriates its resources for new situations, a similar re-appropriation of the Bible's major interpreters, such as Schweitzer, is beneficial. Environmental theology is not a fad; it is a matter of working out faith in the service of social justice, in a time that appears increasingly eschatological. From squatters who live in low-lying areas prone to hurricanes and flooding, to subsistence farmers who cannot afford the produce they grow, the poor are the hardest hit by the environmental degradations that are now reported almost daily. Scharper's 1997 call for the "greening of solidarity" and a special awareness of the political and advocacy aspects of environmental theology⁴⁰ are issues that appear to have been largely ignored thus far despite the development — one hesitates yet to say "maturation" — of environmental theology.

Far from representing the flight from nature or from action sometimes assumed, the apocalyptic mysticism identified by Albert Schweitzer in Paul's thought can contribute to the field of environmental theology a radical ethic of ecological *responsibility*. This ethic is organic to Pauline thought; it follows quite naturally from the conception of humanity as redeemed along with, in fact, *in*, the body of Christ which includes the wider cosmos. Pauline "ecology" is not, strictly speaking, an anthropological nor a

cosmological concern and so it avoids the split between them. It is, rather, mystical and soteriological.

Although there is not the space to fully develop it here, the role of the Spirit in a mystical and participatory Pauline eco-theology is of primary importance. Just as, for Paul, the Spirit is both proof of, and in some way, ‘down payment on’ the participation of the believer in the new creation, so is the Spirit the guarantee of a believer’s ethic of responsibility for the environment (2 Cor 1:22; Gal 5:22).⁴¹ Moreover, the Spirit’s work here, as elsewhere, is reconciliation, in this case of humanity with the natural world. Although death may be “at work” in the natural world, the believer who is incorporated into Christ, with the Spirit as her “life-power,”⁴² attempts to live out the new creation now.⁴³ As Schweitzer reminds us: “This whole mystical doctrine of the world as in process of transformation along with mankind is nothing other than the eschatological conception of redemption looked at from within.”⁴⁴

Being “in Christ” is a strong call to action. As a participatory ethic tied to an apocalyptic end, the eco-mysticism we have identified, with Schweitzer, in Paul, applies the same ethics of participation to environmental as to all other relational issues of Christian understanding and behaviour. The point, Schweitzer might say, is apocalyptic and mystical solidarity. Or to paraphrase Paul’s own argument in Corinthians: one should no more abuse the body (of the world) than one would abuse the body (of Christ). In the end, and in light of the cross, one is in the other, and all is in all.

Notes

- 1 Those “currents” include the overlapping fields (and titles) of eco-feminism, “new cosmology,” political theologies of nature, Gaia theologies, stewardship theology, priestly and Eucharistic ecology, and animal theology, among others. Scharper’s helpful 1997 summary (*Redeeming the Time* [New York: Continuum, 1997], pp. 23-52) at over a decade old, is already becoming dated except in its emphasis on the contribution of the poor; Berry’s collection *Environmental Stewardship* (London: T. & T. Clark, 2006) samples a wide range of thinking from both within and outside the theological academy.
- 2 For some, such as Peter Scott, Schweitzer may be seen as a signpost to the long “retreat of theology from the contestation of and contribution to public meanings and concepts” (*A Political Theology of Nature*

[Cambridge: University Press, 2003], p. 9) and Schweitzer's eschatological focus as the inevitable end-point of theology's retreat from any meaningful discussion of God and the natural sciences.

- 3 Albert Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* (New York: Seabury Press, 1968), p. 370.
- 4 Ibid.
- 5 Ibid., p. 372.
- 6 Scott correctly identifies the concern of ecology as being, "not directed to some abstraction, called Nature ... [rather] towards the quality and character of habitation, including the habitation of humanity." (*Political Theology of Nature*, p. 3).
- 7 Schweitzer, *Mysticism*, pp. 313 ff. Helmut Thielicke, in 1966, noted that "theological ethics is eschatological or it is nothing" (quoted in Francis Bridger, "Ecology and Eschatology," *Tyndale Bulletin* 41.2 [1990]: 294).
- 8 Schweitzer, *Mysticism*, p. 127.
- 9 Ibid., p. ix.
- 10 Thomas Berry has suggested that "we should put the Bible on the shelf for twenty years and listen to nature" (quoted in Scharper, *Redeeming the Time*, p. 126).
- 11 See, for instance, the laudable but ill-named website <www.whatwouldjesusdrive.org>. Surely this is enculturation without any attempt at christological context!
- 12 Schweitzer, *Mysticism*, pp. ix f.
- 13 Bridger, "Ecology and Eschatology," p. 291.
- 14 The author of Revelation (quite literally) illustrates this same emphasis with that text's many allusions to Genesis.
- 15 Schweitzer's phrase.
- 16 Most notably, Friedrich Nietzsche.
- 17 Schweitzer, *Mysticism*, p. 114.
- 18 Ibid., p. 115.
- 19 Ibid., pp. 115f.
- 20 Ibid., p. 118.
- 21 Schweitzer's terms.
- 22 Schweitzer, *Mysticism*, p. 118.
- 23 Ibid., pp. 127f.

- 24 Larry Rasmussen, "Symbols to Live By," in Berry, *Environmental Stewardship*, pp. 174-183.
- 25 Scharper, *Redeeming the Time*, p. 186.
- 26 Many sources point to historian Lynn White's 1967 article "The Historical Roots of our Ecological Crisis" in the journal *Science* as being the prophetic call that ultimately resulted in the birth or rebirth of Christian environmentalism.
- 27 Scharper, *Redeeming the Time*, p. 188.
- 28 Scott, *Political Theology*, p. 181.
- 29 Schweitzer, *Mysticism*, p. 116.
- 30 See Scott's helpful summary in *A Political Theology of Nature*, pp. 9ff.
- 31 Schweitzer, *Mysticism*, p. 118.
- 32 *Ibid.*, p. 313.
- 33 Bridger, "Ecology and Eschatology," p. 291.
- 34 See Bridger's reading of Rom 8:21 where the "creation" or natural order is "subjected [by God] in hope" and thus as part of the original intent of the act of creation.
- 35 Bridger, "Ecology and Eschatology," p. 297.
- 36 John Zizioulas, "Priest of Creation," in Berry, *Environmental Stewardship*, pp. 286 ff.
- 37 Scott, *Political Theology*, p. 182.
- 38 Douglas John Hall's treatment is helpful: see "Stewardship as Key to a Theology of Nature," in Berry, *Environmental Stewardship*, pp. 132-143.
- 39 "Environmental Ethics," in John Bowden, ed., *Encyclopedia of Christianity* (Oxford: University Press, 2005).
- 40 Scharper, *Redeeming the Time*, p. 183.
- 41 2 Cor 1:22 explicitly links the possession of the Spirit with anointing, which is always linked, in scripture, to responsibility and action.
- 42 Schweitzer, *Mysticism*, p. 119.
- 43 See Scott, *Political Theology*, pp. 203-212, on an "ecological pneumatology."
- 44 Schweitzer, *Mysticism*, p. 112.