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SUFFERING, CREATION, AND LUTHER’S *THEOLOGIA CRUCIS*

DANIEL L. BRUNNER

Since 1995 I have taught at a Wesleyan-Holiness, Quaker university, and yet I am a prenatal Lutheran. Despite my birthright claims to all things Lutheran, what keeps me in the fold, more than anything else, is Martin Luther’s theology of the cross, *theologia crucis*. Since I first encountered it in seminary I have been captured by the idea of God’s concealed self-revelation, of our Western fixation on a theology of glory, and of unearthing God in suffering, weakness, and foolishness. At the same time I am convinced that the world’s ecological crisis is indeed the next “great work” facing humanity, demanding that Christians confront ecotheological issues we have had the privilege to ignore for decades.¹

At the outset we must acknowledge that Luther’s ecological legacy—in spite of the anachronism of calling it such—is at best “ambiguous.” Like other reformers he was gripped by “soteriological-anthropocentric themes”; it would be unfair to expect otherwise.² Yet, many scholars, including Lutheran and non-Lutheran, women and men, feminist and Minjung, are discovering a resource for ecotheology in *theologia crucis*.³ Beyond scholarship, though, I am motivated personally. One of our former students, someone who committed hours to helping craft the Christian Earthkeeping program at our seminary, decided on leaving seminary to go to Mozambique to live and work alongside the poor, instead of pursuing doctoral studies. In a recent email he said:

> I struggle for the poor and forgotten here in Mozambique. I have spent the last days with people dying from famine due to climate change. Some days I feel that I have chosen wrongly [by not going into academics]. I stand with the poor, but the world could care less. Money goes to the places with the most people dying. Since we only have hundreds dying we do not count. We have no voice.⁴

Nathan knows the theology of the cross; he has studied it; he is living it.
Walther von Loewenich wrote, “For Luther the cross is not only the subject of theology; it is the distinctive mark of all theology.” Luther himself declared: *Crux sola est nostra theologia*, or “the cross alone is our theology.” And yet, as Mary Solberg emphasizes, “[T]here is a kind of restlessness in Luther’s theology.” Centuries before Kierkegaard, Luther was an existentialist, someone whose writing defies systematization because it arose primarily out of his lived experience. That is its wonder and its hell. Our goal then is not to schematize Luther, but to draw ecotheological ramifications from three of the 28 theses in his Heidelberg Disputation of 1518. In this early, groundbreaking defense at an Augustinian monastery, Luther presents the heartbeat of *theologia crucis*.

**A Theology of Reality**

First, the theology of the cross is a theology of reality. In Thesis 21 of the Heidelberg Disputation Luther states: “A theology of glory calls evil good and good evil. A theology of the cross calls the thing what it actually is.” Dietrich Bonhoeffer, whose own life was an exposition on *theologia crucis*, was only too aware of how evil could “masquerade” as good and “appear in the form of light, good deeds, historical necessity, [or] social justice.”

Scientists and climatologists, ethicists and humanitarians, poets and artists, the marginalized and the Earth itself are all pleading with the developed world to see reality, to see what actually is. In the words of Cynthia Moe-Lobeda, we in the minority (first) world have become “uncreators,” destroying the ecosystems of this planet and “building a soul-shattering gap between the rich and the impoverished.” The World Meteorological Organization warns that humanity is “conducting an unintended, uncontrolled, globally pervasive experiment,” by which “Earth’s atmosphere is being changed at an unprecedented rate.” Bill McKibben calls global warming “the deepest problem that human beings have ever faced.”

The “reality” is that we, the economically privileged, are disproportionately responsible for climate change, from which we disproportionately benefit and are disproportionately protected, and from which the underprivileged disproportionately suffer. The ecocrisis and worldwide economic inequality are inseparably connected. Methodist Bishop Bernardino Mandlate of Mozambique,
when speaking of the debt of impoverished nations, declared, “African children die so that North American children may overeat.”

Luther once stated, “If I profess with the loudest voice and clearest exposition every portion of the truth of God except precisely that little point which the world and the devil are at that moment attacking, I am not confessing Christ, however boldly I may be professing Christ.” What might it mean, then, to confess Christ in the midst of our ecological and economic tragedy, that place where the world and the devil are at this moment attacking? It can only start by entering reality, by fighting against the denial of our own participation in the sinful structures of our world. By resisting denial, we move beyond numbness only to confront the disillusionment and pain that inevitably result from coming to know how things actually are. It opens the door to grief and lament. Facing reality begins to break down detachment. We experience Creation’s groaning, and are driven to the cross. In his Ethics, Bonhoeffer summarized a theology of reality: “What matters is participating in the reality of God and the world in Jesus Christ today, and doing so in such a way that I never experience the reality of God without the reality of the world, nor the reality of the world without the reality of God.”

A THEOLOGY OF DESCENT

Secondly, theologia crucis is a theology of descent. Luther makes this proposal in Thesis 20: “One deserves to be called a theologian…who comprehends the visible and the ‘back’ of God [posteriora Dei] seen through suffering and the cross.” The perspective that the Christian life is about leaving this world and climbing a ladder is a dominant theme, if not the dominant theme, in the history of Christian spirituality. Paul Santmire calls it a “metaphor of ascent.” Luther, however, in his cross theology polemicizes against any dualistic separation of the spiritual from the material and disavows “the great chain of being.” He stresses that in the Incarnation God descended the ladder to this Earth. The fullness of God’s divinity is embodied in the humanity of Jesus.

Luther insisted that the finite carries the infinite (finitum capax infiniti), that the transcendent is wholly immanent. His is an incarnational theology of descent, earthbound and bodily. Rasmussen states that Luther is “boldly pan-en-theistic,” citing this passage from Luther:
For how can reason tolerate it that the Divine majesty is so small that it can be substantially present in a grain, on a grain, over a grain, through a grain, within and without, and that, although it is a single Majesty, it nevertheless is entirely in each grain separately, no matter how immeasurable numerous these grains may be?24

This theme is often overlooked in Luther, that God became incarnate as both a human being and a created being. Elsewhere, he wrote that the power of God “must be essentially present at all places, even in the tiniest leaf.”25 Korean theologian Paul Chung states that we need to revitalize Luther’s doctrine of ubiquity, so contentious in the sixteenth century, to cope with the ecological crisis.26 Luther wrote, “God is substantially present everywhere, in and through all creatures, in all their part and places, so that the world is full of God and He fills all, but without His being encompassed and surrounded by it.”27 The transcendent is indeed immanent.

Much more controversial is Luther’s conviction that a theology of the cross unavoidably involved suffering, that “the ‘back’ of God [is] seen through suffering and the cross.” Luther underscored Deus absconditus, that God was hidden in suffering. This preoccupation with the necessity of suffering—that being a Christian is to have to suffer—has caused numerous feminists to reject the whole idea of the theology of the cross, since it seemingly fails to recognize the systemic nature of sin.28 Holocaust survivor Elie Wiesel remarked: “a religion that glorifies suffering will always find someone to suffer.”29 Luther indeed seemed fixated on the psychological suffering of Anfechtungen, to the exclusion of structural oppression, as illustrated in his response to the peasant revolt. Yet, many feminists and ecotheologians alike argue that the answer is not to reject all discourse about suffering. Korean feminist theologian Chung Hyun Kyung remarks, “Asian women cannot define humanity apart from their suffering.”30 She emphasizes that to be human is both to suffer and to resist oppression that causes suffering, although she acknowledges that trying to find meaning in suffering is thorny, because it “can be both a seed for liberation and an opium for…oppression.”31

Larry Rasmussen observes that not all suffering is negative, because some suffering is part of what it means to be finite and to struggle as creatures in the process of becoming. The cross, however, opposes any disintegrative suffering “that negates life and destroys the realization of creation.”32 The cross, rooted in reality, neither justifies
suffering nor denies it. But where the cross “finds suffering caused by
the culture of death, it willingly enters into it for the sake of life. …
[R]edeeming the planet…means going to the places of suffering to
find God and God’s power there.”

A THEOLOGY OF ENGAGED HOPE

Finally, a theology of the cross is a theology of engaged hope. Luther’s
last thesis says, “God’s Love does not find, but creates, that
which is lovable to it. Human Love comes into being through that
which is lovable to it.” Here, at the end of his defense, Luther lifts
up hope rooted in God’s love. This resurrection hope is not to be
found in eschatological escapism; it arises out of clear-eyed reality and
incarnational descent.

Luther wrote in explanation of Thesis 28, “Therefore sinners are
beautiful because they are loved; they are not loved because they are
beautiful.” God is not primarily a receiver of love, but a giver of a
love that creates love. It is, in the words of Tuomo Mannermaa, “a
characteristic of God to create something out of nothing.” It is the
work of God to engage that which is wrecked by sin, both personal
and structural, and then to create that which is loved and good and
beautiful. Of course, we do see God’s presence in Creation’s beauty:
the world is indeed “charged with the grandeur of God.” But what
do we do with pain and degradation? How are we to understand the
‘suffering’ of rainforests and mountaintops as they surrender to the
bulldozers of human greed? It is precisely here that Luther’s theology
of the cross speaks boldly. When the Creation—human or other-than-
human—suffers any kind of degradation, God suffers. God enters
the negation of suffering, and in suffering we meet God. Douglas
John Hall affirms that Luther’s theologia crucis “is not the good news
of deliverance from the experience of negation so much as it is the
permission and command to enter into that experience with hope.”

Luther’s theology of the cross speaks to an engaged hope that
arises out of love. Rasmussen stresses that “only those who love the
dothing intensely, in its distress, will effect whatever redemption it might
know.” This fierce love knows that God is present—and we also are
to be present—in a Creation that is often “blighted and disgraced,”
because if we were “present only in a redeeming way to creation’s
beauty and not in its plunder and rape, then broken creation would
never be healed.” This love calls us as human beings to solidarity with everyone and everything suffering from exclusion and marginalization. When Bonhoeffer was faced with the rise of fascism and anti-Semitism in 1932, when the world was suffering, he wrote these words: “The hour in which we pray today for God’s kingdom is the hour of the most profound solidarity with the world, an hour of clenched teeth and trembling fists.”

Martin Luther’s theology of cross challenges us to face daringly into the reality of the Earth’s crisis. It reminds us of Jesus whose incarnate descent immersed him in the wonder and suffering of humanity and Creation. And it invites us to an engaged hope that loves fiercely all that God loves fiercely, in solidarity and even in suffering. In the smallest of responsive action is the hope of Creation’s restoration and renewal. Luther said that divinity could be present in a grain. Chung Hyun Kyung cites a poem from an anonymous Indian woman who, in her famine stricken area, also encounters Jesus Christ in the grain that makes her gruel:

Every noon at twelve
In the blazing heat
God comes to me
in the form of
Two hundred grams of gruel.

I know Him in every grain
I taste Him in every lick.
I commune with Him as I gulp
For He keeps me alive, with
Two hundred grams of gruel.

I wait till next noon
and now know He’d come:
I can hope to live one day more
For you made God to come to me as
Two hundred grams of gruel.

I know now that God loves me—
Not until you made it possible.
Now I know what you’re speaking about
For God so loves this world
That He gives His beloved Son
Every noon through You.
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