

S|T|K INNEHÅLL 2 2019

Gustaf Aulén in South Africa – An Unlikely Conversation Partner Hans S.A. Engdahl	75
The UWC Reception of Gustaf Aulén's <i>Christus Victor</i> Typology Ernst M. Conradie	79
An Unlikely Conversation Partner Gustaf Aulén's Connection with Reconciliation in South Africa Demaine Solomons	93
Aulén Deconstructed On Inconsistencies in His Theology of Atonement and <i>Lex Creationis</i> Hans S.A. Engdahl	109
Teologiska perspektiv på rättsstaten hos Gustaf Aulén Jonas Jonson	125
Recensioner	138
Jonas Ideström & Tone Stangeland Kaufman (red.), <i>What Really Matters: Scandinavian Perspectives on Ecclesiology and Ethnography</i> Karin Rubenson	138
Dominic Legge, <i>The Trinitarian Christology of St Thomas Aquinas</i> Johan Wallner	139
Joan Wallach Scott, <i>Sex and Secularism</i> Martin Nykvist.	140

Gustaf Aulén in South Africa – An Unlikely Conversation Partner

HANS S.A. ENGDAHL

This special issue of *Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift* offers four articles about Gustaf Aulén's (1879–1977) theology. Three of them focus on his *Christus Victor*¹ and relate to South African realities in various ways. The fourth article is on Aulén's later engagement with God's law, *lex creationis*, typically work that is patterned in the Second World War climate.

The first article is written by Ernst M. Conradie, professor in systematic theology at the University of the Western Cape (UWC) in greater Cape Town. He gives the trajectory of how Aulén has come to be read in South Africa. Three perspectives are given. First, he gives the background to this university that was a real misnomer and monstrosity, having been established as an apartheid institution in 1960, but later became a bulwark for justice and freedom. However, the exact story of why Aulén was introduced into the curriculum is not told, but it seems that there was a confluence of Alister McGrath, Karin Sporre, and myself in this respect. Conradie continues by writing about all the postgraduate students whom he has influenced and supervised into the Aulénian typology. It is quite an impressive list. Finally, he also deliberates on his own research and writing, which clearly show his intimate association with this Swedish oeuvre. He widens the circle as he, at this time, among other things, should be recognized as one of the leading scholars in eco-theology.

The second article stems from Demaine Solomons, one of the young scholars at the UWC, with a fresh doctorate. He proves to be deeply influenced by Aulén's thinking,² now a lecturer in systematic theology and social

1. Gustaf Aulén, *Christus Victor: An Historical Study of the Three Main Types of the Idea of the Atonement*, Eugene, OR 2002, describing the three types of atonement: the classic, the Latin, and the subjective.

2. Demaine Solomons, *Reconciliation as a Controversial Symbol: An Analysis of a Theological*

ethics. The article clearly reflects the dissertation in various ways and makes use of the three types of Aulén as a way of making South African developments in church and society understandable in the longstanding quest for a more just and reconciled society.

One should also note that Solomons sees himself as a black theologian with a profound and natural allegiance to black theology as well as liberation theology. Having also been one of my students, I can reveal that he also has been influenced by another Lundensian theologian, namely Per Frostin (1943–1992), especially his work on liberation theology in Africa.³

In typical South African fashion, Solomons portrays the fate of reconciliation as a journey that constantly oscillates between the social realities of the wider society to serious concerns of the church in terms of biblical fundamentals and sharp theological thinking and back. When reading Solomons, I am struck by this constant flow and that gives me hope. South Africa is not about reconciliation and atonement being hidden in a church sanctuary, that could never be the case. Others have a lot to learn.

As a scholar at the same university, I cannot exactly say how Aulén appeared on the scene, except for the fact that reconciliation was on in South Africa soon after the first, democratic election and he had written something along the same line. Without rationalizing, I simply expected students to take to Aulén's text *Christus Victor*. And it worked! My article is a deliberate attempt to unsettle Aulén's whole oeuvre, not only *Christus Victor*.

Having known Aulén, also personally as a young student in Lund, I have come to lament the radical shift he made in his career, from *Christus Victor* to creation theology or theology of the law, so as to never return in a serious way to his masterpiece for further deliberations, for example in the post-Second World War era. Subsequently, I have asked some difficult questions regarding this shift in the form of a very preliminary deconstruction, thus not of his *Christus Victor* work per se, but of his total theological contribution. At the end of the article, I show how fruitful it could be to do further work on the desperate need for reparation in South Africa (a possible and impossible task) and how closely such a problem relates to theologies of the Aulén type. This work has just begun.

The last article is written by Jonas Jonson, bishop emeritus of Strängnäs – the same diocese as Aulén – and a scholar and author in his own right. He writes about a later phase of Aulén's life, from 1935 until the end of the Second World War. It is a striking, descriptive account of how Aulén,

Discourse in South Africa between 1968 and 2010, University of the Western Cape/Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam PhD thesis, 2018.

3. Per Frostin, *Liberation Theology in Tanzania and South Africa: A First World Interpretation*, Lund 1988.

reflecting people's growing despair of the country, consistently stuck to the first article of the creed, to *lex creationis*, and the need to defend the legal state (*rättsstaten*).

Several quotes clearly show that this law is closely linked to the love of God, a God who insists on his law because of his endless love. From my own perspective, I would ask whether such formulations in a small way may have remedied his omission of the specific atonement work of God, an omission of which he might have been acutely aware.

Be that as it may, Jonson's article confirms and even strengthens my conviction that we are witnessing a new era in his theology, where inspiration from *Christus Victor* is left aside.

Thanks to his biography on Aulén,⁴ Jonson is the one person who at this time has the full insight regarding Aulén's life and work.⁵

Jonson notes that when planning for the English publication of *Christus Victor* in 1931, Aulén (and he is known for this edition and none other) was approached by the translator and theologian monk Arthur Gabriel Hebert (1886–1963), who suggested that he could be Aulén's co-author in what, at all counts, then was a very small book. Aulén wanted to have none of it.⁶ We should thank him and God for that. *Christus Victor* is the proof of the fact that good theology, especially in short form, will always find its way, sooner or later, to readers hungry for ground-breaking truths, and this just happens, regardless of ecclesial, social, cultural, political, or geographical location. ▲

4. Jonas Jonson, *Gustaf Aulén: Biskop och motståndsmän*, Skellefteå 2011.

5. Forgive the pun: see my article on Aulén preferring Faith and Order rather than Life and Work of the ecumenical movement.

6. Jonson, *Gustaf Aulén*, 115.

The UWC Reception of Gustaf Aulén's *Christus Victor* Typology

ERNST M. CONRADIE

Ernst M. Conradie is senior professor of systematic theology and ethics at the University of the Western Cape.

econradie@uwc.ac.za

Introduction

In this article I will not discuss in any detail Gustaf Aulén's (1879–1977) famous typology on atonement, offered in his highly influential book *Christus Victor*, first published in Swedish in 1930 and in English in 1931 – since this will be explored in more depth in other contributions to this special issue of *Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift*. I will also not consider the Nordic, Germanic, or British reception of his argument, the societal significance of his notion of victory over the forces of death and destruction (see Hans S.A. Engdahl's contribution), or the many critiques on the details of his typology that have been offered since then (see Demaine Solomons' contribution). Likewise, I will not explore Aulén's famous retrieval of and preference for the "classic" type, his critique of the "Latin" type and his controversial interpretation of Luther's position in terms of images derived from the "classic" type, or the cultural lure of the "modern" or "moral influence" type.¹ Indeed, my focus will be less on Christological debates on atonement than on pneumatological debates on what may generically be called "salvation".²

1. Gustaf Aulén, *Christus Victor: An Historical Study of the Three Main Types of the Idea of Atonement*, Eugene, OR 2002.

2. For the use of such a notion of "salvation" (rather than atonement or redemption), given the metaphors employed and their original *Sitz im Leben*, see especially the two edited volumes Ernst M. Conradie (ed.), *Creation and Salvation: 1. A Mosaic of Essays on Selected*

Instead, the purpose of this contribution is to sketch the surprisingly vibrant reception of Aulén's typology at a university far away from Lund, in a different hemisphere, indeed a different world, namely the University of the Western Cape (UWC) in South Africa. Some comments on the history of this university, and especially on how the study of religion and theology unfolded, are indicative of the contrast between Lund and the suburb of Belhar where the UWC is located.

Becoming UWC

The UWC was established as a university college in 1960. It is located close to the working class suburb of Belhar in what used to be called “bush” – because in the urban planning under apartheid it was deliberately rendered invisible from any of the major arteries of the city of Cape Town in an area covered by dense forest of invader species. In terms of the race classification system implemented under apartheid, each population group had to have its own university, especially for the training of teachers, social workers, pastors, and so forth. In the 1970s the university rejected this basis upon which it was founded, opened its doors to all population groups and confronted the “white control” of the university, given the links of many staff members at the time with the Afrikaner Broederbond, a secret organization serving as an intellectual think tank for Afrikaner nationalism. The UWC became one of the major centres of student protest associated with the Soweto uprising of 1976, faced numerous class boycotts, experienced the imprisonment of student leaders and became a virtual war zone in many confrontations with the security forces in the 1970s and 1980s. Under the leadership of Professor Jakes Gerwel (1946–2012), later the General-Secretary in the office of President Nelson Mandela, in the 1980s, it became “the intellectual home of the left”, with strong Marxist leanings among many staff and students. During the transition period (1990–1994) it played a leading role in drafting the South African constitution while its staff and alumni provided intellectual leadership in almost every sphere of society. Many left the institution by 1994 to take up leadership positions at other tertiary institutions, in government and business. After a period of rapid decline (perhaps being a victim of its own success), the university started growing again in the 2000s under the remarkable leadership of Professor Brian O’Connell, especially in the natural sciences, where, surprising to many, it now has considerable strengths in

Classic Christian Theologians, Berlin 2011; Ernst M. Conradie (ed.), *Creation and Salvation: 2. A Companion on Recent Theological Movements*, Berlin 2012; and the two monographs Ernst M. Conradie, *Saving the Earth? The Legacy of Reformed Views on “Re-creation”*, Berlin 2013; Ernst M. Conradie, *The Earth in God’s Economy: Creation, Salvation and Consummation in Ecological Perspective*, Berlin 2015.

fields such as radio astronomy, nanotechnology, bioinformatics, and various other life sciences. With a predominantly black student body (including “Africans” and “Coloureds”³ in terms of apartheid race classification), it certainly remains the most significant “historically black institution” in the country and is typically rated amongst the top ten universities in Africa. It is interesting to observe that the identity of this university does not lie in the past (with its founding fathers or with its role as a site of struggle against apartheid), or for that matter in the present, but in the future, in serving as an experiment in constructing a new society, a world that has never been, a new world that may be possible. A volume on the UWC’s history and legacy is therefore aptly entitled *Becoming UWC*. Its identity is still in the making.⁴

Shifts in Soteriological Debates at the UWC

Why, then, would students and staff members from this university be interested in the typology offered by Gustaf Aulén? Let me offer a few perspectives in this regard.

A Faculty of Theology was established at the UWC in the mid-1970s and at first served exclusively as the seminary for the then Dutch Reformed Mission Church (DRMC). As its name indicates, this is a “daughter” church within the “family” of Dutch Reformed Churches in South Africa, separated from the mother in 1881 on the basis of race classification, with an overwhelming majority of members from so-called “Coloured” communities. The name also indicates the missionary roots of and an evangelical ethos within this church.

Given the long-standing conflict between “mother” and an (outcast) “daughter”, the staff and students from this church were understandably interested in the theme of reconciliation, recognizing its promise, its necessity, and the many difficulties associated with that. In this context reconciliation had three connotations, namely reconciliation in Jesus Christ, reconciliation within the church as the body of Christ, and the ministry of reconciliation in a deeply divided society shaped by being held apart.⁵ There is a clear deductive logic here: the ministry of reconciliation in society has to be

3. The term “Coloured” was used in race classification systems in South Africa and is still retained but now for the purpose of affirmative action. A contested term widely regarded as pejorative (especially if used by outsiders), it refers to persons of “mixed” racial descent. Such mixed descent also applies to those “whites” of predominantly “European” recent descent, while the palaeo-archeological records amply illustrate that all humans originally emerged from Africa.

4. Premesh Lalu & Noëleen Murray (eds.), *Becoming UWC: Reflections, Pathways and the Unmaking of Apartheid’s Legacy*, Bellville 2012.

5. See especially Daan Cloete & Dirk J. Smit (eds.), *A Moment of Truth: The Confession of the Dutch Reformed Mission Church, 1982*, Grand Rapids, MI 1984.

based on reconciliation with God. Theological reflection on reconciliation culminated in the Confession of Belhar, proposed by the General Synod of the DRMC in 1982 and accepted as a confession in 1986. The three main themes, church unity, reconciliation in Christ, and God's justice in society revolved around the critique, emerging from discussions on the UWC campus,⁶ that apartheid assumed the fundamental irreconcilability of people and that any theological legitimization of apartheid amounts to a fundamental distortion of the gospel, indeed to heresy. The metaphors employed to express such reconciliation are clearly derived from what Aulén would call the Latin type of atonement.

After 1982 the DRMC eventually united with other reformed churches of Dutch origin to establish the Uniting Reformed Church of Southern Africa (URCSA) in 1994. As the "uniting" in the name indicates, unity with the "mother", i.e. the Dutch Reformed Church (still with predominantly white membership), remains elusive. Indeed, Sunday roam is a deeply divided hour in these churches, while South Africa itself remains deeply divided in terms of the legacy of race and class. Reconciliation does not come to fruition readily. Although the Confession of Belhar is endorsed in many churches around the world, it remains a bone of contention within the church to which it was first addressed.

Since the 1990s, the theme of reconciliation (but then focussed on reconciliation in society) continued to attract attention – and controversy – given the role of the South African Truth Commission (TRC), that was established in 1996 and concluded its proceedings in 1998. This attracted the attention of many staff members and students at the UWC across several disciplines, including history, law, literature, ethics, and theology.⁷ For several years the poet Antjie Krog (whose award-winning *Country of My Skull* covered the hearings of the TRC⁸) and Hans S.A. Engdahl offered postgraduate courses on the concept of reconciliation, while several students explored the complexities of reconciliation as understood in the TRC, typically with some references to Aulén's typology.⁹ This is not the place

6. See H. Russel Botman, "Narrative Challenges in a Situation of Transition", in H. Russel Botman & Robin M. Petersen (eds.), *To Remember and to Heal: Theological and Psychological Reflections on Truth and Reconciliation*, Cape Town 1996, 37–44.

7. See the volume edited by UWC staff members at the time, H. Russel Botman & Robin M. Petersen (eds.), *To Remember and to Heal: Theological and Psychological Reflections on Truth and Reconciliation*, Cape Town 1996.

8. Antjie Krog, *Country of My Skull*, Johannesburg 1998.

9. See, for example, Lerato Kobe, "The Relationship between Remorse and Offering Forgiveness: Selected Case Studies from the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission", University of the Western Cape M.Th. mini-thesis, 2015; Mbhekeni Nkosi, "The Concept of Restitution in South African Economic Policy Documents between 1994 and 2014: An Ethical Analysis", University of the Western Cape M.Th. thesis, 2016.

to discuss the TRC, its significance (widely heralded in countries such as Sweden), or its severe shortcomings (vehemently discussed within South Africa). In short, the critique is expressed in the question, “Where’s the justice?”, whenever there is talk about reconciliation. Notably, such questions were also raised by Jakes Gerwel, the former Rector and Vice-Chancellor of the UWC.¹⁰ Since the TRC focussed on gross violations of human rights *only*, it did not address the victims of economic injustices, or the so-called beneficiaries of apartheid.

Since the 1980s the former Faculty of Theology at the UWC opened its doors for students from a wide variety of other confessional traditions. It became a short-lived Faculty of Religion and Theology in 1995 and, after a drastic retrenchment of staff in 1998, a (now thriving) Department of Religion and Theology was established in 2000. Within this wider body of theology students (that included Uniting Reformed Church in Southern Africa students until 2000), there has been an increasing interest in the emergence of a cluster of contextual theologies, including liberation theology, black theology, Kairos theology, feminist theology, ecotheology, postcolonial/decolonial theology, and queer theology. In this context the dominant theological metaphor is no longer reconciliation but arguably liberation. Such liberation was understood in the 1980s as political liberation from the oppressive imperial, colonial, and apartheid regimes, but also as liberation from economic oppression, i.e. addressing the struggles of the black working class against capitalist exploitation. Accordingly, God is viewed as the Liberator, while the instruments used by God is no longer only or even mainly the church, but an array of other “carriers” of the revolution. The metaphor of liberation is easily further extended to include an affirmation of human dignity amidst white supremacy, the emancipation of women amidst patriarchal domination, the need for the psychological liberation of the colonized (emphasized by Franz Fanon [1925–1961] and Steven Bantu Biko [1946–1977]),¹¹ long after decolonization and political (if not economic) independence has been achieved, and also the liberation of the Earth, given the quest for ecojustice (the impact of ecological degradation on the poor and marginalized).¹² The metaphors employed here are clearly derived from what Aulén would call the classic type of atonement.

10. See Jakes Gerwel, “National Reconciliation: Holy Grail or Secular Pact?”, in Charles Villa-Vicencio & Wilhelm Verwoerd (eds.), *Looking Back, Reaching Forward: Reflections on the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa*, Cape Town 2000, 280–286.

11. See Steven Bantu Biko, *I Write What I Like: Selected Writings*, Johannesburg 2017; Franz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, Cape Town 2017.

12. See Ernst M. Conradie, Siphon Mtetwa & Andrew Warmback (eds.), *The Land is Crying for Justice: A Discussion Document on Christianity and Environmental Justice in South Africa*, Stellenbosch 2002.

At least since 1994, theology students at the UWC expressed interest in a wide range of ethical issues around the reconstruction and development of society. This was clearly influenced by the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP), launched by the African National Congress as its 1994 election manifesto. This interest covered numerous concrete issues but increasingly clustered around the social impact of poverty, unemployment, and inequality. In terms of ethical theory this required interest in what is variously called “the dynamics of building a better society”, strengthening the “moral fabric” of communities, an “RDP of the soul”, “moral regeneration”, or more generically “social transformation”.

These interests were reflected in the establishment in 2000 of “Ethics” as a major subject that can be selected within various undergraduate degrees at the UWC. It focusses on what may be called the “moral and religious foundations of society” and helps future community leaders to understand what the building blocks of responsible citizenship entail. The theoretical backbone of all the modules included in the curriculum is a mapping of moral concepts¹³ that prioritizes the need for moral *visions*, recognizes the significance of a public form of *virtue* ethics, and only on that basis explores appropriate *values* (e.g. with reference to utilitarian theories) and *obligations* (or duties, e.g. with reference to deontological theories).¹⁴ Several modules focus on religion (e.g. worldviews, moral codes, and religious diversity), but there are no courses on any one specific religious tradition. The modules in Ethics have become increasingly popular amongst students (with theology students in a small minority) – to the extent that there are around 700 students in first year classes and around 200 students in third year classes. The metaphors employed here are clearly derived from what Aulén would call the “modern” type of atonement, i.e. based on the moral influence of religion. Indeed, “religion” (not so much “theology”) itself is typically understood in this modern functionalist sense as a significant role player (which is still the case in the South African context) in maintaining the social fabric of society. In other words, religion serves another purpose, often understood in terms of nation building.

Postgraduate Projects at the UWC Making Use of Aulén's Typology

The discussion above may give the impression that there has been a shift in the popularity of soteriological metaphors amongst theology students at the UWC, from reconciliation to liberation and then to reconstruction.

13. This mapping of moral concepts is developed in Larry Rasmussen, *Earth-Honoring Faith: Religious Ethics in a New Key*, Oxford 2013, 127–159.

14. See Ernst M. Conradie et al., *Morality as a Way of Life: A First Introduction to Ethical Theory*, Stellenbosch 2006.

This may be true in individual cases. However, it is closer to the truth to say that many of the postgraduate students who are attracted to Gustaf Aulén's typology intuitively recognize the significance of all these three types and would want to hold these together, despite the obvious conflict between them.

In this section I will mention and briefly describe a number of postgraduate projects in Christian theology completed at the UWC since 2006 that explicitly make use of Aulén's typology. It may be noted that all of these were done under my supervision. The following projects are mentioned in order of completion:

Cedric Jansen completed a PhD thesis in Afrikaans in 2008 with a title translated as "The Apostolic Faith Mission (AFM) and Poverty: The Place of Poverty in the Multi-Dimensional Missionary Task of the Church". He is a part-time pastor in Wallacedene, a vast squatter camp on the outskirts of Cape Town. He observed that the AFM affirmed the need for both evangelism and for poverty relief, but that there is no theological clarity about how these are related. Some see poverty relief as a consequence of conversion (which therefore has a certain priority), while others regard poverty relief as a handy instrument in evangelism (where its priority is still maintained). Yet others see the liberating message of the gospel in terms of comprehensive well-being so that evangelism is at best an instrument for such purposes. In response, several South African missiologists have promoted a multi-dimensional understanding of mission,¹⁵ but this does not clarify the underlying soteriological tensions. Jansen used Aulén's typology to explore the links between evangelism, liberation, and moral upliftment, but had to conclude that this remains an unresolved tension – and not only in the context of the Apostolic Faith Mission.¹⁶

Heather Festus (now Bock) is a pastor in the Full Gospel Church of God in South Africa. She completed a Masters thesis in 2008 entitled "Bearing One's Own Cross: A Critical Analysis of Mary Grey's View on Atonement". She explores the typical feminist critique that the motif of "bearing one's cross" is often used to legitimize patriarchal oppression – in the sense that women have to accept not only being housewives, but also to endure domestic violence as a Christian duty. That leaves the question how this motif could be interpreted from a feminist perspective – if it is not simply to be discarded (which is not feasible in a Pentecostal context). She opted to focus on the work of the British theologian Mary Grey, given her emphasis on a

15. Jansen explores the positions of David Bosch (1929–1992), J.J. (Dons) Kritzinger, Willem Saayman, Klaus Nürnberger, and Japie LaPoorta in this regard.

16. Cedric Jansen, *Die AGS en Armoede: Die Plek van Armoede in the Multi-dimensionele Missionêre Taak van die Kerk*, University of the Western Cape PhD thesis, 2008.

kenotic Christology and spirituality. For Grey, vulnerability may become an effective way of empowering people towards justice even though this may entail suffering and death. Using Aulén's typology, Festus shows that Grey intertwines various images and motifs, favours the classic and especially the modern types (in terms of moral influence) but resists the Latin type. On this basis she explores the significance of Grey's position for South Africa, especially the Cape Flats where domestic violence is rife.¹⁷

Robert Agyarko is from Kumasi in Ghana and completed a PhD thesis in 2010 entitled *God's Unique Priest: Christology within an Akan Context*. He coined the term *Nyamesofopreko* to suggest that Jesus Christ was God's unique priest. In traditional Akan religion and culture there was no priesthood for Onyame, the Supreme Being, since any such priests would need to be without blemish or else would die. Since being without sin arguably applies to Jesus, he is uniquely able to serve as Mediator between human and God. Agyarko develops a sophisticated understanding of atonement as interpersonal mediation with reference to traditional African culture to indicate what is required to address conflict within communities and to bring about reconciliation between people before God. He seeks to stay true to the Nicene formula that Jesus is truly human and truly divine and explains this again in terms of Akan anthropology. On this basis he criticizes both ancestor Christology and the portrayal of the work of Christ as conquering the Spirit world. With reference to Aulén's typology, his position is therefore much closer to the Latin type.¹⁸

Keith Brooks is a Cape Town based Pentecostal pastor. He completed a Masters thesis in 2015 entitled "‘Deliver Us from Evil’: A Critical Analysis of Soteriological Discourse in African Pentecostalism". He observes that Pentecostalism tends to favour soteriological images aligned to Aulén's classic type, especially regeneration (being "born again"), healing, and deliverance from evil. Deliverance is best understood here in terms of the ministry of deliverance where evil spirits are sometimes quite graphically exorcized. In global Pentecostalism, however, this is understood in different ways, e.g. at a personal level as psychological deliverance (from bad habits), at a political level as deliverance (from oppressive regimes), at an economic level as deliverance from poverty and the traps associated with poverty (often preaching the prosperity gospel), and especially at a cultural level as deliverance from hypostasized evil spirits that may undermine one's well-being in local communities (bad omens leading to diseases, "accidents",

17. Heather Festus, "‘Bearing One's Own Cross’: A Critical Analysis of Mary Grey's View on Atonement", University of the Western Cape M.Ph. mini-thesis, 2008.

18. Robert Agyarko, *God's Unique Priest: Christology within an Akan Context*, University of the Western Cape PhD thesis, 2010.

“misfortune”). In the thesis, Brooks focusses on Pentecostalism in Ghana and shows that Western and Ghanaian scholars working on Pentecostalism in Ghana interpret the ministry of deliverance in rather different ways because they understand deliverance in diverging ways, with (secular) Western scholars viewing it in terms of moral upliftment while Ghanaian scholars recognise the need for victory over evil.¹⁹

Kapemwa Kondolo is the current President of the United Church of Zambia (UCZ) University in Kitwe. He completed a PhD thesis in 2016 entitled *The Ministry of Music: A Case Study on the United Church of Zambia and the New Jerusalem Church*. The latter church broke away in the 1950s from what later became the UCZ. The New Jerusalem Church is regarded as an African Independent/Indigenous Church, while the UCZ is considered to be a so-called “mainline church”.²⁰ The tension between these two churches, for example in terms of membership adherence, is evident not least in their music ministries. The UCZ uses hymnbooks and Western-style rhythms and instruments, at least more so than the New Jerusalem Church that has an extensive and thoroughly indigenized hymnody. The link with Aulén is not with music though, but with the kind of soteriological images that are employed in the lyrics of the most popular hymns sung in these churches, both in an urban and in a rural context. Kondolo gathered information in this regard through empirical work and used Aulén’s typology to map the terrain. His hunch was that distinct soteriological images may be what attract people to the one church more than the other.²¹

Demaine Solomons completed a PhD thesis in 2018 entitled *Reconciliation as a Controversial Symbol: An Analysis of a Theological Discourse in South Africa between 1968 and 2010*. Since he will also contribute to this special issue of *Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift*, I only need to mention his thesis here for completeness. Although his focus is on reconciliation, he demonstrates that theological discourse on reconciliation in South Africa follows three distinct tracts that he captures in the titles of the three main chapters as “Justice through reconciliation in Jesus Christ” (following Aulén’s Latin type, epitomized in South Africa by the *Belhar Confession*), “Justice and reconciliation after liberation” (following Aulén’s classic type, epitomized in South Africa by the critique of “church theology” in the Kairos Document), and “Reconstruction requires national reconciliation” (following Aulén’s

19. Keith Brooks, “‘Deliver Us from Evil’: A Critical Analysis of Soteriological Discourse in African Pentecostalism”, University of the Western Cape M.Ph. thesis, 2015.

20. For this contested distinction, see Ernst M. Conradie & John Klaasen (eds.), *The Quest for Identity in So-Called Mainline Churches*, Stellenbosch 2014.

21. Kapemwa Kondolo, *The Ministry of Music: A Case Study on the United Church of Zambia and the New Jerusalem Church*, University of the Western Cape PhD thesis, 2016.

modern type, epitomized in South Africa by the theological legitimation of the work of the TRC). It is clear that the conceptual relatedness of reconciliation and justice is understood here in diverging ways.²²

Towards an Integration of the Soteriological Motifs

From the above it is evident that UWC students and staff seek to understand the conflicting legacy of three broad schools of theology within the (South) African context, namely evangelical theology, liberation theology, and modern liberal theology, with reference to a wide range of ministerial, ethical, and theological issues. Most of the contributions show the influence of all three of these schools, although one is sometimes favoured above the others. In terms of the history of Christianity in (South) Africa, such a conflation of conflicting traditions is almost inevitable. At the heart of this conflict lies contrasting notions of salvation. This is why Aulén's typology is deemed so helpful – because it represents an influential mapping of terrain. It is not his Swedish background, his Christological focus, or his own constructive position that is relevant; his typology provides one clear, widely-referenced instrument for critical reflection on ecclesial praxis in Africa and a way of developing constructive positions within this context.

In my own contributions to this debate, I have focussed on the conflicting soteriological images and motifs that are gathered together under the three generic rubrics in Aulén's typology. I explored the original *Sitz im Leben* from within which such images are derived and then become metaphorically extended to speak to other needs.

Three examples derived from the story in Mark 2 may suffice.²³ This story may be interpreted as a healing miracle, in terms of the significance of the forgiveness of sins, or of exemplary friendship. The metaphor of healing may be extended to include psychological healing (psychosomatic paralysis) but also economic healing, indeed the “healing of the land”. Forgiveness may be understood as a response to interpersonal guilt, but also economic debts or what Karl Jaspers (1883–1969) called metaphysical guilt.²⁴ Likewise, friendship may be understood in an interpersonal context, as economic partnerships, as research collaboration or even as being “friends with the

22. Demaine Solomons, *Reconciliation as a Controversial Symbol: An Analysis of a Theological Discourse in South Africa between 1968 and 2010*, University of the Western Cape/Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam PhD thesis, 2018.

23. This was explored in an empirical study on diverse Bible study groups in and around Cape Town. See Ernst M. Conradie & Louis C. Jonker, “Bible Study within Established Bible Study Groups: The Results of an Empirical Research Project”, *Scriptura* 78 (2001), 381–398.

24. For a discussion in the South African context, see John W. de Gruchy, “Guilt, Amnesty and National Reconciliation: Karl Jaspers’ *Die Schuldfrage* and the South African Debate”, *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 83 (1993), 3–13.

Earth”. As a result of such metaphoric extension, the avenues through which salvation enters, a particular *Sitz im Leben* is easily obscured.

In various contributions, I have made use of such images and motifs to explore the notion of “healing” with reference to the HIV/AIDS pandemic,²⁵ anthropogenic ecological destruction (e.g. pollution in townships),²⁶ missiological paradigms (with reference to David Bosch),²⁷ and conflicting views on the relationship between justification and justice.²⁸ The focus of each of these contributions is on pneumatological discourse on salvation instead of the Christological discourse on atonement that is evident in Aulén’s typology. This follows a significant argument by the Dutch theologian Arnold van Ruler that there is a need for a relatively independent pneumatology (polemically aimed against a Barthian Christomonism), given important structural differences between Christology and pneumatology.²⁹ Within the South African context, I used three core theological concepts to group together the soteriological images, namely “liberation” (see Aulén’s classic type), “reconciliation” (see Aulén’s Latin type) and “reconstruction and development” (see Aulén’s modern type). Such generic rubrics may be helpful to understand the logic behind these images, albeit that they also tend to obscure the *Sitz im Leben* in which these make sense. This was explored through a postgraduate course on “South African Soteriologies” that I taught in 2013.

My constructive argument is an attempt to indicate the reason why an integration of all three of these types may not only be necessary but also possible. The core of the argument can be summarized in the following way:

There are some situations where a present predicament is so overwhelming that this needs to be addressed first, before anything else, to ensure comprehensive well-being. Examples include slavery, being held hostage, military threats, shipwrecks, drowning, life-threatening illnesses, tyranny, famine, and demonic possession. In South Africa it may be argued that apartheid first had to be overcome before many other social problems around

25. Ernst M. Conradie, “Healing in Soteriological Perspective”, *Religion & Theology: A Journal of Contemporary Religious Discourse* 13 (2006), 3–22.

26. Ernst M. Conradie “The Salvation of the Earth from Anthropogenic Destruction: In Search of Appropriate Soteriological Concepts in an Age of Ecological Destruction”, *Worldviews: Global Religions, Culture, Ecology* 14 (2010), 111–140.

27. Ernst M. Conradie, “Missiology and Soteriology: The Power and Limits of a Multi-Dimensional Approach”, *Missionalia* 39 (2011), 83–98.

28. Ernst M. Conradie, *Om Reg te Stel: Oor Regverdiging én Geregtigheid*, Wellington 2018.

29. Arnold A. van Ruler, “Grammar of Pneumatology”, in John Bolt (ed.), *Calvinist Trinitarianism and Theocentric Politics: Essays towards a Public Theology*, Lampeter 1989, 47–88; Arnold A. van Ruler, “Structural Differences between Christology and Pneumatology”, in John Bolt (ed.), *Calvinist Trinitarianism and Theocentric Politics: Essays towards a Public Theology*, Lampeter 1989, 27–46.

education, health, housing, and so forth, could be addressed constructively. If such predicaments are indeed overcome in one way or another, this may retrospectively be attributed to God's work, albeit that the role of Christ is not always clarified. Amidst the predicament it allows for the prospective prayer "deliver us from evil".

There are other situations where it is necessary to address the guilt of the past in order to address present problems. Again, there are many examples, including the long-term economic and psychological impact of slavery, imperialism and colonialism, financial debt between individuals, institutions, and countries, interpersonal guilt within a family context (e.g. over adultery), rape, assault, murder, and other gross human rights violations. In South Africa the injustices of the past continue to have an impact on education and this in turn exacerbates poverty, unemployment and inequality. If the legacy of the past is not somehow addressed, it will continue to undermine the present. This requires a complex process of establishing the truth in all its dimensions, remorse, showing signs of remorse, contrition, asking for forgiveness, offering forgiveness, conversion, restitution, compensation, reparation, and reconciliation.³⁰ These categories are obviously explored in the Latin type of atonement, with rich, if highly contested, biblical imagery, but they are certainly also debated in the public sphere with regard to a wide range of social issues.

There are yet other situations where the recognition slowly dawns that, in this dispensation, the kind of present predicaments mentioned above can never be overcome fully. Evil cannot be completely eradicated, not least because the instruments that may be used to eradicate evil will only exacerbate it. Moreover, if evil lurks in every heart, every community, and every institution, if the victims of yesterday may well become the perpetrators of today, then the eradication of evil is not possible without self-annihilation. In addition, injustices can never be fully undone. It may be possible to ameliorate the impact of past injustices but the fact that it happened is subject to the arrow of time. When death intervenes, such injustices have to be buried, and not only proverbially. Given this recognition, there is a need to explore ways of restraining, containing the spread of evil in order to work towards a better tomorrow. In all societies this is done through moral codes, policies, penalties, rules, regulations, middle axioms, programmes,

30. See the leading essay and responses in Ernst M. Conradie (ed.), *Reconciliation: A Guiding Vision for South Africa?*, Stellenbosch 2013. See also Kobe, "The Relationship". I developed a distinction between restitution (giving back what can be given back), compensation (for what cannot be given back), reparation (creative responses to address long-term injustices), and restoration of relationships (reconciliation) in Ernst M. Conradie, "What Diagnosis? Which Remedy? Critical Reflections on the Diagnostic Overview of South Africa's National Planning Commission", *Scriptura* 117 (2018), 1–21.

and procedures. It requires the participation of most, if not all, citizens who do abide by these rules – or else this will lead to the disintegration of the social fabric of society. In order to find sources of inspiration to build the moral and religious foundations of society, the soteriological metaphors associated with Aulén’s modern type may be influential.

Conclusion

In short, my argument is that it typically depends on a particular context to indicate which soteriological metaphors may be preferred. The emphasis on the present, the past, or the future suggests that all three types may be needed for adequate theological reflection. At the same time, each of these types can be readily abused and then become rather crude. The mechanisms of liberation may include violence, while it is not always clear how the work of Christ and the Holy Spirit makes a difference. The metaphors associated with reconciliation, including forgiveness, satisfaction, penal substitution, retribution, sacrifice, and scapegoating, have each become highly contested since they have left behind a trail of blood in history. The metaphors associated with reconstruction and development may have less baggage but the modernist assumptions that are typically carried with them may become theologically shallow, leading to a form of self-secularization: God helps us to help ourselves. When we become autonomous, we may no longer need God to address societal problems. In fact, bringing God into the public sphere is often highly problematic, also in the (South) African context. Accordingly, particular religious categories (on reconstruction) need to be downplayed in order to find common ground between religious tradition or, more broadly, between people of good will. If such religious categories can indeed be translated into other, more secular categories, this seems to lead to an ever-shrinking sphere of influence for religion.

Even if one concurs about the need for such an integration of the models, it is necessary, if only for the sake of honesty, to acknowledge that a priority is typically assigned to the one or the other. Understandably, this remains contested, also among UWC staff, students, and alumni. Unlike Aulén, I would, if necessary, privilege theological reflection on reconciliation (more or less the Latin type, especially as expressed through the *Belhar Confession*), precisely because it addresses the roots of the problem. One may argue that a lasting solution can only be found on that basis. This is the gospel of God’s work to overcome the main predicament in history, namely human sin (and not so much natural evil).³¹ This requires a retrieval of the very category of

31. See Ernst M. Conradie, “On Social Evil and Natural Evil: In Conversation with Christopher Southgate”, *Zygon: Journal of Religion and Science* 53 (2018), 752–765.

sin, not only in Christian theology but also in the public sphere. My current project on “Redeeming Sin?” seeks to address that task.³² Such views on salvation from sin need to be situated in the more encompassing narrative of God’s work, from creation to consummation or else it will lose an anchoring in this world in which we live.³³ ▲

SUMMARY

This contribution highlights the remarkable reception of Gustaf Aulén's famous typology on atonement, as offered in his book *Christus Victor* (1930), at the University of the Western Cape in South Africa since 2000. It explains the background to this reception in terms of the need amongst staff and students to hold together the core tenets of evangelical theology, liberation theology, and liberal theology. It describes the content of this reception with reference to teaching, postgraduate theses, and ongoing research. It also comments on the possibility of holding together all three of Aulén's types in terms of the need to address present predicaments, the injustices of the past, and to contain the future spread of evil.

32. See, especially, Ernst M. Conradie, *Redeeming Sin? Social Diagnostics amid Ecological Destruction*, Lanham, MD 2017.

33. See my constructive position in this regard as developed in Conradie, *The Earth in God's Economy*.

An Unlikely Conversation Partner

Gustaf Aulén's Connection with Reconciliation in South Africa

DEMAINE SOLOMONS

Demaine Solomons is lecturer in systematic theology and social ethics at the University of the Western Cape.

dsolomons@uwc.ac.za

Introduction

It is an unlikely connection. To say it is far-fetched would not be an overstatement. This is precisely what *Christus Victor* (1930) invokes when connected to the discourse on reconciliation in South Africa. Gustaf Aulén (1879–1977), a leader of Lundensian scholarship, certainly did not have South Africa in mind when he penned this theological classic. Nevertheless, for reasons as I will explain, *Christus Victor* gained traction particularly at the University of the Western Cape (UWC) in Cape Town. It was here where the Swedish theologian, Hans S.A. Engdahl first introduced Aulén to his students. I was one of them. One should note Engdahl's long history with South Africa. A Lutheran priest with a deep appreciation for South Africa and its people. He later took the position of extraordinary professor at the UWC. Throughout his career, Engdahl built close relationships particularly with the people of the Cape Flats, an area in Cape Town designated as “non-white” by the apartheid government. They, in turn, adopted him and his family as their own. In his lectures, one quickly became aware of how he was dealing with the sensitivities of race and identity in the country. For example, the literature he prescribed always reflected a preference for ideas from the developing world. Black consciousness, black theology, and liberation theologies were central themes of many of our class discussions.

To say Engdahl had an aversion to Western thought would be incorrect, but one certainly had a good sense of where his loyalties lied. It is for this reason that I was somewhat perplexed when in a post-graduate course on the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), Engdahl introduced *Christus Victor* as one of our prescribed texts. At this stage, to me at least, he was an unknown theologian. Just another white man, whose work I had to study to get through a course – as if I was not colonized thoroughly enough. This was my thought at that moment. Besides, what could Aulén possibly say that would help me better understand the reconciliation process in South Africa? To say my expectations were low would be an understatement. Nevertheless, what I did not realize, was that the introduction of *Christus Victor* inadvertently opened the door to something that eventually became the theoretical basis of my doctoral dissertation. A few years later, in conjunction with my doctoral supervisors, Ernst M. Conradie and Eddy Van der Borght, I returned to this typology to map the theological discourse on reconciliation in South Africa. The purpose of this paper thus is to explain exactly how this is conceptualized.

Setting the Scene

Violent forms of conflict have continued to erupt in different locations all over the world since the end of the Second World War. Such conflict may be addressed at various levels, including the need to come to terms with the personal trauma associated with such conflict. Politically, the gross violations of human rights are typically addressed in terms of criminal law and international law. The (in)famous Nuremberg trials may serve as a good example. More recently, various forms of a Truth and Reconciliation Commission have been introduced to facilitate the transition from such social conflict to a new dispensation.¹ The introduction and subsequent proceedings of the TRC in South Africa is widely regarded as an outstanding example of such an approach. Frequently held up as the focal point of reconciliation, the TRC has enjoyed premier status in accounts of South Africa's democratic transition.

While the proceedings of the TRC have elicited much interest outside South Africa, it led to much controversy inside the country. Indeed, the need for and the very symbol of national reconciliation was highly contested. This controversy has to be understood in terms of the years of struggle against apartheid. In the mid-1980s the question was whether

1. Priscilla Hayner, "Same Species, Different Animal: How South Africa Compares to Truth Commissions Worldwide", in Charles Villa-Vicencio & Wilhelm Verwoerd (eds.), *Looking Back, Reaching Forward: Reflections on the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa*, London 2000, 32–41.

political liberation for the poor and oppressed black majority or reconciliation between blacks and whites should have precedence. In the famous *Kairos Document* (1985), the emphasis on reconciliation was severely criticized as a form of “church theology”. During the transition to democracy (1990–1994), the need for a negotiated settlement became widely accepted. As part of such a settlement, the need to come to terms with the history and legacy of apartheid became evident. Both the experiences of the victims of apartheid and the gross violations of human rights by the perpetrators simply had to be addressed. The decision to establish the TRC followed upon these developments in 1994. This was soon supported by calls for “national reconciliation”, “nation building”, the “healing of memories”, the rediscovery of humanity (*Ubuntu*), and a celebration of the so-called “rainbow people of God” as popularized by Desmond Tutu.² Nevertheless, as the proceedings of the TRC unfolded, many criticisms were raised regarding such an emphasis on reconciliation.³ These criticisms related to various aspects of the process: the very possibility of amnesty, the need for criminal justice, the objectivity of the commission, the understanding of “truth”, the emphasis on reconciliation, the leadership role of Archbishop Tutu, the associations with Christian symbolism, and the need for compensation for the victims, were some of the concerns raised.⁴

The proceedings of the TRC were concluded in 1998, followed by a set of extensive reports. The legal aspects of the proceedings about amnesty and reparation need not be addressed here. Reflection on the legacy and significance of the TRC has continued unabated since 1998. In this sense, the TRC cannot be reduced to a set of legal proceedings. It provided an opportunity for ordinary South Africans (who were neither perpetrators nor victims of gross violations of human rights) to reflect on their past and future through the publicity around the TRC. Its significance, therefore, has to be understood in terms of calls for national reconciliation and the implications of that in various spheres of society. More than twenty years after the conclusion of the TRC’s work, it is all too obvious that reconciliation between individuals and groups in South Africa remains a high priority. The South African Reconciliation Barometer of the Institute for Justice and

2. Desmond M. Tutu, *No Future Without Forgiveness*, London 1999.

3. See for instance Mahmood Mamdani, “A Diminished Truth”, in Wilmot James & Linda van de Vijver (eds.), *After the TRC: Reflections on Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa*, Cape Town 2000, 60; Mahmood Mamdani, “Reconciliation Without Justice”, *Southern African Review of Books* 46 (1996), 22–25; Wole Soyinka, *The Burden of Memory, the Muse of Forgiveness*, New York 1999; Anthea Jeffery, *The Truth about the Truth Commission*, Johannesburg 1999, 157.

4. For a detailed account on the role of religion (and Christianity in particular) in the TRC, see Megan Shore, *Religion and Conflict Resolution: Christianity and South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission*, Farnham 2009.

Reconciliation gives clear indications how South African citizens remain deeply divided in terms of the categories of race, class, ethnicity, and culture.⁵

Such South African discourse over the symbol of national reconciliation cannot be separated from the influence of Christianity in South Africa. This has to be understood in terms of the allegiance to Christianity in South Africa, the use of the term “reconciliation” in Christian soteriology, and the significance of what is aptly described as the “church struggle” against apartheid. The influence of Christianity is also evident with respect to the TRC. The pivotal role played by Archbishop Tutu, the charismatic chairperson of the TRC, needs no elaboration here. One may also mention the leadership roles of several other church leaders (such as Alex Borrairie [1931–2018], the deputy chairperson) and theologians (including Charles Villavicencio and Piet Meiring).

Reconciliation as a Controversial Symbol

The term “reconciliation” was indeed at the heart of the church struggle against apartheid.⁶ This has been evident at least since the publication of the famous *Message to the People of South Africa* (1968). In the 1980s, the term was further used in conflicting ways in the *Belhar Confession* (1982/1986), the *Kairos Document*, and the *National Initiative for Reconciliation* (launched in 1985). The term elicited much controversy, especially in the *Kairos Document*.⁷ In the context of local congregations, the theme of reconciliation prompted many further debates, including the criteria for church membership, ordinations, expressions of and structures for church unity, and the need for a ministry of reconciliation across the divides of culture, race, and class.⁸

It is therefore not surprising that the term reconciliation came under close scrutiny in Christian theological reflection in South Africa at least since 1968. One may suggest that such theological controversies had to do with the search for appropriate theological models and root metaphors. The symbol of “reconciliation” offered one such concept, but “ecclesial unity”,

5. Institute for Justice and Reconciliation, *Confronting Exclusion: Time for Radical Reconciliation*, Cape Town 2013.

6. For a detailed account on how the term was used in the South African context in the twentieth century, see John W. de Gruchy, *Reconciliation: Restoring Justice*, London 2002, 33–38.

7. Ernst M. Conradie, “Reconciliation as One Guiding Vision for South Africa? Conceptual Analysis and Theological Reflection”, in Ernst M. Conradie (ed.), *Reconciliation: A Guiding Vision for South Africa?*, Stellenbosch 2013, 13.

8. Of course, one needs to be aware of the contested nature of some of these categories. The contested nature of the race category is most notable.

“liberation”, “justice”, “nation-building”, “human dignity” (*Ubuntu*), “reconstruction”, and “development” offered alternatives. At the very least, the question had to be addressed how these concepts are related to each other. How, for example, is reconciliation related to liberation theologically and methodologically? Should justice and liberation follow upon reconciliation or vice versa? How is reconciliation between different social groups related to the reconciliation in Jesus Christ? In other words, what connotations are attached to the symbol of “reconciliation”? While there may well be a general understanding in theological publications on the question what “reconciliation” entails, the controversies over the symbol of reconciliation suggest diverging interpretations of its significance for theological reflection in South Africa.⁹ In other words, reconciliation appears to lack a fixed or singular meaning, lending credence to the idea that it is best conceived as an essentially contested concept.¹⁰ On this basis, the problem addressed in this contribution may be formulated as follows: How has the symbol of reconciliation been understood in Christian theological literature emanating from the South African context between 1968 and 2010? This calls for further clarification of a number of issues.

Among other, the problem underlying conceptual clarification is that the term “reconciliation” is used in quite different ways. Conradie’s reference to “reconciliation as one guiding vision for South Africa” on the various uses of the term is quite useful here.¹¹ In his view, the term “reconciliation” may refer to personal relationships that may have become distorted in marriage, personal life, between neighbours or colleagues, and so on. Here reconciliation is required to avoid unwanted animosity and to allow the relationship to flourish again. In the social and political context, the term may be used to describe perceptions, attitudes, and behaviour of individuals and groups towards other social groups. These groups are typically defined through markers such as race, class, culture, and sexual orientation, among others. The term “reconciliation” is thus used as a barometer for social cohesion, as a means to establish how members of the different social groups respect, cooperate with, and tolerate each other in order to avoid open conflict.

In addition to this, the Christian discourse on reconciliation presents at least three additional layers of meaning: (1) Reconciliation with God

9. Gruchy suggests the difficulties are heightened as reconciliation come loaded with the weight of Christianity and the problem of how to differentiate between a transformative form of love that may well have useful lessons for secular life and a piety that presupposes the facticity of a divine gift. Gruchy, *Reconciliation*, 25–26.

10. Erik Doxtader, *With Faith in the Works of Words: The Beginnings of Reconciliation in South Africa, 1985–1995*, Cape Town 2009, 12.

11. Conradie, “Reconciliation”, 17–21.

following alienation as a result of sin; this is understood in the light of a broken relationship with God; (2) Reconciliation through being one with Christ in the Body of Christ (the church); and (3) The ministry of reconciliation through the Holy Spirit in church and society.

These additional layers raise questions on how the use of the term “reconciliation” inside the church is related to the use outside of the Christian context. Furthermore, one may also reflect on how the relatedness of these theological, ecclesial, and social layers of meaning are understood. Given the history of division in South Africa, one may well ask what the relationship is between the politics of national reconciliation and the Christian doctrine of reconciliation? For obvious reasons, the compartmentalization of the three layers would be problematic. However, it would be equally problematic to fuse them together and thus confuse the genres.¹² The issue is the subject of much debate because it raises classic theological questions on the relationship between God and the world, text and context, church and society, and also faith and science. Moreover, these three layers of meaning bring into play all three articles of the Christian confession in relation to each other.

Conradie suggests that some employ a “deductive” logic, moving from reconciliation with God to the ministry of reconciliation in society. According to this logic, the fruits of reconciliation are dependent upon reconciliation with God. This approach assumes that no lasting solution to social conflict can be found without addressing the deep roots of such social conflict. In this case, social conflict is linked directly to our alienation from God. However, this can be overcome through God’s gracious forgiveness of sins. From a classic Reformed perspective, such forgiveness is appropriated through justification, sanctification, and the vocation of believers. Furthermore, such reconciliation in Christ enables and requires reconciliation with one’s brothers and sisters in Christ regardless of the social markers that may separate them (“We are all one in Christ”). In this way, the church constitutes what David Bosch (1929–1992) describes as an “alternative community.”¹³ The social significance of such ecclesial forms of reconciliation is most evident in the *Belhar Confession*.

According to this “deductive” logic, the ministry of reconciliation in church and society is only possible on the basis of reconciliation in Christ. In this sense, the ministry goes beyond the requirements for social cohesion and its primary focus remains firmly rooted in reconciliation with God. It is only through reconciliation in Christ that social conflict can be addressed adequately. Without this, reconciliation remains superficial, if not

12. This is the point raised by Gruchy as quoted in Conradie, “Reconciliation”, 18.

13. David J. Bosch, “The Church as an Alternative Community”, *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 13 (1975), 3–11.

misplaced, thus opening itself to renewed conflict. In other words, reconciliation in society springs from the celebration of the Holy Communion. God's reconciliation in Jesus Christ thus becomes the basis for Christians to reject any social system that assumes the fundamental irreconcilability of people.

In contrast, there are those who employ what may be described as an "inductive" logic. According to this approach, the "deductive" logic does not account for the process behind the conclusion that was reached, namely that the deepest root of social conflict is rooted in human alienation from God. This conclusion can only be reached through contextual and pastoral reflection on such conflict. It is the result of prior analysis, namely recognizing that sin constitutes the deepest roots of the human predicament. In this context, theological perspectives may help in deepening the common understanding of what may be at stake. These views aid reflection by situating personal and social relationships within a wider, cosmic frame of reference. However, it may be limited in the sense that it would not necessarily apply to those outside of the Christian faith.

According to this "inductive" logic, the need for a wider frame of reference follows the argument that any breach in a relationship has broader implications than only for the two parties concerned. If such a breach has almost cosmic ramifications, the final resolution of such conflict has to take into account the widest possible scope of the problem. In this context, reconciliation between two individuals is only possible if the whole of that society is reconciled with itself. Ultimately, reconciliation between two people is possible only through reconciliation with God. In turn, this invites reflection on the cosmic scope of God's work of reconciliation. This would include not only human beings and human societies but the whole created order. In other words, everything is included in God's work of reconciliation in Christ. Reconciliation should, therefore, be understood in the context of both God's work of creation and salvation. What is at stake is the tension between the Creator and the creature that has emerged because of captivity to the principalities and powers of this world (Colossians 2:15). "God's cosmic reconciling activity precedes and provides the framework within which God's reconciliation of humanity occurs."¹⁴ This "inductive" logic is most evident in the approach of the *Kairos Document*. Embedded in the "deductive" approach is the danger of using abstract theological language. Here, more focus is placed on the church than on societal needs. In other words, theological legitimacy is considered more important than social relevance. The "inductive" approach, on the other hand, is confronted with

14. Gruchy, *Reconciliation*, 53.

the danger of self-secularization, of reducing the Christian confession to nothing more than an example of religious affiliation that may be tolerated as long as its particular claims are not foregrounded. The obvious danger is one of being socially relevant without having anything distinct to offer in response to a challenge.

Aulén's Three Main "Types" of Christ's Work (Atonement)

The symbol of reconciliation (or atonement) is a central tenet of the Christian faith. Essentially, the Christian Gospel is about overcoming alienation and estrangement between God and humanity. In light of this observation, the Christian tradition portrays Jesus Christ as the mediator of the broken covenant between God and humanity. Christian reflection on the work of Christ is traditionally discussed with reference to a theology of reconciliation. However, unlike the “person of Christ”, to which the ecumenical councils formally stated their position, the question regarding Christ’s work on reconciliation does not have a central ecumenical reference point. This makes it difficult to single out any one view as the traditional (Nicene) Orthodox position.¹⁵ In this light, Christ’s work on reconciliation has been understood in very different ways throughout the history of Christianity. Essentially, *Christus Victor* is an effort to consolidate this history – an attempt to provide a history of the interpretation of “reconciliation” up to 1930, when the book was first published. In *Christus Victor*, Aulén postulates what can simply be described as the three main “types” of Christ’s work on reconciliation (or atonement).¹⁶ In Christologies developed during the twentieth century, Aulén’s analysis has become highly influential, although the details of his argument have often been criticized. For the sake of brevity, the detail of the typology need not be exhausted here; a brief summary will suffice.¹⁷

15. See for instance John N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, London 1968, 163–164, 375; Otto Weber, *Foundations of Dogmatics*, vol. 2, Grand Rapids, MI 1983, 177–191.

16. The original Swedish title, *Den kristna försoningstanken* (The Christian Idea of the Atonement) was published in 1930 in the wake of his series of lectures that were delivered at Uppsala University that same year. The English translation appeared in 1931. See Gustaf Aulén, *Christus Victor: An Historical Study of the Three Main Types of the Idea of the Atonement*, London 1931.

17. The names of the three models of atonement identified by Aulén are used in the following manner. The terms are used interchangeably; this, only as it relates to a specific model: First, referring to the “Ransom theory”, Aulén also uses notions such as *Christus Victor*, “dramatic”, or “classic” approach to describe the model inspired by Irenaeus. Second, referring to the “Satisfaction theory”, he also uses notions such as the “Latin” or “objective” view to describe the model inspired by Anselm of Canterbury (c. 1033–1109). Third, when referring to “Subjective theory”, he also uses notions such as “moral influence” (or exemplary) to describe the model inspired by Peter Abelard (1079–1142).

First, Aulén highlights the classic type (drawing especially on Irenaeus of Lyon [c. 130–202]), in which Christ’s victory over the powers of evil is emphasized. He contends that the classic view portrays atonement as a movement of God towards humankind. God is intimately and personally engaged in the work of humanity’s deliverance:

The classic type shows a continuity of Divine operation, and a discontinuity in the order of merit and of justice, while the Latin type is opposite in both respects. In the classic type the work of Atonement is accomplished by God himself in Christ, yet at the same time the passive form also is used: God is reconciled with the world. The alternation is not accidental: He is reconciled only because He Himself reconciles the world with Himself and Himself with the world. The safeguard of the continuity of God’s operation is the dualistic outlook, the Divine warfare against the evil that holds mankind in bondage, and the triumph of Christ. But this necessitates a discontinuity of the legal order: there is no satisfaction of God’s justice, for the relation of man to God is viewed in the light, not of merit and justice, but of grace.¹⁸

Secondly, in the Latin or Anselmian type, Christ’s satisfaction for guilt incurred by humanity is the focal point. With the Latin view, God seems to be more distant. Here, the satisfaction is paid by a human being, in the person of Christ, to God:

In the Latin type the legal order is unbroken. Images and analogies are taken continually from the law-courts in the manner dear to the Latin mind. Such analogies can also be used by the classic type; but in the Latin type they dominate the whole conception, and any violation of justice becomes unthinkable. It is at this point, in the payment of the required satisfaction, that the continuity of Divine operation is lost; for the satisfaction is offered by Christ as man, as the sinless Man on behalf of the sinners. At the same time the Atonement is still in some sense the work of God, since he is regarded as planning the Atonement; therefore, also, the doctrine does not require that there is any change in God’s attitude to men, even though this may often be taught.¹⁹

Thirdly, the “subjective” type draws on Abelard’s subjective appropriation of Christ’s atonement. In the moral influence theory, God acts even more

18. Aulén, *Christus Victor*, 145–146.

19. Aulén, *Christus Victor*, 146.

distantly. Here, no atonement is needed, and all the emphasis is on human movement to God, and this is accomplished in the human world:

In the third type, the Atonement is no longer regarded as in any true sense carried out by God. Rather, the Reconciliation is the result of some process that takes place in man, such as conversion and amendment. If mention of Christ be made in this connection, His work is no longer thought of as the work of God for man's salvation: He is rather the perfect Example, the Ideal Man, the Head of the race. In so far as Christ's work can affect the relation between God and men, it is chiefly that God now sees mankind in a new light. Therefore in this case, also, it is a matter of an approach of man to God, from below upwards, and not of an approach of God to man.²⁰

Thus, for Aulén, the essential Christian idea of God reaching out to humans, which dominates the classic type, is weakened in the Latin type, and lost in the subjective type of atonement.

Aulén's Typology and the Reconciliation in South Africa

Against this background, I want to advance that “reconciliation” during the church struggle against apartheid is understood in at least three distinct ways. This, as per the available theological literature, at least since the period commonly referred to as the church struggle against apartheid (1960–1994). First, there is an approach, I propose as “Justice through reconciliation in Jesus Christ” (drawing especially on the Latin or Anselmian type), where penal substitution is crucial. In this approach it is assumed that the reconciliation of humanity with God in Jesus Christ implies a ministry of reconciliation in a country divided by race, class, and culture, thus necessitating a concern for social justice. This particular approach employs what I referred to as a “deductive logic”, moving from reconciliation with God to the church's ministry of reconciliation in society. Here, the fruits of reconciliation in South Africa are contingent upon reconciliation with God – it is assumed that the message of reconciliation has been entrusted to the church as the Body of Christ. In this respect, the *Belhar Confession* suggests that the church is to embody reconciliation among its members. It further asserts that reconciliation must be understood as a gracious gift from God through the blood of Christ. Also, it calls the church into understanding its own reconciliation and its place in God through the Body of Christ. It further asserts that the church is called to take up the ministry of

20. Aulén, *Christus Victor*, 146–147.

reconciliation to the point where it is believed to be the responsibility of the church. Thus, the church needs to act as a reconciled community reflecting love and peace among people and establishing visible signs of God's kingdom within the context of the divisions in society. However, the focus on the ministry of reconciliation in the church transcends the noble idea of merely helping people to "get along". Here, the assumption is that no lasting solution to social conflict can be found without addressing the deep roots of such conflict. This social conflict is traced directly to humanity's alienation from God and can only be overcome through God's gracious forgiveness of sins through Christ. In other words, the focus of the church must remain on reconciliation with God. Otherwise, too much emphasis on reconciliation in society without reconciliation with God will continue to be inauthentic, shallow, and misplaced, allowing the space for renewed conflict. In this sense, this approach goes beyond the requirements for social cohesion and remains firmly rooted in reconciliation with God through God. In other words, God's reconciliation in Jesus Christ becomes the basis for Christians to reject any social system that assumes the fundamental irreconcilability of people. However, through using this "deductive logic", one runs the risk of using abstract theological language that only focusses on the church more than societal needs. This approach is evident especially in the *Message to the People of South Africa*, the *Belhar Confession*, the *National Initiative for Reconciliation*, and the current discourse on the legacy of the *Belhar Confession*. Rhetorically, this approach was aimed at apartheid theology and its assumptions about the fundamental irreconcilability of people.

Secondly, there is an approach I describe as "Justice and reconciliation after liberation" (drawing especially on the classic or *Christus Victor* theory). Here, reconciliation is explored in the context of liberation theology, especially in the *Kairos Document* and black theology more broadly. This approach is associated with churches or theologians who see the need to address situations of conflict in society. Here, the need for political, economic, and cultural liberation was emphasized. Those involved assumed that social justice can only follow upon the liberation from apartheid and that reconciliation is only possible on the basis of (following) justice. They employ what I referred to as an "inductive logic", where the situations of conflict are rooted in human alienation from God and where social conflict forms the starting point for the ministry of reconciliation. This view suggests that reconciliation has to be understood in the context of both God's work of creation and salvation, given that what is at stake is the tension between Creator and creature, which has emerged because of captivity to the principalities and powers of this world. The "inductive logic" further

suggests that not only human beings or human society, but the whole of creation is included in God's work of reconciliation in Christ – the need for a wider frame of reference follows the argument that any breach in a relationship has wider implications than only the two parties concerned. If such a breach has almost cosmic ramifications, the final resolution of such conflict has to take into account the widest possible scope of the problem. In this context, reconciliation between two individuals is only possible if the whole of that society is reconciled with itself. In other words, everything is included in God's work of reconciliation in Christ. God's cosmic reconciling activity precedes and provides the framework within which God's reconciliation of humanity occurs. This approach is significant because through it the Christian message of reconciliation in Christ is rediscovered through engaging with social problems such as social and economic inequality and the need for restitution, especially in the context where there is a history of social injustices. However, I want to argue that those using the "inductive logic" as an approach to the discourse on reconciliation are confronted with the danger of self-secularization, of reducing the Christian confession to nothing more than an example of religious affiliation that may be tolerated as long as its particular claims are not foregrounded. The obvious danger, as may be the case with the *Kairos Document*, is one of being socially relevant without having anything distinct to offer.

And thirdly, I identify an approach where it is maintained that "Reconstruction requires national reconciliation" (drawing especially on Abelard's moral influence theory). This approach only became evident after the negotiated settlement reached during the period from 1990 to 1994 in South Africa. Here, I describe the steady movement of reconciliation as a theological concept used by Christian churches and theologians, into a key notion in the political discourse in the transition towards a democratic state structure. In other words, the movement of reconciliation as theological to a multi-disciplinary symbol became a central feature. This prompted the recognition of the need for the reconstruction of society and social development. However, this required coming to terms with the apartheid past (including amnesty), for national reconciliation and nation-building. This was expressed (and legitimized) theologically in diverse ways, including the emergence of a theology of reconstruction, but especially through engagements with the proceedings of the TRC of South Africa. Rhetorically, this approach is aimed at calling for moral responsibility and against the privatization of religion after the advent of democracy. However, in this approach, the biblical message of reconciliation is taken out of context and reduced

to matters directly related to the social transformation and the moral regeneration of South Africa.

Towards an Intergration of the Three Approaches to Reconciliation

These approaches have particular strengths and weaknesses, thus, highlighting the need for a more integrated approach. Generally, the range of soteriological concepts present in the discourse on reconciliation allows people to use whatever concepts they deem appropriate to address particular concerns. Just to highlight once again: First, in the *Belhar Confession* (drawing especially on the Anselmian or penal substitutionary theory), the focus is on addressing the root cause of social conflict. Here, social conflict is traced back directly to our alienation from God. This, in turn, can only be overcome through God's gracious forgiveness of sins through Christ. Reconciliation in society without reconciliation with God is deemed inauthentic, shallow, and misplaced, allowing the space for renewed conflict. God's reconciliation in Jesus Christ becomes the basis for Christians rejecting any social system that seeks to divide people. However, here one runs the risk of using abstract theological language that focusses on the church more than societal needs. Secondly, in the *Kairos Document* (drawing especially on the *Christus Victor* theory), the need for political, economic, and cultural liberation is emphasized. Social conflict forms the starting point for the ministry of reconciliation. Reconciliation is understood in the context of both God's work of creation and salvation, given what is at stake is the tension between Creator and creature, which has emerged because of captivity to the principalities and powers of this world. God's cosmic reconciling activity precedes and provides the framework within which God's reconciliation of humanity occurs. In other words, the Christian message of reconciliation in Christ is rediscovered through engaging with social problems such as social and economic inequality and the need for restitution, especially in the context where there is a history of social injustice. However, here also one runs the risk of self-secularization, of reducing the Christian confession to nothing more than an example of religious affiliation that may be tolerated as long as its particular claims are not foregrounded. Thirdly, during the transitional period (drawing especially on Abelard's moral influence theory), the need for the reconstruction of society and social development was emphasized. This included coming to terms with the apartheid past, including working towards the realization of national reconciliation and nation-building. Rhetorically, this approach is aimed at calling for social responsibility and against the privatization of religion. My main concern with this approach is that the biblical message of reconciliation is taken out of context and

reduced to matters directly related to issues of social transformation and moral regeneration.

Following Aulén's analysis, I posit that the three approaches address the evil consequences of human sin (God's victory over evil, based on the message of resurrection), the roots of such evil in human sin (sinners are forgiven by God through grace, manifested in the cross of Jesus Christ), and a way of life for the present in order to map a better future (following Christ's moral example, redemption is depicted as an achievement that human beings can reach themselves). Here, one would have to consider whether the integration of these soteriological concepts would be appropriate, also for the discourse on reconciliation? After all, the history of the Christian tradition indicates that the symbols of the life, cross, and resurrection of Jesus Christ were integrated with one another in order to present a narrative whole.²¹ In this sense, it would be problematic to emphasize a single approach at the expense of other existing approaches. Also, no one-size-fits-all approach can ever capture the theological breadth of Christ's atoning work. Respectively, we have used soteriological concepts such as forgiveness, justice, liberation, reconstruction, and reconciliation among others, to better recognize and appreciate the message of salvation. However, in emphasizing Aulén's analysis and applying these models to the South African context, one would need to come to terms with the fact that a focus on the forgiveness of sins in Christ (Anselmian or penal substitutionary theory) has not yet brought an end to injustice. In the same way, liberation (drawing especially on the *Christus Victor* theory) from social oppression also does not necessarily translate into the end of injustice. Those proposing theologies which are more liberal in their orientation (drawing especially on Abelard's moral influence theory) also need to be reminded that knowledge and moral appeals alone are not sufficient in addressing the deep-rootedness of suffering. In this sense, the social roots of evil must be recognized. The realization of the good relies on more than just a mere focus on the ideal moral example. In this context, it is clear that in order to make progress on the challenge of reconciliation in South Africa, one would have to go beyond the neat compartmentalization of the various approaches. In other words, one would need an integration of the three approaches to reconciliation. This may very well lead to the distorting of soteriological metaphors and their implied *Sitz im Leben*. At the same time, it may also broaden what may otherwise be considered contrasting soteriological positions. This is often the case in South Africa, where, for example, reconciliation and justice

21. Ernst M. Conradie, "The Salvation of the Earth from Anthropogenic Destruction", *Worldviews: Global Religions, Culture, and Ecology* 14 (2010), 133.

are often used as oppositional terms.²² The same could be said about liberation and reconstruction.²³ Instead, what I am proposing here is a broadening of our local understanding of these soteriological metaphors, thereby highlighting their theological relatedness beyond the false dichotomies that are often emphasized. However, here one would need to be cautious not to blur the distinct character of the three approaches.

In conclusion, inadvertently Aulén's *Christus Victor* provides something that has become one of the defining features of the theological school at the UWC. A legacy, I suspect, that would make this bishop of Strängnäs proud. By no stretch of the imagination is *Christus Victor* a perfect text. It has many shortcomings, and there is no shortage of literature in this regard. Even with this in mind, there is no denying the importance of this theological contribution, especially as far as the symbol of reconciliation (or atonement) is concerned. It truly is a theological classic. With *Christus Victor*, Aulén has found a way to transcend time and space, speaking to his native Sweden as much as he does to South Africa (or anywhere else for that matter). Maybe Aulén is not an unlikely conversation partner. Maybe it is just me, a black South African, who needed to be reminded of the fundamental asymmetry between divine and human action, an unbridgeable gulf between the work of Christ through which God reconciled the world to Godself (2 Corinthians 5:19) and the Spirit's ministry of reconciliation through us regardless of race or geography. ▲

SUMMARY

This contribution provides a conceptual analysis of "reconciliation" as one of the guiding concepts in Christian discourse in South Africa. It is abundantly clear from available literature that reconciliation is understood in very different ways. This is observed from publications as early as the 1960s, a period generally referred to as the "church struggle" against apartheid. Since that time, it is often used to offer theological reflection on social conflict in the country. In this paper, I propose a framework in which one can identify, describe, and assess at least three distinct ways in which the reconciliation concept is understood in theological literature emanating from the South African context. I categorize them as: (1) Justice through reconciliation in Jesus Christ; (2) Justice and reconciliation after liberation; and (3) Reconstruction requires national reconciliation. The famous *Christus Victor* typology of the three main "types" of

22. Miroslaf Volf, "Forgiveness, Reconciliation and Justice: A Theological Contribution to a More Peaceful Social Environment", *Journal of International Studies* 29 (2000), 869–872.

23. See Tinyiko S. Maluleke, "The Proposal for a Theology of Reconstruction: A Critical Appraisal", *Missionalia* 22 (1994), 252–256.

atonement developed by Gustaf Aulén is used as a background to these approaches. The purpose of this contribution is to aid continued theological reflection on the basis of a conceptual analysis of creative ways in which the reconciliation concept is used in a Christian context.

Aulén Deconstructed

On Inconsistencies in His Theology of Atonement and Lex Creationis

HANS S.A. ENGDAHL

Hans S.A. Engdahl is extraordinary professor emeritus of theology at the University of the Western Cape.

hans.engdahl@gmail.com

Introduction

Gustaf Aulén's (1879–1977) *Christus Victor* is today a famous piece of work, a classic in the dome of systematic or dogmatic theology. There are, however, signs of things not being quite right. I have previously referred to John de Gruchy's infamous question to me at the University of Cape Town in 2002, when he was busy writing his book *Reconciliation, Restoring Justice*: "Hans, do you know if Aulén's *Christus Victor* had any impact on Swedish society?" I then passed on the question to Göran Bexell, at the time professor of ethics in Lund, and he answered without hesitation: "I don't think so."¹

One could argue that de Gruchy's question was utterly South African and as such could not land in the Swedish geography in a decent way. However, I think the question was and is valid.

Secondly, in a recent biography, Jonas Jonson writes:

The belief that God reconciled the world to himself and the idea of Christ's victory over the powers of evil gave courage to many in the resistance against totalitarian systems. But now it was as if his theological

1. See Hans S.A. Engdahl, "More than Justice: The Impact of *Christus Victor* on the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission", *Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift* 86 (2010), 160–170. Maybe this article exemplifies what I try to say here: *Christus Victor* is already used in the socio-political domain.

reflection in this perspective, at least for the time being, had reached the end of the road. He [Aulén] continued preaching the gospel of the cross as an imperishable hope, but from the middle of the 1930s law came much more to the fore than gospel in his lectures. The threat of imminent war changed his perspective; he broadened his views and widened his circle of professional relations. He did not any longer speak only to the people of the church; now he wanted to stand side by side with all those who struggled for justice to prevail, regardless of faith. He became a theologian of creation, who constantly dug deeper and deeper into understanding God's lawful but violated order of all life. He admitted that an advanced shift had taken place in his theological outlook, but emphasized that the continuity was unbroken. In actual fact, he had radically shifted from one emphasis to another in his theological thinking.²

Jonson goes no further in his biography.

Aulén was a scholar, a professor of dogmatics in Lund, who thrived at being just that. He was not overtly worried about what was going on in society. But in the early 1930s, he emerged as one of the bishops in the Church of Sweden (Strängnäs), coinciding with the up-march of the Nazis in Germany. He had become a public figure and he seized the moment: henceforth he would speak, unceasingly, against the abuse of power of any kind (read: Nazism or Communism), and for the importance of defending justice (*rätten*). He would do this, tirelessly and even monotonously so, most of the time without mentioning these powers by name.

The thing is clear, Aulén made an impact on the wider society in this way, in Sweden, in the Nordic countries, in the world even. He made an impact, but this had nothing to do with what he had said in *Christus Victor*.³

When dealing with the world at large, the point of departure is not natural law, *lex naturalis*, that could play into the concepts of natural–supernatural, but the law laid down by God, under which we all live. It is based on a doctrine of creation (*skapelsetro*) and it could be called *lex creationis*. What does this law entail? It must be conditioned by the commandment of love and ultimately even the worldly kingdom is under the Word of

2. Jonas Jonson, *Gustaf Aulén: Biskop och motståndsmän*, Skellefteå 2011, 201. All translations from Swedish are my own, unless anything else is stated.

3. Martin Lind writes in his dissertation on the church and Nazism an excursus about Aulén (“Gustaf Aulén’s critique of Nazism”) and I cannot find one reference to *Christus Victor* or the subject matter in *Christus Victor*. Martin Lind, *Kristendom och nazism: Frågan om kristendom och nazism belyst av olika ställningstaganden i Tyskland och Sverige 1933–1945*, Lund 1975, 163–174.

God.⁴ All this means that the church certainly has a role to play *vis-à-vis* the state. Aulén argued that “the word that the church would not be involved in politics must never be taken to mean that the church would be forced to give up its mandate to represent the divine law over against abuse of power from the side of ‘the worldly kingdom’”. In an era where demonic powers and senseless violence were the order of the day, Aulén insisted that there was and always will be “a power of love and righteousness, for which Christ fought and died”.⁵

The church has a task to carry out that goes way beyond party politics: “The political task of the church consists of this critical watching over how the law of God is implemented in society.”⁶

As can be seen, perspectives of atonement or reconciliation do not occur. There is talk about “power of love”, but still under the law of God. All that can be said is said from the level of *lex creationis*.

This paper will deal with exactly this: how Aulén, who had written this text on the atonement,⁷ which indeed also had a bearing on the world (see 2 Corinthians 5:19), leaves this text behind and in his public ministry instead opts for that which is under the law and creation, a domain where we all find ourselves regardless of faith and conviction. A good reason for dealing with this dilemma is that whereas almost anyone of good will and courage could have said what he said about justice and the law as bulwarks against the abuse of power, very few could have expanded on the various atonement motifs. Or differently put, what Aulén is remembered for, and rightly so, is *Christus Victor*, which he seemed to ignore in his momentous, public life as a bishop. It had, as Bexell so rightly assessed, no apparent impact on Swedish society.

In the rest of this article, I will do the following: revisit *Christus Victor* briefly, point out some of Aulén’s antipathies, as well as some of his captivities. I will then deconstruct not *Christus Victor* as such, but Aulén’s total oeuvre, his “theological life”, by way of disclosure, displacement, and dispersal.⁸ Finally, I will indicate how *Christus Victor* would have had an

4. Lind, *Kristendom och nazism*, 167, 169.

5. Cited in Lind, *Kristendom och nazism*, 173–174.

6. Cited in Lind, *Kristendom och nazism*, 173.

7. Atonement and reconciliation are used interchangeably in this article.

8. I have used Jacques Derrida’s (1930–2004) deconstruction of the social anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss (1908–2009) with the following pattern: “The first stage is *disclosure*. In trying to understand a certain text it is necessary to see it in relation to other (texts), to see in which field of force it is to be found. [...] The second stage is *displacement*. It is now a widening of the frames of reference that takes place, and a simplistic ‘either-or’ situation is avoided. A new perspective is brought in and that changes the situation completely. [...] A theory from outside (top-down) could also be brought in. [...] Instead of finding the answer, the solution, deconstruction ends up in *dispersal*. This is not necessarily negative or saying that

important role to play in a post-Second World War as well as in a post-apartheid scenario.⁹

Christus Victor Revisited

Rereading *Christus Victor*, I again realize that it is a remarkable work, a masterpiece, and one whole system. One could argue that everything that needs to be said, is said.

Aulén is right in saying that the classic idea of atonement, as it above all was emerging in the early church, had been “so grievously misinterpreted and neglected; and I have tried to show how important is the place which it has actually held in the history of Christian thought”. One should probably remember that in the early twentieth century, scholars could claim some kind of objectivity and ability to be descriptive. Nevertheless, it sounds a bit pathetic to hear Aulén say the following: “I have not had any intention of writing an *apologia* for the classic idea; and if my exposition has shaped itself into something like a vindication of it, I would plead that it is because the facts themselves point that way.”¹⁰

The facts are there, but there is also a driver who determines which facts are worthy of being part of a text. The truth is rather that Aulén at an early stage deliberately sought justification for what has come to be called the classic idea of atonement. My reading of him is like this: He places quite some importance on the early church fathers and may in this regard be influenced by Anglican theology. The less philosophical Irenaeus of Lyon

nobody cares. For example, in the strict adherence to Derrida’s theory of writing, dispersal means universalization of trace, as foundational to our being or to the existence of all that is.” Hans S.A. Engdahl, *Theology in Conflict – Readings in Afrikaner Theology: The Theologies of F.J.M. Potgieter and B.J. Marais*, Frankfurt 2006, 24. Cf. Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, Baltimore, MD 1976, 99; Christopher Johnson, *Derrida: The Scene of Writing*, London 1997, 51–56. Derrida’s deconstruction of Lévi-Strauss is devastating as he proves that the indigenous people, the Nambikwara, are not “innocent” people (naturalists), but people who generate evil from their midst as any other group (naming and protection of names as first and second violence were already a fact when Lévi-Strauss arrived). Derrida also proves that written language is before oral language (as a structuralist Lévi-Strauss claimed orality as the original language). But here, his deconstruction is at work and he merely establishes a new phase, namely that of displacement. Neither is right, nor wrong. See Johnson, *Derrida*, 33; Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, III.

9. In this article, I am only going to give one example from South Africa (restitution). However, it should be added that I have taught (together with Antjie Krog) a post-graduate course on “The South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission and Its Theological Perspectives”, for six consecutive years between 2005 and 2012 at the University of the Western Cape. Well over fifty students have been part of this course, a couple of them have proceeded with their PhD theses on themes clearly related to this course. *Christus Victor* was required reading.

10. Gustaf Aulén, *Christus Victor: An Historical Study of the Three Main Types of the Idea of the Atonement*, London 1965, 158.

(c. 130–202) is ideal. Aulén is quite aware of what he is doing when he says that it is sometimes useful to read history backwards, “and see how the subsequent development illuminates the preceding stages”. In my opinion, he has at an early stage decided that Irenaeus is his man: “We may, then, feel satisfied that we have found in Irenaeus our true starting-point.”¹¹

Aulén does not only keep incarnation and atonement together, as well as salvation and redemption, he consistently keeps together God of creation and God of redemption. God has entered this world of sin and death deliberately in order to deal with its crisis. And here a quote from Irenaeus comes in handy: “The same hand of God that formed us in the beginning, and forms us in our mother’s womb, in these latter days sought us when we were lost, gaining His lost sheep and laying it on His shoulders and bringing it back with joy to the flock of life.”¹²

Irenaeus’ holistic grasp of our existence in talking about *recapitulatio* cuts through the maze of most theology through the generations. It is about restoring and perfecting the creation that God once embarked upon, the good creation, created with excellent, good intentions. This *recapitulatio* continues with the Spirit and the church and is strongly eschatological. An enmity developed between humans and God so there was a real need for “an Atonement, a *reconciliatio*”. This “punishment of corruption”, which humans deliberately had brought on their heads, “is now abolished by God Himself”.¹³ It is natural for Irenaeus to talk about sin, death, and the devil in one breath. Aulén sticks to this usage, but many – not least within mainstream Protestant theology of his time, Barth being only one of many – would never concur. It was outdated, too dualistic. But he demonstrates convincingly, I argue, that such usage was not more outdated than Christian belief itself. The drama according to Irenaeus is unfolding:

[God] had pity on men, and flung back on the author of enmities the enmity by which he had purposed to make man an enemy to God; He took away His enmity against men, and flung it back and cast it upon the serpent. So the Scripture says: I will put enmity between thee and the serpent, and between thy seed and the seed of the woman; he shall bruise thy head and thou shalt watch for his heel. This enmity the Lord recapitulated in Himself, being made man, born of a woman, and bruising the serpent’s head.¹⁴

11. Aulén, *Christus Victor*, 16–17.

12. Cited in Aulén, *Christus Victor*, 21.

13. Aulén, *Christus Victor*, 20, 24.

14. Cited in Aulén, *Christus Victor*, 24.

The fact is that Aulén constructs his own understanding of the atonement, and once that is done he judges everything on basis of such an understanding. My contention is that he has done this with Irenaeus as a starting point. But in order to gain full validity he needs two reference points. These are Martin Luther (1483–1546) and the New Testament.

Aulén states that Luther sharpens the classic atonement motif further by taking into account not only sin, death, and the devil, but also law and God's wrath as humans' adversaries. While Irenaeus has shown convincingly that sin, death, and the devil are actual, objective realities intimately intertwined, Luther goes on to show that God's rule also leads to enmity to the human. Aulén is not afraid of pointing to the dualism of God in Luther's understanding, while he is eager to demonstrate that the love of God is the winning side and in his intervention through Christ it is shown that love, not wrath, is prevailing.

Luther's discussion of law is challenging. He could here claim to be supported by Paul, who held that "the Law is at once good and evil; from one point of view, altogether good; from another, altogether evil. It is good, as an expression of God's will and commandment; yet it is also a 'tyrant', for it provokes to sin and increases sin."¹⁵

Observance of the law tempts the human to go the Pelagian way, leading to no salvation. Again, Luther's talk about God's wrath is to say what God is now, not at the end of times. It is also a tyrant, "even the most awful and terrible of all the tyrants. It is a tyrant in that it stands opposed to the Divine Love."¹⁶ One could say that Luther here sharpens the drama of the atonement in that it is God's work that is at stake. In his commentary on the Galatians, he claims that in the end it is the grace and mercy of Christ that prevail:

The curse, which is the wrath of God against the whole world, was in conflict with the blessing – that is to say, with God's eternal grace and mercy in Christ. The curse conflicts with the blessing, and would condemn it and altogether annihilate it, but it cannot. For the blessing is divine and eternal, therefore the curse must yield. For if the blessing in Christ could yield, then God Himself would have been overcome. But that is impossible.¹⁷

15. Aulén, *Christus Victor*, 112.

16. Aulén, *Christus Victor*, 114.

17. Aulén, *Christus Victor*, 114.

There is a sense in which one has to accept dualism as a reality, not as two eternal principles, but as a temporary, albeit longstanding arrangement, where sin, death, and the devil seem to prevail forever. Aulén's footnote about dualism is decisive, but Luther sharpens this dualism even further in that he claims that there is dualism in God. This argument makes sense if it is true that God ultimately is in charge. If that is the case, God already somehow has to answer to and be responsible for the evils that are prevalent now, as God could be said to be ultimately responsible for allowing evil to develop in the first place. What one would need to add, however, is how the human responds to this dramatic intervention by God. For a response is necessary. Differently put, an anthropology is needed that can match the stark words of Luther.

The other guide in assessing Irenaeus is the New Testament. Aulén touches upon the quest for the historical Jesus and wisely selects a few examples that serve his purpose. Paul comes in conveniently and "confirms" to Aulén what Luther will say 1,500 years later. Aulén also refers to a very interesting comment by Anton Fridrichsen (1888–1953), the Norwegian New Testament scholar based in Uppsala. He shows the inevitable: there is dualism. Starting from the exorcisms of Jesus dealing with unclean spirits, Fridrichsen concludes that these are all subject to Satan. There are two dominions, that of Satan and that of God's kingdom. And the drama is unfolding:

It took the form of the realization, both that his death was inevitable, and that it would mean deliverance and victory; Satan's triumph would be his undoing. [...] The strange paradox that he, who was the stronger than Satan, should succumb to the power of evil and thereby break it – this paradox was involved in his situation as the Son of Man in lowliness, but having his high vocation, and all the while an instrument of God's will.¹⁸

References to Luther and the New Testament rather well support Aulén's case, and, no doubt, they both strengthen the Irenaean model of atonement. Differently put, Aulén uses Irenaeus' typology as a frame also for the other two types of atonement.

18. Anton Fridrichsen, "The Conflict of Jesus with the Unclean Spirits", *Theology* 22 (1931), 129–130. Not without significance, Fridrichsen (p. 122) adds the following, and this is in 1929 (when the original article was published in Swedish): "The Synoptic Gospels show Jesus to us not only as prophet, miracle worker, and teacher, but also as exorcist. In the earliest tradition the exorcisms play a great part, but the attention paid to them by modern exegesis stands in no reasonable relation to the importance which the Primitive Church assigned to this side of Jesus' activity."

Aulén also has a discussion about rational thinking and allowing for faith to be a paradox. Whereas no one is able to complete an argument without being rational, at least to some extent, it is another matter to allow for contradictions and difficulties that do not easily go away.¹⁹ Theology could be seen as being littered with such contradictions and difficulties. It is certainly a gift of reason to be able to say where the limit for the rational goes.

I find it difficult to refute Aulén's caption of the classic type, as well as his criticism of the Latin type in terms of rationality, not thereby stating that the Latin type would be of no significance. The classic type describes an unbroken line of divine intervention into this world, "God reconciling the world unto himself", while the Latin type describes a broken line in order to fulfil all justice: Christ would have to cover all humanity's guilt from us up to God in order to achieve atonement or reconciliation.

Aulén was being outright rational: "The classic idea shows a continuity in the Divine action and a discontinuity in the order of justice; the Latin type, a legal consistency and a discontinuity in Divine operation."²⁰ Is this the final word? I do not think so. Even if the classic version would enjoy the pride of place in the atonement pantheon, there is still a need to come down to the empirical level to be able to talk about justice, guilt, and so forth.

Antipathies

Here, I want to draw the attention to Aulén's tendency to create antipathies. He consistently plays down what is legal. In terms of atonement he keeps away from that notion; otherwise, there is risk of contamination: there might be an attempt to measure the guilt and sin that have been committed. The simple conclusion is that there must be a way by which one could deal with precisely legal matters and matters of justice without jeopardizing the ultimate reconciliation being God's making not ours.²¹

Secondly, there is also a sense in which ethical aspects are seen as of no help. At the same time, the world cries for ethical leadership. Again, there are ways to deal with the "ethical" without risking the theological content.²²

Then there is the third type of atonement: the subjective. It is downplayed as a rather hopeless idea largely built on individual, human understandings of how to reconcile with God.²³ One should perhaps not underestimate the

19. Aulén wants to demonstrate that the Latin doctrine of atonement is built on rationality. Luther would never accept it, as he "is sure that God's work in Christ of atonement, forgiveness, justification, bears the signature *contra rationem et legem*". Aulén, *Christus Victor*, 121.

20. Aulén, *Christus Victor*, 91.

21. Aulén, *Christus Victor*, 89.

22. Aulén, *Christus Victor*, 91–92.

23. Aulén, *Christus Victor*, 134–135.

fact that even having Christ as the ultimate role model could trigger off reactions that go beyond mere human abilities. I therefore sound a hesitation as to the statement that divine inspiration or intervention is out of question. In addition, I miss the role of the subjective perspective in Aulén. There seems to be none. Somewhere it has to be articulated that atonement is conclusive: it deals with the cosmic aspect, with the church as the body of Christ, with the world, with society, with human communities, and also with individuals. There is always a subjective insight that is valid.

Captivities

What is even more a matter of concern is that Aulén suffered from various kinds of captivities, in fact there are four of them.

First, as a good Lutheran, he stuck without hesitation to Luther's concept of the two kingdoms. The concept could make sense as there will always be a differentiation between God and the world. It also makes sense to safeguard the gospel as an offer to people to receive gifts of God out of grace, while the kingdom of this world would be constituted through various obligations. But there is a tension here. The gospel is preached to people living in this world, concerned with justice, truth, and forgiveness. The one has to do with the other, but they are not the same.

I now contend that there is a captivity here on the part of Aulén. Once he is the bishop, and he is faced with demonic powers in the upcoming Second World War, he straight away adopts a particular stance *vis-à-vis* the kingdom of this world. And what he, i.e. the church, can say is on the level of law and creation. And he sticks to that. What about the dire need for peace and reconciliation? What about atonement? As it seems, all these things were carefully hidden within the classic type of atonement and also kept strictly within the kingdom of God.

This is Aulén's captivity of primary importance. Allegiance to this concept effectively shut out any sense of *Christus Victor*.

Secondly, there is the captivity of *De servo arbitrio*, on the enslaved will of the human.²⁴ Free will is at stake. Augustine (354–430) created a precedence in his dealing with Pelagius (c. 360–418) – whom he indeed had to deal with somehow – that makes it very difficult to talk about the free will in its widest sense without running into Pelagian thinking about how to influence one's salvation through own initiatives. So here, Aulén is in good company. One should, however, recall that the Eastern Church has had far less problems with this, and Origen (184–253), for example, finds it easy to

24. See, for example, Martin Luther, *The Bondage of the Will*, Grand Rapids, MI 1990.

reckon with free will as a reality without tampering with any issue regarding Christ's atonement.²⁵

One can also see how difficult it is to relate the classic type to areas of human concern, where human endeavour would be the main criteria for a life at all. One will have to work out a scheme by which human contributions are taken seriously without mixing them up with divine initiatives towards reconciliation. And we have not even mentioned the tendency towards predestination yet. What is disturbing with the classic view is this passivity that one senses when standing in awe of the dramatic things that are brought about by God for us. There is something in the equation that is missing – and, again, it is not about questioning the divine intervention as such, but rather I lack a euphoric conviction that just because there is a God-given guarantee for atonement, I should be actively involved towards the same in my own circle, and that active involvement should be now, spontaneously now.

The third captivity is no less real. Aulén was bishop in a state church, the Church of Sweden. It meant, for example, that during the Second World War, he could not be an independent actor of the church in relation to the state. The particular case in point is the so-called Midsummer crisis of 1941, when the German Nazi government demanded from Sweden to use her territory for transportation of weaponry, other equipment, and troops through Sweden, also from Norway to Finland. A compromise was reached so as to minimize the risk of being drawn into the war – German troops and goods were indeed allowed through the country. Such a concession, though understandable, does not rhyme well with words about standing up against demonic powers at all costs. But Aulén never, not even once, deviated from the official Swedish line in terms of the war. He remained, as all the other bishops, an obedient servant of the state (church).²⁶

Finally, and perhaps unexpectedly, there is also captivity in the wider world of ecumenism. Aulén was during a number of years as an academic and as church leader a prominent member of the Faith and Order movement, from 1948 an integral part of the World Council of Churches. Looking at his long life-span and his theological achievements it stands clear to me that Faith and Order was another captivity. And yet, he was perhaps at his happiest when he freely could converse, at meetings, with other colleagues on matters of faith and order. It strikes me that Aulén was a close

25. Henry Chadwick, *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition*, Oxford 1966, 120, says the following regarding Origen's urge for freedom: "Perhaps it is this insistence on freedom in God which most deeply marks Origen's theology with a Biblical stamp."

26. Jonson, *Gustaf Aulén*, 264; Klas Åmark, *Att bo granne med ondskan: Sveriges förhållande till nazismen, Nazityskland och Förintelsen*, Stockholm 2011, 122–143.

associate of Archbishop Nathan Söderblom (1866–1931) at the Stockholm Conference on Life and Work in 1925. However, he did not seem too happy there, did not seem to have a very meaningful role. Life and Work was not for him. He was merely beating about the bush. Had Söderblom lived into the 1940s, he might have influenced Aulén in his direction without taking the theological mastery out of him. They might have colluded on the commonalities of Life and Work as well as Faith and Order.

The attentive reader must have noticed that I have here been fairly hard on Aulén. I have in fact devoted myself to digging into Aulén's work as an act of *disclosure* and have been struck by some inconsistencies that are there. Some of them I have now laid bare.

Actual Deconstruction

The next step is to throw it all open. For example, I might ask the question, what is the use of a classic type of atonement, if it has no meaning in ordinary life? Having disclosed things, it is now a matter of *displacement*. According to Jonas Jonson, Aulén claimed that his life's oeuvre was consistent: "He admitted that an advanced shift had taken place in his theological outlook [from *Christus Victor* to creation law], but emphasized that *the continuity was unbroken*."²⁷

He may have had good reasons for thinking that he was consistent. Others might see that he was a victim of the state church, of the intellectual climate created by the war in neutral Sweden and of a Lutheran two-pronged view of what is done before God and before humans. Displacement means dissolving this continuity. Various pieces of theology fly around in all directions. And yet, even a theological legacy has an inner logic and is conducive to various fields of force, going well beyond that of one particular theologian.

One such field of force is the quest for meaning and relevance. If it is true that *Christus Victor* is a superb piece of work, with a powerful, even dramatic message in the midst of it – then it should be possible to place it in such a way that it shines so that people can see it.

What is here required is an innovation of sorts. We need to come up with a new theory, or at least be able to re-contextualize things so as to achieve meaning and relevance, even active response. The new theory is the crown of Aulén's legacy, i.e. *Christus Victor*. What has to be given to the world is that reconciliation is possible, against all odds, and the fact that this doctrine of atonement and reconciliation is so saturated with theology must not hinder us from placing it in the midst of the world. We are challenged

27. Jonson, *Gustaf Aulén*, 201. My italics.

to the bone because of the fact that “God was in Christ reconciling the *world* to himself”.

Furthermore, one could state that instead of going from the one to the other, saying that the continuity is unbroken, that “one is deeply involved with the other”. Shifting to the legal state (*rättsstaten*) is not an innocent move; it will somehow do harm to the doctrine of atonement, one reason being that the law, albeit *lex creationis*, lacks saving capacity.

The shift as it is somehow did harm to *Christus Victor*, made it impotent, almost useless, facing extreme warfare. Instead the new hope for the world (the new theory) has to be directed into this extreme warfare of the Second World War, just the model of *Christus Victor* with its three dimensions.²⁸

But it is not about *Christus Victor* replacing *lex creationis*. On the contrary, it is about “widening the frames of reference, the loosing of the rigid systems of oppositions”.²⁹ Instead of “the continuity is unbroken”, from one to the other, one would have wished to see a consequent *Christus Victor* moment in all the talks against the warmongers (no names mentioned) of the Second World War.

Post-Second World War and Post-Apartheid Scenarios

Finally, I want to show how a “liberated” *Christus Victor* could engage in two different scenarios, that of post-Second World War and post-apartheid South Africa.

From the position of a post-Cold War perspective (from 1989–1990 onwards) it is in fact possible to look back towards the Second World War for possible scenarios of reconciliation and forgiveness. While churches in this post-war time scrutinized their consciences as to their continued divisions, others had the courage to think reconciliation and, one would say, against the hard realities. In the midst of all this it is possible to recall Hannah Arendt’s (1906–1975) theory of political forgiveness: “Political forgiveness is the epitome of natality, freeing both victim and victimizer from the paralyzing consequences of past deeds: it is ‘the exact opposite of vengeance... the only reaction that does not merely re-act, but acts anew and unexpectedly, unconditioned by the act which provoked it’.”³⁰

28. What is offered to the world (of politics, of war, even the Second World War) is only the paradigm given to the eunuch at Gaza on his way back to Ethiopia: the suffering servant of Deutero-Isaiah as the risen one as interpreted by the apostle Philip. Acts 8:26–39.

29. Johnson, *Derrida*, 53.

30. Catherine Guisan, “Political Forgiveness, Promise, and the ‘Understanding Heart’ in Hannah Arendt’s Theory”, in Bas van Stokkom, Neelke Doorn & Paul van Tongeren (eds.), *Public Forgiveness in Post-Conflict Contexts*, Cambridge 2012, 144.

Aulén belongs to another era, even though Arendt's text is as early as 1958; however, the discussion here is not far from *Christus Victor*.³¹ Catherine Guisan argues that:

Since the end of the Cold War forgiving and reconciliation have become part and parcel of academic and political discourse. This is new. Scholars draw from Arendt to support their narratives of political reconciliation although some argue against forgiveness and for resentment that preserves the victim's dignity and animates protests against injustice. [...] Shin Chiba argues that "even her (Arendt's) notion of political forgiveness does not seem to make sense, unless it presumes a certain quality, an attitude, or an ethos of agape, such as contrition, repentance, kindness, altruism..." There is little discussion of kindness, contrition, or altruism, however, in Arendt: forgiving is not a moral or spiritual affect, but a singular act that liberates doer and sufferer from the "relentless automatism of the action process" for the sake of both.³²

Arendt talks about forgiveness (and as a presupposition of any reconciliation) as a "singular act". Would that not resonate with Aulén? Is that not the classic theory at its best? This is fine. God really did bring about reconciliation in one, single, unprecedented act. This is also the dilemma. Where are we as humanity in all this? It is unclear where Arendt would find an answer, and the query from Chiba, who feels compelled to talk about "a certain quality, an attitude, or an ethos of agape", makes sense. The classic aspect is well served with contributions from the Latin version, in terms of justice and morality.

This brings us back to the post-apartheid scenario.³³ I will then go straight away to the, unspoken or not, need for *satisfactio*, compensation, reparations. But here is an *aporia*.³⁴ I suggest that this unresolved crisis will open up all three themes of *Christus Victor*.

31. I here speak in very general terms. Arendt differentiates between forgiveness and reconciliation in that "whereas these two human capacities manifest themselves through singular acts directed toward specific actors, reconciliation consists in the upending search for 'understanding', a coming to terms with one's fate that prompts action instead of resignation. To understand is the attempt to make oneself at home in the world, to seek meaning: it is an open-ended exercise with no final conclusion." Guisan, "Political Forgiveness", 148.

32. Guisan, "Political Forgiveness", 145.

33. I would also argue that the very fact that we today are able to talk about a post-apartheid scenario should still take us by surprise. See Hans S.A. Engdahl, *Miraklet: Sydafrikas väg till försoning och fred*, Stockholm 1996.

34. ἀπορία means difficulty of passing, difficulty, lack of resources.

One essential part of reconciliation is that of reparations. How do you atone for somebody who has been killed? How do you assess reparations in the case of genocide? Having the South African TRC in mind, Mark Sanders comments as follows:

We are faced with an aporia: on the one hand, no monetary price can be attached to the suffering of victims: on the other hand, there must be reparation in acknowledgement of those who have suffered and who continue to suffer. [...] The aporia can be intensified: there must be reparation: there can never be (adequate) reparation.³⁵

Sanders is at pains to demonstrate that the need for reparations is not just another expression of how to overcome racial injustice. It is much more radical than that: “Such a situation calls for decision – of the type described by Derrida in ‘Force of Law’, where responsibility lies in deciding in a ‘night of non-knowledge’, and where justice is irreducible to the application of a law, or any other calculus.”³⁶

The TRC report contained seven volumes. “Volume 7, almost 1,000 pages in extent, lists the name of each victim recognized by the commission, along with a brief account of the human rights violations that he or she suffered.” This is “*the* text for reparation”.³⁷ A poem of Antjie Krog appears at the head of this volume. I quote the first lines:

because of you
this country no longer lies
between us but within.

Originally placed in her book on the TRC, clearly representing a white woman of Afrikaner descent, the poem here comes to represent all human beings.³⁸ Again, we are reminded that life is *aporia* and cannot be fulfilled by us humans in a simple, straightforward way. But all should be involved. Sanders concludes: “There is a more powerful reason, however, to embark on the course of reparation and responsibility that I have outlined: like mourning and condolence, it may foster bonds of responsibility-in-complicity.”³⁹

35. Mark Sanders, *Ambiguities of Witnessing: Law and Literature in the Time of a Truth Commission*, Johannesburg 2007, 115–116.

36. Sanders, *Ambiguities of Witnessing*, 116. Cf. Jacques Derrida, “Force of Law: The ‘Mystical Foundation of Authority’”, *Cardozo Law Review* 11 (1990), 921–1045.

37. Sanders, *Ambiguities of Witnessing*, 114, 145.

38. Sanders, *Ambiguities of Witnessing*, 135. Antjie Krog, *Country of My Skull*, London 1999.

39. Sanders, *Ambiguities of Witnessing*, 145.

It is now possible to draw up a scenario of how Aulén's three models can be understood in the light of this *aporia*. I will not do that here, but merely give a few hints regarding the classic and the Latin model. For, from a general, Christian point of view there is a call that something can and must be done.

The Latin model makes clear that sin and guilt are facts that can be measured and are part of the forensic reality. The ten commandments are valid before God as well as humans (*coram Deo* and *coram hominibus*). Christ, in his humanity, is called to take on the whole burden of sin and guilt of the world. In order to at least be able to take into account, to get some perspective on what is at stake, without ever being able to make a proper assessment, the broken line in God's salvific act could be justified.⁴⁰

But behind it all, the classic model is looming. It has, it could be argued, the Latin model as a supposition. But now it is about God's definite, once and for all act in Jesus Christ. I have talked about this model as leading to passivity. This need not be the case. Two examples from the early church indicate that Paul's words "God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself" could be taken literally. If God gave everything to have this problem solved, humans could follow suit and do the same. What I mean is, that from early on there were Christians who were prepared to give their entire life to the Lord. The ascetic movement, the importance of which could hardly be exaggerated, invited many to give everything, all their lives to God. To them, the classic model would not make them feel like on-lookers, they could whole-heartedly take this declaration to their hearts. Secondly, the same could be said of those becoming martyrs. Again, one could hardly overestimate the importance of the martyr church during the first three centuries, or at any other time, like our own.⁴¹

In other words, on the basis of *Christus Victor*, there are ways to respond to the *aporia* of not least the post-apartheid situation in South Africa. Things can, are, and will be done.⁴²

Even when one allows oneself to dissect a text to the extent that I have done here, the text remains intact as it is. And it is a great text, standing the test of times. ▲

40. One could here also actualize Karl Jaspers' (1883–1969) words: "There exists a solidarity among men as human beings that makes each co-responsible for every wrong and every injustice in the world, especially for crimes committed in his presence or with his knowledge." Karl Jaspers, *The Question of German Guilt*, Westport, CT 1978, 32.

41. As part of the early church, Origen may serve as a good example of both. His notion of *apokatástasis*, "the restitution of all and everything", speaks in this direction, as does his acute awareness of martyrdom. See Origen, *An Exhortation to Martyrdom, Prayer and Selected Works*, Mahwah, NJ 1979.

42. See Sharlene Swartz, *Another Country: Everyday Social Restitution*, Cape Town 2017.

SUMMARY

The contention is that *Christus Victor* is a complete piece of work, which reflects the various aspects of God's liberating act in Jesus Christ, but which, indeed, is ready to be exposed in the public arena. First, I revisit parts of *Christus Victor*, especially the church father Irenaeus, representing an early understanding of the atonement. Here, Aulén sees contours of what he calls the classic model of the atonement, favouring this model, clearly at the expense of the Latin and the subjective models. But all three models have meaning and his point of departure from Irenaeus gives a solid base. Secondly, *Christus Victor* may not be left in isolation. When Aulén says towards the end of the Second World War that *the continuity is unbroken* between his work on the atonement and his later public discourse on *lex creationis*, God's law of creation, I protest. This cannot be. I then make use of tools of deconstruction, taken from Derrida, as follows: *disclosure*, *displacement*, bringing in a *new theory*, and *dispersal*. Breaking up what was deemed as a watertight continuity, I declared *Christus Victor* to be the new theory (new in the sense that almost all who are not in the inner circle of church and theology never heard about it), which now must come out on top. Thirdly, two examples are given of how the model of atonement operates in the public arena: on political forgiveness (Hannah Arendt) and on reparations (Mark Sanders); the former relating to a post-Second World War setting, the latter to post-apartheid South Africa.

Teologiska perspektiv på rättsstaten hos Gustaf Aulén

JONAS JONSON

Jonas Jonson är docent i missionsvetenskap vid Uppsala universitet
och biskop emeritus i Strängnäs stift.

jonasjonson@telia.com

Har skapelsen sitt upphov i Guds suveräna kärleksvilja, så fungerar denna mot kaos kämpande skaparvilja såsom en skapelsens lag, när den dels stävjar och dömer det som hotar skapelsen med fördärv och undergång, dels framdriver gärningar i skapelsens tjänst. Såsom gudsviljans funktion är denna skapelsens lag universell.¹

Gustaf Aulén (1879–1977) arbetade efter nazisternas maktövertagande i Tyskland 1933 oupphörligt med frågan om den skapelsegivna lagen som grundval och kritisk instans för samhället. Hans biskopstjänst i Strängnäs begränsade hans möjligheter att bedriva vetenskaplig forskning, men i föreläsningar, förkunnelse och skrifter bearbetade han i 15 år det teologiska motiv som han benämnde ”Skapelsens lag”. Han utvecklade en politisk teologi, som skulle vara vägledande för kyrkan och tog utifrån denna entydig ställning i samtidens politiska och ideologiska frågor. Denna skapelseteologi med dess rättsliga och politiska implikationer har, trots att den löper genom hela hans omfattande författarskap, inte uppmärksammats på samma sätt som hans försoningsteologi, internationellt välkänd i komprimerad form genom *Christus Victor* (1930).

1. Gustaf Aulén, *Den allmänneliga kristna tron*, 6:e uppl., Stockholm 1965, 151, § 20.

Följande artikel är en sammanfattning av Auléns teologiska framställning av skapelsens lag i förhållande till samhällets rättsordning.² Syftet är att aktualisera denna del av Auléns teologiska arbete och belysa dels hur han bestämmer den skapelsegivna lagen i förhållande till naturrätten, dels hur hans betoning av Guds lag förhåller sig till hans återkommande tema: Guds kamp mot destruktion och död. I sin antinazistiska kamp utgick han från denna lutherskt färgade politiska teologi och uppfordrade Svenska kyrkan till aktiva politiska ställningstaganden.

När Aulén, 34 år gammal, blev professor i dogmatik i Lund 1914, hade han redan en betydande produktion bakom sig. Han hade disputerat för docentur 1907 på en avhandling om *Henrik Reuterdahls teologiska åskådning med särskild hänsyn till Schleiermacher*, skrivit ett antal recensioner av tysk litteratur, utgivit ett par smärre skrifter om tolkningen av Jesu person, debatterat psalmboksfrågan, författat böcker om den lutherska kyrkotanken, skrivit om uppenbarelse och historia och hållit provföreläsning om askesen i det kristna livet. Men det var som professor under första världskriget som han verkligen kom igång som teologisk författare. Artiklar i vitt skilda ämnen flöt i en strid ström ur hans penna, men också en lärobok i dogmatik, en omfattande dogmhistoria och 1923 *Den allmänneliga kristna tron* i dess första upplaga. Han var omåttligt produktiv. Under sina 18 år som professor producerade han text motsvarande åtta trycksidor i veckan, året om.³ 1927 kom *Den kristna gudsbilden genom seklerna och i nutiden* på 400 sidor. Den förberedde hans internationella genombrott som teolog. Det kom med den engelska översättningen av hans Olaus Petri-föreläsningar i Uppsala, *Christus Victor*, en bok som gavs ut i ständigt nya upplagor och blev, som han själv sa, hans ”visitkort” i världen.⁴ Gud som den oinskränkta kärlekens kamp mot alla fördärvsmakter blev huvudtemat och grundmotivet i Gustaf Auléns teologiska arbete. Det återkom ständigt och spetsades till när hotet från fascism, nazism och bolsjevism närmade sig.⁵

De kristna grundmotiven

Motivforskningen i Lund tillsammans med den tio år yngre Anders Nygren (1890–1978) syftade till att frigöra det ”äktkristna”, de oföränderliga grundmotiven i den kristna traditionen, det innehåll som formen både förmedlade och fördunklade. Ett sådant grundmotiv var *agape*, Guds villkorslösa

2. Artikelns bygger på en föreläsning för Religionsvetenskapliga sällskapet i Stockholm 2012.

3. Krister Gierow & Per Ekström, *The Published Writings of Gustaf Aulén: A Bibliography*, Lund 1979. Bibliografien är i det närmaste fullständig och innehåller över 800 titlar.

4. På svenska: Gustaf Aulén, *Den kristna försoningstanken: Huvudtyper och brytningar*, Stockholm 1930.

5. Jonas Jonson, *Gustaf Aulén: Biskop och motståndsmän*, Skellefteå 2011.

kärlek. Ingenting fick motsäga den, ingenting ont kunde härledas från Gud. Auléns kristologi fick ett lätt monofysitiskt drag. Det var Kristi gudomlighet, inte Jesu mänsklighet, som stod i blickfånget. Påskens triumf i förening med himmelfärdens förhärligande var den avgörande Kristushändelsen. Det var Gud som i Kristus försonade världen med sig själv. Aulén hade inget till övers för skolastisk satisfaktionslära, inte heller för den subjektiva försoningsläran, så som den kom till uttryck i pietistiska, humaniserande och liberalteologiska föreställningar. Gud och endast Gud hade både initiativet och segern i sin hand. Människans enda väg till Gud var Guds väg till människan.

Aulén hade börjat sin uppgörelse med allt vad humaniserande teologi hette redan i Uppsala. Han ville tala in i sin tid och deltog i uppgörelsen med nedärvda auktoriteter och religiös mytbildning. Ända sedan Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834) hade protestantismen sökt frigöra sig från hierarkier, ortodoxi och bokstavstro för att finna sin roll och självförståelse i en ny tid. Att framställa Jesus som en moralisk förebild och gudsriket som en inomvärldslig storhet var viktiga inslag i den liberalteologiska tyska kulturprotestantismen. Den visade sig emellertid mycket genomsläpplig för främmande ideologier och hade inte mycket att sätta emot de totalitära systemen. Den reformerte Karl Barth (1886–1968) insåg tidigt detta och formulerade sin teologiska protest i skarpt negativa termer. Han drog en skiljelinje mellan skapelse och uppenbarelse, mellan jord och himmel, mellan samhälle och gudsrrike. Guds immanens förbyttes mot tanken på Guds absoluta transcendens. Kyrka och stat blev oförenliga storheter. Den kristna församlingen skulle vara ett alternativ bestämt av Kristusuppenbarelse, bortvänd från historien och inriktad mot eskatologin. Aulén kallade denna dialektiska teologi för ”negationens väg”. Han kunde dela dess intention att rida spärr mot nazisternas självförhärligande, men var angelägen att markera hur annorlunda lundensarnas teologi ändå var.

Aulén och Nygren brottades med samma fråga som Barth: den äktkristna trons förhållande till det mänskliga och politiska livet. De var övertygade lutheraner och valde en annan väg än Barth. Guds skapelse, inklusive det mänskliga samhället, var Guds goda gåva. Skapelsen och frälsningen emanerade ur samma kärlek och fick inte skiljas åt. Staten som garant för lag och ordning och kyrkan med uppdraget att förkunna evangelium tjänade samma Gud och samma mänsklighet och var båda lika ansvariga inför Gud. Staten var alltså, oavsett dess politik, ställd under Guds lag och hade som sin primära funktion att upprätthålla denna lag. Kyrkan skulle inte bara förkunna evangelium utan också hålla ett vakande öga på att staten fullföljde sitt uppdrag. Tvåregementsläran blev emellertid problematisk när totalitära

partier grep den politiska makten och satte sig över rätten. Nygren, som utifrån sin *agape*-teologi om alla människors lika värde, också var en brinnande antinazist, höll uthålligt fast vid att kyrkan, så länge som den tilläts att förkunna evangelium, i princip kunde leva under vilket politiskt system som helst. Aulén, däremot, aktualiserade lagens första bruk och gick allt längre i sin principiella kritik av den totalitära staten för dess kränkning av rätten. För rätten var nedlagd i skapelsen och att sätta sig över den var att förneka Gud. I längden kunde inget samhälle leva bortvänt från Gud utan att ta allvarlig skada.

Nygren uppmärksammade tidigt att nazismen hade en kvasireligiös karaktär i sitt tal om ras, blod och jord, kort sagt att den var ett slags hedenom. Herrefolksmentaliteten och diskrimineringen av människor var absolut oförenlig med evangelium och måste förkastas. Det var tron på Guds ovillkorliga kärlek till alla människor, oavsett ras eller tro, som fick både Nygren och Aulén att tidigt ta ställning. Deras gudsbild medgav inte några kompromisser. Nygren, som var gift med en tyska och gärna vistades i Berlin, fick på grund av sina skrivelser ett fyraårigt inreseförbud till Tyskland. När kyrkans möjligheter att predika mot nazismens villolära och statens övergrepp blev kraftigt kringskurna, fanns det inte längre något val. Då gällde det evangeliets frihet. Man kunde i praktiken inte vara både nazist och kristen, vilket Deutsche Christen i det längsta försökte.

Lundateologernas strävan att i sin motivforskning frilägga det ”äktkristna” och därigenom rädda kristendomens centrala trosinnehåll från utblandning och urvattning var en historiskt kontextuell teologi. Europeisk kristendom var hotad till livet av en militant, maktfullkomlig och totalitär nyhedendom, som krävde total underkastelse. Dialog, kompromiss och anpassning var utesluten. Kampen gällde då inte bara kyrkan utan hela den västerländska civilisationen. Det blev en kristen plikt att tillsammans med alla människor av god vilja ställa upp på Guds och frihetens sida mot den manifesterade ondskan. Liberalteologisk kulturkristendom och en kristet färgad humanism kunde inte bjuda tillräckligt motstånd. Kampen förutsatte inte bara en ”realistisk” människosyn, som tog ondskan på allvar och inte hade några illusioner om människans egen förmåga, utan också att den kristna traditionens grundmotiv som var Guds ovillkorliga kärlek, korset, uppståndelsen och förhålligandet proklamerades klart. Det fanns till slut bara ett hopp: att Guds kärlek segrade. Auléns förkunnelse präglades under 1930-talet av trots och triumf när han hänvisade till Guds *agape*.

Men han insåg snart att man i den sekulariserade samtiden inte kunde argumentera utifrån kristologin om man ville bli hörd. Aulén bytte omkring 1935 därför ansatspunkt. Efter att i årtal ha uppehållit sig vid

försoningsmotivet valde han nu ett annat motiv för sin teologiska reflektion: den skapelsegivna rätten. Orsaken till att han gjorde detta var uppenbar: den grova kränkning av rätten som blev allt vanligare. Det var Italiens självsvaldiga övergrepp på Abessinien som fick honom att fokusera på skapelsens eller snarare Skaparens lag: ”Rättsbrottet är så flagrant som gärna tänkbart. Vederbörande har också på det mest utmanande sätt demonstrerat sitt förakt för allt vad internationell rättsordning heter, ja överhuvudtaget mot rätten såsom sådan.”⁶

Efterhand skärptes och konkretiserades hans kritik av rättskränkningarna. Vid konferensen om den nya kyrkosynen i Nyköping 1942 talade han, exempelvis, om den hänsynslösa åsiktsförföljelsen på det politiska och religiösa området, rasförföljelsen särskilt mot judarna och om hur man tog livet av individer som ur statsnyttans synpunkt betraktades som mindervärdiga, livsoduliga och en onödig börda för staten. Han nämnde också brutal tortyr och systemet att ta gisslan och därigenom utkräva straff av alla andra än de skyldiga.⁷

Kyrkan och rättsstaten

Tidigare hade Aulén mera i förbigående ägnat sig åt skapelseteologi, socialetik och rättsteori. Utan att överge motivforskningen gjorde han en teologisk u-sväng. Skapelsens lag blev nu hans primära forskningsområde. Det var ett centralt kristet motiv, som länge hade försummats och fördunklats. Under 20 år skulle han sedan envetet, uthålligt och med viss pedagogisk ensidighet frilägga detta motiv och utveckla sin kritik av totalitarismen i alla dess former med den skapelsegivna rätten som utgångspunkt.⁸ Långt senare, när han berättade om sitt samarbete med sekulariserade svenska anti-nazister, beskrev han förändringen så här:

Den samverkan som det här var fråga om brukade jag beteckna som en samverkan på lagens grund. ”Lagen” betyder då för mig Skaparens lag, som jag tolkade med slagordet ”saklig omsorg om nästan”, ett bud som förvisso hade direkta politiska konsekvenser. Lag och rätt är här oskiljaktigt förenade. Så snart jag i dessa sammanhang i tal och skrift kom in på frågan om kyrkan och hennes position, var huvudsaken för mig alltid att tala om kyrkans *förpliktelse*. Också i de predikningar

6. Gustaf Aulén, ”Kristendomen och världsläget”, i Gustaf Aulén & Manfred Björkquist, *Rätt och frihet*, Stockholm 1935, 20.

7. Gustaf Aulén, ”Kyrkan och rättsordningen”, i Gustaf Aulén (red.), *En bok om kyrkan*, Lund 1943, 414.

8. Detta motiv bearbetades senare i bland annat Gustaf Wingren, *Skapelsen och lagen*, Lund 1958. Wingrens beroende av Aulén har inte fått tillräcklig uppmärksamhet.

som jag höll under denna tid har detta tema ofta kommit med, men då givetvis utan att förtränga evangeliets budskap. Det finns i mina teologiska utredningar på *det* planet ett motiv, jag kan gott säga ett av mina huvudmotiv, som hängde nära samman med det antinazistiska temat: kontrasten mellan det konstruktiva, skapande, och det destruktiva, demoniska, så som den möter oss i Jesu gärning. Ett annat motiv, också det med direkt anknytning, är offermotivet. Kontinuiteten med min tidigare teologiska åskådning var obruten. Och ändå måste jag samtidigt vitsorda att den mest påtagliga förskjutning som ägt rum inom min teologiska åskådning är knuten till denna period, krigstidens skakande upplevelser.⁹

Det var en radikal kursändring och den kom inte lättvindigt. Han upplevde att de vedervärdiga omständigheterna tvingade honom att syssla med frågan om rätten och kyrkans förhållande till denna.¹⁰ Frågan om kyrkans ansvar för rättens sak blev så påträngande, att den måste bli hans primära teologiska uppgift under många år. Det handlade om att klarlägga ”lagens första bruk”, dess *usus civilis* och *usus politicus*.¹¹ Saken gällde med andra ord förhållandet mellan kyrka och stat och frågan skärptes i takt med att flera stater blev totalitära med anspråk på att helt forma människors liv och världsåskådning.

Aulén utgick från att det fanns en allmängiltig, universell lag, som var nedlagd i Guds skapelse och ämnad som grundval för all mänsklig samlevnad.¹² Om staten och statsbärande partier bröt mot denna lag måste kampen för rätten föras på lagens plan och med hänvisning till den första trosartikeln. Lagens ”första bruk” bestod i att lagen bekämpade, stävjade och lade hinder i vägen för de fördärvmakter som upplöste och förstörde människors liv tillsammans. Gud var ordningens Gud, som med sina lagar höll kaosmakterna på avstånd, en levande Gud som alltjämt kämpade mot destruktion och ondska. Gud som var kärleken ville bara väl. Därför var skapelsens lag liktydig med kärlekens lag och nedlagd i varje människa. Att

9. Gustaf Aulén, *Från mina nittiosex år: Hänt och tänkt*, Stockholm 1975, 178–179.

10. Gustaf Aulén, *Kyrkan och rätten*, Stockholm 1954, 3.

11. Under lång tid hade kyrkan, under inflytande av pietismen, huvudsakligen talat om lagens ”andra” bruk, som väcker syndamedvetande och driver människan till Kristus. Det var för Aulén en allt för begränsad tolkning och gjorde Guds lag till en intern kyrklig angelägenhet.

12. Den mest ingående analysen av Auléns tänkande kring lagens första bruk finns i Martin Lind, *Kristendom och nazism: Frågan om kristendomen och nazismen belyst av olika ställningstaganden i Tyskland och Sverige 1933–1945*, Lund 1975, 163–174. En sammanfattning finns i Martin Lind, ”En ideologikonfrontation: Kyrka och nazism i Sverige 1933–1945”, i Stein Ugelvik Larsen & Ingvar Montgomery (red.), *Kirken, krisen og krigen*, Oslo 1982, 293–311.

älska sin nästa som sig själv var inget nytt bud som kommit med Jesus. Det var givet i skapelsen och innebar, som Aulén ofta upprepade, ”saklig omsorg om nästan”. På detta bud byggde reformatorisk teologi sin lära om lagens ”civila bruk” i samhället. Rätten hade alltså en fast förankring i Guds lag. Därigenom garanterades dess suveränitet och dess universalitet. När frågan ställdes om vad som var Guds lag, svarade Aulén:

Lagen är skapelsens eller, ännu hellre, Skaparens lag. I den kristna skapelsetron ligger tanken på lagen, på en bestämd skapelsens ordning omedelbart innesluten. Det är nämligen för skapelsetron en grundväsentlig synpunkt att skapelse står i motsättning till kaos och innebär ett övervinnande av kaos. Skapelsen är, just såsom skapelse, ställd under Skaparen, ställd under hans bestämmelse, pliktig att följa den ordning, som ligger innesluten i och är given i och med skapandet. Men skapelsen är på samma gång uttryck för Guds kärleksvilja. När den gudomliga lagen därför i och genom den kristna uppenbarelsen tolkas och sammanfattas i budet om kärleken, i kärlekens krav, betyder detta icke att vi nu skulle få att göra med en annan lag än skapelsens lag eller med en annan gudsvilja än den som tagit sig uttryck i skapelsen, utan det betyder just ett avslöjande och klarläggande av vad som ligger i Skaparens lag. Guds krav är icke kluvet, det är oföränderligen ett och detsamma.¹³

Om skapelsens lag kunde sammanfattas i det dubbla kärleksbudet, reducerat till det slagordsliknande ”saklig omsorg om nästan”, så kunde och skulle den vara principiellt riktningsgivande och tillämpas i alla rättens sammanhang. Guds lag hade, ur kristen synpunkt, absolut auktoritet. Allt som stred mot den måste anses vara en avvikelse från vad rätten krävde. Människan ägde allt sedan skapelsen ett rättsmedvetande, som förstärktes av den kristna etiken. Men det gick inte att direkt översätta skapelsens lag till lagstiftning i olika frågor. Den varierade över tid, betingades ofta av lämplighet och tog sig olika uttryck i olika kulturer. Det avgörande var skapelselagens principiella innehåll: omsorgen om nästan och människans frihet och värdighet.

Som vanligt hänvisade Aulén till Martin Luther (1483–1546) i sin tolkning av lagens första bruk. För Aulén var ju Luther den främste av den kristna trons uttolkare genom tiderna och hans undervisning borde ha ekumenisk giltighet. Med hjälp av Luther gjorde Aulén sin definition av *lex creationis* och dess avgränsningar. Den tillämpades inom den lutherska traditionen i tvåregementsläran, med dess starka betoning av att både staten och

13. Aulén, ”Kyrkan och rättsordningen”, 411–412.

kyrkan stod under det skapande, dömande och frälsande Ordet. Mot en av sina gamla tyska vänner, professorn Paul Althaus (1888–1966), som långsamt snärjdes in i en nazifierad tolkning av tvåregementsläran, måste Aulén kraftigt markera det kristna kärlekskravets universalitet.¹⁴ Som en sammanfattning av Guds vilja, både i skapelsen och frälsningen, stod kärleken emot all makt som hävdade det egna folkets egenart och behov på bekostnad av andra.¹⁵ Kärleksbudet, som staten hade ansvar för att översätta till praktisk politik, kunde inte avgränsas till att gälla vissa grupper, folk eller raser.

Naturrätten och rättens sekularisering

Aulén gjorde en mycket tydlig avgränsning mot den naturliga lagen, *lex naturalis*, som från Thomas av Aquinos (ca 1225–1274) dagar varit riktninggivande för den romersk-katolska kyrkan och fått förnyad aktualitet efter första Vatikankonciliet. Han var angelägen om att framhålla att Luthers tänkande skilde sig från den medeltida rättsfilosofin. Skolastikens utgångspunkt hade varit att människan ägde en medfödd naturlig gudskunskap, som inte helt gått förlorad genom synden. Gudsuppenbarelsen genom Kristus blev då ett slags överbyggnad och nåden blev en hjälp att förverkliga inte bara den medfödda rättskänslan utan även de högre etiska krav som gudsuppenbarelsen ställde. Nåden blev ett stöd för naturen.

Om den naturliga lagen bestod av normer, som en gång för alla blivit nedlagda i människans natur och sedan statistiskt förblivit vad de varit, eftersom Gud så att säga dragit sig tillbaka, så låg, enligt Aulén, tonvikten hos Luther på Guds fortsatta skapande, på den verksamme, kämpande Gudens ordnande skaparvilja, som aldrig gett upp utan alltid ville fullborda skapelsen. Guds bud och ordningar träffade därför människan i hennes konkreta livssituation, inte som ett regelverk, utan som en dynamisk vägledning illustrerad av dekalogen och av Jesu undervisning och exempel. Kyrkan måste alltid leva i relation till samhället och var förpliktad att ända till slutet hävda den rätt som tillhörde själva skapelsen. Den rätten stod fri i förhållande till allt mänskligt godtycke och hade universell räckvidd. Aulén hade en dramatisk och dynamisk gudsbild som han också tillskrev Luther. Mot den tecknade han skolastikens och naturrättens Gud som statisk och regelstyrd, distanserad och svåråtkomlig.

Än värre blev det när naturrätten fick fäste på protestantisk mark och sekulariserades. Den förlorade sin aktiva förbindelse med kyrkan och kom att tjäna som en rent rationell grundval för rätten, befriad från tidigare religiösa bindningar. När denna naturrätt slagit igenom i 1600-talets Nordeuropa,

14. Aulén, *Från mina nittiosex år*, 116.

15. Lind, *Kristendom och nazism*, 169–174.

upphörde kyrkan och teologin att engagera sig för rätten. Man hade inte längre någonting att säga om lagens ”första bruk”, dess civila och politiska uppgift. Fältet var fritt för enväldshärskarna, som kunde bortse från skapelsens lag och sätta sig i Guds ställe. Nazismens ”Eigengesetzlichkeit” var en utlöpare av rättens sekularisering. Aulén gick så långt, att han menade att den totalitära staten dragit de praktiska konsekvenserna av rättspositivismen, om än på ett sätt som rättsfilosoferna inte hade avsett. Om man identifierade rätten med de av staten fastställda ordningarna, ledde det till rättens relativisering och detta kunde bli utgångspunkt för vilka rättskränkningar som helst. I själva verket hade rättspositivismen berett rum för de totalitära staternas skrämmande rättsövergrepp.¹⁶

Auléns avståndstagande från den naturliga lagen och naturrätten hade alltså att göra med att den frusit till döda dogmer, som förmedlade en falsk gudsbild och gav en illusion av att man ur den kunde härleda en konkret rättsordning. På protestantiskt håll hade rättstänkandet sekulariserats och kyrkan hade nästan helt upphört med att förkunna lagens första bruk. Detta hade tre orsaker. I Norden hade kyrkan anpassat sig till den rådande statskyrkligheten och därigenom givit upp det kritiska förhållningssätt till staten, som hade starkt stöd både i Bibeln och hos Luther. I Tyskland hade en vrångbild av Luther vuxit fram bland Deutsche Christen, som gått med på nazismens övergrepp mot dem som inte tillhörde det tyska folket. De lutherska kyrkornas anpassning var liktydig med ett förvärldsligande av kyrkan under påverkan av sekulariseringen.

Kyrkans andra svek mot den äktkristna traditionen kunde beskrivas som världsflykt och isolering. Som vanligt riktade Aulén framför allt sin kritik mot pietismen, som talade om individens frälsning, om att vara obesmittad av världen och hålla blicken fäst på det himmelska riket som inte hade med den här världen att skaffa. Det gjorde kyrkan ”inkrökt i sig själv” och fick henne att sky kampen för ett rättfärdigt samhälle.

Den tredje villovägen var att förhäva sig och tro kyrkan om mer än vad den kunde leva upp till. Kyrkan överskattade ofta sina möjligheter och hade alltför stora pretentioner. Men rätten var inte ett kristet prerogativ och kristna hade inte bättre förutsättningar än andra att förverkliga rätten. Det fanns, exempelvis i Oxfordrörelsen, en iver och optimism beträffande omvända kristna människors möjligheter. Världen skulle räddas genom att enskilda människor förvandlades. Men omvändelsen gjorde inte ensam människor mer kompetenta att handlägga rättsliga, politiska och ekonomiska frågor. Det var naivt att idealisera de kristna och tro att hela världen skulle

16. Aulén, *Kyrkan och rätten*, 6, 31.

förändras genom dem. Man måste realistiskt inse, att kristna var bristfälliga syndare som alla andra, även om de trodde på rättfärdiggörelsen i Kristus.

Där den sekulariserade naturrätten fick råda utan förankring i Guds dynamiska lag fanns visserligen en riktig insikt om att det inte existerar några ideala, absoluta och allmängiltiga rättsordningar. Alla faktiska historiskt givna rättsordningar är relativa. Men utan det principiella korrektiv som Guds lag utgjorde, fanns en risk att relativiseringen kunde gå ut över rättsens suveränitet. Om rätten i grunden inte var något annat än vad staten fastställde och upprätthöll genom makt och tvång var risken för rättskränkning uppenbar. Men det var för Aulén angeläget att ständigt påminna om att den kristna hänvisningen till skapelsens lag var helt främmande för att man skulle kunna fixera ideala rättsordningar för alla tider den vägen. Det var lika utsiktslöst som att försöka lagstifta utifrån Bergspredikan. Nej, själva rättsordningen måste vara framvuxen ur den aktuella situationen, men skapelsens lag tolkad i kyrkans förkunnelse skulle vara rättsens principiella utgångspunkt och kritiska instans.

Avslutning

Aulén tog varje tillfälle att tala om det som här bara har kunnat antydast: i föreläsningar runt om i landet, vid stora manifestationer för Norge som vid firandet av 17:e maj, i debatter, dagspress, radiotal och predikningar. Som ett exempel på hur det kunde låta väljer jag hans tal när han installerade Alf Corell (1910–2001) i Öja och Västermo sommaren 1942:

I en tid, då kränkningar av rättsens bud hör till ordningen för dagen, då våldets makt härjar på jorden och då livet på ett så fruktansvärt sätt brutaliserats och barbariserats, då se vi på ett nytt sätt, som i blixtljus, att Lagen är den granitklippa, den fasta grundval, på vilken all mänsklig samlevnad måste vila, om icke allt skall gå hän emot upplösning, kaos och undergång. Vi förstå bättre än någonsin vad det betyder att ett samhälle, ett folk får leva under en fast och tryggad rättsordning, får leva i frihet under lagens hägn. Det står oss klart, att det här gäller omistliga värden, ett rikt arv, som vi till det yttersta vilja skydda och värna.

Men det gäller också att klart se, att all mänsklig rättsordning ytterst måste hämta sin kraft och sin styrka från en högre lag, från Guds lag. [...] Denna Guds lag, den gäller sannerligen oss alla, och den gäller hela livet, den gäller just det vardagliga livet, sådant det leveres under dagens

arbete med dess mångahanda olika uppgifter. Att besinna detta är en angelägenhet av yttersta vikt.¹⁷

När Aulén inbjöds att föreläsa vid flera lärosäten i USA 1947, valde han att tala just om skapelsen och lagen. Hans föreläsningar publicerades i USA och Japan, men aldrig i Sverige.¹⁸

Han talade rakt in i den amerikanska *mainline*-protestantismen, som under kriget stärkts i sin självkänsla, var inbegripen i stora hjälpprogram i det krigshärjade Europa, och förberedde sig för stora insatser i världsmissionen och i den internationella ekumeniska rörelsen. Aulén, som smittades av de amerikanska kyrkornas självmedvetande och iver, talade om en realistisk och radikal teologi, som skulle befria kristendomen från det slags pietism, humanisering och modernitet som målat över och dolt den kristna uppenbarelseens ursprungliga kraft. Kristendomen var ännu inte framme: dess autenticitet var inte återfunnen, men den var på god väg. Kristi kyrka skulle framträda allt tydligare.

Andra världskriget var en materiell och moralisk katastrof som hade samband med nazismens förnekande av rättens suveränitet och universella karaktär. Aulén upprepade hur naturrätten sekulariserats och relativiserats och att kyrkan måste göra syndabekännelse och avbön. Kyrkan hade underlåtit att vaka över skapelsens lag och blandat ihop kristendom och allmänna mänskliga ideal. Nu slog Aulén på nytt fast att det var kyrkans ansvar att tjäna alla människor genom att vara rättens levande samvete mitt i samhället:

The Church is not a lord of justice, but instead of that [*sic*] a humble servant of the justice emanating from the divine Law of the Creator. However, because this Law is a universal Law, the Church trustfully commends the claim of this Law to everybody's conscience, freely and openly co-operating with all for whom the care of justice is a holy duty. [...] Nothing would [...] be more mistaken than to separate justice from love. Justice is a legitimate child of the Law of love, its firstborn child, and just as a child of love it has to lay the foundations of all human relationship. Therefore, as regards the relation to Society, no duty of the

17. Gustaf Aulén, "Tal vid kyrkoherde Corells installation i Öja och Westermo, Fjärde Söndagen e. Trefaldighet 1942", Predikningar och tal (vol. 36), Gustaf Auléns samling, Lunds universitetsbibliotek.

18. Gustaf Aulén, *Church, Law and Society*, New York 1948. Boken är tillägnad "The Right Reverend Eivind Berggrav, Bishop of Oslo. True Witness to the Light in the age of darkness and True defender of Justice."

Church can be more important than the duty of vindicating justice as supreme, as well to the state as to an over-national world order.¹⁹

Trots alla sina svagheter måste kyrkan leva upp till sin kallelse i relation till världen för att fullt ut vara kyrka. Kyrkans primära kallelse att med ord och sakrament förkunna Kristi försoning stod kvar, men Aulén ville bryta med kyrkans inåtvändhet och se till att lagen fick en lika framträdande plats i kyrkans uppdrag som evangeliet. Det var vad vi skulle kalla en politisk teologi, föranledd av nazismen, andra världskriget och nu det kalla kriget. Det var en teologi som vann gensvar i både Lutherska världsförbundet och Kyrkornas världsråd, som just höll på att bildas. Men trots Auléns räckvidd och envetenhet, föll lagens första bruk snart åter i skuggan av naturrätten och de reformertas försök att utifrån evangelierna skapa en rättvis värld.

När Aulén blivit hedersdoktor vid universitetet i Glasgow 1952 avslutade han sitt eleganta tacktal med att hänvisa till en latinsk inskription på rådhuset i hans gamla skolstad Kalmar: PIETATE SUBLATA IUSTITIA TOLLITUR.²⁰ De som för länge sedan hade satt dit denna text ansåg att vördnad för det som var heligt och okränkbart uppehöll rätten. Rätten fick inte hanteras godtyckligt. Inskriptionen stod på rådhuset, vilket betydde att rätten i första hand betraktades som statens angelägenhet, men dess grund var en annan, nämligen Guds skapelsegivna lag förtydligad i Kristi utläggning och exempel: du skall älska din nästa som dig själv. Under alla sina år som biskop var Gustaf Aulén upptagen av att tolka och förklara innebörden i denna sentens som han lärt sig som gymnasist i slutet av 1800-talet. ▲

SUMMARY

Gustaf Aulén is remembered for *Christus Victor*, based on a series of lectures in Uppsala in 1930. In 1933, he was elected bishop of Strängnäs, at a time when Nazism gained power in Germany. Aulén became a fervent opponent of oppressive and totalitarian regimes. He developed a contextual theology of resistance based on the Law of Creation given by God and engraved in every human heart. Aulén distanced himself from both liberal theology and Pietism. One could lead to passivity and adaptation, the other to false pretensions and illusionary ideals. In his ambition to address society as a whole, and not only the Christian community, Aulén built his social ethics not on Christology, but on the intentions of the Reformation and a biblical theology of creation. Justice should not be founded on human rationality or natural law (*lex naturalis*), but on the Law

19. Aulén, *Church, Law and Society*, 98.

20. Gustaf Aulén, "Tacktal, Glasgow University 20 juni 1952", *Föredrag och tal* (vol. 39), Gustaf Auléns samling, Lunds universitetsbibliotek. Jämför Aulén, *Kyrkan och rätten*, 3.

of God as a dynamic, creative force to be applied in all realms of life. He distinguished the Law of the Creator from natural law, which especially in its Protestant forms and under the influence of secularization, according to Aulén, had degenerated into a collection of fixed and static rules, whereas the Law of God was a continuous revelation of God's universal will. As the love of God is the essence of the law of justice, for a Christian to be a Christian and for the church to be the church they must actively care for the world in all its needs. Aulén's understanding of justice reflects his understanding of God as a living, creative, struggling, and victorious presence in the world, and the church as entrusted with the Word of God. In the historical context of totalitarianism, the church's primary duty in relation to society was to serve as a living conscience of the justice emanating from the divine law of the Creator, and to do so in cooperation with all for whom justice was a holy duty. When read contextually, there is a fundamental consistence in Aulén's theology from *Christus Victor* to *Church, Law and Society*.

Jonas Ideström & Tone Stangeland Kaufman (red.). *What Really Matters: Scandinavian Perspectives on Ecclesiology and Ethnography*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications. 2018. 293 s.

I och med ett stadigt ökande intresse för etnografiska metoder inom teologin har också behovet av metodologisk reflektion ökat. *What Really Matters* är ett bidrag till den diskussionen, med fokus på den kyrkliga miljön i Skandinavien. Undertiteln ger en snäv beskrivning av bokens innehåll. Både ekklesiologi och etnografi ska här tolkas i bredast möjliga bemärkelse. Det här är en bok om teologi på fältet, om hur teologisk forskning kan bedrivas med hjälp av kvalitativa metoder och om vad som händer när den teologiska forskningen använder levande människor i kyrkliga gemenskaper som källmaterial. En grundtanke hos flera av författarna är att just mötet mellan teologisk forskning och etnografi bidrar till att skapa något nytt.

Efter de introducerande kapitlen, som bland annat innehåller en tydlig och informativ forskningsöversikt av den kvalitativa forskningen inom praktisk teologi och kyrkovetenskap i Skandinavien, är boken indelad i tre delar som i tur och ordning behandlar frågor om reflexivitet, normativitet och representation. Dessa begrepp är inte specifika för teologisk forskning, men som forskare i teologi måste vi i många fall sätta oss in i vad de innebär för oss. Kapitlen i respektive del utgör en blandning av rena metoddiskussioner och exempel från aktuell forskning. Varje del avslutas med en sammanfattande reflektion, som också bidrar till att göra boken till något mer än en antologi med bidrag från olika författare. Dessa tre kapitel, som svarar på tidigare texter, bidrar också till metareflectionen över författarnas konkreta exempel.

Flera av bokens författare, inklusive de båda redaktörerna, tar tydligt ställning för värdet av normativ (kristen) teologisk forskning. I ett sammanhang där icke-konfessionell forskning om religion är den självklara

utgångspunkten är det inte okontroversiellt att förutsätta att den teologiska forskaren också själv är praktiserande kristen och åtminstone i flera fall också tillhör den kyrka som hen forskar på. För att den praktisk-teologiska forskningens framtid är det dock nödvändigt att diskussionen om exempelvis forskarens egen roll och relation till det studerade fältet förs på ett sätt som tar både den enskilda forskaren och forskningsfältet på allvar. I *What Really Matters* lyfts frågan om inifrån- och utifrånperspektiv på flera sätt och även om utgångspunkten är att inifrånperspektivet kan tillföra mycket reflekterar kapitelförfattarna också ärligt och självutlämnande över när svårigheter kan uppstå. Genom att skandinaviska forskare här vågar skriva från det inomkyrkliga perspektiv som de ändå inte kan fly ifrån, kan de vända sin subjektivitet till något positivt och därmed utveckla forskningen. Dessutom bidrar de till en ny typ av forskning på den speciella situation som de nordiska folkkyrkorna utgör.

Bokens författare kommer inte bara från de skandinaviska länderna, även om det perspektivet tillåts dominera. I stället har redaktörerna valt att också ta in bidrag från forskare från den anglosaxiska världen. Dessa bidrag är värdefulla för att ge ett större perspektiv och visa på metodologiska grepp som ännu känns ovana här.

Det framgår tydligt, inte minst genom de avslutande reflektionerna i varje del av boken, att redaktörerna har velat göra *What Really Matters* till en helhet. Med det i åtanke är det märkligt att boken saknar ett avslutande kapitel som knyter ihop de olika delarna. Reflexivitet, normativitet och representation är inte begrepp frikopplade från varandra, utan tvärtom beroende av varandra. Hur denna ömsesidiga påverkan ser ut hade kunnat tydliggöras i ett sammanfattande och framåtblickande slutkapitel.

Ideström och Kaufman skriver i kapitel 13 om forskaren som "spelledare". Detta är en bild som Kaufman använt tidigare, med inspiration från Suzanne Collins trilogi om Hungerspelen. I Collins böcker tävlar en

grupp ungdomar instängda på en enorm arena, eller spelplan. Arenan skapas och nyskapas av en allsmäktig spelledare, som därmed när som helst kan förändra förutsättningarna för spelet. Med hjälp av bilden av forskaren som spelledare vill Idestrom och Kaufman tydliggöra forskarens makt över vilka röster som hörs och hur forskningsfältet ser ut och kan förändras. I *What Really Matters* framkommer dock att forskaren inte bara, som i början av Hungerspelens-serien, sitter i säkerhet utanför spelplanen och styr villkoren för människorna som deltar i tävlingen. Den forskare som direkt och indirekt lyfts fram i de olika artiklarna måste också ha beredskap för att forskningspersonerna själva, likt Hungerspelens Katniss, en dag kommer att krossa hinnan som skiljer forskaren från forskningen och spelledaren från de tävlande.

What Really Matters är ett viktigt bidrag till den metodologiska diskussionen i praktisk teologi och kyrkovetenskap. Genom att använda delvis beteendevetenskapliga metoder kan dessa ämnen tillföra något unikt med hjälp av en självreflekterande teologisk analys som inte skäms för sitt inifrånperspektiv, utan vänder det till en styrka. Författarna banar väg för ett nyskapande sätt att beskriva teologisk forskning och metodologiskt försvara en medveten subjektivitet i relation till kyrkan som forskningsobjekt. Den visar på forskning som går över gränser och som drar in forskningspersoner och läsare i en meningsskapande process.

Karin Rubenson
Doktorand, Uppsala

Dominic Legge. *The Trinitarian Christology of St Thomas Aquinas*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2018. 288 s.

Dominic Legges bok om Thomas av Aquino (1225–1274) är uppbyggd som en dogmatik, hans föresats är att ge läsaren en särskild ingång till kristen tro genom att systematiskt ordna trossatser i relation till varandra. Precis

som all dogmatik måste naturligtvis ett fokus formuleras, tillsammans med en metod. Legges fokus är kristologin och hans metod är till synes konventionell: han formulerar kristologin i relation till trosbekännelsernas uppdelningar mellan Fader, Son och Ande. Bokens uppgift är också att beskriva kristologin som en *trinitarisk* kristologi. Legge bygger upp sitt arbete genom att dels betona de utgående handlingarna, alltså personernas ”missionsområden”, dels genom att framhäva personernas funktion inom treenigheten och den hypostatiska föreningen. Uppbyggnaden handlar grovt betraktat om skapelsen, relationen mellan de tre personerna och inkarnationen. Tyngdpunkten ligger på de två senare, även om områdena av naturliga skäl, som vi kommer att se, går in i varandra.

Om vi vill finna den kanske viktigaste poängen som Legge gör i sin läsning av Thomas, så berör detta de tre personernas aktiva närvaro i inkarnationen. Vanligtvis förstår vi den hypostatiska föreningen (föreningen mellan mänskligt och gudomligt i Kristus) som en angelägenhet främst för den andra personen inom treenigheten. Här är alla med någorlunda kunskaper i kristen dogmatik troligen vana vid att föreställa sig den hypostatiska föreningen som ett resultat av Sonens utgående, möjligtvis efter Faderns vilja och Andens medverkan. Detta är också en korrekt beskrivning. Men knuten som Legge menar att Thomas löser upp, är den ständigt närvarande monofysitiska faran som ackompanjerat västerländsk teologi: Vem är *egentligen* ansvarig för Kristi mänskliga natur? Om Sonen själv efter inkarnationen är ansvarig för sin mänskliga natur och själv upprätthåller den borde detta innebära att också den mänskliga naturen i Kristus i någon mening blir gudomlig. Därmed försvaras enligt Legge en ortodox läsning av avsluten från konciliet i Kalcedon år 451. Om Sonen själv upprätthåller sin mänskliga natur som är ”utan synd” blir felslutet alltså ett slags monofysitism, och inte dyofysitism, att Kristus har två naturer som ”är oskiljaktigt

och oupplösligt förbundna utan förvandling eller sammanblandning”.

Detta problem menar Legge att Thomas löser genom att hävda att det snarare är den heliga Anden som genom nåd verkar i Kristi mänskliga natur och därmed ger rätt beskaflenhet, eller habitus. Det är alltså Anden som ”bereder” en syndfri mänsklig natur åt Kristus och ger honom rätt kunskap. Legge framhåller vidare hur Thomas betonar Sonen som Faderns talade Ord, även det ett exempel på hur han förstår trinitarisk teologi som själva hjärtat också av kristologin. Legge gör oss alltså en stor tjänst genom att med hjälp av Thomas lyfta fram ofta förbisedda aspekter av kristologin.

Dominic Legge är dominikanbroder, precis som Thomas, och boken är befäst med imprimatur. Detta är naturligtvis på samma gång såväl betryggande som tråkigt. Å ena sidan slipper vi anmärka på besynnerliga tolkningar av Thomas, men å andra sidan kanske detta är något som hade gjort det hela mer ”spännande”? Min omedelbara reaktion – som sedan följer mig i läsningen – är alltså det utpräglat konventionella draget, även om flera originella resonemang samtidigt förs. Legge skriver som romersk-katolsk fackteolog och för en diskussion med två av de stora namnen från Andra Vatikankonciliet. Yves Congar (1904–1995) bidrar till diskussionen om den heliga Andens delaktighet i inkarnationen. Men det är framför allt när Legge relaterar till Karl Rahner (1904–1984), som resonemanget tar fart på allvar. Legge ställer sig starkt kritisk till Rahners ”uppdelning” av treenigheten som dels ekonomisk och dels immanent. Enligt Legge förstår Thomas i stället treenigheten som fullt uppenbarad i Kristus. Det är i och genom Kristus som treenigheten helt och hållet presenteras och uppenbaras. Rahner och många andra beskriver å ena sidan hur treenigheten är ”i sig själv” och å andra sidan hur den ”uppenbaras”, vilket Legge frångår. Treenigheten i Legges läsning av Thomas såväl presenteras som avslöjas helt och fullt i och med Sonens människoblivande.

Treenighetsläran överlag såväl som forskning om Thomas är påtaglig inom samtida teologi. Trots Legges diskussion med portalgestalter inom romersk-katolsk teologi i förhållande till Thomas och treenighetsläran saknar jag dock den samtida, mångbottnade men också svåra diskussionen inom främst brittisk teologi. Såväl Sarah Coakley som Rowan Williams, John Milbank, Catherine Pickstock och Andrew Louth med flera har på ett pregnant sätt engagerat sig i trinitariska motiv. De sista fyra har dessutom gjort det i nära anslutning till just Thomas och kristologin, liksom till frågor som rör ontologin. Treenigheten är helt enkelt ”inne”!

Legge väljer, kanske av utrymmesskäl eller på grund av bokens begränsade uppgift, att helt förbigå dessa diskussioner. En annan anmärkning är den ekumeniska dimensionen, som helt saknas. Diskussionen som rör exempelvis Andens utgående, som förs boken igenom, tenderar att cementera ortodoxa anmärkningar runt *filioque*, vilket är beklagansvärt. Till Legges stora förtjänster hör emellertid materialbehandlingen. Till skillnad från andra läsningar av Thomas som ibland nästan helt saknar referenser till hans egna texter, exempelvis Milbanks och Pickstocks särpräglade arbeten, så gäller det helt omvända för Legge. De många referenserna underbygger arbetet så till den grad att boken mycket väl lämpar sig för studier i Thomas teologi överlag, och den skulle säkert fungera utmärkt som kurslitteratur inom systematisk teologi eller religionsfilosofi.

Johan Wallner
Masterstudent, Lund

**Joan Wallach Scott. *Sex and Secularism*.
Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
2018. 235 s.**

Ingelhart's kulturkarta, vilken årligen tas fram inom ramen för forskningsprojektet *World Values Survey*, visar att de nordiska länderna i större utsträckning än övriga

världen karaktäriseras av sekulärt-rationella och självuttryckande värderingar. Samma länder brukar ligga i topp när olika organisationer listar världens mest jämställda länder. Föreställningen att sekularism och jämställdhet hör ihop är utbredd och kan utifrån det ovanstående framstå som trovärdig, men stämmer det? Endast det genomslag som #metoo-rörelsen fått i Sverige och övriga ”sekulära” Europa komplicerar bilden. Joan Wallach Scott hävdar i *Sex and Secularism* att kopplingen mellan sekularism och jämställdhet har skapats för att å ena sidan osynliggöra orättvisor i den moderna västvärlden och för att samtidigt framställa islam som en förtryckande religion å den andra. Hon ser som sitt uppdrag att visa hur det tvärtom är den sekulära ideologin som skapat en asymmetrisk genusordning i västvärlden, inte minst genom uppdelningen av samhället i privata och offentliga sfärer.

Scott är en av världens mest framstående genushistoriker och det är med största sannolikhet hennes intresse för fransk historia som lett till forskningen om sekularism. Redan 2007 publicerade hon *The Politics of the Veil*, vilken behandlar det slöjförbud som instiftades i franska skolor 2004 (och som 2010 kom att utvidgas till att gälla allmän plats). *Sex and Secularism* får anses vara en fortsättning och en breddning av diskussionen. Scott tar sig här an inte bara en stor del av den moderna västvärlden, utan också hur dess länder påverkade utvecklingen i sina kolonier.

I bokens första kapitel, ”Women and Religion”, visar Scott hur religiositet från och med slutet av 1700-talet började framställas som något feminint. Utan att förhålla sig till den omfattande forskning som bedrivits om denna feminisering under senare år driver författaren den intressanta tesen att det var sekularismens påhejare som låg bakom denna diskursiva feminisering. Scott understryker också hur denna utveckling resulterade i att samfund, vilka tidigare haft kvinnor i ledande positioner, plötsligt såg det som angeläget att skaffa ett homogent manligt

ledarskap för att undgå kritik. Den diskursiva feminiseringen innebar också att kvinnors religiösa engagemang tolkades som en förlängning av deras arbete i hushållet, vilket förstärkte bilden av religion som hemmahörande i den privata, feminina sfären. I det offentliga skulle religionen emellertid inte ha något inflytande, vilket bland annat kom till uttryck genom att rätten till kvinnlig rösträtt aktivt motarbetades i sekularismens namn, då rösterna från kvinnorna – som ansågs vara prästernas undergivna hantlangare – skulle bidra till ökat politiskt inflytande för kyrkan.

I ”Reproductive Futurism”, bokens andra kapitel, visar Scott hur sekularismen återopade biologin för att upprätthålla en ojämn samhällesordning. Kapitlets titel anspelar på Lee Edelmans forskning och blir för Scott en förklaring till hur sekularismen gör upp med dödens innebörd: den biologiska reproduktionen blir den nya garanten för odödlighet, vilken ersätter religionens löfte om ett evigt liv. Därutöver beskrevs de separata sfärerna som en biologiskt naturlig uppdelning av kvinnor och män, i vad som var en asymmetrisk komplementär genusordning. Den moraliska och kroppsliga disciplineringen av kvinnor och män legitimerades på vetenskapliga snarare än religiösa grunder.

Det tredje kapitlet, ”Political Emancipation”, visar att kravet på just sådan – politisk frigörelse – inte vederlades med grundandet av den moderna, sekulära staten. I flera länder kom det att dröja långt in på 1900-talet innan kvinnor fick rösträtt och deras politiska frigörelse innebar i regel inte ett jämställt samhälle. Genom att hänvisa till Simone de Beauvoir (1908–1986) understryker Scott att kvinnan, även när hon fått medborgerliga rättigheter, förblev ”det andra könet”.

I de två avslutande kapitlen, ”From the Cold War to the Clash of Civilizations” och ”Sexual Emancipation”, uppehåller sig Scott vid hur islam sedan kalla krigets dagar kommit att framställas som sekularismens antites. Diskursen kring civilisationernas kamp, menar Scott, innebar att den på kristendomen grundade sekularismen framställdes

som jämställdhetens fristad medan islam beskrevs som förtryckande, särskilt mot kvinnor. Scott argumenterar för hur detta kom till uttryck inte minst genom den sexuella frigörelse som ägde rum i stora delar av västvärlden under 1960- och 1970-talen, men visar övertygande att sexuell frigörelse inte innebar politisk, ekonomisk eller social frigörelse. Däremot användes och används den sexuella frigörelsen som ett argument för jämställdhet när sekularister använder den beslöjade kroppen som bevis på att muslimska kvinnor lever under förtryck.

Att på ett uttömmande sätt granska diskurser kring genus och sekularism i västvärlden från den franska revolutionen, vilken Scott ser som en vattendelare, till i dag låter sig inte göras i en kort volym som *Sex and Secularism*. Författaren är medveten om det och varnar redan i inledningskapitlet att vissa läsare kommer att sakna fördjupningar inom vissa områden. Något som i detta sammanhang måste framhållas är att Scott i ytterst begränsad utsträckning förhåller sig till den omfattande forskningen om sekularism och sekularisering som bedrivits av historiker, sociologer, religionsvetare, filosofer och teologer under flera decennier. Detta hänger samman med att hon i främsta rummet är intresserad av sekularism ur Michel Foucaults (1926–1984) diskursiva och genealogiska perspektiv, snarare än som en faktisk och bestämd historisk företeelse. Trots att detta och flera andra perspektiv uteblir lyckas Scott framgångsrikt och med teoretisk precision visa att genus är en nödvändig aspekt att beakta i studiet av sekularism och sekularisering.

*Martin Nykvist
Doktorand, Lund*

Anders Ackfeldt. *Islamic Semiotic Resources in US Hip-Hop Culture*. Lund: Lund University. 2019. 214 pp.

Elisabeth Gerle & Michael Schelde (red.). *American Perspectives Meet Scandinavian Creation Theology*. Aarhus: Aarhus University. 2019. 87 pp.

Rune Imberg & Torbjörn Johansson (red.). *Den mångfacetterade reformationen*. Göteborg: Församlingsförlaget. 2019. 303 s.

Tao Thykier Makeeff. *Do Satyrs Wear Sneakers? Hellenic Polytheism and the Reception of Antiquity in Contemporary Greece – A Study in Serious Play*. Lund: Lund University. 2019. 332 pp.

Michael Agerbo Mørch, Jonas Kjøller-Rasmussen & Carsten Elmelund Petersen (red.). *Fra Wittenberg til verden: Martin Luther dengang og idag*. Fredericia: Kolon. 2019. 232 s.

Elena Namli & Carl-Henric Grenholm. *Etik*. Lund: Studentlitteratur. 2019. 352 s.

Benny Grey Schuster. *Om påskelatteren*. Köpenhamn: Vandkunsten. 2019. 492 s.

Lennart Sjöström (red.). *Innan murarna föll: Svenska kyrkan under kalla kriget*. Skellefteå: Artos & Norma. 2019. 640 s.

Till redaktionen insänd litteratur