Evangelical Review of Theology

A Global Forum

GENERAL EDITOR: THOMAS SCHIRRMACHER

Volume 41 · Number 1 · January 2017

Published by

Paternoster:
thinking faith

WEA
WORLD EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE
Theological Commission

for
WORLD EVANGELICAL
ALLIANCE
Theological Commission

ERT (2017) 41:1, 67-86

Work, Spirit, and New Creation

Miroslav Volf

I A Pneumatological Theology of Work?

One cannot talk about the new creation without referring to the Spirit of God. For the Spirit, as Paul says, is the 'first fruits' or the 'down payment' of the future salvation (see Rom 8:23; 2 Cor 1:22) and the present power of eschatological transformation in them. In the Gospels, too, Spirit is the agent through which the future new creation is anticipated in the present (see Mt 12:28). Without the Spirit there is no experience of the new creation! A theology of work that seeks to understand work as active anticipation of the *transformatio mundi* must, therefore, be a *pneumatological* theology of work.

1. Work and the Spirit

But what does the Spirit of God have to do with the mundane work of human beings? According to most of Protestant theology, very little. It has been 'inclined to restrict the activity of the Spirit to the spiritual, psychological, moral or religious life of the individual.'[1] One can account for this restriction by two consequential theological decisions. To use traditional formulations: first, the activity of the Spirit was limited to the sphere of salvation, and second, the *locus* of the present realization of salvation was limited to the human spirit.

[Elsewhere, I have tried] to show that the Spirit of God is not only *spiritus redemptor* but also *spiritus creator*.[2] Thus when the Spirit comes into the world as Redeemer he does not come to a foreign territory, but 'to his own home' (Jn 1:12)[3]—the world's lying in the power of evil notwithstanding. Here, however, I want to discuss briefly the limitation of the Spirit's salvific operation on the human spirit. For my purposes, this is the crucial issue. The question of whether one can reflect on

1 A. I. C. Heron, *The Holy Spirit: The Holy Spirit in the Bible, the History of Christian Thought, and Recent Theology* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983), 154.

2 See Volf, *Work in the Spirit,* 143f.

3 See H. Berkhof, *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (Richmond: John Knox, 1964), 96.

Miroslav Volf *is the founding Director of the Yale Center for Faith and Culture. His books include* Allah: A Christian Response *(2011), and* Free of Charge: Giving and Forgiving in a Culture Stripped of Grace *(2006). He has been involved in international ecumenical and interfaith dialogues. A native of Croatia, he regularly lectures in Central and Eastern Europe. This article is an edited extract from his book,* Work in the Spirit *(Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 2001), Chapter 3, 'Work, Spirit, and New Creation', 102-122, and is published with permission.*

human work within the framework of the concept of the new creation and develop a pneumatological theology of work depends on the question of whether the Spirit's salvific work is limited to the human spirit or extends to the whole of reality.

The exclusion of the human body and materiality in general from the sphere of salvation in Protestant thought[4] is well illustrated by Luther's *The Freedom of a Christian,* a 'small book' that in Luther's own opinion, nevertheless contained his view of 'the whole of Christian life in a brief form.'[5] Later Protestant theologians have followed Luther rather closely in regard to the materiality of salvation.[6]

In *The Freedom of a Christian Luther* makes the well known distinction between the 'inner man' and the 'outward man.' For the discussion of the materiality of salvation it is crucial to determine what, exactly, Luther means by these expressions. The matter is not as simple as it looks, because he equivocates and makes a *twofold* distinction in his use of those terms.[7]

First, and most obviously, Luther makes an *anthropological* distinction. The exact nature of this anthropological distinction is not easy to establish. In particular, it is not clear what he means by the 'inner man.' Fortunately, Luther is very clear on what he means by the 'outward man': it is the aspect of the human being that is sick or well, free or imprisoned, that eats or hungers, drinks or thirsts, experiences pleasure or suffers some external misfortune.[8] The outward man is a person with respect to his bodily existence in the world.

That leaves the inner man stripped of all corporeality as 'the naked self which exists concealed in his [human being's] heart.'[9] Whatever 'the naked self,' or as Luther says, the 'soul,' is, one thing is certain: for Luther it does not denote a human being's bodily existence.

Superimposed on the anthropological distinction between inner and outward man is the second, *soteriological* distinction between 'new man' and 'old man.' Significant for the study of the materiality of salvation is the fact that Luther applies the soteriological distinction between new and old only to the inner man. '*Outward man' is*

4 On this issue, see Miroslav Volf, "Materiality of Salvation. An Investigation in the Soteriologies of Liberation and Pentecostal Theologies." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 26 (1989): 447–67.

5 Luther, *WA,* 1, 11, 8–9. Together with De servo arbitrio this treatise can most easily be described as a 'systematic presentation of his [Luther's] theology' (G. Ebeling, *Luther: An Introduction to His Thought* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970], 212).

6 There is no need to document this statement extensively, I will give only one example. Taking up Luther's distinction between 'inward' and 'outward man,' Bultmann writes: when a person becomes a new creation, 'outwardly everything remains as before, but inwardly his relation to the world has been radically changed' (R. Bultmann, "New Testament and Mythology." In H. W. Bartsch (ed.), *Kerygma and Myth: A Theological Debate* [New York: Harper & Row, 1961] 20).

7 For a discussion of the differences and similarities between Luther's, Plato's, and Aristotle's talk about inner and outward man, see E. Jüngel, *Zur Freiheit eines Christenmenschen. Eine Erinnerung an Luthers Schrift* (München, Kaiser, 1981), 69ff., 116ff.

8 Luther, *WA,* 7, 21f.

9 Ebeling, *Luther,* 202.

and (until the day of the resurrection of the dead) *will remain 'old man'*—in the case of both the Christian and the non-Christian. Only the inner man can become a new man. The anthropological *locus* of salvation is the inner man.[10] The outward man and the whole material reality remain outside the sphere of the salvific activity of God.[11]

We need to look no further than the Gospels to see that the exclusion of materiality from the sphere of the present salvific activity of the Spirit is exegetically and theologically unacceptable. The Gospels widely use soteriological terminology (e.g., the term *sōzein*) to designate deliverance from the troubles and dangers of bodily life.[12] More significantly, they portray Jesus' healing miracles as signs of the inbreaking kingdom.[13]

As deeds done in the power of the Spirit, healings are not merely symbols of God's future rule, but are anticipatory realizations of God's present rule. They provide tangible testimony to the materiality of salvation; they demonstrate God's desire to bring integrity to the whole human being, including the body, and to the whole of injured reality.[14] In a broken way—for healed people are not delivered from the power of death—healings done here and now through the power of the Spirit illustrate what will happen at the end of the age when God will transform the present world into the promised new creation.

When the ascended Christ gave the Spirit, he 'released the power of God into history, power which will not abate until God has made all things new.'[15] The Spirit of the new creation cannot be tied to the 'inner man.' Because the whole creation is the Spirit's sphere of operation, the Spirit is not only the Spirit of religious experience but also the Spirit of worldly engagement. For this reason it is not at all strange to connect the Spirit of God with mundane work. In fact, an adequate understanding of human work will be hardly

10 See Jüngel, *Freiheit,* 72–73. Calvin seemed to have thought somewhat differently than Luther on the issue: 'We should note that the spiritual union which we have with Christ is not a matter of the soul alone, but of the body also, so that we are flesh of his flesh, etc. (Eph 5:30). The hope of resurrection would be faint, if our union with him were not complete and total like that' (Calvin, *The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960], ad 1 Cor 6, 15).

11 It should be noted that classical Protestantism did not deny that the full experience of salvation directly affects bodily existence, for it did expect the future resurrection of the body. The point is that the salvation experience does not directly affect human bodily existence in the present, i.e., before the consummation.

12 See W. Schrage, 'Heil und Heilung in Neue Testament,' *EvTh* 46 (1986), 200.

13 See G. E. Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 76f.

14 See Jürgen Moltmann, *Der Weg Jesu Christi: Christologie in messianischen Dimensionen* (München: Kaiser, 1989), 127. Without knowing the results of modern New Testament studies, Pentecostalists have rightly maintained that by experiencing healing of the body, people became 'partakers of the *bodily nature of the kingdom of God*' (E. P. Paulk, *Your Pentecostal Neighbor* [Cleveland: Pathway, 1958], 110—italics mine).

15 C. H. Pinnock, "Introduction," in G. Vandervelde (ed.), *The Holy Spirit: Renewing and Empowering Presence* (Winfield: Wood Lake, 1989), 7.

possible without recourse to pneumatology.[16]

2. Work and charisms

In a sense, a pneumatological understanding of work is not new. There are traces of it even in Luther. He discussed the *vocatio externa* not only in the context of the Pauline concept of the Body of Christ (which is closely related to Paul's understanding of charisms) but also—and sometimes explicitly—in the context of the gifts of grace: 'Behold, here St. Peter says that the *graces and gifts* of God are not of one but of varied kind. Each one should understand what his gift is, and practice it and so be of use to others.'[17]

In recent years authors from various Christian traditions have suggested interpreting human work as an aspect of charismatic life.[18] The document of the Vatican II *Gaudium et spes* contains probably the most notable example of a charismatic interpretation of Christians' service to their fellow human beings through work: 'Now, the gifts of the Spirit are diverse… He summons… [people] to dedicate themselves to the earthly service of men and to make ready the material of the celestial realm by this ministry of theirs.'[19] To my knowledge, however, no one has taken up these suggestions and developed them into a consistent theology of work.

The pneumatological understanding of work I am proposing is an heir to the vocational understanding of work, predominant in the Protestant social ethic of all traditions.[20] Before develop-

16 Similarly W. Kasper, "Die Kirche als Sakrament der Geistes," in W. Kasper and G Stauter (eds.), *Kirche—Ort des Geistes* (Freiburg: Herder, 1976), 35, with reference to a theology of the world, culture, and politics.

17 Luther, *WA,* 10, I, 311—italics mine. For an early Protestant (and conservative) application of the gifts theme from Romans 12 to the secular and not only the ecclesiastical activities of Christians, see Laurence Chaderton's famous sermon on Romans 12, called 'A fruitful sermon, upon the 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 verse of the 12 chapter of the epistle of St. Paul to the Romanes' (Lake, Puritans, 28ff.).

18 See, for instance, H. Mühlen, "Charisma und Gesellschaft," in H. Mühlen (ed.), *Gestesgaben heute* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald, 1982) 168; G. Lampe, *God as Spirit* (London: SCM, 1983), 202; J. V. Taylor, *The Go-Between God: The Holy Spirit and the Christian Mission* (London: SCM, 1972), 26f. For examples from non-Christian tradition, see Plato, who says: 'Again, in artificial manufacture, we do not know that a man who has this god for a teacher turns out a brilliant success, whereas he on whom Love has laid no hold is obscure? If Apollo invented archery and medicine and divination, it was under the guidance of Desire and Love; so that he too may be deemed a disciple of Love, as likewise may the Muses in music, Hephrestus in metal-work, Athene in weaving…'(*Symposium,* 197Af.). A. K. Coomraswamy, following Plato's lead, has suggested a kind of 'pneumatological' understanding of work: 'So the maker of anything, if he is to be called creator, is at his best the servant of an immanent Genius… he is not working of or for himself, but by and for another energy, that of the Immanent Eros, Sanctus Spiritus, the source of all "gifts"' (A. K. Coomaraswamy, "A Figure of Speech or a Figure of Thought?" in R. Lipsey (ed.), *Selected Papers: Traditional Art and* Symbolism [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977], 33).

19 W. M. Abbott, S.J. (ed.), *The Documents of Vatican II,* Gaudium et Spes (New York: Guild, 1966), n. 38.

20 See, for instance, two contemporary Protestant writers from different segments of Protestantism, D. Field and E. Stephenson, *Just the Job: Christians Talk about Work and Vocation* (Leicester: InterVarsity, 1978), 18ff; and J. C.

ing a pneumatological understanding of work, it is therefore helpful to investigate both the strengths and weaknesses of the vocational understanding of work. Similarly to any other theory, a particular theology of work will be persuasive to the extent that one can show its theological and historical superiority over its rivals.

II Work as Vocation

Both Luther and Calvin, each in his own way, held the vocational view of work. Since Luther not only originated the idea but also wrote on it much more extensively than Calvin, I will develop my theology of work in critical dialogue with Luther's notion of vocation (which differs in some important respects from Calvin's,[21] and even more from that of the later Calvinists).

The basis of Luther's understanding of vocation is his doctrine of justification by faith, and the occasion for its development, his controversy with medieval monasticism. One of Luther's most culturally influential accomplishments was to overcome the monastic reduction of *vocatio* to a calling to a particular kind of religious life. He came to hold two interrelated beliefs about Christian vocation: (1) all Christians (not only monks) have a vocation, and (2) *every type of work* performed by Christians (not only religious activity) can be a vocation.

Instead of interpreting *vocatio* as a call of a select group within the larger Christian fellowship to a special kind of life, Luther spoke of the double vocation of every Christian: spiritual vocation (*vocatio spiritualis*) and external vocation (*vocatio externa*). Spiritual vocation is God's call to enter the kingdom of God, and it comes to a person through the proclamation of the Gospel. This call is common to all Christians and is for all Christians the same ('*communis et similis*').[22]

External vocation is God's call to serve God and one's fellow human beings in the world. It comes to a person through her station in life or profession (*Stand*).[23] This call, too, is addressed to all Christians, but to each one in a different way, depending on his particular station or profession ('*macht ein unterscheid*').[24]

In *Kirchenpostille* 1522—a work in which Luther uses 'vocation' for the first time as a *terminus technicus* 'for a purely secular activity'[25]—Luther gives an explanation of external vocation while answering the question of someone who feels without a vocation:

> What if I am not called? What should I do? Answer: How can it be that you are not called? You are certainly in a station (*Stand*), you are either a husband or a wife, son or daughter, male or female servant.[26]

To be a husband, wife, child, or serv-

Raines and D. C. Day-Lower, *Modern Work and Human Meaning* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 94ff.

21 See Calvin, *Institutes,* 724f.

22 Luther, *WA,* 34, II, 300.

23 I take it that Luther's use of vocation is not limited to one's standing within the three orders but often equals the person's occupation (contra Bockmühl, "Ethics," 108).

24 Luther, *WA,* 34, II, 306.

25 G. Wingren, "Beruf II: Historische und ethische Aspekte," in G. Krause and G. Müller (eds.), *TRE* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1980), 661.

26 Luther, *WA,* 10, I, 308.

ant means to be called by God to a particular kind of activity, it means to have a vocation. When God's spiritual call through the proclamation of the gospel reaches a person in her station or profession, it transforms these into a vocation. The duties of the station become commandments of God to her. In this way, Luther links the daily work of every Christian inseparably with the centre of Christian faith: for a Christian, work in every profession, and not only in ecclesiastical professions, rests on a divine calling.

Two important and related consequences follow from Luther's notion of vocation. These insights make up the *novum* of Luther's approach to human work. First Luther's notion of vocation ascribed much greater value to work than was previously the case. As Weber rightly observed, Luther valued

> the fulfillment of duty in worldly affairs as the highest form which the moral activity of the individual could assume… The only way of living acceptably to God was not to surpass worldly morality in monastic asceticism, but solely through the fulfillment of the obligations imposed upon the individual by his position in the world.[27]

Second, Luther's notion of vocation *overcame the medieval hierarchy between* vita activa *and* vita contemplativa.[28] Since every vocation rests on God's commission, every vocation is fundamentally of the same value before God.

III Limits of the Vocational Understanding of Work

A responsible theology of work should seek to preserve Luther's insight into God's call to everyday work with its two consequences. The way Luther (and especially later Lutheranism) developed and applied this basic insight is, however, problematic. Luther's notion of vocation has serious limitations, both in terms of its applicability to modern work, and in its theological persuasiveness.

1. Critique of Vocation

(1) Luther's understanding of work as vocation is *indifferent toward alienation* in work. In his view, two indispensable features sufficiently qualify a particular work theologically as vocation. The two features are the call of God and one's service to fellow human beings. The origin and purpose of work, not the inherent quality of work, define vocation.

Hence it seems that virtually *every* type of work can be a vocation, no matter how dehumanizing it might be (provided that in doing the work one does not transgress the commandments of God).[29] Although it could never be one's vocation to be a prostitute because it entails breaking God's commandment, the vocational understanding of work does not in any way prevent mindless work on the assembly line at a galloping pace from being considered as a vocation.

Such broad applicability might seem a desirable feature for an understanding of work, especially since (as

27 M. Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958), 80.

28 Volf, *Work in the Spirit,* 70.

29 See Weber, *Ethic,* 282.

Calvin pointed out) it can give 'singular consolation' to people whose work is 'sordid and base.'[30] But one can have broad applicability and the benefits of consolation only at the expense of the transforming potential for overcoming alienation in situations when transformation is both necessary and possible. If even the 'lifting of a single straw' is a 'completely divine'[31] work, there is no reason why the same description could not apply to the most degrading types of work in industrial and information societies.

(2) There is a *dangerous ambiguity* in Luther's notion of vocation. In his view, spiritual calling comes through the proclamation of the gospel, while external calling comes through one's station (*Stand*). It has proven difficult for Lutheran theology to reconcile the two callings in the life of an individual Christian when a conflict arises between them.

> The history of Lutheranism as well as Lutheran ethics shows that Luther's bold identification of vocation [i.e., *vocatio externa*] with the call [i.e., *vocatio spiritualis*] led again and again to the integration of the call into vocation and vocation into occupation, and thus to the consecration of the *vocational-occupational* structure. 'Vocation began to gain the upper hand over the call; the Word of God on the right (gospel) was absorbed by the word of God on the left (law).'[32]

(3) The understanding of work as vocation is easily misused ideologically. As already indicated, Luther elevated work in every profession to the level of divine service.[33] The problem arises when one combines such a high valuation of work with both indifference to alienation and the identification of calling with occupation. Since the notion of vocation suggests that every employment is a place of service to God—even when human activity in work is reduced to 'soulless movement'—this notion functions simply to ennoble dehumanizing work in a situation where the quality of work should be improved through structural or other kinds of change. The vocational understanding of work provides no resources to foster such change.

(4) The notion of vocation is not applicable to the increasingly mobile industrial and information society. Most people in these societies do not keep a single job or employment for a lifetime, but often switch from one job to another in the course of their active life. The half-life of most job skills is dropping all the time, so they have to change jobs. And even if they could keep their jobs, they often feel that being tied down to a job is a denial of their freedom and of the opportunity for development.

Industrial and information societies are characterized by a *diachronic plurality of employments or jobs* for their members. Luther's understanding of external vocation corresponds necessarily to the singleness and permanence of

30 Calvin, *Institutes,* 725.

31 Luther, *WA,* 10, I, 317.

32 J. Moltmann, 'The Right to Work,' in *On Human Dignity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 47.

33 On Luther's understanding of work as divine service, see H. Gatzen, 'Beruf bei Martin Luther und in der industriellen Gesellschaft' (Th. D. diss., University of Münster, 1964), 79.

spiritual calling. As there is one irrevocable spiritual calling, so there must be one irrevocable external calling.

Given Luther's affirmation of the singleness and static nature of external vocation, it is easy to understand why he regularly relates his comments about external vocation to a conservative interpretation of the body of Christ and adds the injunction: 'Let each one remain in his vocation, and live content with his gift.'[34] The injunction to 'remain' and 'be satisfied' is a logical consequence of the notion of vocation.[35] To change one's employment is to fail to remain faithful to God's initial commandment.

The only way to interpret change of employment positively and at the same time hold to the notion of vocation is to assume a diachronic plurality of external vocations. The soteriological meaning of vocation, which serves as a paradigm for the socioethical understanding of vocation, however, makes such an assumption anomalous. For singularity and permanence are constitutive characteristics of the soteriological understanding of vocation.

(5) In industrial and information societies people increasingly take on more than one job or employment at the same time. *Synchronic plurality of employments or jobs* is an important feature of these societies. In Lutheran theology, *vocatio externa* as a rule refers to a single employment or job, which people hold throughout their lives. This corresponds, of course, to the singularity of *vocatio spiritualis.* Unlike much of Lutheran theology, Luther himself maintained that, since a person mostly belonged to more than one *Stand* (she might have been daughter, mistress, and wife, all at the same time), a person had more than one external vocation.[36]

His sense of reality led him to break loose from the exegetical and dogmatic framework set up with the concept of vocation. He is more consistent with this concept when he exhorts a person not to 'meddle' in another's vocation.[37] Strictly speaking, one may take work to be *vocatio* only if one assumes that a Christian should have just one employment or job.[38]

(6) As the nature of human work changed in the course of industrialization, vocation was reduced to gainful employment. Lutheran social ethic followed this sociological development and, departing from Luther but in analogy to the singularity of the *vocatio spiritualis,* reduced its notion of vocation to gainful employment.[39]

The reduction of vocation to employment, coupled with the belief that vocation is the primary service ordinary people render to God, contributed to the modern fateful elevation of work to the status of religion. The religious pursuit of work plays havoc with the

34 Luther, *WA,* 42, 640.

35 Calvin claims that God gave human beings vocations because he knew 'with what great restlessness human nature flames' (Calvin, *Institutes,* 724). Having a calling from God, a person 'of obscure station will lead a private life ungrudgingly so as not to leave the rank in which he has been placed by God' (Calvin, *Institutes,* 725).

36 See Wingren, *Beruf,* 17.

37 Luther, *WA,* 34, II, 307.

38 G. Wunsch, *Evangelische Wirtschaftsethik* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1927), 579.

39 See W. Trilhaas, *Ethik* (Berlin: Walter de Gruiter, 1970, 3rd ed.), 396.

working individual, his fellow human beings, and nature.

1. Reinterpretation of vocation?

In responding to these criticisms, one might be tempted to reinterpret the understanding of work as vocation in order to free it from theological inadequacies and make it more applicable to industrial and information societies. There are, however, both exegetical and theological arguments against doing so.

(1) Exegetes agree that Luther misinterpreted 1 Corinthians 7:20, the, main proof text for his understanding of work. 'Calling in this verse is not calling *with* which, to which, or by which a man is called, but refers to the state in which he is *when* he is called to become a Christian.'[40] Except in 1 Corinthians 7:20 (and possibly 1 Cor 1:26), Paul and others who share his tradition use the term *klēsis* as a *terminus technicus* for 'becoming a Christian.'

As 1 Peter 2:9 shows, *klēsis* encompasses both the call of God out of 'darkness into his wonderful light' that constitutes Christians as Christians, and the call to conduct corresponding to this 'light' (see 1 Pet 1:15), which should characterize life of Christians.[41] Thus, when *klēsis* refers not to becoming a Christian but to living as a Christian, it does not designate a calling peculiar to every Christian and distinguishing one Christian from another, as Luther claimed of *vocatio externa*. Instead, it refers to the quality of life that should characterize *all Christians as Christians*.

(2) Theologically it makes sense to understand work as *vocatio externa* only if one can conceive of this *vocatio* in analogy to *vocatio spiritualis.* One has to start with the singularity and permanence of *vocatio spiritualis,* which individualizes and concretizes itself in the process of human response in the form of a *singular and permanent* vocatio externa. Even Luther himself, in a social ethic designed for a comparatively static society, could not maintain this correspondence consistently. One could weaken the correspondence between *vocatio spiritualis* and *vocatio externa* and maintain that when the one call of God, addressing all people to become Christians, reaches each individual, it branches out into a plurality of callings for particular tasks.[42]

I do not find it helpful, however, to deviate in this way from the New Testament and from a dogmatic soteriological use of *vocatio,* especially since the New Testament has a carefully chosen term—actually a *terminus technicus*—to denote the multiple callings of every Christian to particular tasks both in-

40 C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians,* BNTC (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), 169-70; cf. H. Brockhaus, *Charisma und Amt: Die paulinische Charismenlehre auf dem Hintergrund der früchristlichen Gemeindefunktionen* (Suppertal: Brockhaus, 1972), 224; J. Eckert, "Kaleō, ktl.," in Horst Balz und Gerhard Schneider (eds.), *EWNT* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1981) 2:599.

41 See Preston, "Vocation," in J. Macquarrie (ed.), *A Dictionary of Christian Ethics* (London: SCM), 355: The New Testament term *vocatio* 'refer[s] to the call of God in Christ to membership in the community of his people, the "saints," and to the qualities of Christian life which this implies.'

42 See F. Wagner, "Berufung III: Dogmatisch," in G. Krause and G. Müller (eds.), *TRE* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1980), 711.

side and outside the Christian church. I refer to the term *charisma*.

I propose that a theology of charisms supplies a stable foundation on which we can erect a theology of work that is both faithful to the divine revelation and relevant to the modern world of work. In the following pages I will first give a theological reflection on the Pauline notion of charisma, and second apply it to a Christian understanding of work, while developing further the theology of charisms as the application demands.

IV A Theological Reflection on Charisms

In recent decades the subject of charisms has been the focus of lively discussion, both exegetical and theological. As I argue here briefly for a particular understanding of charisms, my purpose is not merely to analyze Paul 's statements but to develop theologically some crucial aspects of his understanding of charisms, and in this way set up a backdrop for a theology of work.

(1) One should not define charisma so broadly as to make the term encompass the whole sphere of Christian ethical activity. E. Käsemann has argued that the whole ethical existence of the Christian, the *nova obaedientia,* is charismatic.[43] No doubt, the whole new life of a Christian must be viewed pneumatologically, but the question is whether it is legitimate to describe it more specifically as *charismatic*.

I cannot argue for this point within the confines of a book on work,[44] but must simply assert that it seems to me more adequate to differentiate, with Paul, between the *gifts and the fruit* of the Spirit. The fruit of the Spirit designates the general character of Christian existence, 'the lifestyle of those who are indwelled and energized by the Spirit.'[45] The gifts of the Spirit are related to the specific tasks or functions to which God calls and fits each Christian.

(2) One should not define *charisma* so narrowly as to include in the term only ecclesiastical activities. One interpretation limits the sphere of operation of charisms to the Christian fellowship, insisting that one cannot understand 'charismatically the various activities of Christians in relation to their non-Christian neighbors.'[46] But, using individual charisms as examples, it would not be difficult to show the impossibility of consistently limiting the operation of charisms to the Christian church.

The whole purpose of the gift of an evangelist (see Eph 4:11), for instance, is to relate the gospel to non-Christians. To take another example, it would be artificial to understand contributing to the needs of the destitute (see Rom 12:8) as *charisma* when exercised in relation to Christians but as simple benevolence when exercised in relation to *non*-Christians. As the first fruits of salvation, the Spirit of Christ

43 See E. Käsemann, "Amt und Gemeinde im Neuen Testament," in *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen* (Göttingen: Vendenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970) 1:109–134; E. Käsemann, "Gottesdienst," in *Exegetische,* 1:204.

44 On that issue, sec Brockhaus, *Charisma,* 220ff.

45 F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text,* NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 251.

46 Brockhaus, *Charisma,* 239.

is not only active in the Christian fellowship but also desires to make an impact *on the world through* the fellowship.[47]

All functions of the fellowship—whether directed inward to the Christian community or outward to the world—are the result of the operation of the Spirit of God and are thus charismatic. The place of operation does not define charisms, but the manifestation of the Spirit for the divinely ordained purpose.

(3) Charisms are not the possession of an elite group within the Christian fellowship. New Testament passages that deal with charisms consistently emphasize that charisms 'are found throughout the Church rather than being restricted to a particular group of people.'[48] In the Christian fellowship as the Body of Christ there are no members without a function and hence also no members without a charisma. The Spirit, who is poured out upon all flesh (Acts 2:17ff.), imparts also charisms to all flesh: they are gifts given to the Christian community irrespective of the existing distinctions or conditions within it.[49]

(4) The tendency to restrict charisms to an elite group within the Christian fellowship goes hand in hand with the tendency to ascribe an elite character to charisms. In widespread pneumatologies in which the Spirit's function is to negate, even destroy the worldly nature,[50] 'charismatic' is very frequently taken to mean 'extraordinary.' Ecclesiologically we come across this restricted understanding of charisms in some Pentecostal (or 'charismatic') churches that identify charismatic with the spectacularly miraculous.[51]

A secular version of this 'supernaturalistic reduction' confronts us in the commonly accepted Weberian understanding of *charisma* as an extraordinary quality of leadership that appeals to nonrational motives.[52] One of the main points of the Pauline theology of charisms is the overcoming of such a restrictive concentration on the miraculous and extraordinary. For this reason it is of great importance to keep the term *charisma* as a generic term for both the spectacular and the ordinary.[53]

(5) Traditional view of the impartation of charisms can be described as the addition model: 'the Spirit joins himself, as it were, to the person, giving "something" new, a new power,

47 For a similar understanding of charisma, see M. Harper, *Let My People Grow: Ministry and Leadership in the Church* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1977), 100; Mühlen, "Charisma," 161.

48 Küng, *Church,* 246.

49 See *Brockhaus,* Charisma, 170.

50 See W. Joest, *Dogmatik I: Die Wirklichkeit Gottes* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 302.

51 For a similar understanding of charisms in the New Testament, see also K. Berger, "Charisma, ktl.," in *EWNT* 3:1105.

52 For an important (but only partial) criticism of Weber's understanding of charismatic personality and its popular use in Western culture, see A. Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education Has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Souls of Today's Students* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987), 208ff.

53 Schulz, "Charismenlehre des Paulus: Bilanz der Probleme und Ergebnisse," in J. Friedrich et al. (eds.), *Rechtfertigung: Festschrift für Ernst Käsemann zum 70 Geburtstag* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Tübingen: Mohr, Siebeck, 1975), 444.

new qualities.'[54] It might, however, be better to understand the impartation of charisms according to the interaction model:[55] a person who is shaped by her genetic heritage and social interaction faces the challenge of a new situation as she lives in the presence of God and learns to respond to it in a new way. This is what it means to acquire a new spiritual gift. No substance or quality has been added to her, but a more or less permanent skill has been learned.

We can determine the relationship between calling and charisma in the following way: the general calling to enter the kingdom of God and to live in accordance with this kingdom that comes to a person through the preaching of the gospel becomes for the believer a call to bear the fruit of the Spirit, which should characterize all Christians, and, as they are placed in various situations, the calling to live in accordance with the kingdom branches out in the multiple gifts of the Spirit to each individual.

V Work in the Spirit

But is there a connection between charismata and the mundane work? If there is, can a theology of work be based on a theology of charismata? And if it could, would such a theology of work have any advantages over the vocational understanding of work so that we could with good conscience leave the second in favour of the first? Can it be applied to work of non-Christians or is it a theology of work only for a Christian subculture? Does not a pneumatological understanding of work amount to theological ideology of human achievement? To these questions I now turn.

1. Theological basis

If we must understand every specific function and task of a Christian in the church and in the world charismatically, then everyday work cannot be an exception. The Spirit of God calls, endows, and empowers Christians to work in their various vocations. The charismatic nature of all Christian activity is the *theological* basis for a pneumatological understanding of work.

There are also some *biblical* references that can be taken to suggest a pneumatological understanding of work. We read in the Old Testament that the Spirit of God inspired craftsmen and artists who designed, constructed, and adorned the tabernacle and the temple.

> See, the Lord has chosen Bezalel… and he has filled him with the Spirit of God, with skill, ability and knowledge in all kinds of crafts… and… the ability to teach others (Exod 35:2-3)
>
> Then David gave his son Solomon… the plans of all that the Spirit had put in his mind for the courts of the temple of the Lord (1 Chron 28:11-12).

Furthermore, judges and kings in Israel are often said to do their tasks under the anointing of the Spirit of God (see Judg 3:10; 1 Sam 16:13; 23:2; Prov 16:10).[56]

54 T. Veenhof, "Charismata—Supernatural or Natural?" in G. Vandervelde (ed.), *The Holy Spirit: Renewing and Empowering Presence* (Winfield: Wood Lake, 1989), 90.

55 See Veenhof, "Charismata," 91.

56 The point I am making is not invalidated

As they stand, these biblical affirmations of the charismatic nature of human activity cannot serve as the basis for a pneumatological understanding of *all* work, for they set apart people gifted by the Spirit for various extraordinary tasks from others who do ordinary work. But we can read these passages from the perspective of the new covenant in which *all* God's people are gifted and called to various tasks by the Spirit.

In this case they provide biblical illustrations for a charismatic understanding of the basic types of human work: intellectual (e.g. teaching) or manual (e.g. crafts) work, *poiesis* (e.g. arts and crafts) or praxis (e.g. ruling). All human work, however complicated or simple, is made possible by the operation of the Spirit of God in the working person; and all work whose nature and results reflect the values of the new creation is accomplished under the instruction and inspiration of the Spirit of God (see Isa 28:24-29).

2. Work as cooperation with God

If Christian mundane work is work in the Spirit, then it must be understood as *cooperation with God*. *Charisma* is not just a call by which God bids us to perform a particular task, but is also an inspiration and a gifting to accomplish the task. Even when charisma is exercised by using the so-called natural capabilities, it would be incorrect to say that a person is 'enabled' irrespective of God's relation to him. Rather, the enabling depends on the presence and activity of the Spirit. It is impossible to separate the gift of the Spirit from the enabling power of the Spirit.[57] When people work exhibiting the values of the new creation (as expressed in what Paul calls the 'fruit of the Spirit') then the Spirit works in them and through them.

The understanding of work as cooperation with God is implied in the New Testament view of Christian life in general. Putting forward his own Christian experience as a paradigm of Christian life, Paul said: 'it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me; and the life I now life in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God' (Gal 2:20). That Paul can in the same breath make such seemingly contradictory statements about the acting agent of Christian life ('I no longer live, *Christ lives* in me' and '*I live* my life in the flesh") testifies unmistakably that the whole Christian life is a life of cooperation with God through the presence of the Spirit. A Christian's mundane work is no exception. Here, too, one must say: I work, and the Spirit of the resurrected Christ works through me.

Since the Spirit who imparts gifts and acts through them is 'a guarantee' (2 Cor 1:22; cf. Rom 8:23) of the realization of the eschatological new creation, cooperation with God in work is proleptic cooperation with God in God's eschatological *transformatio mundi*. As the glorified Lord, Jesus Christ is

by the observation that the claim to Spirit's inspiration might have served Israel's kings only as a sacral legitimation of a fundamentally secular power (see G. von Rad, *Theologie des AltenTestaments I: Die Theologie der geschichtlichen Überlieferungen Israels* [München: Kaiser, 1969], 109).

57 See Käsemann, "Amt," 110.

'present in his gifts and in the services that both manifest these gifts and are made possible by them.'[58] Although his reign is still contested by the power of evil, he is realizing through those gifts his rule of love in the world. As Christians do their mundane work, the Spirit enables them to cooperate with God in the kingdom of God that "completes creation and renews heaven and earth."[59]

3. A pneumatological approach to work: does it solve anything?

In the last two chapters [of my book] I develop some of the most important aspects of a pneumatological understanding of work. Here I want to show that this understanding of work is not weighed down by the serious deficiencies of the vocational understanding of work.

(1) The pneumatological understanding of work is free from the portentous ambiguity in Luther's concept of vocation, which consists in the undefined relation between spiritual calling through the gospel and external calling through one's station. The resurrected Lord alone through the Spirit calls and equips a worker for a particular task in the world.

Of course, neither the Spirit's calling nor equipping occur in a social and natural vacuum; they do not come, so to speak, directly from Christ's immaterial Spirit to the isolated human soul. They are mediated through each person's social interrelations and psychosomatic constitution. These mediations themselves result from the interaction of human beings with the Spirit of God.

Yet charisms remain different from their mediations and should not be reduced to or confused with them.[60] For the Spirit who gives gifts 'as he wills' (1 Cor 12:11) by social and natural mediation is not the Spirit of human social structures or of a persons' psychosomatic makeup, but the Spirit of the crucified arid resurrected Christ, the first fruits of the new creation.

(2) The pneumatological understanding of work is not as open to ideological misuse as the vocational understanding of work.[61] It does not proclaim work meaningful without simultaneously attempting to humanize it. Elevating work to cooperation with God in the pneumatological understanding of work implies an obligation to overcome alienation because the individual gifts of the person need to be taken seriously. The point is not simply to interpret work religiously as cooperation with God and thereby glorify it ideologically, but to transform work into a charismatic cooperation with God on the 'project' of the new creation.

(3) The pneumatological understanding of work is easily applicable to the increasing diachronic plurality of employments or jobs that characterize industrial and information societies. Unlike Christian calling, charisma-in the technical sense is not 'irrevocable'

58 Käsemann, "Amt," 118.

59 Moltmann, "Work," 45.

60 For a similar differentiation between calling and mediations within the vocational understanding of work, see O. Bayer, "Berufung," in T. Schober et al. (eds.), *Evangelisches Soziallexikon* (Stuttgart: Kreuz, 1980, 7th ed.), 142.

61 See Volf, *Work in the Spirit,* 163–68.

(see Rom 11:29). True, a person cannot simply pick and choose her charisma, for the sovereign Spirit of God imparts charisms 'as he wills' (l Cor 12:11). But the sovereignty of the Spirit does not prohibit a person from 'earnestly desiring' spiritual gifts (1 Cor 12:3 1; 14: 1, 12) and receiving various gifts at different times.[62] Paul presupposes both a diachronic and a synchronic plurality of charisms.

The diachronic plurality of charisms fits the diachronic plurality of employment or jobs in modern societies. Unlike in the vocational understanding of work, in the pneumatological understanding of work one need not insist that the occupational choice be a single event and that there be a single right job for everyone[63] (either because God has called a person to one job or because every person possesses a relatively stable pattern of occupational traits). People are freed for several consecutive careers in rapidly changing work environments; their occupational decisions need not be irrevocable commitments but can be repeatedly made in a continuous dialogue between their preferences and talents on the one hand, and the existing job opportunities on the other.[64]

In any case, one can change jobs without coming under suspicion of unfaithfulness. If the change is in harmony with the *charisma* given, then changing can actually be an expression of faithfulness to God, who gave the *charisma* and readiness to serve fellow human beings in a new way. There is no need to worry that in the absence of a permanent calling, human life will be 'turned topsy-turvy'[65] (as Calvin thought) or that human beings will 'spend more time in idleness than at work'[66] (as the Puritans feared). Rather, freedom from the rigidity of a single, permanent vocation might season with creativity and interrupt with rest the monotonous lives of modern workaholics.

(4) It is also easy to apply the pneumatological understanding of work to the synchronic plurality of jobs or employments. In Paul's view every Christian can have more than one charisma at any given time. His aim is that Christians 'excel in gifts' (1 Cor 14: 12), provided they exercise them in interdependence within the community and out of concern for the common good. The pneumatological understanding of work frees us from the limitation of being able to theologically interpret only

62 Paul explicates his views on charisms in the context of the understanding of the church as the Body of Christ. He does not derive his views on charisms from this metaphor of the church, but uses the metaphor to illustrate certain aspects of his teaching on charisms.

63 So industrial psychology until recently: see W. S. Neff, Work *and Human Behavior* (Chicago: Aldim, 1977, 2nd ed.), 125.

64 Thomas Aquinas speaks of natural inclinations (caused by divine Providence) to particular employments: 'Haec autem diversificatio hominum in diversis officiis contingit primo ex divina providentia, quae ita hominum status distribuit… secundo etiam ex causis naturalibus, ex quibus contingit, quod in diversis hominibus sund diversae inclinationes ad diversa officia' (*Quaest. quodliberal,* VII, Art. 17c; cf. E. Welty, Vom *Sinn und Wert der menschlichen Arbeit* [Heidelberg: Kerle, 1949], 41). As portrayed by Thomas Aquinas, the natural inclinations of different people are as static as Luther's calling and are hence equally ill-suited to modern, dynamic societies.

65 Calvin, *Institutes,* 724.

66 Baxter, as quoted by Weber, *Ethic,* 161.

a single employment of a Christian (or from the limitation of having to resort to a different theological interpretation for jobs that are not primary).

In accordance with the plurality of charisms, there can be a plurality of employments or jobs without any one of them being regarded theologically as inferior, a more 'job on the side.' The pneumatological understanding of work is thus also open to a redefinition of work, which today's industrial and information societies need.[67]

VI Spirit and Work in *Regnum Naturae*

As I have sketched it, the pneumatological understanding of work is clearly a theology of *Christian* work. The significance and meaning of Christians' work lie in their cooperation with God in the anticipation of the eschatological *transformatio mundi*. The power enabling their work and determining its nature is the Holy Spirit given when they responded in faith to the call of God in Christ.

But what about the work of non-Christians? Traditionally theologians simply bypassed the issue as uninteresting. Although Luther, for instance, did not apply the concept of vocation to the work of non-Christians,[68] he reflected little in his writings on the theological significance of their work. This is understandable, given the identity of church and society in the *Corpus Christianum* that Luther and other seminal theologians of the past presupposed.

In much of the world throughout history, however, church and society were never identified, and the cradle of the *Corpus Christianorum* is becoming its grave: in the Western world a clear and irretrievable separation between church and society is taking place. Since Christians today live in religiously pluralistic societies, their theologies of work must incorporate reflect ion on the-work of non-Christians. Hence my next step is to indicate the implications of a pneumatological theology of work for understanding non-Christians' work.

What is the relation of the work of non-Christians to the new creation? The answer to this question is implicit in the way I have determined the relation between the present and the future orders. If the world will be transformed, then the work of non-Christians has in principle the same ultimate significance as the work of Christians: insofar as the results of non-Christians' work pass through the purifying judgment of God, they, too, will contribute to the future new creation.

In Revelation one reads that the kings of the earth and the nations will bring their splendour, glory, and honour into the New Jerusalem (Rev 21:24, 26). It makes perhaps the best sense to take this enigmatic statement to mean that all pure and noble achievements of non-Christians will be incorporated in the new creation.

But is it possible to understand the work of non-Christians pneumatologically? Charisms are specifically ecclesiastical phenomena. They are

67 See above, 7–14; Miroslav Volf, *Zukunft der Arbeit—Arbeit der Zukunft: Der Arbeitsbegriff bei Karl Marx und seine theologische Wertung* (München: Kaiser; Mainz: Grünewald, 1988), 100ff.

68 See Wingren, *Beruf,* 15; Gatzen, *Beruf,* 39ff.

gifts given to those who acknowledge Jesus as Lord. How, then, can anything we learned about the nature of work from the theology of *charisms* apply to the work of non-Christians? The answer depends on how we conceive of the relationship between the Spirit of God and the non-Christians. I can only sketch an approach to this extremely complex and not sufficiently investigated subject here.

First, if we affirm that Christ is the Lord of all humanity—indeed of the whole universe—and not only of those who profess him as their Lord, and that he rules through the power of the Spirit, then we must also assume that the Spirit of God is active in some way in all people, not only in those who consciously live in the Spirit's life-giving power. As Basil of Caesarea observes in his *De Spiritu Sancto,* creation possesses nothing—no power, no motivation, or ingenuity needed for work—that it did not receive from the Spirit of God.[69] There is hence an important sense in which all human work is done 'in the power of the Spirit.'

Second, one and the same Spirit of God is active both in the Church and in the world of culture. As the first fruits of the new creation, the Spirit is active in the Church, redeeming and sanctifying the people of God. In the world of culture the Spirit is active sustaining and developing humanity. The difference in the activity of the Spirit in these two realms lies not so much in the different purposes of the Spirit with the two groups of human beings, as in the nature of the receptivity of human beings.

Third, the goal of the Holy Spirit in the church and in the world is the same: the Spirit strives to lead both the realm of nature (*regnum naturae*) and the realm of grace (*regnum gratiae*) toward their final glorification in the new creation (*regnum gloriae*).[70]

Since in the realm of grace the Spirit is active as the first fruits of the coming glory, which is the goal of the realm of nature, we must think of the Spirit's activity in the realm of nature as analogous to its activity in the realm of grace. What can be said of the work of Christians on the basis of the biblical understanding of charisms can also be said by analogy of the work of non-Christians.

Revelation of the future glory in the realm of grace is the measure by which events in the realm of nature must be judged. To the extent that non-Christians are open to the prompting of the Spirit, their work, too, is the cooperation with God in anticipation of the eschatological transformation of the world, even though they may not be aware of it.

VII A Christian Ideology of Work?

Work as cooperation with God in the

69 Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto,* as quoted by W. Kern and Y. Congar, "Geist and Heiliger Geist," in F. Böckle et al. (eds.), *Christlicher Glaube in moderner Gesellschaft* (Freiburg: Herder, 1982), 22:87.

70 For the relation between natura, gratia, and gloria, see J. Moltmann, "Christsein, Menschsein und das Reich Gottes: Ein Gespräch mit Karl Rahner," in *Stimmen der Zeit* 203 (1985), 626 (though I am not always able to follow Moltmann in the way he determines the relation between *gratia* and *gloria,* and hence also between *natura* and *gratia*).

eschatological transformation of the world! Work in the Spirit! These are lofty words about human work. But is it not true that work reflects not only the glory of human cooperation with God but also the misery of human rebellion against God? This is, indeed, a testimony of Genesis 2 through 3, which explains how pleasant work in a garden (2:15) became futile toil outside of it (3:17ff.). The experience of most working people confirms it. The statement Wolterstorff makes about art is *a forteriori* true of work: it 'reeks of murder, and oppression, and enslavement, and nationalism, and idolatry, and racism, and sexism.'[71]

Given the drudgery of much of modern work, the exploitation of workers, and the destruction of nature through human work, does not the talk about working in the Spirit and about the eschatological significance of work sound suspect? Does it not amount to a glorification of work that conceals the debasement of workers? Is a theology of work only an ideology of work in disguise?

1. God's judgment of human work

The understanding of work as cooperation with God in the *transformatio mundi* is not a general theory of all human work. It is not applicable to every type of work and to every way of working, for the simple reason that the new creation will not incorporate everything found in the present creation. When God creates a new world he will not indiscriminately affirm the present world. Such promiscuous affirmation would be the cheapest of all graces, and hence no grace at all. The realization of the new creation cannot bypass the Judgment Day, a day of negation of all that is negative in the present creation.[72]

Paul's reflection on the ultimate significance of missionary work in the face of God's judgment (1 Cor 3:12-15) might give us a clue to understanding God's judgment in relation to human work in general. Like the test of fire, God's judgment will bring to light the work that has ultimate significance since it was done in cooperation with God. Like gold, silver, and precious stones (see 1 Cor 3:12), such work will survive the fire purified.

But the Judgment Day will also plainly reveal the work that was ultimately insignificant because it was done in cooperation, not with God, but with the demonic powers that scheme to ruin God's good creation. Like wood, hay, and straw, such work will burn up, for 'nothing that is impure will ever enter' the New Jerusalem (Rev 21:27). Every understanding of work as coop-

71 N. Wolterstorff, "Evangelicalism and the Arts," in *Christian Scholar's Review* 17 (1988), 467.

72 The claim that "all human activity, including that of work, is captured, permeated and transfigured by the event of salvation" and that "secular reality gains a new-divine-dimension" (L. Roos, "On a Theology and Ethics of Work," in *Communio* 11 [1984], 103, reporting on French theologies of work) amounts to a dangerous ideology of work if it is understood as an indiscriminate statement about all human activity and about the whole of secular reality. For some of human activity is beyond salvation and requires abolition (i.e., prostitution), and some of secular reality has demonic dimensions and requires destruction (i.e., chemical weapons).

eration with God that does not include the theme of judgment is inadequate. As we have to pattern our work according to the values of the new creation, so we also have to criticize it in the light of the eschatological judgment.

In relation to God's judgment on human work, it is important to distinguish between what might be called the moral and the ontological value of human work. I have already argued against ascribing eschatological significance merely to the attitude of love exhibited in work.[73] It would also be insufficient to attach eschatological significance only to the results of work done in love.[74] 'Man's envy of his neighbour' (Eccles 4:4), as the realistic ecclesiast puts it, spurs him on to many of the best human achievements.

Do they lose their inherent value because they were done out of ethically impure motives? Every noble result of human work is ultimately significant. It is possible that the fire of judgment will not only burn up the results of work, the worker herself escaping 'the flames' (1 Cor 3:15),[75] but that the flames of 'the absolutely searching and penetrating love of God'[76] will envelop the evil worker while her work is purified and preserved.

The reality of judgment makes it clear that relating human work positively to God's new creation does not amount to an ideological glorification of work. It lies in the affirmation that the work has meaning in spite of the transitoriness of the world. If human work is in fact 'chasing after wind' (Eccles 4:4)-whether or not one experiences it subjectively as meaningful-it is not so because of the transitoriness of the world, but because of the evilness of the work. All work that contradicts the new creation is meaningless; all work that corresponds to the new creation is ultimately meaningful.

This should serve as an encouragement to all those 'good workers' who see themselves in the tragic figure of Sisyphus. In spite of all appearances, their work is not just rolling a heavy rock up a hill in this earthly Hades; they are preparing building blocks for the glorified new creation. Furthermore, all those weighed down by the toil that accompanies most of human work can rest assured that their sufferings "are not worth comparing with the glory" of God's new creation they are contributing to (Rom 8:18).

2. Work against the Spirit

What is the relationship between the Spirit of God and the work that deserves God's judgment? There is a sense in which all human work is done in the power of the Spirit. The Spirit is the giver of all life, and hence all work, as an expression of human life, draws its energy out of the fullness of divine Spirit's energy. When human beings work, they work only because God's Spirit has given them power and talents to work. To express the same thought in more traditional terminology, without God's constant preserving and sustaining grace, no work would be possible.

But a person can misuse his gifts

73 See Volf, *Work in the Spirit,* 96-98.

74 See *Documents*, Gaudium et Spes, n. 39: 'manete caritate eiusque opere.'

75 For this interpretation of 1 Cor. 3:15, see Fee, First Corinthians, 144.

76 B. Hebblethwaite, *The Christian Hope* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 215.

and exercise them against God's will. Through his work he can destroy either human or natural life and hence contradict the reality of the new creation, which preserves the old creation in transfigured form. The circumstance that the gifts and energies that the Spirit gives can be used against the will of the Spirit results from the Spirit's condescension in history: by giving life to the creation, the Spirit imparts to the creation the power for independence from the Spirit's prompting.

Because the Spirit creates human beings as free agents, work in the power of the Spirit can be done not only in accordance with but also in contradiction to the will of the Spirit; it can be performed not only in cooperation with the Holy Spirit who transforms the creation in anticipation of the glorious new creation, but also in collaboration with that Unholy Spirit who strives to ravage it.

For Further Reading

We want to encourage our readers to make use of the resources that are now easily accessible around the world. The most important of these is the Theology of Work Project (http://www.theologyofwork.org) which has a vast array of high-quality articles and information, including a commentary on the whole Bible with application to the workplace. Their key contribution is careful engagement with the Bible on issues relating to work, including its intrinsic worth.

An organisation which merits particular mention is the Lausanne Movement, which fosters three issue networks around topics mentioned here (Business as Mission, Marketplace Ministry, and Tentmaking), as well as other related issue networks (Cities, Creation Care, etc.). Lausanne have published an important Occasional Paper (number 59) on Business as Mission (BAM), arising from the 2004 Forum on BAM held in Thailand in 2004.

For theological reflection on economic issues, a key resource is the Journal of Markets and Morality, published in a free open access form by the Acton Foundation (http://www.marketsandmorality.com/index.php/mandm). This journal features careful and nuanced interaction between theology and economics from specialists in both fields, and is a first resource for ethical questions around markets.

There are many other organisations and groups focused on faith and work issues, often making high-quality resources freely available, and we encourage you to look at the website of the Council for Business and Theology for links to these.

Recommended books for perspectives on work:

Miroslav Volf, *Work in the Spirit: Toward a Theology of Work* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock

Darrell Cosden, *A Theology of Work: Work and the New Creation* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2004)

R. Paul Stevens, *The Other Six Days: Vocation, Work, and Ministry in Biblical Perspective* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000)

Ben Witherington, *Work: A Kingdom Perspective on Labor* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2011)

Recommended books for perspectives on markets and economics:

Christopher J. H. Wright, *Old Testament Ethics for the People of God* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2013)

Samuel Gregg, *Economic Thinking for the Theologically Minded* (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 2001)

Brian Griffiths, Robert A. Sirico, Norman Barry, and Frank Field, *Capitalism,*

Morality and Markets (London: The Institute of Economic Affairs, 2001)

Richard A. Horsley, *Covenant Economics: A Biblical Vision of Justice for All* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox, 2009)

Paul Mills and Michael Schluter, *After Capitalism: Rethinking Economic Relationships* (Cambridge: Jubilee Centre, 2012)

Stephen Green, *Good Value: Reflections on Money, Morality and an Uncertain World* (London: Allen Lane, 2009)

Clive Beed and Cara Beed, *Alternatives to Economics: Christian Socio-Economic Perspectives* (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 2006)

Recommended books for the field of Business as Mission:

Neal Johnson, *Business as Mission: A Comprehensive Guide to Theory and Practice* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2010)

Michael Baer, *Business as Mission: The Power of Business in the Kingdom of God* (Seattle, WA: YWAM Publishing, 2006)

Steven Rundle and Tom A. Steffen, *The Emerging Role of Business in Missions* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2011)

Web sites: www.bamglobal.org and www.businessasmission.com