

This is an electronic reprint of the original article. This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

---

## The Christology of Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen revisited from the perspective of Scandinavian Creation Theology

Kristensson Uggla, Bengt

*Published in:*  
Dialog

*DOI:*  
[10.1111/dial.12611](https://doi.org/10.1111/dial.12611)

Published: 13/08/2020

*Document Version*  
Accepted author manuscript

*Document License*  
Publisher rights policy

[Link to publication](#)

*Please cite the original version:*

Kristensson Uggla, B. (2020). The Christology of Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen revisited from the perspective of Scandinavian Creation Theology. *Dialog*, 2020, 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dial.12611>

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



DIALOG

**The Christology of Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen  
re-visited from the perspective of Scandinavian Creation  
Theology**

Journal:	<i>Dialog</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Dialog in Dialog
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Kristensson Ugglå, Bengt; Åbo Akademi Ekonomisk-statsvetenskapliga fakulteten, Faculty of Social Sciences and Economics;
Keywords:	Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, Christology, Scandinavian creation theology, anti-liberal theology, Gustaf Wingren
Abstract:	This article is a response to Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen's Christology from the perspective of Scandinavian creation theology. Starting from the identification of a common post liberal horizon, together with similar challenges from anti-liberal theology, the author enters into a critical examination of Kärkkäinen's systematic theology elaborating on the possible contributions from Gustaf Wingren. First, the significance of creation as horizon of understanding for Christology is discussed. Second, the relationship between anthropology and Christology is being investigated, with a special focus on theological resources to transcend the dichotomies and the zero-sum game which places God and man in opposition as competitors.

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

Dialogue in *Dialog: The Constructive Theology of Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen*  
200805

Bengt Kristensson Ugglå

*The Christology of Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen*  
*re-visited from the perspective of Scandinavian Creation Theology*

I feel deeply honored by the invitation to respond to Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen's remarkable systematic theology from the perspective of Scandinavian creation theology. Like the other four parts of *A constructive Christian theology for the pluralistic world*, the elaboration on Christology in *Volume 1: Christ and Reconciliation*, which I will focus on, is characterized by an intellectual hospitality you only seldom experience as a reader of this genre. Kärkkäinen's ground-breaking presentation is determined by the integrative aim to include perspectives originating from all parts of the world, and the most divergent intellectual domains, in a continuous search for a coherent, balanced understanding Christian truth and faith. Consequently, the author makes no attempts to escape from – but instead actively include – all the crucial challenges and critical complications associated with doing *glocal* theology in a “post”-world. It is no exaggerations to claim, that his excellent “ecumenical” accomplishment will have enduring impact on the future of theology.

IN DIALOGUE WITH SCANDINAVIAN CREATION THEOLOGY

Kärkkäinen's aim to present “a coherent, inclusive, dialogical, and hospitable vision” of Christian truth and faith – together with his multiperspectival, multidisciplinary, and multicultural approach – is based on the robust conviction that it is time for Christian

theology “to break out from its ghetto.”<sup>1</sup> This approach of radical openness, together with his deeply generous way of dealing with thinkers from different traditions and contexts, may be considered as an invitation to a constantly expanding dialogue, which also includes Scandinavian creation theology. This loosely compound “school”, perceived as a reconfiguration of the Reformation theology of Martin Luther (1483-1546), mediated and “modernized” by a creative interpretation by the Danish theologian Nikolaj F.S. Grundtvig (1783-1872), and mainly articulated in a constellation of “founding figures”: Knud E. Løgstrup (1905-1983), Regin Prenter (1907-1990), and Gustaf Wingren (1910-2000).<sup>2</sup> In my response, I will mainly concentrate my discussion on Wingren, a Lundensian theologian who has undoubtedly presented the most systematic and comprehensive version of Scandinavian creation theology.

It is more than obvious, that this theological tradition has a lot to learn from Kärkkäinen’s majestic work. Yet, in this specific context it seems more appropriate to follow the reverse path and ask: what kind of contribution may Scandinavian creation theology offer to Kärkkäinen’s project? Even if it is possible to claim that these creation theologians in many ways shared with Kärkkäinen an understanding of theology as an “integrative” discipline, his global scope of interest, together with his many dialogue partners, offers important resources that will be able to use in order to balance and correct many of the context-based assumptions and limitations associated with a theological reflection, which to a large extent is to be considered a branch of “the hegemony of aging white European and North American men” in 20<sup>th</sup> century theology.<sup>3</sup>

Already at a first glance, the reader may recognize that there are no references to Scandinavian creation theology in Kärkkäinen’s work. The absence of references and lack of connections, despite the encyclopedic character of this project, is not by coincidence. There are, at least, two major reasons for this. First, we need to consider the poor reception of

Scandinavian creation theology in Kärkkäinen's both main geographical settings: Finland and U.S. When it comes to Scandinavian creation theology, Finland stands out as a strange exception among the Nordic countries, in the sense that this kind of theology has never been influential on Finnish soil, notwithstanding the common historical roots and profound confessional similarities (and the American more extended use of the concept "Scandinavia" including all Nordic countries). Scandinavian creation theology has, however, neither had any deeper impact on American theology. Besides textbooks used in pastoral education at seminaries during two or three decades post WWII, the reception in the U.S. is poor.<sup>4</sup> Second, due to the fact that Scandinavian creation theology stands out as a distinctive *Lutheran* branch of theology, with its main ecclesiastic base in the national majority churches, it can be said to exist an obvious confessional distance to the Pentecostal tradition.

#### THE POST LIBERAL CHALLENGE

Considering how absent Scandinavian creation theology is in Kärkkäinen's systematic theology, and the fact that most of the major works of the "founding figures" was published already more than half a century ago, it is tempting to draw the hasty conclusion that it might be pointless to enter into an elaboration on what kind of contribution this particular tradition of theology may offer to Kärkkäinen's systematic theology. This is certainly not the case. Interestingly enough, there are some striking similarities between the context from which Scandinavian creation theology grew and the contemporary theological context which Kärkkäinen is dealing with so attentively.

Scandinavian creation theology emerged in the wake of the breakdown of the grand liberal theological paradigm of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. All three "founding figures" were strongly influenced by Karl Barth and shared the critique of dialectical theology against the idealistic Jesus of classical liberalism, stressing God's identification with Jesus Christ and

focused on the divine presence and action in death and resurrection. But at the same time, they strongly criticized the anti-liberal approach that came to dominate this way of coping with the postliberal challenges. The “curious anti-liberal mania”<sup>5</sup> that characterized the constant attack on the liberal legacy in European theology during the period after 1920 was, according to Wingren, in reality staged by a dangerous “cooperation between very sophisticated Barthianism and really stupid fundamentalism.”<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, Wingren criticized the anti-liberal tendency to cut the church off from ordinary human life and society, including the broader academic community, which he considered “the most profound theological tragedy of his time” – and the devastating consequences of the predominant anti-liberal theology in reality eliminated the prerequisites for any ecclesiology: “The church cannot be described unless its positive relation to the external world outside the church can also be described.”<sup>7</sup>

Wingren takes his specific place in 20<sup>th</sup> century theology as an angry critic of the dominant anti-liberal movements – represented by theologians from Barth to Nygren – that took *the distinctively Christian* as their methodology for understanding the Christian faith – as opposed to God’s omnipresence, and what we all share as human beings. The theological clarity that may be achieved by the use of methodologies concentrating on *isolating* something distinctively unique to Christianity has, according to Wingren, devastating consequences for our understanding of the Christian faith. This critique of anti-liberal standpoints was, for Wingren, closely associated with a radical openness to critical examinations of different kinds. During his own time, this was closely associated with a wholehearted acceptance of the breakthrough of the historical view of the Bible.<sup>8</sup>

If we turn to Kärkkäinen’s constructive theology, we find some striking similarities in his way of situating his own project and dealing with, what I prefer to name, “anti-liberal” strategies to cope with the theological challenges in a post liberal context. In

order to avoid “ghetto”-attitudes, both epistemologically and theologically, Kärkkäinen makes ambitious efforts to include Classical liberalism in a critical dialogue (nevertheless, rejecting theology as merely an interpretation of human experience and religiosity). At the same time he makes a clear demarcation against what I consider as “anti-liberal” approaches, represented by both postliberal theologians (theological claims cannot solely be based on communitarian intratextuality) and the “unwillingness to engage in mutual dialogue with either ‘secular’ academic disciplines or other living faiths” of Radical Orthodox (as well as Barthian) theologies.<sup>9</sup> In this approach, which I have named “anti-anti-liberal theology,” we find obvious similarities between Kärkkäinen and Wingren.<sup>10</sup>

#### CREATION AS HORIZON OF UNDERSTANDING

What does this understanding of the theological context mean when we are dealing with Christology today? Here, it’s time for some critical remarks. Considering the anti-liberal climate of the current theological context, it seems to be associated with significant risks to develop a Christology without a previous conceptualization of creation and humanity, which is the case in *Christ and Reconciliation*. Already the decision to make Christology the starting point of a systematic theological presentation is associated with complications, because it invites tendencies to present Christ in isolation from the world and the creation. According to Wingren’s perspective, this appears as a way of doing theology guided by an order that differs from the organizational principle of the Credo as well as the Bible. Kärkkäinen’s important claim about the necessity to acknowledge the Jewishness of Jesus as person, together with the Jewish roots of the Christian confession, is convincing (and important in order to resist anti-Jewish approaches). Still, I would claim that the affirmation of the doctrine of creation as an integral part of the Christian creed itself and as a necessary horizon of understanding for the Christian Gospel is underdeveloped in *Christ and*

*Reconciliation*. Not even the content of Volume 3, *Creation and Humanity*, can compensate for the marginal role played by creation theology in this constructive theology.

In a historical perspective, the Christian confession was without any doubt originally “pure” Christological. However, early heretic versions of the Christian faith reminded the early Church of the fact that the Gospel is not spoken into an “empty” God-forsaken world. Very soon, the early church fathers were confronted with challenges, that urged them to articulate the *implicit* doctrine of creation that was a prerequisite for any Christology. It is interesting to note that Wingren started his research career investigating Marcion, i.e. the arch-heretic who stands out as a symbol of a unilateral refinement that attempts to isolate something distinctly Christian. In his polemic with anti-liberal theologians, Wingren was eager to point out that this way of thinking had many striking similarities with dominant theological tendencies of his own day (read: Barth and Nygren).

If Marcion had an important *negative* function for Wingren, as a contrast representing an interpretation of the Christian faith in which everything that unites Christianity with a general human position is expurgated, then Irenaeus – and later Luther – served as *positive* configurations of an interpretation of the Christian faith that instead had an integrating function for human life as a whole. Wingren gathers together everything in Irenaeus’ theology in the concept *recapitulatio*, restored creation. Salvation means becoming human again, which presumes an original affirmation of creation-given human life, recognized as something to be restored. There is a passage on Irenaeus and his concept *recapitulatio* in Kärkkäinen’s Christology, but he never cultivates its profound significance for connecting Christology to creation theology.<sup>11</sup> The contrast seems to be sharp, if we compare with Wingren’s Christological considerations, where everything is related to the recapitulation of creation.

Using the term “creation” invites misunderstandings. Yet, according to this Scandinavian tradition, creation theology neither delivers information about an enigmatic historical origin nor a foundation for a theology of orders (*Ordnungstheologie*). Instead of referring to a particular kind of historical knowledge, or providing a reactionary legitimation of the *status quo*, creation means *change*. First and foremost, because creation means that God is *creating now*, which is identical with man’s continual becoming: “When the Bible speaks about God, it does not speak about a reality which man encounters in a specifically religious act and of which he has some knowledge [...] God is creator, and his relation to man is given in the simple fact that man lives.”<sup>12</sup> In a similar way, the Law is recognized as a flexible dynamic, regulated by the ethical demand of the other, thus constantly changing according to different contexts in order to be in accordance with God’s will.

In contrast to the transcendental focus on the centred self which dominates a liberal theological approach, the starting-point of Wingren’s reflections on theological anthropology is the profound experience of being *de-centred* – by gifts and demands, and by a Gospel that does not originate from oneself. Both creation and salvation, according to this Lutheran way of doing theology, is something *extra nos*. Let me quote Wingren: “To live means to receive life from outside oneself. As soon as we are cut off from these external sources, life is extinguished. The resurrection life is the receiving of life from an external source, from which even now in faith man draws his sustenance. But the same thing holds good even now of the bodily life, and not just that of believers, but of all bodily life.”<sup>13</sup> Everything important in life is located *outside ourselves!*

However, sometimes it’s being claimed, that Scandinavian creation theology has limited relevance today, considering the historical circumstance that this interpretation of Christian faith seems to be too closely linked with a formerly monolithic Lutheran majority culture in the Scandinavian countries (which once more makes the lack of reception in

Finland an enigma). As a former patristic scholar and specialist on Luther, Wingren delivered perhaps the most important evidence against this argumentation, when he developed his version of Scandinavian creation theology in terms of *a post-Constantinian Lutheran theology educated by the pre-Constantinian theology of Irenaeus*. Wingren often returned to the general significance of the fact, that the doctrine of creation, conceived as an affirmation of God's universal presence in all creatures, was developed by a theologian located in a tiny congregation, a church that found itself in an extreme minority situation, where Christians were being hunted and killed. From this he concludes, that creation theology should be considered as an appropriate theology also for a post-Constantinian era, where Christians have to co-exist with people of other faiths (or without faith) in a post-Christian society.<sup>14</sup>

These theological reflections, on creation as a necessary horizon of understanding of Christology, seems to be very much in accordance with the truly universal methodological considerations behind Kärkkäinen's constructive theology. I am convinced that a contribution from Wingren might strengthen Kärkkäinen's Christological elaborations and encourage him to include, not only science and other religious traditions, but also to ~~to~~ ~~the~~ ~~con~~ embrace the universally human – also as a prerequisite to understand the unique elements of the Christian faith.

## CHRISTOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

Kärkkäinen relates his Christology to both the history of effects of the Chaledonian tradition and the Christological debates during the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries in a profound way. Inspired by the imperative, articulated by Pannenberg, Rahner, et al, not losing sight of the integral connexion between anthropology and Christology, Jesus's humanity and Christology, anthropology and theology, Kärkkäinen tries to establish a kind of balancing act between Christologies From Above and From Below. Inspired by Moltmann, he develops his

Christology by “the mutual conditioning of the From Below and From Above approaches,” linking Jesus to the Spirit and thus also to the Father, within a trinitarian theological framework.<sup>15</sup> If Moltmann is the one who seems to get things right, according to Kärkkäinen, Pannenberg is the one who fails to establish a “thick account of divinity, due to an affirmation of the true humanity of the incarnated Son that goes too far.”<sup>16</sup>

In contrast to Kärkkäinen’s balancing act, and I would say metaphysical tendencies, Wingren provides a more *dialectical* approach, connected to a stronger focus on the transformational power of a “*grain-of-wheat*”-*eschatology*.<sup>17</sup> This opens perspectives for a theological reflection on Christology and anthropology that might be able to transcend the dichotomies residing behind the balancing-act of “both-and.”

Already as a young scholar at Johanneum in Berlin in 1938, Wingren wrote in his personal journal: “Anthropology is terribly neglected in all of modern theology.”<sup>18</sup> Later he clearly spoke out publicly that he considered the anthropological deficit of contemporary theology as the most crucial problem to cope with in a postliberal situation: “Since 1920, every thesis that has interpreted constructively what ‘man’ is in the light of the belief in creation has been destroyed.”<sup>19</sup> Wingren claimed that a theology of *recapitulation*, affirming the continuity of the divine operation, in accordance with an understanding of salvation in Christ as the renewal of creation, also requires a greater emphasis on the place of the human nature in the work of Christ.

In his Christological considerations, Wingren makes frequently use of the new Adam typology, connecting the primal history in Genesis with Paul’s kenotic hymn in Phil 2:5-11. Considering the metaphysical tendencies behind linking incarnation to pre-existence in Chapter 7 (titled “*The Word Became Flesh*”), it is perhaps not surprising that Kärkkäinen makes this critical remark: “Although kenotic interpretations can affirm the humanity of Jesus, they share obvious problems in affirmation of his divinity.”<sup>20</sup>

In contrast to this “balancing approach,” Wingren’s version of the new Adam typology emphasizes both the positive connection between Adam and Christ and their divergent orientations. Christ, who emptied Himself, is only comprehensible if he is set besides the opposite account of Adam, who exalted himself and fell. Inspired by Gustaf Aulén, Wingren thus closely connect the victory of Christ to the act of self-giving on the cross, and its profound significance for his “becoming human”. In *Church and Gospel* he writes: “The more He assumed of Adam’s burden the more the purpose of the incarnation was fulfilled. The death on the cross was the culmination of His becoming man.”<sup>21</sup> Ten pages later in the same book, he claims that the failure “to accord to the humanity of Jesus the central place in soteriology which it undoubtedly has in the New Testament is due to the strongly anti-liberal attitude of almost all European theology since the First World War.”<sup>22</sup> Wingren concludes, with a critical remark also against Aulén, that “the early Christian doctrine of recapitulation requires a greater emphasis on the place of human nature in the work of Christ.”<sup>23</sup>

Consequently, according to Wingren, it seems only possible to understand what the humanity of Christ means, if theology takes creation as its starting-point. Here, as so often in Wingren’s theology, Irenaeus is the one who provides the theological resources that makes it possible to transcend the false dichotomies of human/divine in Christian theology: “If, however, man is set in opposition to God from the beginning [...] it becomes quite impossible afterwards to withdraw from this position. Positive statements which are made about man then become limitations on the sovereignty of God, and positive statements about the omnipotence of God are seen to be limitations on man’s freedom.”<sup>24</sup> In contrast to a tradition determined by metaphysics, Wingren highlights the anti-speculative aspects in Irenaeus and how clearly he thus connects the belief in creation to theological anthropology: “God’s creation and man’s continual becoming are identical – the same reality seen from two

different aspects.”<sup>25</sup> Or, in more specific terms: “Man’s growth is thus not simply a work, a consequence of God’s act of creation, but actually *is* God’s act of creation, exactly the same reality as God’s creation, though seen from a different angle.”<sup>26</sup>

## CONCLUDING REMARKS

Finally, is Wingren’s theological anthropology to be viewed as a kind of humanism? I would argue that Wingren developed a kind of *humanism of the other*, which distancing him from a liberal anthropocentrism of self-glorification as well as an anti-liberal anthropoclasism rejecting all human achievement.<sup>27</sup> In terms of theological anthropology, the gift of creation thus primarily means a de-centring of the subject. Yet, the economy of gift also generates a re-centring of the subject, conceived of as an affirmation of human capacity. The result is a profoundly dialectical way of thinking, where an original de-centring move is balanced by a new centring move.<sup>28</sup>

Wingren strongly highlights “the ‘not yet’ of man’s creation”<sup>29</sup> and emphasises that the “*recapitulatio* is never fully realized.”<sup>30</sup> In light of this ongoing process, the allegory of *the grain of wheat*, applied within an eschatological framework, served as a paradigmatic model for Wingren’s theological anthropology. The grain of wheat achieves nothing for itself when it falls onto the ground and dies. But later on, it provides new life – *for others*. We experience the profound dialectics way of thinking originating from the dynamics of his grain-of-wheat eschatology, and the integral connexion between Christology and anthropology in an article on the meaning of work (!) from 1940, where he writes: “If we flee from our neighbour to God, we come not to God. But to ourselves, to our own selves. When the other is pushed from the centre of our lives, Christ is also pushed from the centre. For Christ is given to the world, he is human, in the form of a servant. The journey outward toward the people for the earth is a journey in the direction in which the cross stands and in

which death occurs; that is a journey in the direction toward where He is, and where. There is hope, the hope of resurrection.”<sup>31</sup> Thus, for Wingren, the secret of the grain-of-wheat eschatology is at the same time a matter of how the experience of “being outside ourselves” may be transformed into a “being for others”.

This way of closely linking Christology and theological anthropology presupposes an affirmation of the creation as a necessary horizon of theological understanding when elaborating on Christology. And this is also the critical point where Wingren’s Scandinavian creation theology could contribute to Kärkkäinen’s Christology. In this article I have argued, that the profound challenges associated with the attempt to start the presentation of the Christian faith from the second article (leaving the first article further without notice, anticipating volume three on creation and humanity), which I consider as problematic in general, but particularly problematic in a post liberal theological context with an emerging anti-liberal dominance, may be counterbalanced by a contribution from Wingren and Scandinavian creation theology. An articulation of the human dimension, according to a dynamism of “divine-human becoming” beyond the zero-sum game which places God and man in opposition to each other as competitors, opens up new perspectives for both Christology and theological anthropology. If we consider the current postliberal conditions for doing theology, such a contribution would not threaten, but strongly support, the overall aim of Kärkkäinen’s constructive theology.

In Wingren’s understanding of *communicatio idiomatum*, which Kärkkäinen elaborates on in Chapter 5, he summons up all the dimensions of the unity between Christ’s human and divine natures in his Christology, transcending the opposition between divine and human: “To listen to the divine voice is to live a human life. It is a sort of *communication idiomatum* in our life: the divine and the human cannot be separated.”<sup>32</sup> This seems also an appropriate way to articulate the major challenge in Kärkkäinen’s Christology.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen. *A Constructive Christian Theology for the Pluralistic World: Volume 1, Christ and Reconciliation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2013), 13, xi.
- <sup>2</sup> For a presentation of Scandinavian Creation Theology, see Niels Henrik Gregersen, Bengt Kristensson Uggla, Trygve Wyller (eds). *Reformation Theology for a Post-Secular Age: Løgstrup, Preter, Wingren, and the Future of Scandinavian Creation Theology* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2017).
- <sup>3</sup> Kärkkäinen, *Christ and Reconciliation*, xi.
- <sup>4</sup> The differences between the theological contexts of the Nordic countries in general, and the lack of reception of Scandinavian Creation Theology in Finland in particular, still waits for further explorations. For an investigation of the American reception, see Derek Nelson. "Scandinavian Creation Theology in American Perspective" in Gregersen et al. ). *Reformation Theology for a Post-Secular Age*, 241-251.
- <sup>5</sup> Gustaf Wingren. *Creation and Law*. Translated by Ross Mackenzie (Eugene: Cascade Books 1958/1961/2003), 12.
- <sup>6</sup> Gustaf Wingren. *An Exodus Theology: Einar Billing and the Development of Modern Swedish Theology*. Translated by Eric Wahlstrom (Philadelphia: Fortress Press), 165.
- <sup>7</sup> Gustaf Wingren. *The Flight from Creation* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press 1971), 15, 18.
- <sup>8</sup> Cf. "The Bible is a literary product with a simple account of human origins, the investigation of which requires no more than accepted rules of procedure." Gustaf Wingren, *The Living Word: A Theological Study on Preaching and the Church*. Translated by Victor C Pougée (Eugene: Wipf & Stock 1949/1960/2002), 136.
- <sup>9</sup> Kärkkäinen, *Christ and Reconciliation*, 11-12.
- <sup>10</sup> Bengt Kristensson Uggla. "Gustaf Wingren as Anti-Anti-Liberal Theologian: The Contribution of Scandinavian Creation Theology to a Liberal Theology for Today". In: *Liberale Theologie heute / Liberal Theology Today*. Herausgeber: Lauster, Schmiedel, Schüz (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 37-48.
- <sup>11</sup> Kärkkäinen, *Christ and Reconciliation*, 149.
- <sup>12</sup> Wingren, *Creation and Law*, 179.
- <sup>13</sup> Wingren, *Creation and Law*, 18.
- <sup>14</sup> Bengt Kristensson Uggla. *Becoming Human Again: The Theological Life of Gustaf Wingren*. Translated by Daniel M Olson (Eugene: Cascade Books 2016), 152, 291, 343-5.
- <sup>15</sup> Kärkkäinen, *Christ and Reconciliation*, 49.
- <sup>16</sup> Kärkkäinen, *Christ and Reconciliation*, 139f.
- <sup>17</sup> Gustaf Wingren. *Credo: The Christian View of Faith and Life*. Translated by Edgar M. Carlson (Minneapolis: Augsburg 1974/1981), 21. See also Kristensson Uggla, *Becoming Human Again*, 153-166.
- <sup>18</sup> Gustaf Wingren. *The Johanneum Journal* (Gustaf Wingren's personal archive, Lund University Library), 179.
- <sup>19</sup> Wingren, *The Flight from Creation*, 62.
- <sup>20</sup> Kärkkäinen, *Christ and Reconciliation*, 167. Cf. his understanding of kenotic Christology: "Jesus self-emptying, his making himself dependent on the will and love of his Father, is in keeping with the true divinity of the Son as revealed to us and with the true humanity as created by God." (ibid., 166)
- <sup>21</sup> Gustaf Wingren, *Gospel and Church*. Translated by Ross Mackenzie (Eugene: Wipf & Stock 1960/1964/2006), 38.
- <sup>22</sup> Ibid., 48.
- <sup>23</sup> Ibid., 61.
- <sup>24</sup> Gustaf Wingren, *Man and the Incarnation: A Study*. In *the Biblical Theology of Irenaeus*. Translated by Ross Mackenzie (Eugene: Wipf & Stock 1947/1959/2004), xii.
- <sup>25</sup> Ibid., 7.
- <sup>26</sup> Ibid., 33.
- <sup>27</sup> I have borrowed this phrase from Emanuel Lévinas. *Humanism of the Other*. Translated by Nidra Poller (Chicago: Chicago University Press 1972/2005). See also Kristensson Uggla, *Becoming Human Again*, 60.
- <sup>28</sup> Bengt Kristensson Uggla. "What Makes Us Human? The Lutheran Anthropological Link Between Wingren And Ricoeur." In: *Open Theology* 2018/4: 308-315.
- <sup>29</sup> Wingren, *Creation and Law*, 197.
- <sup>30</sup> Wingren, *Man and the Incarnation*, 196.
- <sup>31</sup> Gustaf Wingren. "Arbetets mening" [The Meaning of Work]. *Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift*, Volume 25 (1949), 286.
- <sup>32</sup> Wingren, *The Living Word*, 212.