



Waste Land: Theological reflection on brownfield rehabilitation

Paul Ede

The area of Possilpark in Glasgow is marked by the presence of large areas of degraded brownfield sites, a legacy of the old Saracen Foundry. Polluted, undeveloped land, in fact, is most prevalent in the poorer areas of Glasgow and presents one of the most intractable problems for the governance and wellbeing of the city. Seen in this light, brownfield rehabilitation has become the locus of meaningful missional engagement for Clay Community Church (CCC), a new charismatic-evangelical church plant in Possilpark. As a church committed to a contextual approach to outworking the gospel, seeking the transformation of brownfield sites has emerged as a major strand of its missional work. As part of an evaluation of the work, an Action Plan has been drawn up using Action Research by a working group from the church. This pioneering work has now been continuing for a number of years. In this article, Paul Ede, a founding leader of the Community Church, reflects on the implications of this Action Plan and project in the light of Christological, Trinitarian and biblical considerations.



Christology

The Action Plan drawn up for the brownfield rehabilitation project expressed the desire ‘to keep ourselves in perspective regarding our environmental work’. This arose from the realisation that it is God, ultimately, who redeems the land and the people of Possil, not us. Retaining a focus on Christ as the redeemer, moreover, was put in place for several practical reasons. First, it prevents the danger that a ‘God-complex’ should develop in Clay Church’s perception of its mission.¹ Focussing on Christ as redeemer is a key way to make sure that practitioners within CCC retain an appropriate self-image

and power-relinquishing humility towards Possil's land and people. In terms of the values of the church, this reinforces the capacity to work 'with' not just 'for' the people and non-human creation of Possil. Secondly, focussing on Christ as redeemer calls us constantly back to faithful practice, so that this work does not simply degenerate into an amusing hobby or pastime, devoid of Kingdom orientation. Third, it places Christ as the sustainer of the mission of the people of God at the heart of what we do, ensuring the capacity to pace ourselves in the long-term.

These convictions demonstrate the intuitive understanding among research participants that CCC's praxis of brownfield rehabilitation must primarily be rooted in the salvific work of Christ.² Willis Jenkins has opined that Christian environmental ethics has tended to base its foundation on renewed forms of creation theology and the realignment to a theistic worldview. He claims this tends to happen to the exclusion of soteriology and Christology. But, Jenkins asks, 'Why should Christian theologians talk about nature and worldviews when Christianity centers around talk of nature and grace?'³ Faced with the choice between the bio-centrism of Deep Ecology and the anthropocentrism of the conservation movement,⁴ many Christian environmental ethicists (including Michael Northcott)⁵ suggest a shift to theo-centrism as the way to relativise the centrality of either nature or man to the detriment of the other. While acknowledging the importance of the shift, Jenkins critiques this tendency for not drawing deeply on the rich soteriological traditions of the Christian faith.⁶ He was spurred to make these observations through his study of Third World practical eco-theologies, including a group of revivalist tree-planters in Uganda.⁷

Following Loren Wilkinson, Stephen Bouma-Prediger's ecological Christology suggests that the idea of Christ as the new Adam is the most helpful metaphor of the atonement with regards to environmental mission because it 'does the most justice to the full New Testament teaching of Christ's involvement in the cosmos both as Creator and Redeemer'.⁸ In light of CCC's experience of brownfield rehabilitation, we can perhaps go even further and say that Christ is the *New Gardener*. Where Adam was once given the cultural mandate to care for creation, but failed (Gen 1:28; 2:15), so Christ as the new Adam becomes the truly faithful Gardener who will

faithfully fulfil that mandate. It is intriguing to note here the question as to whether there were deliberately ironic undertones to Mary's mistaking of the risen Christ for a gardener (John 20:15). Christ not only renews creation in its ultimate glory as the renewed Jerusalem-as-garden-city (Rev 21), but also sends his Church by his Spirit amidst today's cities to anticipate and concretise the reconciliation of nature and culture implied in that vision. It is nestled in this Christological understanding that CCC can faithfully outwork the implications of the Christian vision of the redemption of nature and culture through its contemporary context of brownfield rehabilitation in Possilpark.



Keeping the Trinity at the heart of the work

The image of Christ as the New Gardener, however, must be balanced with similar biblical images of the Spirit and the Father. The former as the one who brooded over creation (Gen 1:2) and descends to empower the new 'Gardener-disciples' at Pentecost (Acts 2); the latter as the one who tends the vineyard in which Christ is the vine and the Church its branches (John 15:1). In this we are reminded that Christology is always inherently Trinitarian.⁹ The doctrine of God and pneumatology (particularly in the form of the doctrine of *missio-dei*)¹⁰ must therefore shape a missional Christology. In *The One, the Three and the Many*, Colin Gunton puts forward the thesis that a Trinitarian, relational theory of creation is foundational to reconstructing the distorted understanding of nature promulgated by modernity.

In terms of urban greenspace, Jane Jacobs has sought to counteract the influence of both Romantic sentimentalism (through the urban parks movement) and enlightenment instrumentality (through modernist city design and planning) by turning to systems thinking. This move is rooted in an intuitive understanding of how multi-faceted inter-relationships combine to uniquely shape each instance of urban greenspace. Studying *relationships* between periphery and centre, between desire-lines and exits, between geology and identity, is critical to understanding essence, form and function. To this must be added an understanding of how human interactions with one another and with the land shape a given urban space. Jacobs' embracing of ordered complexity as a mode of thinking that seeks to take seriously the way that inter-relationships are foundational to greenspace construction,

reveals a desire to move beyond the false quasi-divination of nature and the opposite urge to instrumentalise it. This concern was shared by Colin Gunton, as James Houston points out:

The loss of this relatedness leads to the modern plight of ‘disengagement’¹¹ and of ‘instrumentality’ in our attitudes to reality, so it was in concern for the relational recovery of truth and reality that Gunton wanted to explore a Trinitarian understanding of creation.¹²

What Jacobs intuited about greenspace design, Gunton explicates theologically. To Gunton, modernity was the product of a rejection during the Enlightenment of a narrow theism that portrayed God in monistic terms. This narrow theism had abandoned notions of God’s immanence in creation through the incarnation and the Spirit. In turn, the false monist portrayal of God was perceived to suppress human individuation,¹³ and so it was concluded that the very concept of a transcendent God must be rejected.¹⁴ As a result, it was suggested (schizophrenically) that human freedom could be found both in the exaltation of the natural world to the space of transcendence (Rousseau) *and* through man’s dominance over nature (Kant).¹⁵ Taking the anthropocentric logic of both together, a simultaneous severing of man’s relationship to God *and* creation is observed. Modernity not only alienated man from nature (as also observed by Louv and Northcott), it also alienated man from God.

Gunton’s solution is to recover a more accurate understanding of God’s relationship to the created order than the false conception rejected by modernity. In so doing, he heals modernity’s conceptual severance between man, land/nature and God. Gunton offers a third way beyond the nature-culture dualism promulgated by modern thought. This involves rediscovering the true nature and activity of the triune Godhead in what Gunton calls an ‘open transcendentalism’, characterised by the concepts of perichoresis, substantiality and relationality.¹⁶ Of particular interest is Gunton’s concept of *substantiality*, by which he asserts that our freedom can be discovered as the Holy Spirit reveals our substance in relationship to God’s purposes for creation. True freedom is not discovered in the immanent order alone, but in the convergence of immanence and transcendence amidst nature as the Holy Spirit draws humankind and creation

towards their eschatological end.

The reality that the Holy Spirit brings the transcendent into our immediate immanent experience as part of his role in drawing humankind and creation to their eschatological end (Ps 104:30) is the pneumatological counterpart (in terms of a Trinitarian creation theology) of Willis Jenkins' Christological assertion of Christ's role as the mediator of salvation to the *cosmos*.¹⁷ Tony Campolo offers a similar reading of John 3:16.¹⁸ One way to explore Trinitarian creation theology (and by implication 'new creation' theology) from a pneumatological angle is to ask the question, 'to what extent is the Spirit of Pentecost the same Spirit that brooded over the waters of creation?' The obvious answer belies the point of the question. It serves to make connections between creation, redemption and the activity of the Spirit that are almost never made in charismatic churches in the West. Could this be because the Western charismatic movement (and perhaps also global Pentecostalism – as far as it has been exposed to Western thought) has remained overly syncretised with modernity? It is interesting, for example, that in their recent global review of progressive Pentecostalism engaged in social action, Miller and Yamamori's list of eight types of social ministries does not include any mention of ecological mission.¹⁹ The *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* defines the charismatic movement as:

the occurrence of distinctively Pentecostal blessings and phenomena, baptism in the Holy Spirit with the spiritual gifts of 1 Corinthians 12:8–10 outside a denominational and/or confessional Pentecostal framework.²⁰

In light of Gunton's work, this definition seems overly anthropocentric and rooted in the work of the Spirit only as redeemer of humanity rather than creator/redeemer of the cosmos.

Indigenous forms of Spirit-led environmental mission have, however, emerged in contexts less influenced by the modern worldview.²¹ Inus Daneel describes the work of ZIRRCO²² in the 1980s in such terms. In 1988 ZIRRCO set up a network of African Independent Churches to support them as they developed a response to the ecological devastation of Zimbabwe. They were particularly concerned with afforestation, the protection of water resources, and wildlife conservation, and they developed an innovative set of liturgical

practices and theological insights to support that mission. There was a focus on the Holy Spirit as ‘Earthkeeping Spirit’, devoted not only to the healing of humanity but also to the healing of the land. A new tree-planting Eucharist was developed, encoding the honouring of God as the first planter of trees in Genesis. This bound the praxis of ecological mission to the heart of the church’s liturgical life, and simultaneously celebrated the immanence and transcendence of the Gardener-Christ. In addition, the Eucharist became a place of the ‘blending of healing – of humans and of the land’.²³ Daneel continues: ‘In such blending the interpenetration between Son and Holy Spirit is evident. Ritually, therefore, christology and pneumatology become one, as Africa enacts the conviction that “the Spirit always brings the activity of the Son to its goal” (Moltmann).’²⁴ In evidence here is a full-orbed understanding of the work of the Spirit that re-establishes the connection between his work in Genesis, Acts and Revelation. Tellingly, Daneel’s reaction to this new missiology was to admit that ‘no longer could I maintain the Western dualism of spiritual as opposed to physical reality. African holism became the hermeneutic for theological reorientation.’²⁵ A similar holism, much closer to home, can be found in Scotland’s pre-modern heritage of Celtic Christianity, which combined a strong Trinitarian focus with a rich theology of creation.²⁶

Other examples of the praxis of environmental mission in an African context include the work of the recently deceased Nobel Peace Prize winner Wangari Maathai who in 1977 set up a tree-planting movement among Kenyan women called the Greenbelt Movement. She helped transform the attitudes of Kenyan churches towards environmental mission by encouraging them to celebrate Easter Monday with the planting of trees:

If we could make that Monday a day of regeneration, revival, of being reborn, of finding salvation by restoring the Earth, it would be a great celebration of Christ’s resurrection. After all, Christ was crucified on the cross. In a light touch, I always say, somebody had to go into the forest, cut a tree, and chop it up for Jesus to be crucified. What a great celebration of his conquering [death] it would be if we were to plant trees on Easter Monday in thanksgiving.²⁷

Of particular interest in the context of this report is the fact that Maathai's movement began in an urban context with the planting of seven trees at a public park in Nairobi. Fifteen years later, Tony Campolo was encouraging evangelical Christians in Western cities to engage in urban tree planting as a legitimate form of environmental mission:

The big cities of America are, for the most part, on the verge of bankruptcy. As these cities cut their spending, one of the first things to go is any ongoing program to plant trees. 'But trees are a fundamental building block of a healthy urban environment,' says Dan Smith of the American Forestry Association [...] This kind of tree planting is a whole new kind of missionary work for urban Christians. It becomes a way for the church to say 'we care' to the rest of the community and for Christians to live out their calling to rescue dying creation.²⁸

Returning to Jane Jacobs, from a Christian perspective we realise that a relational understanding of human interaction with urban greenspace cannot be truly humanising without also reconnecting people to the three-in-one Godhead who is the relational foundation of all being. Systems theory remains a helpful tool for greenspace development, but it must be grounded in a robust theology of the Trinity to be truly faithful. The relationships between man and the urban environment are held together by the One in whom all relationships find their source.

In summary, we can see how the praxis of African Christian ecological mission, illumined by Jenkins, Gunton and Daneel, can point beyond Jacobs to an innovative form of Trinitarian and Spirit-led ecological mission appropriate for urban greenspace development in Western cities.



Cities and the healing of the land – biblical theology

The question might well be asked, however, 'if environmental mission is legitimate why don't we see more of it in the Bible?' What follows is a necessarily short answer to the question, rooted in biblical narratives from 2 Chronicles, 2 Kings, Ezekiel, Isaiah, Psalm 87, Romans 8 and Revelation 21. The intent is to lay the foundation of a

holistic biblical theology for urban eco-mission. One caveat, however, is of utmost importance: while we now read the scriptures from the perspective of significant power over nature, the opposite was the case in biblical times. As Richard Bauckham writes: ‘Whereas for us the healing of the relationship between humans and the rest of creation most obviously suggests that humans stop destroying nature, for them it most obviously suggested that nature be friendlier to humans (so, e.g. Isa 11:6–9).’²⁹ Walter Brueggemann nevertheless states that ‘the matter of creation as healthy environment is unavoidably implicit everywhere in the Old Testament.’³⁰

The promise of 2 Chronicles 7:14 is very familiar in charismatic church circles:

if my people, who are called by my name, will humble themselves and pray and seek my face and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from heaven, and I will forgive their sin and will heal their land. (Niv)

The last four words of this verse, however, tend to be used as a biblical foundation for prayer seeking structural change and the establishment of the presence of Yahweh above the powers, rather than a mandate to seek ecological healing. This is another sign, perhaps, of modernity’s successful severing of the connection between God’s people and creation in the Western world. Much less well known than 2 Chronicles 7:14 is a short passage describing the ministry of Elisha in that perfectly illustrates an ecological outworking of this promise:

The people of the city said to Elisha, “Look, our lord, this town is well situated, as you can see, but the water is bad and the land is unproductive.”

“Bring me a new bowl,” he said, “and put salt in it.” So they brought it to him.

Then he went out to the spring and threw the salt into it, saying, “This is what the LORD says: ‘I have healed this water. Never again will it cause death or make the land unproductive.’” And the water has remained pure to this day, according to the word Elisha had spoken. (2 Kgs 2:19–22 Niv)

Here we see an example of Daneel’s Earthkeeping Spirit at work in an urban context (Jericho),³¹ healing the degradation of the land. The actual causes are not named. In this healing miracle an anthropocentric benefit occurs but the vector is creational. Note particularly the use of the Hebrew word *rapha* (to mend, cure or make whole) with reference to the water of the well. This is exactly the same word used of the land in the Chronicles passage. T. R. Hobbs notes that the use of salt as a healing agent is ‘unknown elsewhere in the OT.’³² Was it this passage that Christ had in mind when he told his disciples ‘You are the salt of the earth’ (Matt 5:13)? And if so, how might this insight shape urban mission today? If nothing else, this passage reminds us that the coming Sabbath rest for the land promised by the Lord of the Sabbath, Christ, will result in sustainable land usage, be it the restriction of unjust over-production (encoded in the Jubilee laws of Leviticus 25:4) or the reversal of unjust disuse, as anticipated here.

In Ezekiel 47 a similar elemental rejuvenation of earth by water occurs as the Spirit, flowing from the Temple of Jerusalem, brings life to the land of the Dead Sea. Often read in charismatic and Pentecostal circles after an anthropocentric and gift-oriented pattern, this passage can also be read as a model of ecological renewal rooted in the resurrection of the city by means of a renewed Temple. The former approach usually asks the ‘renewal question’: ‘how deep have we gone into the water?’ (meaning by this ‘how deeply have you partaken of a personal experience of the Spirit and asked for his gifts?’). The latter instead asks missiological questions: ‘where does the river flow to, and for what purpose?’ Answer: it flows to a degraded habitat and miraculously restores life there. Like most translations, the NIV translates Ezekiel 47:8b as ‘When it empties into the Sea, the water there becomes fresh.’ The Hebrew for ‘becomes fresh’ is in fact *rapha* (as before in the episode of Elisha at Jericho) and could also be translated ‘the waters of the sea *shall be healed*’ (as for example in the ASV).³³ This, in turn, results in a further healing of the surrounding land. The use of the word *rapha* here connects the vision of Ezekiel to the promise of 2 Chronicles, just like the passage in 2 Kings. The Spirit of creation is as concerned with healing the land as the people, because the two are interdependent.

Walter Brueggemann shows that this vision of land restoration is a demonstration of Yahweh’s covenant commitment to the exilic

generation to bring them again into the land promise that he had laid down in the Torah.³⁴ God's covenant purposes always involve the redemption of his people as an integrated whole, along with the alien, the poor *and the land*. This promise of land restoration remains in the New Testament but is extended to all peoples and the whole of creation, as we see in Romans 8:21 and Revelation 21. The comingling of an anthropocentric interpretation of this passage with a broader, biotic one yields rich biblical material for a charismatic and Trinitarian urban eco-missiology. This is especially the case when we recall not only that Christ considers himself the 'spring of water welling up to eternal life' (John 4:14) in a deliberate echoing of this passage in Ezekiel,³⁵ but also when we recall Paul's description of the Church as the new Temple (Eph 2:21; 1 Cor 3:16).

Just as Ezekiel's vision was given by God as an encouragement to the exiled Babylonian Jews before their return to Jerusalem, so too the stirring prophecy of Isaiah 61 was later used by Christ as the foundation of his vocation (Luke 4). Here again, we observe a strong connection between the work of the Spirit (Isa 61:1) and the healing of the land (although the specific word *rapha* is not used). Although Luke has Christ read out only the first two verses of this chapter, the implication is that, through the anointing of the Spirit, Jesus will be the one who will fulfill and enable the entire promise of the following verses. This includes verse 4: 'They will rebuild the ancient ruins and restore the places long devastated; they will renew the ruined cities that have been devastated for generations.' (In the KJV the word for 'ruin' in Isa 61:4 is translated as 'waste', meaning 'wasteland'.) Taken as a whole, then, this prophecy forms a strong foundation for a pneumatology and Christology of whole-city redemption. Colin Symes, part of the collaborative support group for the Action Plan, observed that the word here translated 'devastated' is from the Hebrew root *shamem* which means (in the intransitive, as here) 'to be stunned, grow numb, be desolated or lain waste'. This recalls the way creation groans in Romans 8:22. It certainly seems a rich description of the state of the urban wasteland in Possil, and in context may point not only to the idea of the walls and buildings themselves being restored but also any wasted land (*in situ* and *ex situ*) being rehabilitated to fruitful use. Walter Brueggemann points to the same root word *shamem* in Isaiah 62:4 and describes this passage as a

particularly rich evocation of God’s desire to restore such defiled land to his people.³⁶

Ultimately both Ezekiel’s vision and Isaiah’s prophecy point towards the eschatological promise of *shalom*. This is the reconciliation of whole of creation and each of its constituent elements – including land and wildlife – to the Godhead.³⁷ The imagery of Ezekiel 47 and Isaiah 61 is recapitulated in John’s great vision of the New Jerusalem in Revelation 21. Here, the Tree of Life has been replanted by the New Gardener at the centre of a resurrected city devoid of brownfield land, where creation and human culture are intimately intertwined and all is reconnected to the pervasive presence of God. Referring to Ezekiel 47, Leslie C. Allen writes ‘Barren land was to be transformed into a scene of sustenance and herbal healing, a perennial antidote to pain and need. Rev 22:2, drawing on a slightly different tradition, firmly equates this blessing with the tree of life.’³⁸ David Smith has shown how the narratives of Israel and the early Christians point towards God’s over-arching calling to the people of God to partake in his mission to redeem entire city-systems.³⁹ This also implies the redemption of urban ecological systems. N. T. Wright, commenting on Romans 8:19–21, writes that ‘as God sent Jesus to rescue the human race, so God will send Jesus’ younger siblings, in the power of the Spirit, to rescue the *whole* created order, to bring that justice and peace for which the whole creation yearns.’⁴⁰

The trope of city-redemption is certainly evident in Psalm 87. While the meaning of this Scripture is ultimately difficult to pin down,⁴¹ this psalm does suggest that in the New Creation the many diverse Gentile and Jewish cities of the known world will be found finally and fully ‘in Zion’. This is redolent, in an anticipatory sense, of how the redeemed people of God will find themselves fully and finally ‘in Christ’. The psalmist is clearly stating that it is the *cities themselves* that will be declared to have been ‘born in Zion,’ with Zion being imagined as the eschatological mother-city of all cities.⁴² It therefore seems natural to add Glasgow to this prophetic list. And if Glasgow will be found ‘in Zion’ in the New Creation then the call of the Church today is to anticipate this in *all* its multi-faceted aspects: not just the anticipated inclusion of the Gentiles, but also the healing (*rapha*) of (urban) land.⁴³ The promise that the cities themselves will sing that ‘all my fountains are in you’ takes on particular resonance

for urban eco-missiology in light of the water imagery employed in 2 Kings and Ezekiel.

Taken together, then, these narratives demonstrate the tension between modernity and Judeo-Christianity with regard to the latter's concern for the integrity of the relationships between the created order, mankind and God. Biblical thought, action and prophecy is committed to the reconciliation and healing of these relationships (Col 1:16) even as modernity seeks to tear them asunder.

Notes

- 1 Bryant L. Myers, *Walking With the Poor: Principles and Practices of Transformational Development* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1999), 116.
- 2 Willis Jenkins, *Ecologies of Grace: Environmental Ethics and Christian Theology* (New York: OUP, 2008), 4.
- 3 *Ibid.*, 13.
- 4 Peter Harris, *Kingfisher's Fire: A Story of Hope for God's Earth* (Oxford; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Monarch Books, 2008), 152.
- 5 Jenkins, *Ecologies of Grace*, 14 f.
- 6 *Ibid.*, 15.
- 7 *Ibid.*, 6.
- 8 Loren Wilkinson, "Christ as Creator and Redeemer", in *The Environment and the Christian: What Does the New Testament Say About the Environment?* (ed. Calvin B. DeWitt; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 1991), 25–44, 39 f. Quoted in Stephen Bouma-Prediger, *For the Beauty of the Earth* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 2001), 124.
- 9 Lesslie Newbigin, "Ecumenical Amnesia", *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 18.1 (January 1994): 2.
- 10 David J. Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1991), 10.
- 11 By 'disengagement' here, Gunton is referring to the modern belief that to correctly appropriate reality, humankind can and must step back and assess it objectively from a rational perspective. To modernists this objectivity is possible from within creation without

- reference to anything external to creation. Colin E. Gunton, *The One, the Three and the Many: God, Creation and the Culture of Modernity* (Cambridge: CUP, 1993), 13.
- 12 James Houston, “Creation and Incarnation”, in *Caring for Creation: Biblical and Theological Perspectives* (ed. Sarah Tillett; Oxford: BRF, 2005), 92.
- 13 Gunton, *The One, the Three and the Many*, 26.
- 14 *Ibid.*, 27.
- 15 *Ibid.*, 224.
- 16 *Ibid.*, 210 ff.
- 17 See Jenkins, *Ecologies of Grace*.
- 18 John 3:16a is translated ‘For God so loved the *world* that he gave his one and only Son’ in the NIV. Evangelicals usually read the ‘world’ to mean ‘those who do not know Christ’ (an anthropocentric reading). Tony Campolo, however, has pointed out that the Greek word used here is *cosmos*, and argues for a straight transliteration. This reading instead emphasises the cosmic dimensions of Christ’s salvation. Tony Campolo, *How to Rescue the Earth Without Worshipping Nature* (Nashville, Tenn.: Thomas Nelson, 1992), ix.
- 19 Donald E. Miller and Tetsunao Yamamori, *Global Pentecostalism: The New Face of Christian Social Engagement* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), 42.
- 20 Stanley M. Burgess and Gary B. McGee, eds., *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1988), 130.
- 21 M. L. [‘Inus’] Daneel, “Earthkeeping in Missiological Perspective: An African Challenge”, *Mission Studies* 13 (1996): 132.
- 22 Zimbabwean Institute of Religious Research and Ecological Conservation.
- 23 Daneel, “Earthkeeping in Missiological Perspective”, 180.
- 24 *Ibid.* Cf. Jürgen Moltmann, *God in Creation: An Ecological Doctrine of Creation* (London: SCM Press, 1985), 9.
- 25 Inus Daneel, “Contextualising Environmental Theology in African Society”, online: <http://www.unisa.ac.za/default.asp?Cmd=ViewContent&ContentID=7345> (accessed 7 August 2011).
- 26 Peter Neilson, *Church on the Move: New Church, New Generation, New Scotland: An Emerging Profile* (Glasgow: Covenanters; Edinburgh: Scottish Christian Press, 2005), 116.

- 27 Greenbelt Movement, “Heaven Is Green: An Interview With Wangari Maathai”, online: <http://www.greenbeltmovement.org/a.php?id=115> (accessed 24 December 2011).
- 28 Campolo, *How to Rescue the Earth*, 139.
- 29 Richard Bauckham, “The New Testament Teaching on the Environment: A Response to Ernest Lucas”, in *A Christian Approach To The Environment* (ed. R. Carling; Oswestry: John Ray Initiative, 2005); originally published as a special issue of *Transformation: An International Journal of Holistic Mission Studies* (vol. 16.3, 1999). For more on this important discussion see David W. Smith, *Seeking a City With Foundations* (Nottingham: IVP, 2011), 124.
- 30 Walter Brueggemann, *The Land: Place as Gift, Promise and Challenge in Biblical Faith* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 2002), xix.
- 31 T. R. Hobbs, *2 Kings* (Word Biblical Commentary 13; Waco, Tx.: Word Books, 1985), 23.
- 32 Ibid.
- 33 Hobbs, *2 Kings*, 23 f.
- 34 Brueggemann, *The Land*, 134.
- 35 Dave Bookless, *God Doesn't Do Waste: Redeeming the Whole of Life* (Nottingham: IVP, 2010), 84.
- 36 Brueggemann, *The Land*, 194 (and also of the passage in 2 Kings 2:13).
- 37 Smith, *Seeking a City*, 163.
- 38 Leslie C. Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48* (Word Biblical Commentary 29; Waco, Tx.: Word Books, 1990), 280.
- 39 Smith, *Seeking a City*, 127.
- 40 N. T. Wright, “The Letter to the Romans: Introduction, Commentary and Reflections”, *The New Interpreters Bible* (12 vols.; Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 2002), X:596 (italics mine).
- 41 Marvin Tate, *Psalms 51–100* (Word Biblical Commentary 20; Dallas, Tx.: Word Books, 1990), 387.
- 42 Ibid., 389.
- 43 The usual reading of v. 7 is to connect it to the Pauline letters (Eph 3:3–9 and Gal 4:26), and their emphasis on the inclusion of the Gentiles into the promises of God (Tate, *Psalms 51–100*, 393).

This misses the reading of Paul's letter's which also emphasises the healing of creation (Rom 8:19–22) – an equally important theme of eschatological fulfilment often marginalised by evangelical scholarship (but recovered by, e.g., N. T. Wright, “The Letter to the Romans: Introduction, Commentary and Reflections”).