

# The Advent Of The Spirit: The Turn To Pneumatology In The Theology Of Jürgen Moltmann

D. LYLE DABNEY

## THE ADVENT OF THE SPIRIT

Although Jürgen Moltmann is by no means a process theologian, he is most definitely a theologian in process. Probably no aspect of his thought makes that more apparent than the development in his doctrine of the Holy Spirit. In his early publications, one is hard pressed to find any sustained, substantive statement concerning the Spirit. Indeed, one writer has commented that pneumatology in Moltmann's early writings is "simply non-existent."<sup>1</sup> But in his most recent work, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit has come to be a central concern; one which has expressed itself most remarkably in the appearance a short time ago of a highly praised volume on pneumatology, *The Spirit of Life, A Universal Affirmation*,<sup>2</sup> in a series of books in which no such volume had been planned. How are we to understand this advent of the Spirit? What forces have led to this turn to Pneumatology in the theology of Jürgen Moltmann? And how are those forces shaping the doctrine of the Holy Spirit which is in the process of emerging in his current work? Those are the questions this paper seeks to answer.

Moltmann's publications can be divided, both in terms of the time of their appearance and their content, into roughly three groups.<sup>3</sup> The first stretches from his doctoral dissertation at Göttingen under Otto Weber in 1952 through the first years of the 1960s and is concerned primarily with the history of Reformed theology in Germany and France. The second,

---

*Lyle Dabney is the Associate Pastor at Marvin United Methodist Church in Tyler, Texas. He received his doctorate after studying under Jürgen Moltmann at the University of Tübingen.*

---

overlapping the first, can be dated from the late 1950s and continues through the late 1970s. Its beginning is marked by studies of Bonhoeffer and Barth, and an initial response to Ernst Bloch. But it reaches its high point in the triad of books which constitute Moltmann's first major works on systematics: *Theology of Hope*,<sup>4</sup> *The Crucified God*,<sup>5</sup> and *The Church in the Power of the Spirit*.<sup>6</sup> Each examines the whole of Christian theology from a single perspective: first from Easter, then from Good Friday, and finally from Pentecost. The third and last group of publications, dating from the late 1970s to the present, has as its centerpiece a series of books called by Moltmann "Contributions to Systematic Theology" which are to form what he terms a "Messianic Theology." The first three of what was originally planned as five volumes have already appeared in print: *The Trinity and the Kingdom*,<sup>7</sup> *God in Creation*,<sup>8</sup> and *The Way of Jesus Christ*.<sup>9</sup> In addition, as was mentioned above, a book unforeseen in the initial conception of the series has recently been published, a pneumatology entitled *The Spirit of Life*.<sup>10</sup>

Although it played an expanding role in the second phase of Moltmann's work, it is only in this last series of publications that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit has come powerfully to the fore, climaxing with the appearance of the unplanned volume on pneumatology. But, although Moltmann's doctrine of the Spirit has flowered only in the final period, its roots are buried deep in the earlier phases of his work. To understand what motivates the advent, and determines the shape of this pneumatology, we must look, therefore, not just to the later, but much more to his earlier publications. In that which follows, we will examine two of the three books that represent Moltmann's central concern during the second phase of his work: first, in a rather extensive investigation, *Theology of Hope*, and then, in a more limited way, *The Crucified God*. In so doing, I will seek to demonstrate the logic of the emergence of pneumatology as a vital element in Moltmann's thought by examining the fundamental problems with which he grapples. It was his struggle to overcome these problems, I will suggest, that initially led him to turn to pneumatology and which is still shaping the doctrine of the Holy Spirit he is yet in the process of developing.

### THEOLOGY OF HOPE

The roots of Moltmann's turn to pneumatology reach deep into his past.<sup>11</sup> To understand both why the doctrine of the Spirit was largely absent from his first theological efforts and why it has flowered so unexpectedly later in his work, it is necessary to explore the factors that shaped his early thought. Moltmann's first major work of systematic theology was *Theology of Hope*, published in 1964. In it, he brought together three major currents of thought in post-war Germany: the theology of Karl Barth, the philosophy of Ernst Bloch, and the biblical theology of Gerhard von Rad and Ernst Käsemann. Each contributed to the absence of any meaningful pneumatology in the book, and thus each helped set the stage for the later advent of the Spirit in Moltmann's subsequent theological development.

The first factor was the theology of Karl Barth, or, more precisely, the conflict over his theology in post-war Germany. Moltmann belongs to that generation of

theologians who returned to Germany after the war in the hope of building a new, more humane society out of the ruins of the old.<sup>12</sup> The church in post-war Germany was defined, both in terms of its public theology and its internal politics, by the pre-war struggle of the Confessing Church of the 1930s, symbolized above all by the Barmen Declaration of 1934. That which stood behind that declaration was, of course, the theology of Karl Barth with its utter and complete concentration upon Jesus Christ as the "one Word of God," which the church, over and against every human word, "must hear, must trust and must obey." From that sort of "churchly" theology there arose after the war a triumphant "churchly" church in Germany, which proclaimed a correspondingly "churchly" God. Moltmann, speaking about his own experience of that post-war situation, writes that he exaggerates only slightly when he says that the church moved from an experience of God in the midst of the abyss, to the exaltation of God as the "Lord of the church," belonging to the church and to it alone. "The church installed itself," he continues, "in a "Christian society" and won more influence over school, press, and politics than was good for it, for it was itself more influenced by social powers and interests than it suspected."<sup>13</sup> It was to such a church that Moltmann returned in 1948 after his years in allied prisoner of war camps. After gaining his degree in theology, he served for five years as pastor in a small rural parish in Bremen-Wasserhorst in the north of Germany.

But if, on the one hand, the sharply dialectical theology of the pre-war Barth contributed to the rise of a self-satisfied post-war "church of the status quo," the spiritual guardian of the new, supposedly "Christian" Germany, then it must be clearly stated, on the other hand, that the post-war theology of Barth pointed in a very different direction. The Barth who, before the war, had declared God to be *ganz anders*, standing over and against all things creaturely, now, after the war, spoke of God and creature standing together in Jesus Christ. He even wrote of the "Humanity of God."<sup>14</sup> Without surrendering in the least his insistence upon christology as the center of Evangelical theology, Barth began to expand his field of vision. While his earlier concern in the midst of the struggle between the "Confessing" and the "German" Churches had been the church's faithfulness to its confession of Jesus Christ, he turned in the new, post-war situation to address not just "churchly" problems, but, from the standpoint of christology, also questions being asked by society at large, above all those of ethics and politics.<sup>15</sup> Thus, in the situation that emerged in Europe after the war, Barth turned his theological attention, at least theoretically, not simply to the concerns of the church, but rather, in and through the church's proclamation of Jesus Christ, to the concerns of the world itself. This "turn to the world" resulted in an increasingly tense relationship between the guardians of the pre-war "Barthian" theology of the post-war German Church and those who championed Barth and the theology he himself propounded in that new and different situation of the late 1940s and 1950s.

Moltmann's theological formation took place in the context of this tension. From the very beginning of his studies at Göttingen, he was interested in ethical and political questions; an interest his teacher Hans-Joachim Iwand, among oth-

ers, encouraged.<sup>16</sup> His professors in systematic theology, and that meant, above all, in Barth's theology, were Iwand, Ernst Wolf and Otto Weber—later his *Doktorvater*. In addition, he studied the theology of the Old and New Testaments under Gerhard von Rad and Ernst Käsemann. From these theologians, Moltmann received his fundamental theological orientation: reformed, christo-centric, and dialectical. In sum, his was a self-consciously "churchly" theology which was, nevertheless, strongly concerned with politics and ethics. Clothed in such theological armor as a "critical Barthian," Moltmann assumed, first, the office of pastor, and then, at Otto Weber's insistence, a chair of theology in the Germany of the 1950s. And although his theological orientation was certainly broadened and modified in subsequent years, most clearly through contact with Arnold A. van Ruler and his *Apostolatstheologie*, whose emphasis upon the mission of the church first opened Moltmann's eyes to the possibility that Barth had not said all that needed saying in the realm of systematic theology,<sup>17</sup> this fundamental orientation remained the distinguishing character of his thinking through the whole development of his later theology; a development whose first expression was *Theology of Hope*.

The second of the three factors that contributed to Moltmann's writing of *Theology of Hope* was the philosophy of Ernst Bloch, first and foremost in his most important work, *Das Prinzip Hoffnung*.<sup>18</sup> Bloch (1885-1977) was a representative of a movement within Marxism called "esoteric Marxism" which sought to both "go beyond" as well as "get behind" such orthodox forms of Marxism as Leninism and Stalinism. In "getting behind" the rise of orthodox Marxism, this school of thought appropriated the insights of pre-Marxist future-oriented political and religious movements in western history, especially certain elements of Judaism and Christianity, for—as Bloch wrote—"eschatological conscience came into the world through the Bible."<sup>19</sup> And in "going beyond" orthodox Marxism, this movement spoke of a future which went far beyond the traditional Marxist goal of a classless society; a society which Bloch in *Das Prinzip Hoffnung* named the "*novum ultimum*" or, alternatively, "the home of identity" ("*die Heimat der Identität*").

In *Das Prinzip Hoffnung*, Bloch develops a unique philosophy which encompasses both theory and praxis. He portrays a world which is open and full of new possibilities because it is ontologically grounded not in an all-determining beginning, but rather, in an all-actualizing end: the *novum ultimum*. "The true genesis," declares Bloch, "is not at the beginning but at the end."<sup>20</sup> This ontology of "being which is not yet" (*Noch-Nicht-Sein*) postulates therefore the future utopia as that which is finally real and the world as an open process toward that end.

Corresponding to this ontology, Bloch develops a *theory* that is at one and the same time a *praxis* of hope. Humanity in its present state is, according to Bloch, *homo absconditus*, a searching and seeking creature whose true being is "not yet," but could possibly through human searching and seeking "come to be." Human beings live, therefore, in hope in the coming "home of identity," the utopian future. Out of that arises, Bloch claims, the utopian excess of all future-oriented political and revolutionary movements, of all human dreams and arts which

strain toward the future, and, above all, of all eschatological religion. They are all examples of hope, of the human yearning for the *novum*, in which humanity strains forward toward the utopian future. This *novum* is, on the one hand, never utterly new, for it is always presaged in the present, but, on the other hand, it is at the same time never simply the culmination of that which is self-evident in the present. For the "being which is not yet" occurs ever and again as the unforeseen fulfillment of "that which already is," indeed, more than that, as more than any being could imagine. Humanity is thus for Bloch a social experiment, an open process of self-realization directed toward the utopian future; a process that will end in all or nothing, depending on whether or not the goal of the *novum ultimum*, the "home of identity" is reached. Therefore, with the future still open, the end not yet known, Bloch offers a Marxist *praxis of hope* which emerges from the theory of hope and points beyond the traditional goal of Marxism to the *novum ultimum*. For Bloch sees Marxist philosophy as a "meta-religion" which has inherited all the various strands of political, intellectual, and religious hope in Western history and is, therefore, in a position to analyze the historical and social situation of humankind and to prescribe concrete forms of praxis which can place humanity on the path to its true being, its "being which is not yet."

Moltmann read Bloch's book, *Das Prinzip Hoffnung*, in 1960. The impression it made upon him and upon many of his contemporary theologians, who were likewise struggling with the situation in which post-war Germany found itself, was enormous. As Moltmann wrote in 1970:

Bloch's philosophy placed in our hands an initial set of conceptual tools which enabled us to bring to both theoretical and practical expression that, and the extent to which, Christianity is from beginning to end eschatological, that is to say, a world-changing and world-overcoming hope.<sup>21</sup>

As such, Bloch's philosophy of hope became the point of departure, as well as an on-going partner in dialogue, for Moltmann's own parallel project of a *Theology of Hope*.

If Karl Barth and Ernst Bloch represent the theological and the philosophical poles of Moltmann's thinking in the early 1960s, then the third and immediate factor that contributed to the writing of the *Theology of Hope* was the heated debate concerning "promise and history" that took place at that time in Germany.<sup>22</sup> This discussion was begun not by systematic theologians but by biblical theologians: the Old Testament scholars Gerhard von Rad, Walter Zimmerli, Hans-Walter Wolff and Hans-Joachim Kraus, as well as New Testament scholars such as Rudolph Bultmann and Ernst Käsemann. The primary forum for this debate was the pages of the journal *Evangelische Theologie*. The Old Testament scholars were advocating a theology of the Old Testament which conceived of the entirety of the biblical witness in terms of a "history of the promises of God."<sup>23</sup> Over and against such an interpretation stood the New Testament theology of Rudolph Bultmann which interpreted the message of and about Jesus Christ existentially and thus proclaimed the Gospel as the "end of history."<sup>24</sup> Ernst

Käsemann, once Bultmann's student at Marburg and then Moltmann's teacher at Göttingen, had recently set off a major stir in German theological circles by challenging this interpretation of the New Testament. He contended that apocalyptic was the mother of Christian theology.<sup>25</sup> As Moltmann wrote:

He meant by "apocalyptic," frankly, not speculation about the events at the end of the world, but the fundamental question concerning when God would really be God over his kingdom and when his righteousness would be victorious over all the world. But this question presumed that the "end of history" was yet outstanding and was by no means already present.<sup>26</sup>

It was a spark from this heated debate on "promise and history" that lit the tinder of Barth's theology and Bloch's philosophy in Moltmann's thought. In 1964, as a contribution to this debate, he published his first major work in systematics: *Theology of Hope*.

The *Theology of Hope* was an immediate and astonishing success, and the almost thirty years that separate us now from its first appearance have only underlined that, by any measure, its publication was a major event in the history of theology in the twentieth century. In its eleventh German edition as of 1980, and translated into numerous other languages, it is, in all probability, the most-read piece of serious theology since the 1922 edition of Barth's *Römerbrief*.<sup>27</sup> A strikingly original and subtle work, it is far more than the sum of its sources.

*Theology of Hope* consists of an opening "Meditation on Hope" and five chapters, which systematically unfold what the subtitle of the work terms "the ground and the implications of a Christian eschatology."<sup>28</sup> In the "meditation," Moltmann introduces the book and seeks to meet and provisionally set aside the usual objections to its subject matter. Over and against the traditional understanding of eschatology as a kind of appendix recounting the "last things" which one finds attached to the end of a work of theology, Moltmann declares his oft-quoted thesis:

The eschatological is not one element of Christianity, but it is the medium of Christian faith as such, the key in which everything in it is set, the glow that suffuses everything here in the dawn of an expected new day. For Christian faith lives from the raising of the crucified Christ, and strains after the promises of the universal future of Christ. Eschatology is the passionate suffering and passionate longing kindled by the Messiah. Hence eschatology cannot really be only a part of Christian doctrine. Rather, the eschatological outlook is characteristic of all Christian proclamation, of every Christian existence and of the whole Church.<sup>29</sup>

And with these words, the major emphases of the book come to initial expression. *First*, eschatology is not something to tack onto the end of a theological system, but defines, rather, the whole of the field, just as Barth had emphasized earlier.<sup>30</sup> For, *secondly*, when one speaks of eschatology, one is speaking not of the end, but of the center of theology: the resurrection of Jesus Christ, which, as the very essence of the eschatological, represents God's promise to the entirety of

creation. From this eschatological center, *finally*, there arises the passion of the Messiah, and, therefore, of those taken into the mission of the Messiah: the Church as disciples of Jesus Christ. It is, thus, these three elements that make up the substance of *Theology of Hope's* eschatology: 1) as that which defines all of Christian theology, 2) as defined by God's promise in the resurrection of Jesus Christ, and 3) as expressed in messianic mission. After a long quote about hope from book three of Calvin's *Institutes*,<sup>31</sup> he continues the meditation by characterizing his task as *spes quaerens intellectum*, a word-play on a phrase of Anselm's that Barth had made current, and, in conclusion, states his intention to set out in that which follows a critical theology of hope, or, in a phrase borrowed from Bloch, a *docta spes*.<sup>32</sup>

Moltmann commences in chapter one with a survey of the modern development of eschatology from its beginnings in the historical research of Weiß and Schweitzer, through a brief review of Kant and Hegel, to the then most recent systematic treatments of eschatology and revelation by Barth, Bultmann, and Pannenberg. He dismisses each of these accounts as different forms of a Greek theology of the "epiphany of the eternal present,"<sup>33</sup> a concept he further elucidates in the next chapter, and contrasts them with his own understanding of eschatology and revelation.

In the second, and even more in the third chapter, we come to the heart of *Theology of Hope*: Moltmann's interpretation of the history of Israel and the resurrection of Jesus Christ as an account of divine promise and human hope. His interpretation of the history of Israel in chapter two turns around the difference between Israel's "faith in the promise" (*Verheißungsglauben*) and the "epiphany-religion" (*Epiphaniereigion*) of the ancient near east. Employing the history of religions categories of Viktor Maag,<sup>34</sup> Moltmann portrays the faith of Israel as "nomad-religion": a faith which worships an inspiring, guiding, protecting deity; a faith appropriate to a wandering, homeless people. Yahweh, the God of the Israelite nomads is precisely such a God, an Exodus-God who is constantly on the move, constantly going ahead of his people and calling them to follow after, calling them to discipleship and to faith in his promise. Israel's God is, in this sense, to be understood as the God of the future, who addresses his people from "that which is not yet" through a word of promise.<sup>35</sup> This "word of promise" Moltmann defines as "a declaration which announces the coming of a reality that does not yet exist."<sup>36</sup> It is, therefore, a contradiction of the present by the future; a contradiction which calls Israel toward its future and opens to it the very meaning of its history. In this way, Moltmann writes, the word of promise creates history. Israel's "nomad-religion" is, therefore, from beginning to end "faith in the promise."

Over and against such a faith stands the "epiphany-religion" of Israel's neighbors which seeks and celebrates the "appearance of eternal divinity" at certain places and seasons of the year. Through such experiences of the "presence of the eternal," primeval, timeless, changeless reality is affirmed, and the world of nature and humanity is brought once again to its proper order. The divinity wor-

shipped in this religion is, thus, the oriental, hellenistic god of the "eternal return," who does not contradict, but rather confirms the *status quo*, who does not affirm, but rather denies the future, and who does not open up new possibilities for, but rather closes down all possibility of change in history. It is, in sum, not the God of promise, in whom Israel placed their faith, but the god of the "eternal present," whom Israel's neighbors experienced. Using these contrasting categories, Moltmann portrays the history of Israel as a struggle of faith to remain true to the God of promise in the face of the temptation represented by the "epiphany-religions" round about them. Precisely this history as testified to in the pages of the Old Testament, maintains Moltmann, is the presupposition of the history of Jesus Christ which follows.<sup>37</sup>

The resurrection of Jesus Christ is the theme of the third chapter. Since "Christian eschatology is at heart christology in an eschatological perspective"<sup>38</sup> for Moltmann, the history of Jesus Christ, centering in the resurrection, is the point of departure for the entire argument of the book. According to Moltmann, the resurrection of Jesus Christ is the ground and the measure of the church and its proclamation.<sup>39</sup> For in the resurrection, the continuity in Jesus Christ's dialectical identity of "total contradiction of cross and resurrection, of god-forsakenness and the nearness of God" is made manifest;<sup>40</sup> an identity that defines the relation between God and world. For in this event, "Christ and his future," and that means the future of the Lord Jesus Christ and thus the "yet outstanding future" of the world (a quote from Käsemann), is revealed as that which utterly contradicts the "god-forsaken" present.<sup>41</sup> As such, the proclamation of the Resurrected One is to be understood as God's universal word of promise to creation and as the only ground of its true hope. By revealing Christ and his future and thus opening the present for that "yet outstanding future," this word of promise calls forth hope and thereby gives rise to the mission of the church as *nova obedientia*. According to Moltmann, then, the resurrection of Jesus Christ reveals the ontologically real, the *novum ultimum* of the kingdom of God. The proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ as God's word of promise directs creation to this end and is thus the driving force of the history of the world. For from it emerges the *novum*.

If "Christ and his future" is revealed in the word of promise of the Gospel, then the mission of the church consists in entering into a dialogue with the world over its concerns, above all, over its concerns about the future. In chapter four, Moltmann takes up this task in an initial way by engaging the philosophy of history and historiography in general in debate. Finally, in the fifth and final chapter of the book, he turns his attention to the question of the church's concrete praxis in modern society. Christianity, asserts Moltmann, is neither the cult of subjectivity, nor the cult of co-humanity, nor the cult of the institution. It is, rather, the church of hope in the promise of God which lives out its life on a horizon of expectation of the coming of the kingdom of God and, in "creative expectation" (once again, a phrase from Bloch) sets itself to the task of changing the world as an example of a kind of "presentative eschatology." Moltmann writes:



"Creative discipleship" of this kind in a love which institutes community, sets things right and puts them in order, becomes eschatologically possible through Christian hope's prospects of the future of the kingdom of God and man. It alone constitutes here in our open-ended history the appropriate counterpart to that which is promised and is to come. "Presentative eschatology" means nothing else but simply "creative expectation," hope which sets about criticizing and transforming the present because it is open towards the universal future of the kingdom.<sup>42</sup>

As we have seen, in *Theology of Hope*, Moltmann brings together and transforms elements of the thinking of, among others, Karl Barth, Ernst Bloch, Gerhard von Rad and Ernst Käsemann. With Barth, he turns to the world and lays claim in a new way to the christology of the second article of the creed to address issues of politics and social ethics. With Bloch, he rejects the vertical axis of "time and eternity" in favor of a horizontal axis of "present and future" and thus posits an "ontology of the future," the *novum ultimum*, which actualizes itself in movements of hope in the present and thereby creates history. And finally, with von Rad and Käsemann, he pursues a truly biblical theology which begins to do justice to the themes of eschatology and promise which have emerged in biblical studies in this century. Thus, Moltmann has succeeded in forging a powerful eschatological theology from the raw ore of various theological, philosophical, and historical materials in the fire of the struggle he faced in post-war Germany. The response the book has received in land after land demonstrates that the issues it sets in such sharp relief and the theology it proposes to deal with them, strikes a chord not just in Moltmann's homeland, but rings true ever and again around the world.

Now, having surveyed the main outlines of *Theology of Hope*, we can at this point take up the question concerning the lack of pneumatology in the book. Why is it that, as Donald Claybrook writes, one can "not so much as 'glean' a doctrine of the Holy Spirit" from Moltmann's first major work in systematic theology?<sup>43</sup> To answer that question, I suggest, we must go to the very root of the problem of pneumatology in the history of continental Reformation theology of which Moltmann is an heir. For the absence of any substantive treatment of the Spirit in *Theology of Hope* has to do with the basic structure of its understanding of the relationship between God and world: a dialectical contradiction of law by gospel, of the human by the divine, of creation by redemption; a relationship in which God and God's redeeming Word stand over and against creation revealing its failure and summoning it to faith. That basic structure belongs not just to Moltmann, but is the defining characteristic of Reformation theology on the European continent itself. To understand the problematic of Moltmann's pneumatology in this book, we must, therefore, look to the problematic of the historical development of pneumatology in that tradition.

Reformation theology is one of the two dominant models in the West conceived by the relationship between God and the world, the human and the

divine, creation and redemption.<sup>44</sup> The first model is seen most clearly in Catholic Scholasticism, a theology of the first article of the creed. This type of theology, a theology of creation, begins with a kind of syllogism: God is good in being and act; creation is an act of God; therefore, creation is essentially good. Now, that is by no means to be understood as denying the presence and pervasiveness of sin in the world, nor as implying that creation is complete. Rather, according to this model, despite the brokenness and incompleteness in the world, it is ultimately the goodness of the Father's creating that defines the creation. That goodness expresses itself above all in an innate capacity for God (*homo capax Dei*), an openness or desire to ascend to the fulfillment of our nature in union with our creator. Thus, Catholic theology of this sort is cast as an appeal to the created nature of human beings to find the fulfillment of their being by ascending to God through a receiving of the grace of Jesus Christ as provided in and through the church. Catholic Scholastic theology is, therefore, a theology which posits a fundamental continuum between God and world, creation and redemption. It is a theology of *nature fulfilled by grace*. Thus the representative affirmation of medieval Scholasticism was: *Gratia non destruit, sed supponit et perficit naturam*.<sup>45</sup>

Over and against that sort of theology of the first article stands the theology of the Reformation, the second dominant model of theology in the West. The fundamental logic of Reformation theology is protest, indeed, *Reformation theology is protesting*, or *Protestant theology*. What Reformation theology protests against is above all the root affirmation of Scholastic theology: that creation is intrinsically good. Not the goodness but the sin and brokenness of the world is Reformation theology's point of departure; and that sin is seen as the defining reality in all of creaturely existence. When Calvin spoke of the "depravity" of nature,<sup>46</sup> he did not mean that there was no good in the world; what he meant was there was no *unalloyed* good in the world, no part or capacity or desire untouched by the fall (*homo non capax Dei*). For sin has spoiled all, according to this model, and there is no untouched *humanum* or residual *imago* to which one can point as purely good, as open to and in search of its creator. Indeed, according to this theology, the claim that there is such a possibility, such a *capax Dei*, is the essence of sin itself, for it constitutes the claim that one can by one's own efforts be redeemed. Thus, Reformation theology is cast not in the form of an appeal to the good, but in the form of a dialectic, according to which God, in Jesus Christ as the Word of God, stands over and against creation, *extra nos*, confronting human beings in their sin and shame and summoning them to faith in the free grace of God made manifest in the death of Christ on the cross *pro nobis*. We come to right relationship with God, it is claimed, not through being enabled by grace to fulfill nature's law and ascend to God, but by forswearing such reliance on law and placing our trust in Christ who by grace imputes his righteousness to us. This sort of theology is, therefore, a theology of the second article of the creed; finding its point of departure not in creaturely good, but in creaturely sin, and taking the form not of creation's ascent to its God and Father, but of God's descent in Jesus Christ, the Son, to creation. Central to this sort of theology is, thus, utter contradiction between

law and Gospel, God and world, creation and redemption. Not creation *and* anything, most certainly not nature *and* grace, but rather *solus Christus, sola fide, sola scriptura* were the Reformation watchwords. Indeed the one the Reformers allowed, law *and* Gospel, simply underlines that point, for the *and* in this instance marks a relation not of continuum but of absolute discontinuity; for this is theology of *law contradicted by Gospel*. Reformation theology is a theology, therefore, not of continuum but of complete and utter contradiction.

Now, it is this basic structure of Reformation theology that shapes its pneumatology.<sup>47</sup> Whereas Scholastic theology, following Augustine, understood the Holy Spirit to be at work in the grace mediated through the church which enabled men and women to bring their natural will into conformity with God's and thus press on to union with their creator,<sup>48</sup> Reformation theology took the work of the Spirit to be the answer to the question: How is it that faith is not a human work? For if Jesus Christ's death on the cross represents the objective side of God's redemptive grace *extra nos*, according to Reformation theology, then the act of the Holy Spirit *in nobis* represents the subjective side whereby we are brought to living faith in Christ. That faith is not a human work, but an act of divine grace is, thus, the point of departure for the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Reformation theology.

It is the history of Reformation pneumatology itself that reveals the problematic of this doctrine of the Holy Spirit.<sup>49</sup> For, from the very beginning this doctrine proved itself unable to maintain a clear, consistent differentiation between human spirit and Holy Spirit. The reason for that inability was that, although the Reformers defined the Spirit *formally*, in terms of the orthodox doctrine of the trinitarian God, they always defined the Spirit *materially* in relation to human beings. Thus, for instance, while Luther spoke of God the Father in terms of the sacrifice of the Son on the cross—he declared the cross to be the "mirror of the fatherly heart of God"<sup>50</sup>—he almost never spoke of the Spirit with reference to the history of the Son. He even dropped the statement concerning the conception of Jesus by the Holy Spirit in his commentary on the second article in his Small Catechism!<sup>51</sup> Thus, for Luther, references to the Holy Spirit were almost exclusively made in relation to human beings. In the words of the catechism: "God's Spirit is called the Holy Spirit, that is, the Spirit who has made and yet makes us holy."<sup>52</sup>

This state of affairs was due above all to the fact that the Reformers simply continued the medieval subordination of pneumatology to christology, as symbolized in their acceptance of the *Filioque*. As a result, they thought of the Holy Spirit only in terms of one side of what Hendrikus Berkhof has called "the double relationship between the Spirit and Christ."<sup>53</sup> In accordance with the pneumatology implicit in the *Filioque*, they spoke of the Spirit of God as the Spirit of Jesus Christ, the gift (*donum*) of the Son, and located the Spirit's work in the event of human proclaiming and believing of the Gospel. They overlooked thereby the breadth of the work of the Spirit on the "other side" of the relationship: in the incarnation of the Son, in his mission, in his death and in his resur-

rection. They largely ignored, for this reason, the profound correspondence between the work of the Spirit in the "only begotten Son" and in the "many daughters and sons" of God which is central to the pneumatology of the New Testament. And having missed that, they totally lacked an "objective" image of the Holy Spirit which could have served as a measure for all the work of the Spirit in and for human beings. The result was that Reformation pneumatology has always lacked a clear *theological* criterion for the discernment of the "spirits," and thus their talk about the Holy Spirit always threatened to, and indeed, often did, collapse into talk about human spirit.

In an effort to counter this tendency, representatives of Reformation theology have had recourse to an increasingly formal and abstract form of pneumatology in which the person and work of the Holy Spirit was limited to *eternity* in the doctrine of the trinity, to the past in the doctrine of the inspiration of scripture, and to *public proclamation* in a "theology of the Word." The theological consequence of this dynamic in Reformation thought was an even greater subordination of pneumatology to christology.<sup>54</sup> The historical consequence was the emergence of a long series of protesting, mostly one-sided Spirit-movements, which succeeded in accomplishing little more than being driven underground or abroad and calling forth new formalizations of Reformation pneumatology.<sup>55</sup> From this has resulted the characteristic dynamic of the historical development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Reformation theology: a dialectical pendulum movement which swings from a "Spiritless" theology of the Word, on the one hand, to a "Wordless" theology of the Spirit, on the other, and which thus consistently moves between a position which plays off christology against pneumatology to one which simply reverses that order and plays off pneumatology against christology.

That dialectic began to manifest itself in the theology of the Reformers themselves. It was the question of the relationship between the Spirit and the Word which was at stake in both Luther's struggle with the Schwärmer<sup>56</sup> and in Calvin's conflict with the Anabaptists.<sup>57</sup> Over and against their opponent's claim that the presence of the Holy Spirit among them had freed them from the "outer" Word,<sup>58</sup> the Reformers insisted that the work of the Spirit and the Word, both God's "inner" and "outer" work, that is, stand or fall together.<sup>59</sup> Despite the fact that they struggled mightily to hold christology and pneumatology together, those who came after the Reformers found it very difficult to maintain the identification of the Spirit and the Word in the one work of God. Rather, what came to characterize the tradition was a growing inability to prevent the notion of the unity of God's act from collapsing into its constituent parts, with the Word increasingly being identified with divinity and the Spirit with humanity.<sup>60</sup> This tendency was then decisively furthered through the Enlightenment turn to subjectivity, through which arose modern philosophical Idealism with its identification of human with divine s/Spirit,<sup>61</sup> which, in turn, forms the background to the most recent form of the dialectic of Reformed pneumatology. In the course of this historical development it has gradually come about, that appeal to the Holy Spirit—as Emil Brunner emphasized, the basis of the Reformation<sup>62</sup>—has come to

be seen as nothing less than a threat. As Wolfgang Trillhaas, himself an heir of that tradition, has written:

The rejection of enthusiasm has crippled the churches of the Reformation...(in that it has deprived them of) confidence in their ability to come to a clear doctrinal statement (concerning pneumatology). The fear of a misuse of the appeal to the Holy Spirit has become a dogmatic fear of the Holy Spirit.<sup>63</sup>

It is against the background of that history of continental Reformation theology that we must hear Moltmann's *Theology of Hope* and come to understand its pneumatology. The book reflects the fact that Moltmann was heir to the latest, and perhaps most dramatic, swing of the theological and pneumatological pendulum: the twentieth century protest of Karl Barth's dialectical theology against nineteenth century Idealism's equation of divine and human S/spirit, represented above all by "the father of modern theology," Friedrich Schleiermacher.

Moltmann had been educated in the traditional ontological categories of Protestant theology, indeed, of the Western intellectual tradition in general: time and eternity. Barth's dialectical theology, bringing that tradition to something like its final culmination earlier in the century, had underlined and exploited the ontological and noetic contradiction between the two in order to refute the identification of the human with the divine s/Spirit in nineteenth century Protestant Idealism. From that emphasis on the absolute discontinuity between time and eternity, between the human and the divine, the "Word of God" and the "word of man," however, there resulted the implied denial of any meaning whatsoever to human existence in time, whether individual or communal, and the banishing of God and God's Gospel from the realm of time and space. Barth's "turn to the world" of the late 1940s and 1950s is best understood as an attempt to overcome that problem from the standpoint of the center of Protestant theology, the christology of the second article of the creed. As such, the later theology of Barth served as a point of departure for Moltmann and the theology that he developed through the 1960s.

If in 1957 the *Apostolatstheologe* A. A. van Ruler freed Moltmann from the illusion that "after Barth there would be no new systematic theology,"<sup>64</sup> then in 1960 the philosopher Ernst Bloch made it possible for Moltmann to begin to find his way beyond Barth. Moltmann took up Bloch's ontology of "being which is not yet" to both escape from the dead end of Barth's vertical contradiction between time and eternity and to express the horizontal eschatological horizon of present and future. At the same time, however, he was highly critical of Bloch's assertion that Marxism was "religion's heir" and his understanding of history as human self-realization.<sup>65</sup> For Bloch, hope, the *novum* and even the *novum ultimum* were all the result of purely "natural," immanent forces. But for Moltmann, that was anything but the case; "It is not human activity that makes the future...(but) the inner necessity of the Christ event itself,"<sup>66</sup> he wrote; declaring thereby that Christianity rather than Marxism is the locus of hope in the world. In order to clarify and emphasize

this difference between his thought and that of Bloch's, Moltmann called upon the theology of the reformers and their insistence upon the utter transcendence of God. "For the reformers," writes Moltmann, "the Gospel is identical with *promissio*;"<sup>67</sup> redemption is, therefore, not a human act, but God's act, not that which is immanent in creation, but that which stands over and against creation as promise. Moltmann attempts in this way to distance himself from both the transcendence of Barth and the imminence of Bloch. He writes:

For the element of otherness that encounters us in the hope of the Old and New Testaments—the thing we cannot already think out and picture for ourselves on the basis of the given world and of the experiences we already have of that world—is one that confronts us with a promise of something new and with the hope of a future given by God. The God spoken of here is no intra-worldly or extra-worldly god, but the "God of hope" (Rom. 15.13), a God with "future as his essential nature" (as E. Bloch puts it), as made known in Exodus and in Israelite prophecy, the God whom we therefore cannot really have in us or over us but always only before us, who encounters us in his promises for the future, and whom we therefore cannot "have" either, but can only await in active hope.<sup>68</sup>

So, Moltmann's God is, on the one hand, *contra Barth*, not the "extra-worldly God," not the God of eternity who lives "above us," but the God of the future, and Moltmann's understanding of the *novum* and the *novum ultimum* is, on the other hand, *contra Bloch*, not the work of an "intra-worldly God," an immanent God who dwells "in us," but the work of precisely the same God of hope who always remains "before us." The future as the "location" of God serves, therefore, as Moltmann's answer both to Barth's exclusion of God from creation, as well as Bloch's exclusion of God from *redemption*.

But, while it is clear that Moltmann's response to Bloch's exclusion of God from redemption is very effective, it remains very much in question if he is as successful in escaping Barth's exclusion of God from creation. Indeed, it is hard to disagree with those who have criticized Moltmann in *Theology of Hope* for having simply taken the vertical dialectic of Barth and laid it on its side so that now the absolute contradiction is not between time and eternity, but between the future and the present.<sup>69</sup> And having done that, Moltmann has effectively suffered the same fate that the early dialectical theology of Karl Barth suffered, the *de facto* exclusion of God, and that also means God's Spirit, from the "god-forsaken" world, and the loss of any ability to demonstrate any continuity between creation and redemption.

This is why there is no significant pneumatology in *Theology of Hope*. *First*, because the Spirit of God is, like the resurrected Son and the Father, shut up in the future and away from the present. Indeed, Moltmann calls the Spirit, citing Bultmann, "the power of futurity."<sup>70</sup> *Second*, because, although there are stray comments about the Spirit which speak of resurrection and suffering, the plain truth is that, if the Spirit is really the "power of futurity" and stands over and against the "god-forsaken" present, then the Spirit can have no other role in this

conceptual structure than that laid out in the Reformation. A pale shadow of that doctrine is yet recognizable when Moltmann, citing Hegel and the Pauline epistles, proposes to understand the Spirit of God in terms of "reason."<sup>71</sup> Indeed, the end result of the dialectical history of that doctrine is clearly discernable in the way, at crucial junctures of the book, Moltmann plays off eschatological *knowing* against present *experiencing*; a contradiction which is the root of the contrast between "faith in the promise" and "epiphany-religion" in chapter two and which becomes overt in his appropriation of Käsemann's exegesis in chapter three where "fulfillment ecstasy" is contrasted with "*eschatologia crucis*."<sup>72</sup> Therein is the truth in Dale Moody's critique of Moltmann's *Theology of Hope* to the effect that it is his "excessive fear of epiphany religion" that accounts for its lack of pneumatology.<sup>73</sup> And that leads, *thirdly*, to the realization that there is so little of pneumatology in the work because, when all is said and done, the Holy Spirit, true to the continental Reformation tradition in general and to the Barthian theology in which Moltmann was schooled in particular, has been utterly subsumed under christology and absorbed into a kind of "Spiritless theology of the Word"; only in this instance, "Word" is understood as "promise" which brings change. Thus Moltmann can write, with no mention of the work of the Spirit at all:

If the word is a word of promise, then that means that this word has not yet found a reality congruous with it, but that on the contrary it stands in contradiction to the reality open to experience now and heretofore. It is only for that reason that the word of promise can give rise to the doubt that measures the word by the standard of given reality. And it is only for that reason that this word can give rise to the faith that measures present reality by the standard of the word. "Future" is here a designation of that reality in which the word of promise finds its counterpart, its answer and its fulfillment, in which it discovers or creates a reality which accords with it and in which it comes to rest.<sup>74</sup>

But it was precisely that claim, that this eschatological word of promise spoken out of the future into the present brings about change, indeed, "creates a reality which accords with it," which was called into question by the most vociferous critics of *Theology of Hope*. If the present and the future, analogous to the dialectical identity of the "god-forsaken" and the resurrected Christ, stand over and against one another in absolute "contradiction," then how can it be demonstrated that the one can actually have an effect on the other? For this reason, Christoph Hinz termed the book "marcionite" and claimed that it "purchased the hope of redemption at the price of the devaluation of the created world and the Creator-God,"<sup>75</sup> while Jozep Niewiadomski, ever the most vociferous of Moltmann's critics, railed against the "radical contradiction between God and reality" in the work.<sup>76</sup> More to the point, the Latin American theologians Jose Miguez Bonino and Gustavo Gutierrez complained that, in denying the direct continuum between the present and the future, Moltmann had broken the chain of cause and effect between the acts of Christians and/or non-Christians in the present and the

coming kingdom of God in the future.<sup>77</sup> Noel Erskin has subsequently taken that one step further and linked it to the question of pneumatology. He has claimed that the Spirit here in Moltmann is little more than "the living remembrance of the living and crucified Christ coupled with a lively hope for the Kingdom," and precisely for that reason, his theology is left with no connection between the present and the future.<sup>78</sup> It was these kinds of criticism that drove Moltmann beyond *Theology of Hope* in search of an understanding of God and world that lead not just to an unbridgeable contradiction, but to real continuity between the present and the future through the discontinuity of the present's brokenness and failure. For it was that criticism that went to the heart of what Moltmann sought to do in *Theology of Hope*, for in the book he hoped to help creation:

see reality and mankind in the hand of him whose voice calls into history from its end, saying, "Behold, I make all things new," and from hearing this word of promise...acquire the freedom to renew life here and to change the face of the world.<sup>79</sup>

It was, therefore, Moltmann's struggle to come to grips with these criticisms leveled at *Theology of Hope* that led him to the next step in the unfolding process of his theological development. Central to that effort to overcome the problem of discontinuity in the tradition he had inherited, was the gradual turn to pneumatology. As Richard Bauckham writes:

It was through pneumatology that Moltmann softened the Barthian exclusiveness of the Word, from which he began, so that the unique promise of the Gospel enters a world which, for all its god-forsakenness, is not devoid of God's presence in hope.<sup>80</sup>

## THE CRUCIFIED GOD

Now, whereas eschatology had been the central theme of his earlier *Theology of Hope*, in *The Crucified God*, as Richard Bauckham has commented, "promise and hope as the driving force of history...retreat into the background to make room for *pathos* and *sympatheia*, *kenosis* and *theosis*."<sup>81</sup> Thus, when one initially takes up the second book, one cannot help but wonder how its emphasis on suffering, abandonment, and death could possibly come from the same pen as the first which spoke so clearly of resurrection and hope. But a closer reading reveals the underlying relationship between them, and further, that both the continuity and the discontinuity between the earlier and the later books, can be traced back to the criticism of *Theology of Hope*: the problem of concrete continuity between the present and the future. Thus, in the early pages of the book, Moltmann writes by way of explanation:

*Theology of Hope* began with the *resurrection* of the crucified Christ, and I am now turning to look at the *cross* of the risen Christ. I was concerned then with the remembrance of Christ in the form of the *hope* of his future, and



now I am concerned with hope in the form of the *remembrance* of his death. The dominant theme then was that of *anticipations* of the future of God in the form of promises and hopes; here it is the understanding of the *incarnation* of that future, by way of the sufferings of Christ, in the world's sufferings...Unless it apprehends the pain of the negative, Christian hope cannot be realistic and liberating. In no sense does this theology of the cross "go back a step;" it is intended to make the theology of hope more concrete, and to add the necessary power of resistance to the power of its visions to inspire to action.<sup>82</sup>

So, what Moltmann intends is not to negate anything done in the earlier book, but rather to complete the theology contained therein by an examination of the other side of the matter, an examination of the *crucifixion of the resurrected Christ*. Thereby he wants to "make the theology of hope more concrete, and to add the necessary power of resistance to the power of its visions to inspire to action." In other words, he is seeking to overcome the criticism of his earlier work by demonstrating how in fact the present is impacted by the future. It is that undertaking that leads Moltmann to his first clear statement of a theology of the Holy Spirit. Having already gone into Moltmann's background sufficiently to establish those factors shaping the basic trajectory of his work, in the following we can concentrate on sketching the doctrine of the Spirit he develops and then on demonstrating how his thought in this book is still held captive to the pneumatological tradition of continental Reformation theology. This will set the stage for more fully appreciating his subsequent turn to the Spirit.

The thesis of *The Crucified God*, published in 1972, is that theology is facing "a revolution in the concept of God;"<sup>83</sup> and the reason it gives for this state of affairs is that theologians from both east and west, both Catholic and Protestant, and from across the theological spectrum, are joining in recognizing the centrality of the cross for any effort to speak of the identity of the trinitarian God. Citing the Orthodox theologian, Vladimir Lossky, "The kenosis...(and) the work of the incarnate Son (is) the work of the entire most holy Trinity," Moltmann declares that the death of Jesus Christ on the cross is nothing less than a dialectical "God-event,"<sup>84</sup> an event of divine kenosis in which the trinitarian life of God is thrown open for all to see. There we learn, he writes, that on the cross, the history of the triune God has been humbly joined in solidarity with the human history of abandonment by God, indeed, of godlessness. The key to this interpretation he finds in the death cry of the crucified Christ (Mark 15:34): "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" Here, he claims, the basic categories of the trinitarian kenosis are laid out, and with them the identities of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit: the Father sacrifices or gives up the Son to the cross, the Son suffers abandonment by the Father, and "what proceeds from this event between Father and Son is the Spirit."<sup>85</sup>

As Moltmann has himself frankly admitted,<sup>86</sup> and as many of his critics have been quick to seize upon,<sup>87</sup> the problem of his interpretation of the kenosis of the

trinitarian God on the cross of Jesus Christ is that he fails to carry through his program with regard to the Holy Spirit. Thus Donald Claybrook writes: "While maintaining that the event of the cross had to be reinterpreted in trinitarian terms, nonetheless, he proceeded to discuss it in terms of the Father and the Son only."<sup>88</sup> Certainly there are passages in which Moltmann clearly states that the Father and the Son "deliver themselves up" or "surrender themselves" in the Spirit of "abandonment and self-surrender."<sup>89</sup> But one is driven to question whether Moltmann has fully pressed the question of the role of the Holy Spirit, when one reads the far more frequent and emphatic passages such as the following:

To understand what happened between Jesus and his God and Father on the cross, it is necessary to talk in trinitarian terms. The Son suffers dying, the Father the death of the Son. The grief of the Father here is just as important as the death of the Son. The Fatherlessness of the Son is matched by the Sonlessness of the Father, and if God has constituted himself as the Father of Jesus Christ, then he also suffers the death of his Fatherhood in the death of the Son. Unless this were so, the doctrine of the Trinity would still have a monotheistic background.<sup>90</sup>

One must ask oneself what "talk in trinitarian terms" actually means here, where, as is usually the case, the Spirit is not even mentioned. For all of his good intentions in this talk about the trinity, in fact, Moltmann largely limits his account of the cross to the sacrifice and abandonment of the Father and the Son. His own oft-repeated formulation is telling: "That which occurred on the cross, was an event between God and God."<sup>91</sup> Note carefully, "between God and God," not "between God and God and God." In point of fact, when Moltmann makes reference to the Spirit, it is usually not in regard to the event of the cross itself, but only *subsequent* or *analogous* to the divine kenosis on the cross, for Moltmann portrays the cross not as the locus of the Spirit's presence and activity but rather as the *source* of the Spirit. According to his formulation, then, what occurred on the cross was an event between the Father and the Son, but "because this death took place in the history between Father and Son on the cross of Golgotha, there proceeds from it the Spirit..."<sup>92</sup> It is this Spirit, says Moltmann, "who brings the dead to life."<sup>93</sup>

Precisely here, the ultimate result of Moltmann's failure to carry out his program of *theologia crucis* with regard to the Spirit becomes evident: according to Moltmann's account, the will of the Spirit seems to be ultimately contrary to that of the Father and the Son.<sup>94</sup> For, while the Father and the Son demonstrate their "deep conformity of will"<sup>95</sup> by giving themselves to the suffering of the cross, the Spirit seems to evince a will that has nothing to do with suffering and death. As the "Spirit of the surrender of the Father and the Son," he is, in Moltmann's account, not the one who himself suffers or sacrifices; he is neither given up nor suffers the loss of the other. He is, rather, the one who "brings the dead to life." Despite his best intentions, therefore, Moltmann's portrayal of the Spirit of God remains a *crossless* Spirit, indeed one who stands finally in contradiction to the God of the cross. And if he fails to demonstrate the role of the Spirit in the event

of the cross in which the history of God and world is told, then his claim to be offering a trinitarian theology of the cross fails. For, in fact, although it is certainly not his intention, on its own terms, Moltmann's account of the God of the cross in *The Crucified God* is little more than binitarian.

As noted above, Moltmann has acknowledged this problem on more than one occasion. More importantly, he has specified why the book, which purports to be an explicitly trinitarian account of the cross, has in fact so little to say about the Spirit of God. Writing in response to a number of criticisms concerning pneumatology leveled against *The Crucified God*, which had been collected together in a volume entitled *Diskussion Über Jürgen Moltmann's Buch "Der Gekreuzigte Gott,"*<sup>96</sup> Moltmann mentioned several of those who had complained that the "personality" of the Holy Spirit was noticeably underdeveloped in comparison to the book's account of the Father and the Son. He had written his next book, *The Church in the Power of the Spirit*, in 1975, he explained, in an effort to redress that pneumatological deficit. But the underlying problem, he now realized, was not just a lack of attention or imagination on his part; it was, rather, the whole tendency of the Western theological tradition with regard to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Citing Orthodox theology's long-standing accusation that the adoption of the *Filioque* had led to fundamental deformations in Western theology, Moltmann goes on to describe the two dominant models of trinitarian thinking in the western tradition as a *Sendungstrinität* (a "sending-trinity") and a *Liebestrinität* (a "love-trinity"). Both, he claims, proceed from the assumption that all divine activities have their origin in the Father and then the Son. Thus nothing remains for the Spirit except to develop pneumatology in subordination to christology. He claims that the doctrine of the trinity he lays out in his own *The Crucified God* followed the first model, the *Sendungstrinität*. According to this model, the *Father* is the one who sends both the Son and the Spirit, the *Son* is sent from the Father but himself sends the Spirit, while the *Spirit* is in every instance the sent one, and that by both the Father and the Son. Thus, while both the Father and the Son are active *subjects* of their own actions, the Spirit, according to this model, remains in all triune activities a passive *object* of the actions of others. And this, Moltmann explains, is the ultimate reason the Spirit is so lacking in "personality" in his trinitarian account of the cross.

I would suggest that this response to his critics, which echoes other such astonishingly frank exercises in self-criticism throughout his career, marks the turning point in Moltmann's approach to pneumatology, indeed, perhaps to theology as a whole. For in it we see Moltmann coming to grips with some of the most fundamental issues in the very structure of the way the Western tradition has conceived of theology, a tradition which had to this point decisively shaped his own thinking. He is coming to realize during this period that the very tradition he has received has precluded any meaningful development of a doctrine of the Holy Spirit. The course of the theology he himself had worked through from the early 1960s to the mid-1970s had demonstrated that. And the concomitant problem that drives his theology during this whole period, the problem of conti-

nuity between the future and the present, is rooted in the same structure of this kind of theology of the second article of the creed: this dialectical construct which sets God's redemptive Word over and against creation in a relation of utter contradiction; or, in Moltmann's words, a *Sendungstrinität*. It was an attempt to escape from the confines of that tradition that has led Moltmann from that point on in the process of his development to a turn to pneumatology. And it is in his latest set of "Contributions to Systematic Theology" that this advent of the Spirit comes to the fore.

#### THE TURN TO PNEUMATOLOGY

Therefore, when we see Moltmann, in *The Trinity and the Kingdom*, published in 1980, enter into a detailed examination of the question of the *Filioque* (178-187) and, in conversation with theologians both East and West, propose a formula for resolving the dispute in such a way as to encompass the real concerns of both parties, we are not just witnessing a theologian involved in "the concerns of the theological tradition for their own sake."<sup>97</sup> Rather, we are witnessing a theologian escaping from the illegitimate subordination of pneumatology to christology that has determined the Western tradition and led to division in the church. And the immediate result of such an escape can be seen in that, for the first time his theology can take the Spirit seriously as a "subject" of divine activity<sup>98</sup> alongside the Father and the Son, which leads him to the new understanding that "the history of Jesus is as incomprehensible without the action of the Spirit as it would be without the God whom he called my Father."<sup>99</sup> With this insight, he has broken free of the specter of binitarianism and emerged into a true trinitarian theology.<sup>100</sup>

Further, when we see Moltmann five years later, in *God in Creation*, speak of the Spirit of God as being present in all creation, we are witnessing Moltmann's attempt to escape a theology which simply posits utter contradiction between God and world; which seeks to play off redemption against creation; which will understand God not simply as standing over and against the world but rather as embracing that which God has made in love and suffering.<sup>101</sup> In so doing, Moltmann is discovering in a new way that the Spirit of God is not just *Spiritus Salvificans*, the Spirit "poured out" upon all flesh by Jesus Christ, but at one and the same time the *Spiritus Vivificans* of whom the confession speaks, the "life-giving" Spirit with which God gifts creation ever and again (Psa. 104). And if the Spirit of God is not just active in redemption but also in creation, then Moltmann can also say that the Spirit is the possibility of God for the future: "If the cosmic Spirit is the Spirit of God, the universe cannot be viewed as a closed system. It has to be understood as a system that is open—open for God and for his future."<sup>102</sup>

And when we see Moltmann, in *The Way of Jesus Christ* which appeared in 1989, begin to explore the work of the Holy Spirit in the work of the Son, to clarify the mutuality between the second and third persons of the trinity, we are witnessing a theologian who is finding a way beyond the irresolvable dialectic of the god-forsaken one who dies on the cross and the god-embraced one who is resur-

rected to new life. We witness a theologian coming to a new critical insight into the problematic of the pneumatology of the Western tradition, who recognizes that both the Reformers of the sixteenth century as well as the early creeds of the church virtually ignored the work of the Holy Spirit in the history of the Son. We witness a theologian who is coming to a new understanding of the fact that the story of Jesus the Christ begins not with Jesus himself but with the creative Spirit of God,<sup>103</sup> which means that from the very beginning the life of Christ is intricately related to the Father and the Spirit and indeed, to all the creation that has been brought forth in the Spirit of Life. With that new insight, there comes a new interpretation of Jesus' ministry: the Spirit is "the worker of all his works."<sup>104</sup> It is that "creative energy of God" which descends upon Jesus at his baptism<sup>105</sup> as a representative for all creation. Thus it is as the bearer of God's Spirit that Jesus the Christ heals the sick and forgives sinners, calls disciples and sits at the table with "sinners and tax collectors," kneels to take a child in his arms and stands to bear the cross. And if it is the Spirit of life that raises Jesus Christ from the dead, then he raises not just humanity, but all creation with him. Thus Jesus Christ is not only the savior of men and women, but of all the material world.

Finally, when we see Moltmann, in his latest book, the unplanned *The Spirit of Life*, devoting for the first time an entire volume to pneumatology, we are witnessing a theologian who has been surprised by the advent of the Spirit, for he frankly writes that the book is for him nothing less than "a voyage of discovery into an unknown country."<sup>106</sup> That voyage, interestingly enough, has for the first time also brought him into serious conversation with the theology of John Wesley,<sup>107</sup> a theologian whose own agenda, I would point out, was also decisively shaped by the issues of continuity and the Holy Spirit.

## CONCLUSION

There are different kinds of theologians and correspondingly different kinds of theologies. Jürgen Moltmann is above all a theologian in process, a process which opens itself and opens others to a common theological undertaking. When one walks through the development of his thought, one is struck ever and again by the vigor, the insight, and the creativity of his work; as well as the frankness and forthrightness of his self-criticism. The one is, in all probability, a function of the other. He is a theologian who takes risks, who breaks new ground, who blazes a trail for others to follow. So it is with this unexpected advent of the Spirit in his work. In the process of his turn to pneumatology which we have recounted in these pages, we see where his path has taken him. It has taken him beyond a "theology of the Word" to an unfolding "theology of the world;" and in doing so it has taken him into the "unknown country" of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit and the beginnings of a theology of the third article. It is a direction in which, as Moltmann has himself commented, no "valid new paradigm of theology is yet discernable."<sup>108</sup> But his work, still in process, is an open invitation to join him in that journey.

## Notes

1. Donald A. Claybrook, *The Emerging Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Writings of Jürgen Moltmann*, Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1983, p. 185.
2. Jürgen Moltmann, *The Spirit of Life: A Universal Affirmation* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992; German original 1992).
3. For a personal reflection on the development of his thought, see Jürgen Moltmann, "Theologie der Hoffnung," ed. J. B. Bauer, *Entwürfe der Theologie* (Graz/Wien/Köln: Verlag Styria, 1985), pp. 235-257. For a catalog of Moltmann's publications through mid-1987, with a list of a number of major studies on his thought, see eds. Dieter Ising, Günter Geisthardt and Adelbert Schloz, *Bibliographie Jürgen Moltmann* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1987).
4. Jürgen Moltmann, *Theology of Hope: On the Ground and the Implications of a Christian Eschatology* (London: SCM Press, 1967; German original, 1964).
5. Jürgen Moltmann, *The Crucified God: The Cross of Christ as the Foundation and Criticism of Christian Theology* (New York: Harper & Row, 1974; German original, 1972).
6. Jürgen Moltmann, *The Church in the Power of the Spirit. A Contribution to Messianic Ecclesiology* (New York: Harper & Row, 1977; German original, 1975).
7. Jürgen Moltmann, *The Trinity and the Kingdom: The Doctrine of God* (New York: Harper & Row, 1981; German original 1980).
8. Jürgen Moltmann, *God in Creation: An Ecological Doctrine of Creation* (London: SCM Press, 1985; German original, 1985).
9. Jürgen Moltmann, *The Way of Jesus Christ: Christology in Messianic Dimensions* (New York: Harper & Row, 1990; German original, 1989).
10. Moltmann announced his original plan for the series in the preface to *God in Creation*, p. xivf. See his comments concerning the genesis of the volume on pneumatology in *The Spirit of Life*, p. xf.
11. For an excellent introduction to those factors that led to *Theology of Hope*, see M. Douglas Meeks, *Origins of the Theology of Hope* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974).
12. Jürgen Moltmann, "Persönlicher Rückblick auf die letzten zehn Jahre," in *Umkehr zur Zukunft* (München\Hamurg: Siebenstern, 1970), p. 7-14, 7f; *Experiences of God* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), p. 6ff; M. Douglas Meeks, *Origins of the Theology of Hope*, p. ix-xii, xif.
13. Moltmann, "Persönlicher Rückblick," p. 9.
14. Karl Barth, *The Humanity of God*, trans. John Newton Thomas (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1960), pp. 37-65. Cf. Eberhard Busch, *Karl Barth: His Life From Letters and Autobiographical Texts*, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), p. 391ff, 423ff. Further see Eberhard Jüngel, "Der königliche Mensch. Eine christologische Reflexion auf die Würde des Menschen in der Theologie Karl Barths," *ZdZ* 5(1966):186-193; "...keine Menschenlosigkeit Gottes...Zur Theologie Karl Barths zwischen Theismus und Atheismus," *EvTh* 31(1971):376-390; now in: *idem, Barth-Studien* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1982), pp. 233-245 and 332-347.
15. Eberhard Jüngel, "Einführung in Leben und Werk Karl Barths, *Barth-Studien*," pp. 22-60, 53f, 58f. See W. Härle and E. Herms, "Deutschsprachige Protestantische Dogmatik nach 1945" *BEvTh* 27 (1982), pp. 1-100, 10f.
16. Jürgen Moltmann, "Theologie der Hoffnung," ed. J. B. Bauer, *Entwürfe der Theologie*, p. 238.
17. Jürgen Moltmann, "Persönlicher Rückblick auf die letzten zehn Jahre," p. 9; Moltmann, *Experiences of God*, p. 11; M. Douglas Meeks, *Origins of the Theology of Hope*, p. 24ff.
18. Ernst Bloch, *Prinzip Hoffnung* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1959). See Jürgen Moltmann, "Messianismus und Marxismus: Einführende Bemerkungen zum 'Prinzip Hoffnung' von E. Bloch," *Kirche in der Zeit* 15 (1960), pp. 291-295; Bloch, "Die Menschenrechte und der

Marxismus: Einführende Bemerkungen und kritische Reflexionen zu Ernst Bloch, 'Naturrecht und menschliche Würde,' "Kirche in der Zeit 17(1962):122-126; idem "Das 'Prinzip Hoffnung' und die christliche Zuversicht. Ein Gespräch mit Ernst Bloch," *EvTh* 23(1963):537-557; since the third edition found in *Theology of Hope*, p. 313-334; idem, "Die Kategorie Novum in der christlichen Theologie," in *Perspektiven der Theologie: Gesammelte Aufsätze* (München: Chr. Kaiser/Mainz: Matthias-Grünwald-Verlag, 1968), pp. 149-173; idem, *Umkehr zur Zukunft* pp. 113-132; idem, "Wo Hoffnung ist, ist Religion," and "Ernst Bloch und die Hoffnung ohne Glaube," in idem, "Das Experiment Hoffnung. Einführungen" (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1974), pp. 29-47, 48-63; idem, *Im Gespräch mit Ernst Bloch: Eine theologische Wegbegleitung* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1976). In addition, see Richard Bauckham, *Moltmann: Messianic Theology in the Making* (London: Marshall Pickering: 1987), pp. 3-22; M. Matic, *Jürgen Moltmanns Theologie in Auseinandersetzung mit Ernst Bloch* (Frankfurt a.M./Bern/New York: Lang, 1983).

19. Bloch, *Das Prinzip Hoffnung*, 1:254.

20. *Ibid.*, II:1628.

21. Moltmann, "Persönlicher Rückblick auf die letzten zehn Jahre," p. 10.

22. Moltmann, "Theologie der Hoffnung," in J. B. Bauer, *Entwürfe der Theologie*, p. 239. For an initial overview, see Jürgen Moltmann, "Die Wahrnehmung der Geschichte in der christlichen Sozialethik," *EvTh* 20(1960):263-287; Gerhard Bornkamm, "Geschichte und Glaube im Neuen Testament," *EvTh* 22(1962):1-15; Walther Zimmerli, "'Offenbarung'...Im Alten Testament. Ein Gespräch mit R. Rendtorff," *EvTh* 22(1960):15-31; Jürgen Moltmann, "Exegese und Eschatologie der Geschichte," *EvTh* 22(1962):31-66; H. G. Geyer, "Geschichte als theologisches Problem. Bemerkungen zu W. Pannenberg's *Geschichtstheologie*," *EvTh* 22(1962):92-112; R. Rendtorff, "Geschichte und Wort im Alten Testament," *EvTh* 22(1962):621-649; H. W. Wolff, "Das Alte Testament und das Problem der existentiellen Interpretation," *EvTh* 23(1963):1-17; M. Hoenecker, "Zum Verständnis der Geschichte in Gerhard von Rads *Theologie des Alten Testaments*," *EvTh* 23(1963):143-168.

23. The chief example of this is, of course, Gerhard von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, vol. 1, 5th ed., (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1966), Bd. II, 4th ed., (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1965).

24. Rudolph Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1953).

25. Ernst Käsemann, "Anfänge der christlichen Theologie," *ZThK* 57(1960):162-185; idem, "Zum Thema der christlichen Apokalyptik," *ZThK* 59(1962): 257-284; idem, *Exegestische Versuche und Besinnungen*, 2nd ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1965).

26. Moltmann, "Theologie der Hoffnung," in J. B. Bauer, *Entwürfe der Theologie*, p. 240.

27. Karl Barth, *Der Römerbrief 1922-23: unveränd. Abdr. d. neuen Bearb. von 1922* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1940).

28. From the third German edition on, Moltmann's essay, "'Das Prinzip Hoffnung' und 'die Theologie der Hoffnung'" (published earlier in: *EvTh*) 23(1963):537-557, appears as an appendix.

29. Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, p. 16.

30. Barth, *Römerbrief*, p. 298: 'Christentum, das nicht ganz und gar und restlos Eschatologie ist, hat mit Christus ganz und gar und restlos nichts zu tun.'

31. Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. J.T. McNeil, trans. F. L. Battles (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975), p. 20.

32. Bloch, *Das Prinzip Hoffnung*, p. 36.

33. Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, p. 84f.

34. *Ibid.*, p. 96f.

35. *Ibid.*, p. 102ff.

36. Ibid., p. 103.
37. Ibid., p. 139ff.
38. Ibid., p. 192.
39. Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, p. 165f: "Christianity stands or falls with the reality of the raising of Jesus Christ from the dead by God. In the New Testament there is no faith that does not start a priori with the resurrection of Jesus...A Christian faith that is not resurrection faith can therefore be called neither Christian nor faith."
40. Ibid., p. 199.
41. Ibid., p. 148.
42. Ibid., p. 335.
43. Donald A. Claybrook, *The Emerging Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Writings of Jürgen Moltmann*, p. 185. Also, Peter F. Momose, *Kreuzestheologie: Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Jürgen Moltmann* (Freiburg/Basel/Wein: Herder, 1978), p. 88f; J. J. O'Donnell, *Trinity and Temporality: The Christian Doctrine of God in the Light of Process Theology and the Theology of Hope* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), p. 121f.
44. On the two models and their very different starting points, see David Brown, *Continental Philosophy and Modern Theology* (Oxford: Basil Mitchell, 1987), p. 20, 75; Hans Urs von Balthasar, *The Glory of the Lord 1* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1982):45ff; H. H. Schrey, "Theologie II. Evangelische Theologie," RGG, 3rd Aufl., VI:769f.
45. Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition, vol. 3: The Growth of Medieval Theology (600-1300)*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), p. 103f, 284-293, esp. 292; Eric Przywara, "Der Grundsatz 'Gratia non destruit, sed supponit et perficit naturam,'" *Scholastik* 17(1942):178-186.
46. Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, p. II.1.viii-xi.
47. For a much fuller description of this history, see D. Lyle Dabney, *Die Kenosis des Geistes: Kontinuität zwischen Schöpfung und Erlösung im Werk des Heiligen Geistes* (Dr. theol. dissertation, Tübingen, 1989), p. 102ff.
48. H. D. Hauschild, "Geist/Heiliger Geist/Geistesgaben IV. Dogmengeschichtlich" *TRE* 12:196-217, 201f.
49. See A. I. C. Heron, *The Holy Spirit* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983), p. 107ff, 126ff; Emil Brunner, *Vom Werk des heiligen Geistes* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, Paul Siebeck, 1935), p. 7f; Wilhelm Dantine, *Der Heilige und der Unheilige Geist* (Stuttgart: Radius, 1973), p. 31ff.
50. S. Paul Althaus, *Die Theologie Martin Luthers*, 2nd ed., (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1963), p. 162.
51. See *Die Bekenntnis-Schriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), p. 511.
52. *Die Bekenntnis-Schriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*, p. 653f.
53. Hendrikus Berkhof, *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1976), p. 17.
54. See Hendrikus Berkhof, *Theology of the Holy Spirit*, 25f. Cf. W. D. Hauschild, "Geist/Heiliger Geist/Geistesgaben IV Dogmengeschichtlich," p. 201, 204, 209.
55. Cf. Klaus Blaser, *Vorstoß zur Pneumatologie* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1977), p. 10: 'So ist es doch gerade das Defizit an bedeutsamer Pneumatologie in den historischen Kirchen und offiziellen Theologien, das solche Bewegungen provoziert und hervorruft.' Also, N. A. Nissiotis, "The Importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity for Church Life and Theology," ed. A. J. Philippou, in *The Orthodox Ethos*, (Oxford: Holywell, 1964), pp. 32-69, 38.
56. Regin Prenter, *Spiritus Creator* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1953), p. 247ff. Also, Jaroslav Pelikan, *Spirit Versus Structure: Luther and the Institutions of the Church* (London: Collins, 1968), p. 134ff.
57. Walther Kreck, "Wort und Geist bei Calvin," in ed. W. Schneemelcher's *Festschrift für*



Günter Dehn, (Neukirchen: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1957), pp. 167-181, 168ff; W. Balke, *Calvin and the Anabaptist Radicals* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), p. 320ff.

58. See for instance the "Fürstenpredigt" of Thomas Münzer (1524) before Frederick dem Weisen in Weimar, in: O. H. Brandt, *Thomas Münzer: Sein Leben und Seine Schriften* (Jena: E. Diedericks Verlag, 1933), p. 148-163. Cf. Howard Yoder, "Die Schwärmer und die Reformation," *Concilium* (D) 15 (1979):519-522.

59. I. Lönning, "Die Reformation und die Schwärmer," *Concilium* (D) 15(1979), pp. 515-518. Also, Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition, vol. 4: Reformation of Church and Doctrine (1300-1700)*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), p. 187ff.

60. For an early example, see R. Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, Bd. IV.1st, 2nd and 3rd Aufl.*, (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagshaus, 1917), p. 485ff. The orthodox doctrine of the inspiration of scripture also is an example of this problem. See Otto Weber, "Inspiration II: Inspiration der hl. Schrift, dogmengeschichtlich," RGG, 3rd Aufl., Bd. III, 1959, 775-779. For an overview of the pneumatology of Protestant orthodoxy see G. Hornig, "Lehre und Bekenntnis im Protestantismus," in ed. C. Andresen's, *Handbuch der Dogmen- und Theologiegeschichte, Bd. III: Die Lehrentwicklung im Rahmen der Ökumenizität* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), p. 71-146, 84f. Also, H. Schmid, *Die Dogmatik der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche, 10. Aufl.*, (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1983), p. 261-318; E. Hirsch, *Hilfsbuch zum Studium der Dogmatik, 4. Aufl.* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1964), p. 344-357; H. Heppe, *Reformierte Dogmatik, ed. E. Bizer (Hg.), 2. Aufl.*, (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1958), p. 17ff.

61. Emmanuel Hirsch, *Geschichte der Neueren Evangelischen Theologie 2*(Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1951):208ff, points to Jakob Boehme as the decisive figure in this turn. Also, Heinrich Barth, "Die Geistfrage im deutschen Idealismus," in Karl Barth und *idem, Zur Lehre vom heiligen Geist* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1930), p. 1-38; K. Hamilton, "Created Soul - Eternal Spirit: A Continuing Theological Thorn," *SJTh* 19 (1966), p. 23-34.

62. Emil Brunner, *Vom Werk des heiligen Geistes*, p. 7.

63. Wolfgang Trillhaas, *Dogmatik*, (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1962), p. 408. Cf. Wilhelm Dantine, *Der Heilige und der Unheilige Geist*, p. 33; Dantine, "Die Gottheit des Geistes," *US* 30 (1975), p. 294-302.

64. Moltmann, "Persönlicher Rückblick auf den letzten zehn Jahre," p. 9.

65. See Moltmann's essay, "Das Prinzip Hoffnung und die Theologie der Hoffnung" which appears as an appendix to *Theology of Hope* from the third German edition on. Earlier it had been published in: *EvTh* 23 (1963), pp. 537-557.

66. Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, p. 216.

67. *Ibid.*, p. 44.

68. *Ibid.*, p. 16.

69. Richard Bauckham, *Moltmann: Messianic Theology in the Making*, p. 41-45; R. A. Alves, *A Theology of Human Hope* (New York/Cleveland: Corpus Books, 1969), p. 61ff; Langdon Gilkey, *Reaping the Whirlwind: A Christian Interpretation of History* (New York: Seabury, 1979), p. 234; Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Christliche Spiritualität. Theologische Aspekte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), p. 60; F. P. Fiorenza, "Dialectical Theology and Hope," *HeyJ* 9 (1968), pp. 143-163, 384-399; 10 (1969), pp. 26-42.

70. Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, p. 212.

71. *Ibid.*, p. 224.

72. *Ibid.*, p. 154ff, esp. 162f.

73. Dale Moody, *The Word of Truth*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), p. 57, cf. 36.

74. Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, p. 103f.

75. C. Hinz, " 'Feuer und Wolke im Exodus.' Kritisch-assistierende Bemerkungen zu Jürgen Moltmanns *Theologie der Hoffnung*," in ed. H. D. Marsch's, *Diskussion über "Die Theologie der Hoffnung" von Jürgen Moltmann* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1967), pp. 125-161, 156. Also, p. 148-158. Cf. P. C. Hodgson, *Jesus—Word and Presence*, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), p. 16ff; W. McWilliams, *The Passion of God: Divine Suffering in Contemporary Protestant Theology* (Macon: Mercer Univ. Press, (1985), p. 47ff. Against the complaint by Hinz, H. G. Geyer, "Ansichten zu Jürgen Moltmanns 'Theologie der Hoffnung' " in H. D. Marsch, *Discussion*, p. 40-80, 64, complains that Moltmann has emphasized the continuity between Israel and Jesus too much. Cf. H. Fischer, "Systematische Theologie," in ed. G. Strecker's, *Theologie im 20. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983), p. 289-388, 387. See Moltmann's answer to Hinz and Geyer in: *idem*, "Antwort auf die Kritik der Theologie der Hoffnung," in ed. H. D. Marsch's, *Discussion*, p. 201-238, 220.
76. Josep Niewiadomski, *Die Zweideutigkeit von God und Welt in J. Moltmanns Theologien* (Innsbruck/Wein/München: Tyrolia Verlag, 1982), p. 10, cf. 53.
77. J. M. Bonino, *Theologie im Kontext der Befreiung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), p. 122ff; G. Gutierrez, *A Theology of Liberation* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1973), p. 216ff.
78. Noel L. Erskin, *Christian Hope and the Black Experience*; trans. and ed. Theodore Runyon, *Hope for the Church: Moltmann in Dialogue with Practical Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1979), p. 112-127, 126.
79. Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, p. 26.
80. Richard Bauckham, *Moltmann: Messianic Theology in the Making*, p. 45.
81. Richard Bauckham, "Moltmanns Eschatologie des Kreuzes," in Michael Welker (Hg.), *Diskussion Über Jürgen Moltmanns Buch "Der Gekreuzigte Gott,"* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1979), p. 43-53, 53. Further, for an excellent introduction to the second book, and an examination of the transition from the first to the second, see *idem*, *Moltmann: Messianic Theology in the Making*, p. 53ff.
82. Moltmann, *The Crucified God*, p. 5
83. *Ibid.*, p. 201.
84. *Ibid.*, p. 206
85. *Ibid.*, p. 244.
86. Moltmann, "Theologie der Hoffnung," in J. B. Bauer (Hg.), *Entwürfe der Theologie*, p. 246f.
87. Among others, see Peter F. Momose, *Kreuzestheologie*, p. 87; C. E. Braaten, "A Trinitarian Theology of the Cross," *JR* 56 (1976) p. 113-121, 118; J. E. Vercautse, "Der gekreuzigte Gott. Zu J. Moltmanns gleichnamigem Buch," *Gregorianum* 55 (1974), p. 319-378.
88. D. A. Claybrook, *The Emerging Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Writings of Jürgen Moltmann*, p. 185. Further see 194, Ftnt. 52; 202, Ftnt. 91.
89. Moltmann, *The Crucified God*, p. 207; F. P. Momose, *Kreuzestheologie*, p. 88; D. A. Claybrook, *The Emerging Doctrine*, p. 194. Cf. Jürgen Moltmann, "Der gekreuzigte Gott und der apathische Mensch," in *idem*, *Das Experiment Hofnung: Einführung* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1974), p. 93-111, 107f; R. Bauckham, *Moltmann: Messianic Theology in the Making*, p. 99.
90. Moltmann, *The Crucified God*, p. 243.
91. *Ibid.*, p. 244 et. al.
92. *Ibid.*, p. 246.
93. *Ibid.*, p. 245.
94. See R. D. Zimany, "Moltmann's Crucified God," *Dialog* 16 (1977), p. 49-57.
95. Moltmann, *The Crucified God*, p. 243.
96. Jürgen Moltmann, "Antwort auf die Kritik an 'Der Gekreuzigte Gott,'" ed. Michael Welker, *Diskussion Über Jürgen Moltmann's Buch "Der Gekreuzigte Gott"* (München: Chr.

Kaiser Verlag, 1979), p. 165-190, esp. 184-187.

97. Richard Bauckham, "Jürgen Moltmann," in ed. David F. Ford's, *The Modern Theologians 1* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989):293-310, 309.

98. Moltmann, *The Trinity and the Kingdom*, p. 125f.

99. *Ibid.*, p. 74f.

100. See Moltmann's criticism of Barth, *The Trinity and the Kingdom*, p. 139ff.

101. Moltmann, *The Trinity and the Kingdom*, p. 9ff.

102. *Ibid.*, p. 103.

103. *Ibid.*, p. 73ff.

104. *Ibid.*, p. 91.

105. *Ibid.*, p. 91ff.

106. *Ibid.*, p. x

107. *Ibid.*, p. 163ff.

108. Jürgen Moltmann, "Heiliger Geist in der Geschichte," *Orientierung* 47(1983), p. 128-130.

