

# The Reality Of Hope: Moltmann's Vision For Theology

ROBERT T. CORNELISON

The work of Jürgen Moltmann has spanned the better part of thirty years. Throughout those years, his theology has taken many turns and shifts of direction. The major themes, however, have remained constant. From his earliest writings to the present, and surely into the future, the themes of hope, the concretization of theological discourse, and God's acting to open the human future will remain staples of Moltmann's theologizing.

In this article I will lay bare both the historical and theological developments that Moltmann's thought has undergone over the years.<sup>1</sup> I will first examine the historical and theological contexts within which Moltmann developed his theology, then I will present the main outlines of Moltmann's particular vision of the purposes and content of theological discourse.

## THE HISTORICAL ROOTS OF MOLTSMANN'S THEOLOGY

The history of Political Theology is firmly embedded in the cultural and political history of twentieth century Germany. Prior to World War I, Germany enjoyed political stability under the united empires of Bismarck and, later, Prince Wilhelm. Germany was basking in the success of the Franco-Prussian War. German culture had reached new heights and seemed destined for a stable and sanguine future.

Theology also reflected this positive attitude toward culture. In the last decade of the nineteenth century there was a renewal of interest in Kantian

---

*Robert T. Cornelison is Assistant Professor of Theology at Fordham University in New York. He was a doctoral student of Jürgen Moltmann in Germany at the University of Tübingen and also at Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia.*

---

philosophy and Schleiermachiian theology. For Kant, it is impossible to know God's own being. Rather, we can only know God through the effects he has on the world.<sup>2</sup> Since God can only be known through his effects, contemporary culture and the Christian community become the places where God is to be found. In the hands of Kant, therefore, religion is limited to ethics. Schleiermacher's primary influence on the last decades of the nineteenth century lies in his methodology. For Schleiermacher, religion is fundamentally related to, if not identified with, self-consciousness and human experience. Theology, therefore, is limited to the exposition of the results of religious experience. This methodological turn in theology reached its fulfillment at the turn of the century with the theologies of Albrecht Ritschl and Adolf von Harnack. For Ritschl, God was understood as a moral need, as a means of overcoming the contradictions of human existence:

In every religion what is sought...is a solution of the contradiction in which man finds himself, as both a part of the world of nature and as a spiritual personality claiming to dominate nature....In this juncture, religion springs up as faith in superhuman spiritual powers, by whose help the power which man possesses of himself is in some way supplemented, and elevated into a unity of its own kind which is a match for the pressure of the natural world.<sup>3</sup>

Understood in this manner, the content of the Christian message is reduced to anthropological insights, and religious consciousness becomes the means of determining the content of the Christian message.

Adolf von Harnack's perspective betrayed similar insights. For Harnack, Christianity was understood as an historical movement which could only be adequately understood through historical criticism. In his *What is Christianity?*, Harnack attempted to separate the "husk" of the gospel from its "kernel" by determining the true, unchangeable essence of Christianity historically. Harnack considered this "kernel" to be: "Firstly, the kingdom of God and its coming. Secondly, God the Father and the infinite value of the human soul. Thirdly, the higher righteousness and the commandment of love."<sup>4</sup>

As is clear from this, the kernel of the gospel is little more than a moral imperative cast in historical terms. In Harnack's hands, the coming Kingdom of God is purely personal, the "rule of the holy God in the hearts of individuals," the infinite value of the human soul becomes a statement of the value of his contemporary culture, and the command to love becomes the basis for ethics.<sup>5</sup>

In Ritschlian and Harnackian perspectives, the accommodation of Christianity to modern culture was not problematic in the least. The bankruptcy of such a perspective, however, became most evident on the eve of World War I when Harnack and ninety-two other theologians signed a manifesto in favor of the war policy of the kaiser. In that manifesto, the accommodation of theology to culture reached its logical conclusion.

The theological response in Germany to this "cultural Christianity" took the form of a "Neo-orthodoxy" which adopted transcendentalist, existentialist, and preservationist methodologies. Karl Barth stands as the foremost representative

of the transcendentalist perspective, Rudolf Bultmann is counted the most important representative of the existentialist perspective, while Emil Brunner is the primary representative of the preservationist view.

In his *Epistle to the Romans*, Karl Barth defined his method as a "recognition of what Kierkegaard called the 'infinite qualitative distinction' between time and eternity."<sup>6</sup> This shifted the locus of revelation from the human person who is the recipient of revelation (the perspective of Kant, Schleiermacher, and those who followed them) to the transcendent God who is the source of all revelation. Rather than understand God to be identified with culture through religion, religion for Barth places culture into *krisis*. Religion is the removal of every ground of confidence except confidence in God alone.<sup>7</sup> Religion as an organ of culture must be discarded and replaced by a religion of the primacy of the grace of God.

While Barth never renounced his emphasis on the grace of God in his later writings, he did alter his position somewhat during the 1930s. Confronted by the specter, and later the reality of the Hitler regime, Barth adopted a more Christocentric approach to theology. In his *Church Dogmatics* and in the celebrated *Barmen Declaration*, Barth counterpoised the sovereign lordship of Christ over and against the totalitarian claims of Hitler and the Nazi dictatorship.<sup>8</sup>

The personalist theological perspective of Bultmann also emphasized the otherness of God, but did so in a quite different way from Barth. For Bultmann, God is "other" and maintains an aseity which is absolute. God's activity with humans, therefore, is primarily confrontational in nature: God confronts humans with an existential call to decision.<sup>9</sup> For Bultmann, this call is revelatory of God as Other, but even more importantly it is revelatory of human nature. The call to decision is the call to authentic selfhood, the key to an individual's self-understanding.<sup>10</sup>

Emil Brunner's "Theology of Orders" develops a preservationist perspective. As a Neo-orthodox theologian, Brunner also emphasized the otherness and aseity of God. For Brunner, God is the "absolute and sovereign LORD, the unconditioned subject...which can be known absolutely only through self-communication."<sup>11</sup> Although God is absolute subject and thus free, God chooses the world as the locus of his activity. For Brunner, that activity consists primarily of ordering and preserving. The world reflects a certain order which is the result of the creative activity of God.<sup>12</sup> Understood in this manner, the purpose of theology and ethics is to determine the "orders" and structures of existence, "to discover the meaning of existing reality." God's fundamental relationship to the world is thus the preservation of the social and economic orders already in existence.<sup>13</sup>

These three forms of Neo-orthodoxy held sway into the early 1960s, when cultural changes forced theological changes. Barth's Christocentric theology, which had provided the churches with sound theological principles for withstanding the totalitarianism of Naziism, seemed out of place in a world where the churches were, for all intents and purposes, autonomous over and against the state. Bultmann's personalist perspective also seemed a bit obsolete in a world which had begun to think in social rather than individualistic terms. Student

movements, the incipient women's movement, and the election of the Social Democrats in Germany all shifted the focus of government, culture, and theology toward social perspectives. Bultmann's personal and individualistic theology tended to privatize religion, while society during the 1960s was calling for theology to become socially responsible.

Brunner's theology of preservation was also somewhat atavistic. The 1960s was the decade of change and revolution. The philosophy of Marx was brought to the forefront of sociological theory. The critical theorists of the Frankfurt School, especially Ernst Bloch, had much influence on the subsequent development of theology. And in 1966-1968, Christians and Marxists met to discuss fundamental issues which divided them. Previously valued preservation had been replaced by the value of change. The stage was set for the development of a theology which responded to the needs of this new age.

It is here that Moltmann's Political Theology enters the stage. Moltmann's theology is derived from, yet is also a critical corrective to, the aforementioned theologies. According to Moltmann, the term "political theology" has been in use at least since Roman times. The Stoics divided theology into three distinct typologies: natural, mythical, and political. Natural theology attempted to draw relationships between the natural world and the divine world, and therefore concerned itself with metaphysics. Mythical theology was used in the theater and was poetic in nature. Political theology was used for dealings with state gods, and thus was public in nature. Of the three, political theology was probably most important, because it ensured the continued existence and welfare of the state.<sup>14</sup>

In the twentieth century, theology in Germany performed a similar legitimating function. In a somewhat programmatic work published in 1922, Carl Schmitt declared that "all meaningful concepts of modern state doctrine are secularized theological concepts." For Schmitt, this meant that theology was to be subservient to the state, legitimating its social and political structures.<sup>15</sup> The "new" Political Theology of Moltmann (and Johann Baptist Metz on the Catholic side) contended that religion must eschew its legitimating function and become critical of the socio-political structures already in place. In essence, theology had to become revolutionary and liberative.<sup>16</sup>

This new perspective on theology, of necessity, colored the way in which Moltmann read the theological work of the previous half century. For Moltmann, Bultmann's theological work betrayed an individualistic element which did not allow it to maintain a critical posture over and against society. In Bultmann's own words: "Man's life is moved by the search for God because it is always moved, consciously or unconsciously, by the question about his own personal existence. The question about God and the question about myself are identical."<sup>17</sup>

By identifying religion with the question about oneself, Bultmann privatized religion. Political questions receded into the background. Moltmann goes beyond Bultmann by demanding that all theological statements and texts must be placed in a *political Sitz-im-Leben*.<sup>18</sup> The human being is a *zoon politikon*, a "political being," and thus all theologizing about humans must have a decidedly

social and political content if it is to be true to its subject.<sup>19</sup>

Moltmann also found that new biblical-critical insights, found particularly in the work of Ernst Käsemann, militated against Bultmann's perspective. Käsemann's work on the New Testament led him to proclaim that apocalyptic, rather than anthropology, stands at the center of biblical theology, that apocalyptic was indeed the "mother of all theology."<sup>20</sup> For Moltmann, this meant that theology had to shift its emphasis from the individual person to history, and then to eschatology.

Moltmann reaches a similar conclusion about the Theology of Orders of Brunner and others. For Moltmann, such a theology was little more than another form of civil religion. Since it focused on the identification of and preservation of God-given orders in society, it could not go beyond legitimating that society. It becomes an ideology of the status quo.<sup>21</sup>

Moltmann's relationship with Barth's theology is a bit more complex. Moltmann has always held Barth's theology in the highest esteem, and indeed drew many insights from it. At the same time, however, he recognizes the limitations of Barth's thought.<sup>22</sup> For Moltmann, Barth's neo-orthodox theology suffers from its transcendental emphasis. God's "vertical" transcendence demands that God also transcends all differences of time. God is equally distant (or close) to past, present, and future. For Moltmann, this perspective allows Barth to maintain the otherness of God, but presents difficulties when Barth attempts to speak about the transformation of the world. Because God is present at all times equally, past and present forms of existence carry the same weight as future forms. This would mean, therefore, that there is little support for social change, because past and current situations have as much validity as future ones.<sup>23</sup>

While Moltmann adopts a somewhat different perspective from Barth, his theology is certainly also dependent on much of what Barth had written. Of central import for Moltmann's work is Barth's emphasis on the centrality of eschatology: "If theology is not altogether and unreservedly eschatology, there remains in it no relationship whatever to Christ."<sup>24</sup> Moltmann took this as a call to make eschatology the centerpiece of his own theology, as is evident in his first major work, *Theology of Hope*:

While Barth's inspiration is not to be underestimated, the influence of Ernst Bloch is probably most important for Moltmann's development. In fact, Moltmann himself states in an autobiographical article that it was through reading Bloch that all at once the loose threads of a biblical theology, of the theology of the apostolate and the kingdom of God, and of philosophy, merged into a pattern for a tapestry in which everything matched.<sup>25</sup>

In Bloch, Moltmann found an atheist who was quite a good friend to religion. Indeed Moltmann often quotes Bloch's statement to the effect that "only an atheist can be a good Christian; only a Christian can be a good atheist."<sup>26</sup> In his major work, *Das Prinzip Hoffnung* (1938-1947), Bloch lays out a philosophical explanation of hope which combines both theological and Marxist interpretations. For

Bloch, while hope need not, of necessity, be based in religion, the eschatological messianism in Judaism and Christianity provides examples of people's hopes being worked out concretely in history.<sup>27</sup> For Moltmann, Bloch's insight into hope provided the impetus for his own insight that hope had long been a neglected aspect in Christian theology. Kant certainly raised the question of what we can hope for, but theology had neglected to accept the challenge of answering that question directly until Moltmann came along and placed it into the center of the theological enterprise.

Three stages can be discerned in Moltmann's theological development. The first stage placed a future-oriented eschatology over and against what Moltmann considered to be Neo-orthodoxy's emphasis on the present. In traditional dogmatic treatments, eschatology, as the doctrine of the "last things," was usually relegated to the final sections of such works. Moltmann, however, made eschatology into the context within which all theology was to be done.

This stage began roughly with the publication of Moltmann's *Theology of Hope: On the Ground and Implications of a Christian Eschatology*.<sup>28</sup> In this work, following Bloch, Moltmann contends that the essence of God is essentially future. If God is future, God's relationship to the world cannot be merely one of preservation, but must allow for the creation of truly new possibilities in the world. God's presence as future means that the past no longer controls what the present and future will be.<sup>29</sup>

Moltmann introduced the idea of Promise as the correct understanding of the relationship of God to the world. God is not primarily vertically transcendent to the world, touching it as a tangent touches a circle, as Barth claimed. Neither is God the call to personal decision or the force of preservation in the world, as Bultmann and Brunner respectively claimed. Rather, God relates to the world through Promise, the wilful decision of God to open the horizon of the human future. It is through the Promise that God binds himself to the world, and subsequently history is viewed as the time period between the Promise and its fulfillment, a time period pregnant with possibility.

Moltmann is clear, however, that the history of the promise is not identical with human history. We are not working out the Promise on earth. Rather, the Promise is first a critical movement in which God stands over and against what we humans have attempted. This is the so-called "eschatological reservation," in which the future promised by God first stands as an indictment of what we humans have attempted to make for our own future. At the same time, however, the Promise provides a goal for society to attain. It is a lure to make real the future which is promised by God.<sup>30</sup>

The second stage of Political Theology was marked by a conscious effort to incorporate the sociology of knowledge into theology in an attempt to create a "critical theory of theology." Such a critical theory would be self-reflective and self-critical. In Moltmann's words, it is the attempt to create "...a critical theory in which knowledge-guiding interests and the practical effects of this knowledge is revealed and reflected in men....It is a turning from the theory of things to a reflection on the use and effects of things."<sup>31</sup>



This stage began with Moltmann's work, *The Crucified God*.<sup>32</sup> In this work, Moltmann attempts to delineate the relationship between theory and praxis in theological discourse. He formulates the relationship between the two as the difficulty of maintaining the balance between the *identity* of Christianity and its *relevance*.<sup>33</sup> From Moltmann's perspective, Christianity derives its identity from the uniqueness of the Christ event: Christ's history is what lends Christianity its identity. If this were the whole story, however, Christianity would have remained a closed community, a sect which envisioned itself much as the community limned in the Epistles of John. Christianity is not this closed community, however. It is a community which is in the world, is affected by the world, and in turn, affects the world. Consequently, Christianity has to make clear its relevance to the larger world around it.

The problem which confronts Christianity, in Moltmann's view, is that of keeping a balance between the two. If Christianity emphasizes its identity too much, it stands the danger of becoming self-contained and isolated. If, however, it emphasizes its relevance to the world, it very quickly becomes identified with the culture which surrounds it, and consequently loses its identity, that which makes it unique.

Moltmann attempts to resolve this dilemma through an understanding of the relationship between orthopraxy and orthodoxy. For Moltmann, the question of the relationship between identity and relevance, orthodoxy and orthopraxy, centers on the problem of the verification of the truth claims of theology. In traditional theological discourse, the truth of a theological statement is determined either by its agreement with already-determined dogmas of a church, or by its adherence to the rubrics of logic. These two modes of verification lead to what Moltmann considers to be *orthodoxy*, the focus on correct theory as primary. A second means of verification concerns itself with the agreement of revelation with already-conceived cultural truths. In such a case, theological statements can be considered true only if they correspond to what the predominant culture already knows to be true. The Liberal Theology of the nineteenth century is a prime example of this.

Moltmann attempts to reconcile these two perspectives by adopting *orthopraxis* as the only viable means of verifying theological statements. In this perspective, the truth of theological discourse can only be verified through the *practice* that it produces.<sup>34</sup> Understood in this manner, Moltmann's theology is a "functional criticism of the social, political, and psychological functions of religion and the Church." It must seriously consider whether theological discourse hinders or furthers liberation, freedom, and justice.<sup>35</sup>

The third, and current, stage of Political Theology's development is a reformulation of Christian doctrine in light of the insights of the earlier stages. In the early 1980s, Moltmann began what he called "a series of systematic contributions to theology."<sup>36</sup> In these contributions, Moltmann is not trying to present an overarching system of theology à la Barth, or a *Summa Theologica* à la Thomas. Rather, Moltmann wants to do doctrinal theology in such a way that the issues

which are raised can lead to active dialogue and discussion between and within various religious traditions. Four of these contributions have already reached print. The first, *Trinity and the Kingdom*, develops a social doctrine of the Trinity and attempts a rapprochement between Eastern and Western views of the Trinity. The second work in this series is *God in Creation*, which presents an ecological doctrine of creation. The third installment is *The Way of Jesus Christ*, which makes explicit the messianic implications of Christian theology. The most recent theological attempt in this series is Moltmann's pneumatology, *The Spirit of Life*. In this work, Moltmann explains the Spirit not only as the source of fellowship within Christianity, but also as a source of fellowship with those outside the Church. He understands the Spirit to be that which creates, sustains, liberates, justifies, and sanctifies life.<sup>37</sup> The remaining installments in this series will have to be awaited.

### MOLTMANN'S VISION FOR THEOLOGY

Moltmann has often stated in his writings that it is of utmost importance for theology to have a vision. In the remainder of this work, I would like to lay out what I see as Moltmann's vision for theology.

1. The major insight which seems to have stamped both the form and content of Moltmann's work is the idea that **all theology is political**. This is not merely the claim that theology has political import, or that somehow theology merely mediates between the theoretical realm and the socio-political realm. Rather, it means that the act of theologizing and the theology which is produced are inherently political. They can be overtly political as in the cases where theologians pontificate on political issues such as nuclear war, or abortion, or economic programs. More to the point, however, is Moltmann's realization that theology is subtly political in the ways that it either acts to promote or hinder liberation through its discourse. Following Marx, Moltmann contends that theology must first uncover, and then carefully choose its own political interests and political perspectives. It must perform a powerful criticism of its own ideological perspectives and methodologies before it can address the political realm.

Moltmann is also clear that the voice of Christianity directed to the political world must always be a prophetic one. The transcendence of the Christian eschatological message is not to be co-opted by a culture or a political system; the gospel is the message of prophetic liberation, first a critical indictment, then a word of hope, consolation, and inspiration.

2. A second important element of Moltmann's vision is that theology is fundamentally **dialogical**. Moltmann is quite aware that his own theology, as well as theology in general, is contextual in nature. It is clear that Moltmann is writing within a "church" context, as a member of a church, for those who are members of the church. It is also clear that Moltmann is writing as a white male in a European context. It is this contextualization which makes theology concrete. Moltmann, however, has not made the context the exclusive or even decisive source for his theology. Moltmann's theology is neither Eurocentric or "andro-



centric." Rather, Moltmann relativizes his own context by recognizing a plurality of contexts which have produced a variety of different theological perspectives. For Moltmann, it is in the interplay of these perspectives that Christian theology grows and broadens itself.<sup>38</sup> Theologizing, therefore must always remain open to other perspectives. One's individual theology must be influenced by that interplay.

A perusal of Moltmann's works shows that he has had a variety of dialogue partners, all of whom have affected his thought in one way or another. Many of his early insights about religion as an ideology were formed through the dialogue between Christians and Marxists held in the late 1960s by the Paulus Society. Feminist theology, particularly that produced by his wife, Elisabeth Moltmann-Wendel, has opened Moltmann's eyes to the inadequacy of traditional Christian symbols and language about God.<sup>39</sup> The liberation movements in Latin America, Africa, and Asia have also conditioned Moltmann's work, demanding that he move beyond the Eurocentric perspective which has characterized traditional European theology.<sup>40</sup>

3. Closely related to the above is Moltmann's insistence that theology must be always and deliberately **ecumenical** in character. From its beginnings, Moltmann's theology has utilized the implications of a variety of Christian and non-Christian religions. Central in this regard has been Moltmann's dialogue with Judaism. His first major work, *Theology of Hope*, brings forward the continuities and discontinuities between Judaism and Christianity through the promise of God. His latest work, *The Spirit of Life*, understands the Spirit operative in Judaism to be the self-same Spirit which Christians worship as the third person of the Trinity. The works between these all deal with Judaism in one way or another. Moltmann collaborated with Pinchas Lapide on a volume comparing and contrasting Jewish monotheism and Christian trinitarianism.<sup>41</sup> *Trinity and the Kingdom* places Jewish mystical thought, particularly that of Isaac Luria, at the center of trinitarian theology. *God in Creation* uses Jewish perspectives on creation to help Moltmann develop an ecological doctrine of Creation. *The Way of Jesus Christ* places Christ within the context of Jewish messianism.

Different Christian religions also act as dialogue partners for Moltmann's theology. Orthodox trinitarian thought informs the formation of his doctrine of the Trinity in *Trinity and the Kingdom*. Catholic theology, particularly that of Karl Rahner, not only provides a foil against which Moltmann develops his own theology, but also informs Moltmann's understanding of the God-world relationship.<sup>42</sup>

4. A final element of Moltmann's vision for theology is that all theologizing, if it is to be truly Christian, must be based in and must answer for **Christian hope**. Moltmann contends that the true test of Christian theology is if it can explain and attest to the depth and breadth of the Christian hope. For Moltmann, the heart of the Christian message is concrete hope for the future. This insight calls for a transformation of the theological task.

Traditional theology has placed pride and egoism, the turning from God toward the self, as the central and fundamental sin of humanity. Moltmann,

however, holds a different view. For him, an even more fundamental sin than pride is the sin of turning away from God in despair. As a characteristic of people in all cultures, in all times, despair is the source of many of the concrete problems in the world. Despair at one's situation in life creates a certain degree of anxiety. This anxiety, in turn, leads to the will-to-power and a will-to-dominate. The attempt to alleviate anxiety and insecurity leads to the exertion of power against another.

Moltmann's response to the problem of despair is the recognition that the basis for Christian faith is the hope which is attested to in the Gospels. This hope is not hope in the work of human ingenuity alone. Nor is it hope in the cataclysmic inbreaking of God's will on earth from above. Rather, it is the hope of God working with humans in the world. It is the reorganizing of one's life in the recognition that God has opened the future of humanity. Despair cannot survive in the face of God's action on behalf of humans. In light of the Christian hope, existence is full of possibility and newness, because God has opened the human future.

In summary, then, it is appropriate to say that Moltmann's vision of theology is to see to it that theology's own vision is broad enough and is given adequate play in the world. It is the vision which parallels the gospel message: God has extended the horizon of human history, and opened it to possibilities which cannot be directly derived from past experience. The future is not determined. That is the message of the Christian hope. To make that message clear to three decades of Christians has been Moltmann's hope.

#### Notes

1. For a discussion of the influence that Moltmann's professors exerted on his work, see M. Douglas Meeks, *The Origins of the Theology of Hope* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974). For the best German account of the history of Political Theology in its Protestant and Catholic manifestations, cf. S. Wiedenhofer, *Politische Theologie* (Berlin: Kohlhammer, 1976). For a comparative approach to the historical backgrounds of Political Theology and Christian Realism, see R. Cornelison, *The Christian Realism of Reinhold Niebuhr and the Political Theology of Jürgen Moltmann in Dialogue* (Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1992), chap. 1.
2. I. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. F. Max Müller (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966), pp. 1-18, for Kant's own introduction to his criticism of reason. For Kant's placement of religion within practical reason, see his *Critique of Practical Reason*, trans. L. Beck (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1956), pp. 128-136.
3. A. Ritschl, *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, III, trans. H. R. Mackintosh and A. B. Macaulay (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1900), p. 199.
4. A. von Harnack, *What is Christianity?* (Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1978), p. 51.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 56.
6. K. Barth, *Epistle to the Romans*, trans. E. Hoskyns (New York: Oxford, 1980), p. 10. Cf. also J. Hamer, *Karl Barth*, trans. D. Maruca (Westminster, MD: Newman, 1962), pp. 215-263, for a discussion of Kierkegaard's influence on Barth.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 88.
8. Cf. K. Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1932+). On the *Barmen*

Declaration, see A. Burgmüller and R. Weth, ed., *Die Barmer Theologische Erklärung* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner, 1983).

9. R. Bultmann, *Jesus and the Word*, trans. L. Smith and E. Lantero (New York: Scribners, 1958), p. 52.

10. "New Testament and Mythology," trans. R. Fuller, in H. Bartsch, ed., *Kerygma and Myth* (New York: Harper, 1953), p. 40.

11. E. Brunner, *Revelation and Reason*, trans. O. Wyon (London: SCM, 1947), p. 43.

12. E. Brunner, *The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption*, trans. O. Wyon (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1952), pp. 151f.

13. E. Brunner, *The Divine Imperative* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967), p. 291.

14. J. Moltmann, "The Cross and Civil Religion," in Moltmann, et al., *Religion and Political Society* (New York: Harper & Row, 1974), pp. 22f.

15. C. Schmitt, *Politische Theologie* (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1979), p. 49. The idea of religion acting as a legitimator of the state has been part and parcel of many treatises on government. Two of the best known would be J. J. Rousseau, *The Social Contract* (Albuquerque, NM: Institute for Economic & Political World Strategic Studies), chap. 8, "On Civil Religion," and Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1943), part 3, "On a Christian Commonwealth."

16. Cf. the discussion of the theology of revolution in E. Feil and R. Weth, ed., *Diskussion zur "Theologie der Revolution"* (Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1969).

17. "New Testament and Mythology," trans. R. Fuller, in H. Bartsch, ed., *Kerygma and Myth* (New York: Harper, 1953), p. 53.

18. J. Moltmann, *Politische Theologie/Politische Ethik* (Munich: Kaiser-Grünwald, 1984), p. 12.

19. Cf. J. Moltmann, *Religion Revolution and the Future*, trans. M. D. Meeks. (New York: Scribners, 1969), p. 218.

20. E. Käsemann, "On the Subject of Primitive Christian Apocalyptic," in *New Testament Questions of Today* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969), pp. 108-137.

21. J. Moltmann, "Die Wahrnehmung der Geschichte in der christlichen Sozialethik," *Evangelische Theologie*, 20(1960):263-287.

22. This double relationship to Barth's thought is reflected in the letters which were exchanged between Barth and Moltmann in 1964-65. Moltmann sent Barth a copy of *Theology of Hope*. After reading it, Barth responded that it was a work which had truly extended his own thought, but perhaps not as fully as it could have. Moltmann responded in a letter in which he acknowledged his debt to Barth, but also contended that the *Theology of Hope* truly represented a new turn in theology, which may have been Barthian in impetus, but not in content. Cf. J. Fangmeier and H. Stoevesandt, ed., *Karl Barth Letters: 1961-1968*, trans. and ed. by G. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1981), p. 174ff and 348f.

23. Cf. J. Moltmann, *The Theology of Hope* (New York: Harper and Row, 1967), p. 40f.

24. K. Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, trans. E. Hoskyns (New York: Oxford, 1933), p. 314.

25. "Politics and the Practice of Hope," *The Christian Century*, 87(March 11, 1970):289, cited in Meeks, p. 16.

26. Bloch's statement is in *Atheism in Christianity*, trans. J. Swann (New York: Herder and Herder, 1972), front material.

27. *Das Prinzip Hoffnung*, 3 vol. (Frankfurt A. M.: Suhrkamp, 1959).

28. Cf. J. Moltmann, *The Theology of Hope* (New York: Harper and Row, 1967), p. 40f.

29. J. Moltmann, "The Future as a New Paradigm of Transcendence," *The Future of Creation*, trans. M. Kohl (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), pp. 1-17.

30. Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, pp. 21, 196, 269. Cf. also R. Chopp, *The Praxis of Suffering*

(Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1986), p. 40.

31. J. Moltmann, *Umkehr zur Zukunft* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1970), p. 135 (translation mine).

32. Trans. R. A. Wilson (New York: Harper and Row, 1974).

33. J. Moltmann, *The Crucified God* (New York: Harper and Row, 1974), chapter 1.

34. This does not mean that there is no place for theory in Moltmann's thought. He maintains that theory and practice are always found in a dialectical relationship in which theory informs practice and practice informs theory. Cf. J. Moltmann, *On Human Dignity*, trans. M. D. Meeks (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), pp. 107-108.

35. *Ibid.*, p. 98.

36. J. Moltmann, *The Trinity and the Kingdom*, trans. M. Kohl (New York: Harper and Row, 1981), p. xi.

37. *God in Creation*, trans. M. Kohl (New York: Harper and Row, 1985); *The Way of Jesus Christ: Christology in Messianic Dimensions*, trans. M. Kohl (San Francisco: Harper, 1990); *The Spirit of Life: A Universal Affirmation*, trans. M. Kohl (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1992).

38. Cf. Moltmann, *Trinity and the Kingdom*, p. xii.

39. Cf. E. Moltmann-Wendel and J. Moltmann, *Humanity in God* (New York: Pilgrim, 1983).

40. Cf. Moltmann, "An Open Letter to José Miguez Bonino," *Christianity and Crisis*, (March 29, 1976): 57-63; *Minjung: Theologie des Volkes Gottes in Südkorea*, ed. J. Moltmann (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner, 1984).

41. *Jewish Monotheism and Christian Trinitarian Doctrine* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981).

42. Cf. *Trinity and the Kingdom*, Chaps. 3 and 4.