

1

Introduction

*And the One who was seated on the throne said, “See, I am making all things new.”*¹

Rev 21:5

The doctrine of the Trinity . . . summarizes what it means to participate in the life of God through Jesus Christ in the Spirit. . . . [It] is a way of contemplating the mystery of God and of ourselves, a heuristic framework for thinking correctly about God and about ourselves in relation to God.

—Catherine Mowry LaCugna²

Human beings are created in the image and likeness of the Creator. This means that Christian anthropology must be both christological and relational in nature. “In the image of God” means firstly “in the image of Christ the Creator Logos,” and secondly, “in the image of God the Holy Trinity.”

—Kallistos Ware³

1. See Moltmann’s exegetical comments on Rev 21:5, where he discusses this passage in light of Gen 1:1; 2:2 (the Hebrew terms *asa* and *bara*); and Isa 65:17 (the creation of a new heaven and a new earth). Moltmann’s concluding point is that in the eschatological new creation “it is not something different which replaces creation; it is *this* creation which will be made new” (Moltmann, “Bible, the Exegete and the Theologian,” ch. 5 in Bauckham, *God Will Be All in All*, 231).

2. LaCugna, *God for Us*, 379.

3. Ware, “La théologie orthodoxe,” 238.

The Argument

IN THE FOLLOWING STUDY, I EXAMINE THE THEOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY of Maximus the Confessor and Jürgen Moltmann, arguing that they root their understanding of the human calling in creation⁴ within their Trinitarian and christological visions. Though coming from distinct theological traditions, I analyze the ways that both Maximus and Moltmann's theological anthropology springs to life from Trinitarian and christological grounds.⁵ Therefore, as I will demonstrate in Maximus and Moltmann, we realize the human vocation, what it means to be fully and authentically human, as we contemplate the Trinity,⁶ pattern our lives after Jesus Christ, and serve within the church. As we will see throughout this study, human beings, created in the image of the triune God, are called and graced to cooperate with God in the restoration of all things,⁷ a renewal initiated and guaranteed by the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

4. Mark McIntosh's work on the "human calling in creation" is especially helpful. See his *Divine Teaching*, where he elucidates: what it means for the whole creation to have humans in its midst; how humans are graced to draw elements of creation up into language, conversation, and communion; developing a peaceful and holistic vision of the human calling that corrects humanity's misuse of creation; how humans are saved so that they might share and draw the rest of creation into the communion of the Trinitarian life; how humanity is called to serve and facilitate the creation's consummation in glory. McIntosh's discussion on Trinitarian Illumination and the Human Calling in Creation has also been helpful, from the chapter, "Trinitarian Perspectives on Christian Spirituality," in *Blackwell Companion to Christian Spirituality*, 177–89.

5. Moltmann speaks in these terms when he explains that the "nature of human beings springs from their relationship to God," that humans are defined and understood as the image or appearance of God on earth, so that there is a reciprocal reflection that takes place between theological and anthropological thinking (*GC*, 22off.). As I will show, for both Maximus and Moltmann, their reflections on the Trinity and Christ profoundly shape and structure their understanding of the human vocation.

6. Regarding the contemplative life expounded by Maximus (and others featured in the *Philokalia*), Philip Sherrard says that it is "only through the contemplative life in all its aspects—ascetic watchfulness, prayer, meditation, the whole uninterrupted practice of the presence of God to which the *Philokalia* is the guide—that humans can actualize in themselves the personal love and knowledge of God on which depend not only their own *authentic existence as human beings* but also their capacity to *cooperate with God in fulfilling the innermost purposes of creation*" (*Christian Spirituality*, 428, italics mine). Throughout the study, I will illustrate how the contemplation of the Trinity and the Person of Christ, for both Maximus and Moltmann, illuminates the meaning and purpose of human existence.

7. Miroslav Volf provides an informative analysis of Moltmann's discussion on "the restoration of all things," particularly in relation to the soteriological concepts of

A Preliminary Portrait and Contrast

In analyzing the theology of Maximus and Moltmann, we are presented with remarkable visions of the human calling in creation. According to Maximus, who draws from the rich traditions of Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Evagrius, and Pseudo-Dionysius, the human vocation is rooted deeply in the life of the Trinitarian God—the Father, Son, and Spirit who together are the source and goal of creation. As an icon of the Holy Trinity, a living image of God revealed in Christ, the human being is called to reflect the divine glory and function as God’s microcosm and mediator within God’s creation. Though humanity’s fall into the sin of self-love interrupted this primordial vocation, Maximus details how women and men are restored by the coming of the Word, through intimate fellowship with Christ and his Body, so that through the deifying energies of the Spirit, they are made new, unified with God, and enabled to fulfill their divine calling in the cosmos.

While in different terms, colors, and shades, Moltmann’s portrait of the human calling shares some interesting, convergent elements with Maximus, in the midst of all the distinct features. According to Moltmann’s theological vision, Trinitarian thinking provides the matrix for a genuine and fertile understanding of the human calling in creation. Inspired by concepts employed by early Christian theologians, such as *perichoresis* in John of Damascus and divine Eros in Maximus, Moltmann also roots his portrayal of the human vocation within the Trinity, the community of overflowing divine love. Furthermore, Moltmann’s vision of the human vocation is constructed on a christological basis, with special attention to the reality of Christ as the enfleshed Word, the one in whom the divine glory dwells, and the one who paves the way for the eternal Sabbath rest of all creation in God’s presence. While Moltmann does explore the notion of human being as a microcosm, he elaborates on God’s image in creation along different lines, discussing the *imago Dei*, *imago Christi*, and *gloria Dei*.

In contrast to Maximus and Moltmann, many modern theologies, influenced by the turn to the human subject, tend to devise an account of human being first, then attempt to find ways in which the Trinity and Christ are somehow relevant to the notion of human being. As opposed to the Trinitarian and christocentric anthropologies of Maximus and Moltmann,

reconciliation, completion, and redemption (“After Moltmann,” 25off.); cf. Müller-Fahrenholz’s discussion on this theme in Moltmann (in relation to Barth and others), in *KP*, 213ff. Regarding Maximus’s perspective on this, see Daley, “*Apokatastasis* and Apocalyptic,” 201–2; and Balthasar, *CL*, 354–58.

modern theologians often start with the human person, then attempt to account for elements of our human existence that we think we already know about.

What makes the theological anthropologies of Maximus and Moltmann so intriguing is the way that they begin in the opposite order from many modern, anthropocentric theologies. That is, Maximus and Moltmann start by turning their gaze to contemplate Christ and the Trinity, then proceed to explicate how the human being comes to exist and is called and drawn into the ever increasing fullness of life in God.

My goal, therefore, is to demonstrate how Maximus and Moltmann construct their theological anthropologies, to show how they shift from contemplation of the Trinity and Christ to a concrete vision of what it means to be human. In other words, we can only really understand and properly interpret the human calling in Maximus and Moltmann when we have seen how it emerges from their thinking on the Trinity and Christology.

Consequently, this insight into the theological anthropologies of Maximus and Moltmann has important implications for contemporary theology. We live in an era in which the turn to the subject has influenced our thinking, so that many scholars assume that if we can know anything at all, it is ourselves and our human existence. According to this kind of thinking, theological reflection properly begins from anthropology, then considers how the doctrines of the Trinity and Christ may (or may not!) have something to say about human being. This study strongly suggests that, paradoxically, the opposite might be the case. That is, the richest and deepest understanding of human existence and our calling in creation emerges out of reflection on the Trinity and Christ, not by beginning with ourselves. This means that the doctrine of the Trinity, and its emergence from reflection on the paschal mystery of Christ, turns out to be far more intrinsic and basic to theological reflection, and more fruitful for theological construction, than some tendencies in modern theology might suggest.

Structure of the Argument

In the development of my argument, the book is structured in the following way. After the introduction, chapter 2 focuses on the Trinitarian matrix of the human calling. First, I look at the Trinitarian matrix in Maximus, including his teaching on the Trinity as source and goal of creation, the divine ideas tradition, adumbrations of the Trinity within creation, and the

Trinitarian features of *The Church's Mystagogy* (his mystical ecclesiology). I then examine the Trinitarian matrix in Moltmann, including the perichoretic dimension within the Trinity and in creation (a concept he adopts from John of Damascus), and the missional feature that entails the notion of the Trinity as a community of seeking love and a Trinitarian theology of the cross.

In the third chapter, I elucidate the christological basis of the human calling in creation, looking at how Maximus grounds his vision for humanity's vocation upon the christological formulations of Chalcedon, with an emphasis on the incarnational context, while Moltmann establishes his vision based on a messianic Christology, underscoring the need for holistic and developmental thinking.

The fourth chapter centers on the redemptive goal of the human calling, demonstrating how each theologian describes the graced role that humanity plays in the restoration of creation. I examine *theosis* in Maximus, its biblical and patristic background, Maximus's appropriation of the concept, various agents of *theosis*, the fruits of deification, and an illustrative text in which Maximus shows the deep connections between *theosis*, Trinitarian and christological thinking, and the human vocation. Then I consider Moltmann's portrayal of the redemptive goal as the Sabbath rest of all creation, looking at the biblical background, the completion of creation, the mystery of God's presence in the Sabbath (in Maximus and Moltmann's meditations on 1 Kings 19), human rest in God's rest, Trinitarian and christological patterns, and the implications for the human calling.

The fifth chapter looks at the Trinitarian-christocentric praxis of the human calling. I demonstrate the Trinitarian and christological aspects of Maximus's reflection on the human being as ordered microcosm, the disintegration of the microcosm through the passions, its reintegration through the virtues, and the ongoing incarnation of Christ in the virtues. Additionally, I consider Maximus's understanding of the human being as universal mediator, including his appropriation of the Evagrian threefold schema of the spiritual life, further threefold patterns of spiritual development that he restructures in Trinitarian and christological terms, and the five cosmic mediations that are accomplished by Christ and realized through the church. I then analyze the way Moltmann envisages Trinitarian-christocentric praxis, particularly through his teaching on God's human image in creation as: the *imago Dei*, the original designation of human beings; the *imago Christi*, the messianic alignment of human beings; and the

gloria Dei, the eschatological glorification of human beings. Following this, I review Moltmann's Trinitarian and christologically rooted vision of the messianic fellowship of service for the kingdom of God. According to this perspective, I show how Moltmann speaks of fulfilling the doxological calling as worshipers of the triune God, the call to discipleship as followers of the crucified Christ, and the call to mission as Spirit-empowered servants of the kingdom of God.

The fifth chapter concludes with a reflection on the primacy of love in both Maximus and Moltmann's understanding of the human calling. I indicate that for both theologians, love is at the center of the human vocation. Moreover, love for God and neighbor is the foundation and goal of this vocation. I demonstrate this in Maximus's *Mystagogy*, where he explains that the church, as the image of God in creation, works the effects of God, including the unification of diverse people (while preserving their differences), bringing together male and female in Christ, bringing creatures to rest in the embrace of the Holy Trinity, all within the spirit of love for God and others. According to Moltmann's teaching, I show how the church is called to be Spirit-empowered servants of the kingdom of God, participating in Christ's messianic mission, the liberation and uniting of humanity in Christ, and the restoration of all creation in the fellowship of love. Additionally, Moltmann envisions God's nature as love (rather than almighty power), a Trinitarian love that does not rule through division and separation, but through healing and uniting what has been separated. Human beings, consequently, created in the image of the triune God and recreated in Christ through the energies of the Spirit, are called to unite with one another in Christian community, to embody love for all of God's creation, and to fulfill the divine command to love God and neighbor.

The sixth chapter, the conclusion, considers the implications of my argument for how we do theology today. To begin, I discuss the way Maximus and Moltmann start their theological anthropologies by meditating upon and trying to understand Christ and the Trinity, then contrast this approach with the tendency of modern theologies to devise an account of human being first, and then try to find ways in which Christ and the Trinity are somehow relevant to this human being. To illustrate these different approaches to theological anthropology, I take two key representatives of modern theology, Immanuel Kant and Friedrich Schleiermacher, contrast them with Maximus and Moltmann, and demonstrate how the theological anthropologies of Maximus and Moltmann provide insights that lead to

important implications for contemporary theology. Further, I consider the constructive alternatives to the anthropocentrism of modernity offered by Maximus and Moltmann. Correcting this anthropocentric tendency, Maximus and Moltmann offer theocentric views of human being, underscoring that humanity is rooted both in God and in the broader community of creation. I suggest, additionally, that a critical retrieval of ancient texts and practices, as this book illustrates, can help us reenvision our understanding of humanity and creation. Finally, I demonstrate the approach to knowledge in Maximus and Moltmann that is different from those who view knowledge in objectifying and reductionistic ways. For Maximus and Moltmann, knowledge of God, humanity, and creation is contemplative and participatory.

Why Maximus and Moltmann?

As noted previously, one reason for exploring Maximus and Moltmann's Trinitarian and christologically structured anthropology *together* stems from an ecumenical motivation. My intent is to dialogue across Orthodox and Reformed traditions⁸ through critical analysis of each theologian's conception of the human calling in creation.

A second reason is that my intuitions regarding the intriguing parallels between Maximus and Moltmann have been confirmed by leading scholars from various traditions, including Lars Thunberg (Lutheran), Hans Urs von Balthasar (Catholic), Joy Ann McDougall (Episcopalian), and Anestis Keselopoulos (Orthodox).⁹

A third reason for examining Maximus and Moltmann's Trinitarian-christocentric anthropology in conjunction is that, as the above scholars indicate, both theologians are "hub" figures that bring together a number of seemingly disparate realms in their theological anthropology. For example, Balthasar notes how Maximus reaches inside and opens up a host of intellectual worlds that appeared to have lost contact, bringing light out of each one that illumines the others, leading to new connections and

8. That Moltmann has deeply engaged Orthodox theology, including Maximus and Maximian scholarship, is well known. See Conostas, "Eschatology and Christology," 191–99; Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 4. Moreover, in a personal letter from December 2007, Moltmann told me that Maximus is his favorite among all Orthodox theologians.

9. For a sampling of how these theologians have discerned interesting correlations, see: Thunberg, *MaC*, 147; Balthasar, *CL*, 343; McDougall, *PL*, 143; and Keselopoulos, *ME*, 93.

surprising similarities and relationships.¹⁰ He explains that Maximus unites these worlds in his own approach to theology, as a contemplative biblical theologian, a philosopher trained in Aristotelian thought, a mystic in the Neoplatonic tradition of Gregory of Nyssa and Pseudo-Dionysius, a devout monk of the Evagrian tradition, and a man of the church who gave his life for the orthodox Christology of Chalcedon and for a church centered in Rome.¹¹

Likewise, Moltmann is a theologian who brings together a number of seemingly disparate spheres of thought, including: biblical theology from a German Lutheran perspective; Dutch “apostolate theology” with its eschatological perspective of the church’s universal mission toward the coming kingdom of God; concern for social ethics (fueled by his pioneering research into Dietrich Bonhoeffer’s work), and the church’s involvement in secular society (through Ernst Wolf); Barthian theology; Karl Rahner and Vatican II; Balthasar and DeLubac (*Resourcement*); Orthodox theology (including Maximus, John of Damascus, and Dimitru Stăniloae); Hegelian thought (which through Hans Joachim Iwand informed his dialectical interpretation of the cross and resurrection); through his *Theology of Hope*, he brings together Ernst Bloch’s Marxist philosophy and Jewish messianic theology (Franz Rosenzweig and Abraham Heschel); pastoral concern (having served as a pastor in Wasserhorst), seeking to do “the theology of the people,” bridging academic and pastoral theology; an increasing openness to other traditions and movements, including Roman Catholic, Orthodox, Liberation theologies, and Pentecostal/Charismatic; and finally, his experience of the world-wide church has shaped his ecclesiology in particular.¹²

10. Balthasar, *CL*, 57. See Pelikan’s reflections on the “bilingual” approach of Maximus, one that speaks both languages of spirituality and theology, as well as bridges Eastern and Western Christianity (introduction to *CWS*, 11). Although in different ways, Moltmann’s theology also seeks to bridge Eastern and Western Christianity, as I will show throughout this study.

11. Balthasar, *CL*, 57. Balthasar even suggests that Maximus’s eschatological vision not only makes him the teacher of the Celtic speculative theologian Erigena, but also through Erigena and a long line of thinkers, the intellectual ancestor of the German idealists (*CL*, 343).

12. See Bauckham, *TJM*, 1–3. Moltmann has engaged numerous traditions and movements, including Christian-Marxist dialogue, Black, Feminist, and Latino/a theology, Catholic and Orthodox theology, and Pentecostal/Charismatic theology. He has moved in many theological circles, engaged and integrated insights from diverse traditions, and sought, through his ecumenical theology, to bridge various traditions including Eastern and Western Christianity.

Therefore, in view of these reasons—ecumenical, intuitions confirmed by other scholars, and synthesizing approaches—this study proceeds to demonstrate how Maximus and Moltmann root their understanding of the human calling in their Trinitarian-christocentric visions.

Method

My methodological approach to this project is informed and influenced by an ecumenical group of scholars.¹³ First, David Tracy's recent work, in which he juxtaposes Pseudo-Dionysius and Martin Luther on the incomprehensibility and the hiddenness of God, has been a paradigmatic and constructive model of theology that dialogues across traditions and engenders fruitful conversation between Orthodox and Lutheran theology.¹⁴ Second, John Meyendorff's historical and systematic approach—as seen in such works as *Byzantine Theology*, with its judicious and constructive exposition—is exemplary for my own work here.¹⁵ Finally, I employ Moltmann's ecumenical method, in which he critically and constructively draws from and integrates Catholic, Orthodox, and Protestant sources.¹⁶

13. Rowan Williams's reflection on theological methodologies has been informative. His proposal of a typology of theological activity suggests that we clarify the ways that the *celebratory* (poetic), *communicative* (rhetorical), and *critical* (scientific) styles interact. Williams's overall point, that one often displays various modes of arguing and interpreting rather than advancing a single system, is well taken (and applied) (prologue to *On Christian Theology*, xii–xvi). See also Moltmann's discussion of metaphorical language, including his reflection on Gregory of Nyssa and theological language. Moltmann's thoughts further explain how collating his work with that of Maximus, including the similarities and differences in language and concepts, is feasible, *ET*, 162. He also directs his readers to Sally McFague's work, *Metaphorical Theology*, 19n134, 364n138.

14. See the interesting and provocative interview by Lois Malcolm in which Tracy discusses some of the trajectories within his current research, "Interview with David Tracy," 24–30. In addition to the methodological influences mentioned in this section, I have also been informed by Bernard Lonergan's approach to theology, a method that functions as a framework for collaborative, critical reflection, creativity, and conversation between different thinkers and their particular areas (*Method in Theology*, xiff.).

15. Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology*, viiff.

16. Moltmann, *God in Creation*, xv. See McIntosh, *Divine Teaching*, for excellent examples of correlating theologians from diverse backgrounds. For example, McIntosh compares and contrasts Origen of Alexandria, Thomas Aquinas, and Karl Barth on "basic points of commonality" in their accounts of the fundamental biblical story of the universe (40ff.). McIntosh also considers the various treatments of salvation in such theologians as Origen of Alexandria, John Calvin, and Elizabeth Johnson (65ff.).

One final note regarding method: while this project seeks to highlight certain correlations (a conceptual common ground of sorts) between Maximus and Moltmann, I understand that they come from distinct historical, geographical, and traditional backgrounds. I do not intend to ignore the irreducible differences between them, even while I seek to demonstrate elements of the conceptual common ground in which they root the human calling.¹⁷ In other words, this book places Maximus and Moltmann in conversation, and listens to their constructive insights on humanity and creation, without homogenizing their unique theological visions.

Sources

On the note of sources, the following analysis of Maximus and Moltmann's theological anthropology focuses on their primary texts, including Maximus's *Mystagogy*, *Centuries on Love*, *Ad Thalassium*, and *Ambigua*,¹⁸ and Moltmann's six "systematic contributions to theology."¹⁹ Of course, I consider a number of their other texts, due to the immensity of their oeuvre, including many essays, articles, and chapters written by Moltmann over the past four decades. Additionally, I utilize critical secondary literature on Maximus and Moltmann, such as the work of Maximian scholars Polycarp Sherwood, Hans Urs von Balthasar,²⁰ Lars Thunberg, Vladimir Lossky,

17. While there are many correlations between Maximus and Moltmann's theology, throughout the study I do my best to view them in the light of their own particular contexts. Keeping the correlations *and* differences in mind will, I think, strengthen my argument as I seek to talk across traditions on the human calling in creation.

18. I want to be clear from the beginning: This is not a patristics study per se; it is a constructive project that utilizes patristic sources. It seeks to interface Orthodox patristic theology with contemporary constructive theology, in the spirit of what Florovsky calls "neopatristic synthesis." Ware, commenting on Stăniloae's *Dogmatic Theology*, explains that the "patristic writers are treated by Fr. Dumitru always as contemporaries, as living witnesses whose testimony requires on our side a continual self-examination and rethinking, with present day concerns in view. Faithful to the past, responsible to the present [Stăniloae's work] is . . . prophetic . . . open to the future, creative, pointing towards paths as yet unexplored" (foreword to Stăniloae, *Experience of God*, 1:ix).

19. Regarding Moltmann, his six systematic contributions are: *Trinity and the Kingdom of God* (1981); *God in Creation* (1985); *Way of Jesus Christ* (1990); *Spirit of Life* (1992); *Coming of God* (1996); *Experiences in Theology* (2001).

20. Balthasar's groundbreaking work in Maximus is widely acknowledged and appreciated, yet scholars have indicated some of its weaknesses, including: the notion that the questions he asks of Maximus are mostly modern questions (many related to Hegelian thought), issues important to French and German Catholic theology in the

and Moltmannian scholars, Richard Bauckham, Joy Ann McDougall, and Geiko Müller-Fahrenhotz.²¹

Questions and Critiques

The overall question this study seeks to answer concerns how human beings, created in the image of God, fulfill their vocation in God's creation, and how this occurs, according to Maximus and Moltmann, in vital connection to Trinitarian and christological thinking. The study, therefore, shows how Maximus and Moltmann's theological anthropology springs to life from their Trinitarian and christological visions

Furthermore, as the argument develops, I will address certain questions and critiques related to Maximus and Moltmann's Trinitarian and christologically based understanding of the human vocation. One of the issues that lingered in my mind while working on this project was Lewis Ayres's pointed criticism of contemporary Trinitarian and christological teaching, with its use of what he calls "totalizing meta-narratives."²² Further matters concern Moltmann's methodology and his Trinitarian theology. In short, some theologians have questioned the methodological rigor of Moltmann's theology,²³ while others have voiced particular concerns regarding Moltmann's Trinitarian theology, including patripassionism and tritheism.²⁴ Another question concerns the universalizing, by Maximus, of the

mid-twentieth century; and the claim that his portrayal of Maximus blends authentic elements of Maximus's theology with shades of his own theological enterprise (see Daley's foreword to Balthasar, *CL*, 16–17).

21. The following resources provide a broad perspective on developments in Maximian and Moltmannian scholarship: Blowers, *Exegesis and Spiritual Pedagogy*, 1ff.; Louth, "Recent Research on St. Maximus," 67–84; Thunberg covers the five periods of research from 1930 to today (*MM*, 12–20); Bauckham details studies of Moltmann's theology (*TJM*, 262–74); the following two, in their extensive notes and bibliographies, engage recent Moltmannian scholarship: McDougall, *PL*, 165–99; Müller-Fahrenholz, *KP*, 245–62.

22. Ayres, *Nicaea and Its Legacy*, 384–429. One chief misconception I will steer clear of is the basic division between eastern and western Trinitarian theologies and the use of meta-narrative strategies, such as Theodore de Régnon's history of Trinitarian theology in the late nineteenth century, in which both of these misconstructions occur. See Barnes, "De Régnon Reconsidered," 51–79; cf. Marshall's comments regarding the emerging scholarship on Latin and Greek Trinitarian theology, which is unbound by de Régnon's views, in "Trinity," 199ff.

23. In the foreword to McDougall, *PL*, xiii, Moltmann responds to criticism regarding his methodology (xiii–xiv), something he addresses further in *ET*, ch. 2.

24. Bauckham addresses five particular issues which have been raised in criticism of Moltman (*TJM*, 23–26).

All Things New

particular human being Jesus of Nazareth and Maximus's proclivity to find christological meaning in all things.²⁵ A final question and critique, which is actually raised by Moltmann, concerns the "spiritualizing" of creation in Orthodox soteriology (especially in the doctrine of *theosis*), rather than speaking in terms of "new creation."²⁶ Throughout the study I address these specific questions and critiques, along with other critical issues related to Maximus and Moltmann's theological anthropology.

SAMPLE

25. See Norris, "Logos Christology," 194, and Yeago, "Jesus of Nazareth," 163–93.

26. This is addressed in ch. 3. See Moltmann, *CoG*, where he traces the historical development of the doctrine of *theosis*, then provides a critical evaluation (272–74). See also Stăniloae, Moltmann's Orthodox friend and frequent interlocutor, on Rev 21:5, where he reflects on God making "all things new," as humanity and the cosmos realize their full potential through unification with the Holy Trinity (*Experience of God*, 2:193–94).