

Evangelical Review of Theology

GENERAL EDITOR: THOMAS SCHIRRMACHER

Volume 36 · Number 4 · October 2012

Articles and book reviews reflecting global evangelical
theology for the purpose of discerning the obedience of faith

Published by



for
WORLD EVANGELICAL
ALLIANCE
Theological Commission

The Spirit and the Cross: Insights from Barth and Moltmann

Ben Pugh

KEYWORDS: *Spirit, Trinity, Jünger, Balthasar, monarchical, eucharist, procession, revelation, evangelism*

IN AN EARLIER ARTICLE for *ERT*, the Spirit's role in justification was ably presented.¹ This is a valuable contribution because one of the reasons why justification has been so ignored in popular spirituality is that it may be seen as something scholastic, theoretical, even 'difficult'. That this is far from Paul's understanding hardly needs stating. The atonement has suffered similarly in evangelical hands. There has been an excessive and reactionary tendency to stress the objective character of the atonement. Added to this is the fact that, for decades, almost all the published evangelical work on the subject has been academic and polemic in nature. One is left with a situation in which, in the life of our churches, the subject is avoided because it is too abstract, difficult, or even contentious.

My hope in writing this paper, is

to bring out the role of the Spirit in the Trinitarian accomplishment of the cross, and thus the Spirit's action also in the application of its benefits to faith. I hope that by thinking some of the thoughts of the giants of continental theology, influenced as they admittedly were and are by philosophical preoccupations very different from our own, fresh light may be shed on the situation of the present time.

I Karl Barth: Revelation and Response

Karl Barth's *Church Dogmatics*² is founded entirely upon the doctrine of the Trinity. This, of course, is out of reaction to liberal scepticism about the Trinity that relegated the subject to a mere appendix.³ Barth's main reason for placing the doctrine of the Trinity at the head of his work is to lay the foundations of his doctrine of revela-

1 Jeffery Anderson, 'The Holy Spirit and Justification: A Pneumatological and Trinitarian Approach to Forensic Justification', *ERT* (2008) 32:4, 292-305.

2 Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics* I-IV, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1936-1968), hereafter denoted by, CD.

3 See Friedrich Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith*, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1928), 738-751.

tion. For Barth, God's threeness is his power to reveal himself. An aloof deistic god of monotheism is too remote. The near-to-hand god of mysticism is too nebulous. The God of Christian faith can be near and far at the same time. The gods of monotheism and mysticism are really nothing at all. The Triune God has shown himself in a way that is something in particular: Jesus Christ.⁴

The way that God reveals himself in creation and redemption, and supremely in the incarnation of Christ, is how he really is in himself, according to Barth. This assertion is an affirmation of the liberals' desire to avoid abstract metaphysical speculation about the being of God, but also, in opposition to liberalism, an assertion of the givenness of God's revelation. Because of the unity between what is revealed to us of God and what actually exists of God, all enthronement of the autonomous thinking self must be done away with. Rather than sinfully making our concepts and thoughts of God the starting point, all thinking about God must begin with the givenness of what God has revealed. God's revelation of himself in history, God's entering into the human story, is the man Jesus Christ. Our reckoning with this one great fact of revelation is the starting point of all truly Christian theology.⁵

1. The Role of the Spirit in Barth

All that Barth asserts concerning the being of the triune God and his works in salvation, centred as it is upon the revelation of Christ, prepares the way

for an exposition of the work of the Spirit. Because God reveals himself in a way that is hidden—veiled in human flesh, no one has the power to comprehend this revelation. In the tradition of Calvin and Luther, the impotence of man in the dialectic is thus maintained. It is precisely this impotence that the third member of the Trinity comes to rectify. The Holy Spirit is the 'subjective reality of revelation'.⁶ Indeed, for Barth, the Spirit may be defined as the 'revealedness'⁷ of the revelation, the revelation itself being the 'being and work'⁸ of the Son.

In this way the stage is set for accrediting the Holy Spirit with an indispensability rarely seen in western theology. In Barth's scheme, the Spirit truly is vital. It is not human presentations of the gospel that reach people. In their natural, sinful state, those who hear are incapable of comprehending the things of God and incapable of seeing the revelation of God that is Christ. It is the Spirit alone that enables people to respond to the Revelation with their own 'Yes' that rises from their hearts.⁹ He it is who awakens men and women to faith in the revelation and enables them to live a life of obedience.

Noteworthy is Barth's continuing insistence upon thinking along christological lines. Where soteriology all too easily becomes focused on the subjective realm,¹⁰ Barth insists, '...

4 CD 1:1, 349-83, 406.

5 CD 1:1, 378, 150-158.

6 CD 1:2, 203.

7 CD 1:1, 339.

8 CD IV:1, 147.

9 CD IV:1, 356, 646.

10 Ferguson sees this tendency as the main weakness of the traditional *ordo salutis*. Sinclair B. Ferguson, *The Holy Spirit* (Downers Grove: IVP, 1996), 99.

the being and work of Jesus Christ—for even here we cannot abandon the christological basis—must now be understood as the being and work of His Holy Spirit'.¹¹

The position that Barth thus arrives at, that of the union of the work of the Spirit with the work of the Son, provides a very useful point of departure for thinking about the Spirit and the cross. Barth uses the language of synonym, not comparison. He says that the work of the one is the work of the other. This stands to reason, for if the aim of the Spirit is that the revelation should actually be revealed to people, (assuming that there is nothing else needful besides the apprehension of this revelation,)¹² then the work of the Spirit is indeed one with the work of the Son, the revelation itself.¹³

Barth has restored the christological centre of Christian theology. This means that his pneumatology, like every aspect of his *Dogmatics*, is christocentric. A weakness of Barth's scheme, however, is that the cross becomes a non-essential item. Salvation is complete in the pure fact that Christ has been revealed. This completed act now simply awaits application into human lives by the Spirit. There being no more

revealing to be done, the Holy Spirit, as the subjective realisation of that revelation, is thus solely responsible for actually bridging the gulf between God and man.¹⁴

A greater reciprocity between the two bridging acts, that of Christ in history and the Holy Spirit in human experience, is desirable. The cross is a phenomenon that intrudes itself into human experience, as we will later see in Moltmann. Likewise, the Spirit must be seen to be involved in the event of the cross itself if the work of Christ is to be seen as truly Trinitarian.

Barth is christocentric but not stau-rocenic.¹⁵ The result of this is that the God of his earlier dialectic period actually remains in large measure the God who is 'Totally Other'. The dialectic between a holy God and sinful man is not sufficiently resolved even by making Christ central. The result of this is that many of Barth's best interpreters seem to find it impossible to resist the urge to place the cross itself at the heart of Trinitarian discussion. In this way, Barth's God can be seen more clearly to be a God of compassion, of suffering even, who involves himself with the lives of his creatures.

Barth has, after all, paved the way for this by obliterating the distinction between the immanent and economic Trinity. This makes it possible to read back into the life of God himself the event of Golgotha. The cross, rather than the incarnation, can then become a definition of God.

11 CD IV:1, 147.

12 Barth's apparent neglect of regeneration is a flaw that Moltmann picks up on. See section 2.2 of this paper.

13 Behind this union of their works there is also, of course, a union of their Persons. Torrance rightly observes that Barth viewed the phrase in the Nicene Creed about Jesus being 'true God of true God, begotten not made, of one substance with the Father' as a statement of momentous importance (see CD 1:1, 484-512).

14 See especially, CD 1:2, 234.

15 Notwithstanding the remarkable phrase, 'The crucified Jesus is the image of the invisible God.' CD II:2, 132.

2. The Role of the Spirit in Barth's Interpreters

We can now turn to consider the role of the Spirit in Barth's interpreters. The man whom Barth considered to be one of the best¹⁶ was Hans Urs von Balthasar,¹⁷ who builds upon Barth's work by focussing on the reciprocity between Son and Spirit that exists within the immanent Trinity. He advocates an adaptation of the *filioque* insertion to reflect this. Instead of the double procession being viewed as a procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son into the world, the double procession for von Balthasar is firstly a procession from the Father to the Son, that is, his anointing at baptism.

The second procession is the outgoing of self-sacrificing love in the Spirit from the Son back to the Father.¹⁸ This of course, builds on Augustine's model of the Spirit being the love exchanged between the Father and the Son,¹⁹ and carries the same deficiency in the area of the Spirit's distinct personhood. Nevertheless, an understanding of the atonement as a response of love to the Father on the part of the Son facilitated

by the Spirit has great potential.

A further contribution to Barthian interpretation comes from Karl Rahner.²⁰ He sees the sending of the Spirit and the Son into the world as a single 'concept'.²¹ As love, God is eternally moved towards self-communication. Revealing himself to the world by sending his Son would not be a complete act of communication unless the recipient were able to respond. The sending of the Spirit returns this communication. The Spirit causes the response of faith to rise from the addressees, the men and women that God has created to receive this communication.²² The sending of the Son and the sending of the Spirit are, therefore, two sides of one work of redemption and not to be separated.

Another brilliant interpreter of Barth is Eberhard Jüngel. He, like von Balthasar, develops Spirit-Son reciprocity specifically with reference to the cross.²³ For Jüngel, the cross is the defining moment of God's revelation in Christ, not the incarnation. The Spirit is essential to Jüngel's theology as the bond of love uniting Father and Son during the crisis of the cross. For him, the statement, 'God is love', is about the Father's identification in the Spirit

¹⁶ G. Badcock, *Light of Truth and Fire of Love: A Theology of the Holy Spirit* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 111.

¹⁷ The most important primary source in English for von Balthasar's pneumatology is *Pneuma and Institution* (Einsiedeln: Johannes Verlag, 1974).

¹⁸ Commenting on Balthasar's theology, O'Donnell states, '...the event of the cross is a conspiracy of the love of Father and Son'. J. J. O'Donnell, 'The Doctrine of the Trinity in Recent German Theology', *The Heythrop Journal* 23 (1982), 156.

¹⁹ Augustine of Hippo, *On the Trinity* 17-18 (Website: www.ccel.co.uk).

²⁰ Karl Rahner, *The Trinity* (Tunbridge Wells: Burns & Oates, 1970).

²¹ Rahner, *Trinity*, 85.

²² McFarland is very similar, using the analogy of speech. The Father speaks the Word, the Son is the Word and the Spirit is the 'Amen' of response. I. McFarland, 'Christ, Spirit and Atonement', *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 3:1 (March 2001), 90.

²³ See Eberhard Jüngel, *God as the Mystery of the World* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1983), 368-396.

with the crucified Christ.²⁴ The Spirit, as the bond of that love, prevents there arising any fissure in the unity of Father and Son within the Trinity during that moment of agony.²⁵

It is in Barth's interpreters, therefore, that the full implications of his pneumatology with reference to the work of Christ begin to be seen. But it is Jurgen Moltmann, himself highly influenced by Barth, who has carried these implications forward into what eventually became a fully developed Trinitarian theology of the cross. To him we now turn.

II Jurgen Moltmann: No Pentecost Without Easter²⁶

In Moltmann's early Trinitarian expositions of the cross, the Spirit tends to be marginalized.²⁷ In his *The Crucified God*²⁸ he gives a very disproportionate amount of space to Father and Son, yet claims to be fully Trinitarian. The Spirit is seen as the bond of love uniting Father and Son during the crisis of the cross who then, in a way that does not seem clear, releases life into the world

as a result of this event.²⁹ In his later works, *The Church in the Power of the Spirit*,³⁰ and *The Trinity and the Kingdom of God*,³¹ his pneumatology is more developed.

For Jüngel, the cross is a dynamic yet fixed and final revelation of the Triune God as he is in himself. For Moltmann however, the cross is not only a definition of the inner life of God but the inaugural moment of God's eschatological future. The very fact that God has opened himself up to the world in this way in order to redemptively draw the world into himself means that he has also become involved in its progress through history.³² God has freely chosen to be so involved with the world he came to save as to be caught up in its very destiny. The world's becoming is therefore God's becoming.

This, of course, serves Moltmann's liberationist agendas very well.³³ Concepts of immutability and impassibility leave God too remote from human suf-

24 Jüngel, *Mystery*, 326.

25 Jüngel, *Mystery*, 346.

26 'They [the disciples] only receive the divine Spirit after Easter, and because of Easter'. J. Moltmann, *The Trinity and the Kingdom of God* (London, SCM, 1981), 122.

27 Carl Braaten was quick to notice this deficiency, contending that, for all Moltmann's insistence on a Trinitarian theology of the cross, 'Would not a binitarian concept of God work just as well?' C. Braaten, 'A Trinitarian Theology of the Cross', *Journal of Religion* 56 (1976), 118.

28 Jürgen Moltmann, *The Crucified God* (London: SCM, 1974), 235-249.

29 Moltmann, *Crucified*, 244.

30 Jürgen Moltmann, *The Church in the Power of the Spirit* (London: SCM, 1977), 54-59.

31 Moltmann, *Trinity*, 122-126.

32 This theme emerges prominently in *Trinity*. See esp. 94-96, also *Church*, 53-56.

33 That Moltmann's eschatology is focussed on this-worldly hopes of Utopia is seen as the main weakness of Moltmann's theology by S.N. Williams, 'The Problem with Moltmann', *Evangelical Journal of Theology* 5:2 (1996), 158-59. Badcock sees Moltmann's eschatology as simply not biblical, *Light*, 210. He also cites Hill who highlights the striking weakness that if God's very being is defined in terms of dying, suffering and progressing with man, then what happens to his being once the eschaton has arrived? *Light*, 210-11 citing William J. Hill, *The Three-Personed God: The Trinity as a Mystery of Salvation*, (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1982), 175.

fering for Moltmann, himself the victim of a wartime trauma.³⁴ This overall picture of God as defined by the cross yet open to ongoing development provides the two basic keys to understanding his thoughts on the relation of the Spirit to the cross:

1. The Spirit Facilitates the Mutual surrender of Father and Son at the cross

For Moltmann, the cry of dereliction, 'My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?' (Mt. 27:46; Mk. 15:34) represents a tremendous Trinitarian conundrum, and one that he is not afraid to confront. He sees in this cry enormous scope for discussions of theodicy—God identifying himself with the world's godforsaken—indeed, God justifying himself to a suffering world.³⁵ Yet he also, and quite rightly, refuses to gloss over this apparent division that opens up within the very life of God as the Father seemingly abandons his Son. The cry of dereliction surely shatters any watertight Trinitarian theories about God's three-in-oneness.

Moltmann does not offer any neat solution to this problem but posits

that the answers lie in the direction of pneumatology. We may define what, for Moltmann, the role that the Spirit has at the cross by the term, 'union'.³⁶ In Western Trinitarian theology, it is a well-rehearsed Augustinian maxim that the Spirit is the love that unites Father and Son. This could be what is involved in the Hebrews 9:14 passage. It may be the case that what enabled the Son to make a spotless sacrifice to God even though it would involve a critical moment of forsakenness at his hands was the presence of the Spirit.³⁷

According to Moltmann's logic, the Spirit was also enabling the Father to hand over his Son. Both Father and Son were giving: the one his only Son, the other, his very life. At the very point where these two streams of self-giving converge, there is the Spirit. He is the presence of mutual love between Father and Son that prevents the cross from being an act of barbarism on the part of the Father or a pointless sacrifice on the part of the Son.³⁸

³⁴ The story and that of his ensuing conversion is movingly told in G. Muller-Fahrenholz, *The Kingdom and the Power: The Theology of Jürgen Moltmann*, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 15-25. Tomlin notes, interestingly, how theologies of the cross are a significantly post-war phenomenon. In the case of Germany and Japan, the cross has been essential as a tool to reflect on loss and suffering. On the part of the victors the cross has served to correct heady optimism (G. Tomlins, G., *The Power of the Cross*, [Carlisle: Paternoster, 1999], 3-4).

³⁵ Moltmann finds the cross to be a rich seam of answers to protest atheism (*Crucified*, 219-227).

³⁶ '...the common sacrifice of the Father and the Son comes about through the Holy Spirit, who joins and unites the Son in his forsakenness with the Father'. (Moltmann, *Trinity*, 83. Cf. *Church*, 126).

³⁷ This 'presence' at the cross where otherwise there was 'absence' is, for Dabney, the very essence of a true *Pneumatologia Crucis*. D.L. Dabney, 'Pneumatologia Crucis: Reclaiming *Theologia Crucis* for a Theology of the Spirit Today', *Scottish Journal of Theology* 53:4 (2000), 524.

³⁸ Broadly speaking, Moltmann's overall scheme seems to make sense in this regard, although some of his more shocking statements, such as those concerning the Father allegedly casting out and annihilating the Son at the cross (*Crucified*, 241), are admittedly impossible to defend. (See criticisms of Jowers, 'Theology', 246-51).

2 The Death of Christ Procures the Outpouring of the Spirit

If, under the previous heading, 'union' was the key concept for Moltmann, here, it is 'glorification'.³⁹ This 'glorification' will lead back to 'union', however, as the eschatological goal of the outpouring of the Spirit is the union of all things into the Trinity so that God will be 'all in all'. On the way to this goal, the Spirit brings glory to both the Father and the Son in doxology. In Moltmann's 'eucharistic'⁴⁰ model of the Trinity, the classic monarchical hierarchy within the Trinity in which the Father is first, then the Son, then the Spirit, is turned on its head.

In the eucharistic model, the Spirit produces thanksgiving and praise in people, which is offered to the Father through the Son. He criticises Barth for his limited understanding of the Spirit as merely bringing about in people the 'recognition' of what was achieved by Christ.⁴¹ For Moltmann, the fact of regeneration points to something that actually takes place in the believer and not just on the believer's behalf at the cross that is then merely comprehended.⁴² The Spirit actually involves the believer in the fellowship of the Trinity. The Trinity was opened up to the world

at the cross. The goal of the eucharistic procession of the Spirit is that, as a result of the cross, people are brought into the community of the Trinity and become part of God's future.

III Barth and Moltmann: Some Preliminary Deductions

1. The Trinity, the Cross and the Spirit

According to Barth, the fact that God has been able to reveal himself shows that he is a Trinity. This revelation is focussed on the being and work of Christ. If, in accordance with Moltmann, it may be further said that the fact of the Trinity, that is, the idea that there is such a thing as the Trinity, is self-evident from the cross, then this must include the Spirit. We may accept that the cross is the high-water mark of God's revelation in history, his announcement to the world that he exists as a trinity of persons.

This announcement, however, must not be restricted to Father and Son but must make a third Person just as necessary and identifiable. It may then be argued that if the Spirit does have an essential role in the event of Golgotha, then it is quite likely that the subject of the cross is a central concern for the Spirit in his ministry today.

The Spirit may be seen as essential at Golgotha if we borrow the language and concepts of Moltmann's 'monarchical' and 'eucharistic' processions. At the cross we see, firstly, a type of 'eucharistic' procession in which it is by the Spirit that the Son offers himself to the Father. The Spirit is the anointing upon Christ that enabled him to com-

³⁹ See Jürgen Moltmann, *The Future of Creation* (London: SCM, 1979), 88-92, and *Church*, 126.

⁴⁰ This is outlined in J. Moltmann, *The Spirit of Life: A Universal Affirmation* (London: SCM, 1992), 298-301.

⁴¹ Moltmann, *Spirit*, 150.

⁴² This is a judgment of Barth that is not entirely fair, however, as Barth does speak freely of the Spirit 'awakening' and 'quickening' the hearts of believers as well as 'enlightening' them (*CD IV*:1, 153).

plete the work that he had taken human flesh to do. This work culminated with his offering himself on the cross through the Eternal Spirit. The goal here was to change the disposition of the Father towards the people on whose behalf the offering was made. As a response to this perfect self-offering, there is a monarchical procession of the Spirit from the Father which is intended to reach man with the benefits of Calvary. This sending of the Spirit into the world on completion of the work of the Son is the heavenly response to the Son's perfect offering.

There is then a third procession—people renewed by the Spirit initiate another eucharistic procession, a doxological self-offering. This happens as the Spirit bears witness to the completed work of Christ and arouses the desired response in people. In this way, God's 'self-communication' is completed by means of the answer that comes forth from the hearts of the men and women whose eyes have been opened. There is thus an offering up, then an outpouring, and then an offering up once more that characterises the whole plan of redemption and stamps it as Trinitarian.

These three processions reveal the Spirit to have a central place in facilitating and glorifying the Son's self-offering. Before, during and after the event, the Spirit centres himself around the cross. The cross is where the Spirit himself was significantly present and, together with Father and Son, brought about the redemption of mankind. However, he is also active before the cross, leading the Son towards it, and he is active after the event, leading the people of God towards it.

Of particular interest are the two

processions that I have described as 'eucharistic', first, the Son's self-offering and then that of his people. It could perhaps be said that the Spirit had the elect in mind when he facilitated the first self-offering, that of Christ to the Father. Now he has the cross in mind as he facilitates the second self-offering, that of the church to the Father. In a sense, the cross was not the focus of the first eucharistic procession of the Spirit, we were. We are not the focus of this second eucharistic procession of the Spirit, the cross is. The second eucharistic procession brings the cross into a central place in church life. The cross is on the Spirit's mind as he facilitates the worship and service of the church.

2. Implications for Evangelicalism

If the cross is kept at the centre of a church's devotional life, its members benefit firstly from the monarchical procession. The Spirit enables them to feel and enjoy the forgiveness procured at the cross and all that this new status makes possible, but they are also then able to go on to maturity as they find themselves caught up with the second eucharistic procession. The Spirit takes them out of themselves in order to mimic the self-offering of Jesus.⁴³ Christ's own brave and selfless

⁴³ Cf. Torrance, '...we are to think of the work of the Spirit not simply as the actualising within us of what God has already wrought for us in Jesus Christ once and for all, but as opening us up within our subjectivities for Christ in such a radical way that we find our life *not in ourselves but out of ourselves, objectively in him*' (italics original) (Torrance, *Theology*, 238).

deed in this way becomes reproduced in the lives of his people.

None of this will happen, however, if only the cross is emphasised without the Spirit. For in the first eucharistic procession, the essential role of the Spirit in the Christ-event and its culmination is clearly seen. That the Spirit was essential to Calvary is the foundation for insisting that Calvary is central to the Spirit. If this Spirit-Son reciprocity is taught accurately, then neither the cross nor the Spirit will be marginalized.

It is the focus of the second eucharistic procession of the Spirit that most needs to be understood today. Charismatic believers, in particular, need to be taught the centrality of the cross to the mind of the Spirit. It is too quickly assumed that 'we' are the centre and so the Holy Spirit in all his 'Godness' becomes confused with the impulses of the human spirit.⁴⁴ Understanding the true concerns of the Spirit will moderate the subjectivism of charismatic Christianity.

Not only so, but its notoriously divisive and sectarian tendencies⁴⁵ could also be dealt with as charismatics are encouraged to engage with the cen-

tral truths that concern all Christians. In this way a deeper unity with other streams and a greater credibility will be established.⁴⁶ Charismatics have also been accused of triumphalism, of proclaiming victory so much as to have no word of comfort for the defeated. Smail has wrestled at length with the possibilities of a theology of suffering springing from the cross and the Spirit.⁴⁷

There are doubtless many more possibilities for Spirit-filled staurocentricism. I have scarcely even mentioned the possible impact upon evangelism, mission and worship. Suffice to say, that just as a crucifix has a balanced shape to it, its *patibulum* extending as far to the left as it does to the right of the centre pole, so a cross-centred pneumatology should bring balance to every aspect of church life. 'Balance' may be seen by the more progressive among us as acquiescence to a lifeless evangelical orthodoxy. Yet in an age of apostasy, balance will be an increasingly attractive source of strength and stability, and will be indispensable for the future of any church.

IV Conclusion

The Spirit is the facilitator of the Cal-

⁴⁴ Torrance, pertinently asks the question, 'Does the Church possess the Spirit or is the Church possessed by the Spirit?' (T.F. Torrance, *Theology in Reconstruction*, (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1975), 244)

⁴⁵ I speak here as a sympathetic insider. Taylor mentions, insightfully, that the tendency of some Pentecostalist groups to see themselves as the finders of a secret to which believers are blind is a factor that makes them vulnerable to sectarian behaviour. (John V. Taylor, *The Go-Between God: The Holy Spirit and the Christian Mission*, (London: SCM, 1972), 199)

⁴⁶ 'The more the renewal relates itself to the central things of the gospel, e.g. the person and work of Christ rather than just tongues or healing, the more its contribution becomes recognisable and receivable by the rest of the Church, and the more it is delivered from its own idiosyncrasies and eccentricities.' (Thomas Smail, *The Forgotten Father*, (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1980), 18)

⁴⁷ Smail, 'The Cross', 64-70; see also Thomas Smail, *Windows on the Cross* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1995), 65-77.

vary event, he is given after completion of the work and he bears witness thereafter to that completed work. Barth's and Moltmann's works have creatively affirmed and explored these three facets to the Spirit's work in relation to the cross. Barth originated a framework of theological thought that contemplated God as revealing himself through Christ. Others have then taken this framework and thought along new lines about the work of redemption.

These new lines of thought, in their many forms, are one in their insistence that all truly Christian theology, if it is to be worthy of the name, must take the fact of the Trinity as its starting point. In Moltmann, this Trinitarianism takes on a fully cruciform shape. Further to this, Moltmann's increasingly strong emphasis on the Spirit has opened up the possibility of rethinking pneumatology itself in a cross-centred way. Not only may the cross and the doctrine of the Trinity be brought together, therefore, but also the cross

and the doctrine of the Spirit can now be seen as belonging together.

A useful way of thinking through this interaction between cross and Spirit is to borrow Moltmann's terminology of the 'monarchical' and 'eucharistic' processions. Monarchical processions begin with the Father, 'eucharistic' processions begin with the Spirit. Both Christ's self-offering in the Spirit and that of the church subsequent to Calvary may be seen as a eucharistic procession from the Spirit. It is by exploring this second eucharistic procession that some of the problems characteristic of the charismatic movement can be addressed.

There is much work to be done in drawing out the implications of Barth and Moltmann for evangelicalism. The possibilities of a staurocetric pneumatology remain to be fully explored. I hope in this paper to have made a start at thinking through what the theology behind such endeavours ought to look like.

Calvin, Barth, and Reformed Theology

Edited by Neil B. MacDonald and Carl R. Trueman

Karl Barth and John Calvin belong to the first rank of great theologians of the Church. Both, of course, were also Reformed theologians. Historically, Calvin's influence on Reformed doctrine has been much greater than that of Barth's, and continues to be so in the present day. In contrast, Barth's Reformed credentials have been questioned – not least in his understanding of election and atonement. The question is: who should be of greater importance for the Reformed church in the twenty-first century? Who has the better arguments on the Bible? Barth or Calvin? Doctrinal areas of focus are the nature of the atonement, Scripture, and the sacraments.

Neil B. MacDonald is Senior Lecturer in Theology, University of Surrey Roehampton, London, UK. **Carl R. Trueman** is Professor of Church History, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, USA.

978-1-84227-567-2 / 229 x 152mm / 200pp (est.) / £19.99

**Paternoster, Authenticmedia Limited, 52 Presley Way,
Crownhill, Milton Keynes, MK8 0ES**