CHAPTER 6

Perichoresis:
An Old Magic Word for a New
Trinitarian Theology

Jürgen Moltmann

My early theological work was filled with prophetic concepts like protest and promise, promise and exodus, and exodus and liberation. This was the period of the *Theology of Hope* (1964) and *The Crucified God* (1972). The logic of promise and the expectation of the advent of God shaped my theological thinking as a historical thinking.[1] In those years we all spoke about the presence of God in history and God's actions in history. For a historical understanding of reality God "dwells," so to speak, in time, because time, not space, is the ruling category of history. The God who exists in time is the driving force of world history, going ahead of the developments and paving the way to the future of the eternal kingdom: A "restless" God leading God's people with "restless" hearts in a world of unlimited possibilities until they all find rest in the finally redeemed and new creation of everything. What we were reflecting consciously or unconsciously in the 1960s was an overheated political history of revolutions and repressions, and an accelerated speed of the modern—that is, restlessly modernizing—world of economy and culture: "The renewal of the new," as the American slogan says.

In the 1970s we slowly became aware of the simple fact that the human history of the future takes place on this limited planet Earth

and that human culture can only live inside of the laws, cycles, and rhythms of the earth, the "mother of life" (Ecclesiasticus 40:1). If we humans disturb or in the end destroy the environment of the earth, we will destroy our own civilization and ultimately threaten our very existence. We have therefore a problem with the overall category of time. No one of us can last, or stay, or dwell in time; we can only "keep up" with time by hastening from the past into the future. But where can we stay and rest and dwell?

We developed at that time new theologies of History (Pannenberg), of Hope (Moltmann), and of Liberation (Gutiérrez) in order to come to terms with reality. But we were not able to overcome the dichotomy between history and nature, a dichotomy our ancestors had developed at the outset of the modern age. Should we try to historicize nature, too, and speak of a "history of nature" (Carl Friedrich von Weizsäcker) or the "history of creation" (Gerhard von Rad), or would it be better to naturalize human history as early romantic philosophy and modern ecologists would have it? Or should we combine both dialectically with the vision of young Karl Marx: humanizing nature and naturalizing human beings to find new harmony in their mutual "home of identity" (Ernst Bloch)?

When I began working on an ecological doctrine of creation at the beginning of the 1970s (especially after the first oil crisis in 1973) and on a social understanding of the Trinity after 1975, I had to enlarge my small theological world with the priestly notions of space and home, of *shekinah* and *perichoresis*, of indwelling and resting.[2] The connecting link between the earlier theology of time and the later theology of space was for me the discovery of the Sabbath and the sabbatical wisdom: God's rhythmical indwelling of sabbatical times and God's creative interrupting of what we call history.[3] As I looked for guidance in this transition I found many theological and philosophical studies on the concepts of time, but very few on the definition of space.[4] While physics teaches us that time and space are complementary, our human engagement with them is not symmetrical: We can experience different times in the same place, but not different places at the same time. In space we exist beside each other and together, but in time we exist one after the other. In space simultaneously, in time successively. Thus we miss the reality of God, creation, and our own bodily existence if we experience them only in time and not in space as well. According to the Old Testament, God "dwells" not only in the sabbatical times but also in the heavens of his unlim-

ited potentialities, and simultaneously God "dwells" in the midst of the Israelites. On the ark first, then in the holy of holies in the temple of Jerusalem, and finally in God's exiled, homeless, and suffering people resides God's *shekinah*.[5] According to the New Testament, God's fullness "dwells" in Christ bodily (Col. 2:9), and the Holy Spirit "dwells" in our bodies and our community as her temple (1 Cor. 6:19). We ourselves cannot exist in time only, hastening with the accelerated speed of the modern/already "postmodern" world into the future; we must also dwell in our bodies, and with our senses linger in the sensual world of nature and find rest again and again in the peace of God. We not only exist and struggle against one another in a hostile world, but also must live together and make home in neighborhoods, friendships, and love. We can only live and breathe freely if we give one another space to live our lives. The whole natural world around us lives symbiotically with and from and in one another, for life on earth means community in communication. Peter Kropotkin was right when he showed—contrary to Darwin and Huxley—the "mutual help in the animal and the human world" (1896).[6]

The Transforming Concept of Perichoresis

This essay is devoted to exploring the implications of our deepened conviction that all life is community in communication. There is an ancient concept for community without uniformity, and personality without individualism; it is the term "perichoresis." I want to examine its validity for envisioning a trinitarian understanding of God, the inhabitation of the Holy Spirit, the human community, and the community of culture and nature on earth within a "sustainable society."

The semantic history of the word *perichoresis* is well investigated: the noun means "whirl or rotation," the verb means "going from one to another, walking around, handing around (for example, a bottle of wine, or of cola if you prefer), encircling, embracing, or enclosing."[7] In the New Testament we find nothing but the term *he perichoros*, which means simply "environment" (Matt. 3:5; 14:35). Gregory of Nanzianzus was the first to use the word theologically, but John of Damascus made *perichoresis* the key word for his Christology and his doctrine of the Trinity. In Christology this term is used to express the mutual interpenetration of the different natures, divine and human,

in the person of the God-human-Christ: the *communicatio idiomatum*. The example cited is "red-hot iron" made out of fire and iron, or the burning bush of Moses that was not consumed. In the doctrine of the Trinity, *perichoresis* is used to capture the mutual indwelling of the equal divine persons: Father, Son, and Spirit. Here also the Greek word *hidrysis* occurs, which emphasizes mutuality without mixing or separating. The divine persons embrace one another in love and exist in one another. John of Damascus wanted to conceive with the term *perichoresis* the unity of the Son and the Father, according to the Gospel of John: "I am in the Father and the Father is in me" (14:11). The Son and the Father are not one subject or one substance, but one in a singular unity. They are unseparated and unmixed. The existence of the one "in" the other (that is, their perichoretic unity) expresses this singular unity in the best way.

The Latin translation of perichoresis was first *circumincessio*, later *circuminsessio*; the former speaks of a dynamic interpenetration *(incedere)*, the latter of a lasting and resting mutual indwelling *(insedere)*.[8] The Council of Florence (1438–45) finally formulated the dogmatic definition, preparing the ecumenical agreement of the orthodox and the catholic churches:

> Because of this unity *(perichoresis)* the Father is totally in the Son and totally in the Spirit. The Son is totally in the Father and totally in the Spirit. The Holy Spirit is totally in the Father, totally in the Son. No one precedes the other in eternity, or exceeds the other in magnitude or power.[9]

With the Latin translations *circumincessio* and *circuminsessio* the double meaning of the trinitarian unity is expressed: movement and rest. You may get the same result by using for the Greek noun *perichoresis* the verb forms *perichoreo* and *perichoreuo*. Combined, these express both mutual resting in one another and dancing round with one another. In the eternal life of the Trinity there are simultaneously absolute silence and total whirlwind, just like the "eye" of a hurricane. More importantly, there is on the level of the trinitarian perichoresis no priority of the Father, but total equality of the divine persons. You cannot even number them as number one, two, or three.

The very special suggestion of perichoresis is that the divine persons are "habitable" for one another, giving one another open life-space for their mutual indwelling. Each person is indwelling and room-giving at the same time.[10]

Each person is in ecstasy out of itself in the other. This is the meaning of each person's "ek-sistence" (the Greek roots mean to "stand outside"). It is love that draws a person so much out of himself or herself that the person "ek-sists" in the other. In human terms this is, of course, the mystical language of love shown in so many love poems. We can learn from the divine perichoresis that the definition of person must not follow the idea of Boethius—*Persona est individua substantia naturae rationalismus*[11]—but is rather an ecstatic hypostasis.

Through their mutual indwelling the divine persons are giving each other themselves and the divine life in selfless love. The perichoretic community can also be seen as a kenotic community: The persons are "emptying" themselves into one another. What the Son is doing by becoming human, according to Philippians 2:6, is nothing other than what he is doing in eternity with regard to the Father and the Spirit: giving oneself.[12]

It follows that the perichoretic community of the three divine persons precedes the divine essence. Father, Son, and Spirit are giving one another divinity. The trinitarian persons are neither concretizations of the one divine essence nor "modes of being" of the one absolute subject. Were this the case, nobody could tell why there are only three and not four or more "reiterations" of the Divine Being (as Barth called them).

Finally, if the three divine persons are ever forming their unique divine community, they are also ever distinguishing one another. The Father makes the difference between the Son and the Spirit because of the Father's different relations to the Son and the Spirit, and so also the Son in relation to the Father and the Spirit, and the Spirit in relation to the Father and the Son.

The Trinitarian Concept of the Unity of the Triune God

Working within the framework of the ancient metaphysics of substance, Tertullian formulated the unity of the triune God in a neuter and objective manner: *Una substantia, tres personae*. This placed the unity of the three persons in their common divine substance. They are *homousios*. They are one in essence but not one person.[13]

Working within the framework of the modern metaphysics of subjectivity, Karl Barth and Karl Rahner (following Schleiermacher)

identified the unity of the triune God in a subjective and personal manner: *One divine person in three modes of being, or one divine subject in three distinct modes of subsistence.* This placed the unity of God's three modes of being in the one sovereign personality of God. God is the personal God in three modes of being.

In both ways of thinking, the unity of the triune God is determined not in a trinitarian manner, but in a metaphysical manner—be it through the metaphysics of cosmological proofs for the existence of God, according to which one deity is and the deity is one; or through the metaphysics of transcendental subjectivity, according to which the deity is the self-willing and self-knowing subject of itself and therefore must also be the subject of its own revelation and communication. The history of the latter approach goes from Hegel via Isaak August Dorner to Karl Barth and Karl Rahner.[14] Both forms of thinking work from the assumption that the unity of the triune God precedes the threeness of the persons of God and is not formed through them. The starting point is general metaphysics, not the special biblical salvation history. This is why the doctrines of the Trinity that are formed out of these two forms of thinking are not useful as a hermeneutical key for the biblical witness of the history of God. Take for example the story of Jesus' prayer in the Garden of Gethsemane: Are there two modes of the one being of God struggling, or is the one mode of subsistence saying to the other one, "Not my will, but thine, be done" (KJV)? The doctrines of the Trinity that have been developed out of these metaphysical forms of thinking show clear tendencies toward modalism, either in Schleiermacher's restoration of Sabellianism or in the neoscholastic theses of "the one nature, the one knowledge, and the one consciousness in God" that Barth as well as Rahner have taken up.

The Christian "doctrine" of God arises out of the biblical history of God, interprets this history, and leads into the future of this history. The Christian understanding of the Trinity starts with the recognition of three distinct actors of this history—Father, Son, and Spirit—and then asks about their unity. While Paul and the Synoptic Gospels mean the "Father" of Jesus Christ when they speak about "God," we find a trinitarian language in the Gospel of John: "The Father and I are one" (10:30) and "Whoever has seen me has seen the Father" and "I am in the Father and the Father is in me" (14:7-17). The Son Jesus and "Abba" the Father of Jesus Christ are personally related to each other as "I" and "Thou," and through their mutual

indwelling form their unity that is expressed through the first person plural as "We" and "Us." The divine persons exist in their mutual relationships for one another and through their reciprocal indwelling in one another. By virtue of their perichoresis the divine persons exist so intimately with one another, for one another, and in one another that they constitute a single, unique, and complete unity by themselves. This is the trinitarian concept of the unity of the triune God, because it combines threeness and oneness without reducing the three to one or the one to three, and avoids the dangers of modalism as well as tritheism. If we understand the inner-divine life perichoretically, the divine life is fulfilled as little by one subject alone as is the trinitarian history of salvation. The unity of the triune God exists in the "comm-unity" of the divine persons. The subjectivity of each one of them and their intersubjectivity are to be understood in a complementary manner, just as are the consciousness of each one of them, the will of each one of them, and their common consciousness and common will.[15]

Because the salvation of the creatures exists in their being included in the eternal life of the triune God and in participating in it, we understand the unity of the triune God as an open, inviting, uniting, and integrating community (John 17:21 "[that] they also be in us"). If sin is the separation of the creatures from the eternal source of their life, then salvation lies in their inclusion into the community of eternal life. This community with God is no external unity. It occurs when the Son of God, Jesus, takes men and women into his intimate relationship with his Father (whom he called "Abba"), making them into children of God, who then also call God "Abba" (Rom. 8:15; Gal. 4:6). The Spirit takes the creatures into her community with the Son and the Father. What kind of community with the triune God is this?

The community with God is also a mutual indwelling and thus a perichoretic unity: "Those who abide in love abide in God, and God abides in them" (1 John 4:16). Mutual indwelling and perichoresis are also the life secrets of the whole new creation, because in the end God will be "all in all" (1 Cor. 15:28) and everything will be in God. The perichoretic unity of the triune God should therefore be understood as a social, inviting, integrating, unifying, and thus world-open community. The perichoretic unity of the divine persons is so wide open that the whole world can find room and rest and eternal life within it. All creatures will "enter into God," we orthodox theologians say,

to find life-space and their home in God. I have expressed this with the term "open trinity," which I set against the traditional figures of a closed, circular, or triangular Trinity. The divine Trinity is "open" not because it is imperfect, but by virtue of the graciously overflowing love, open for all the beloved creatures. It is the redeeming "broad room" for the creatures and the life-space for all living beings. Divine love gives free space for the freedom of the creatures. This is what is meant by the inclusive concept of the unity of the triune God.[16]

C. G. Jung rightly recognized in many religious pictures of the Trinity a fourth person, Mary, but wrongly interpreted this as the archetype of a Quaternity.[17] "Mary" is in truth the symbol for the redeemed humankind and the renewed creation. She finds therefore her room and home in the Trinity. This means the Trinity is an open environment for the redeemed and renewed creation.

The Trinitarian Experience of God

Two years ago I discovered in southern Spain, in Granada, an ancient Catholic order I had never heard of. They call themselves "Trinitarians," were founded in the eleventh century, and are dedicated to the "liberation of prisoners." The heraldic figure on the church of the Trinitarians, St. Thomas in Formis, shows Christ the redeemer sitting on his throne in heaven and at his hands on both sides are men with broken chains. One is a prisoner with a cross in his hand, the other a prisoner without a cross. Christ liberates both and takes them into his fellowship and into fellowship with one another. Trinity stood at the heart of this original "liberation theology" more than eight hundred years ago.[18]

But what has the Holy Trinity to do with the liberation of the imprisoned? How can the adoration of the Holy Trinity become a driving force for the liberation of persecuted, imprisoned, and abandoned people? In hopes of clarifying the inner theological relationship between the Trinity and liberation, I shall first analyze the trinitarian experience of God in Christian faith and then explore the trinitarian experience of the community in Christ.

> The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ,
> the love of God,
> and the communion of the Holy Spirit
> be with all of you.

This ancient benediction (2 Cor. 13:13) describes very well the trinitarian experience of God that is constitutive and characteristic of the special Christian faith.

1. The first aspect of the trinitarian experience is liberation by grace. Faith develops out of the promise of God and the experience of grace, which draws the forsaken and the guilty, and victims and perpetrators into communion with God. This happens through Christ: He is our brother in need and our redeemer in guilt. Christ is in solidarity with us and intercedes for us vicariously. Christ accepts sinners, heals the sick, comforts the sorrowful, and liberates the imprisoned. In this communion with Christ we find a new affirmation of life and a great hope against death. In Christ's fellowship we experience the embrace of the love of God.

2. The God of Jesus Christ becomes our God, and we trust in God for Christ's sake. The one whom Christ called so intimately "Abba" becomes in the communion with Christ also our God and Father. Only in Christ do we discover this mystery of God. If we want to know what it means to call God "Abba, dear Father," we have to forget the Roman paternalism, the "father of the family" (pater familias), the "father of the fatherland" (pater patriae) and the God-father (Jupiter) and look only at the life of Jesus. The "Abba" of Jesus is not a God of patriarchy. When Jesus discovers this name of God in his baptism in the Holy Spirit, he left his family and lived among the weary and heavy laden, the poor and forlorn. The "Abba" of Jesus is not a God of male violence, because Jesus liberates human beings through his suffering: "And by his bruises we are healed" (Isa. 53:5). The "Abba" of Jesus is also not a God of a clerical hierarchy, since Jesus gathered around him a brotherly and sisterly community and forbade them to call any human being "father," for only God is their "Father" (Matt. 23:9). The Christian faith in God the Father has nothing to do with the "father of all," the Greek super-god Zeus, or the father of the gods, Jupiter. The cross on Calvary stands between the "Abba" of Jesus and the idols of political, cultural, and religious violence. For this reason Paul never called God "Lord and Father" as became usual in Romanized Christianity since Lactantius, but he always distinguished precisely in a trinitarian fashion between God the Father of Jesus Christ, and Christ the Son of God, "our Lord" (1 Cor. 1:3, etc.). God is the Father of Christ and Christ is our Lord.[19]

3. We call the presence of God in the communion with Christ the "Spirit." This term signifies in the Old Testament the divine creative

power and the vitality of the creatures (Psalm 104). When we turn to Christ, it also signifies the divine power of resurrection, the life-giving power *(pneuma zoopoioun)*. This presence of God was and is experienced as the "source of life" *(fons vitae)*, the font of new vitality. And "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom" (2 Cor. 3:17). Just as Israel called God "LORD" when the people were led out of slavery into the promised land of freedom, so Christians call the Spirit "LORD" because they are led out of the internal and external prisons of body and soul. The reign of the Spirit is the power of life and has nothing to do with any kind of a religion of violence. While the Spirit of resurrection grants inner freedom, the kingdom of God creates an open space for a free life. We may even say that God's self is the "broad place where there is no distress any more," if we take up the cabalistic secret word for God: *Makom*.[20]

The grace of Christ, the love of God, and the community of the Spirit work together in the liberation of human beings toward the true life. Christ accepts us in grace; God loves without reserve; the Spirit gives us new vitality. The three persons are personally differentiated: Christ-God-Spirit. Each person works his or her own way: grace-love-community. But they work together in a unified movement that liberates and unites the creatures who are separated from God. We live in the Trinity; our lives are trinitarian lives.

What happens to us, then, in the trinitarian experience of God? The first Christian Pentecostal congregation (Acts 2:17) understood what occurred to them as the fulfillment of the prophecy of Joel 2:28-32. In the monstrous catastrophes of the end time, the Spirit of God will be "poured out upon all flesh." What is meant by "flesh" *(kol basar)* is not only the pious flesh of Israel, but "all" flesh—that is, all of humanity, and not only the human flesh, but all living beings on earth. "Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your old [people] shall dream dreams." Young people, who do not yet have full standing in public life, and old people, who no longer fully participate in public life, will be the first to experience the Spirit of life. A new equality of generations arises in this outpouring of the life-giving Spirit. No one is too young, no one is too old; they are all the same in the reception of the Spirit. Men and women are made equals. Women are just as near to the Spirit as men; there is no longer any male privilege—in the Spirit a new messianic community of men and women "prophesies" with equal right and equal giftedness. For this reason, Christianity from the beginning has indisputably baptized

men and women equally, and recognized by this act their giftedness by the Spirit.

Does a Christian church that shuts out women from preaching and prophesying "have" the Holy Spirit, or does such exclusion of women "dampen" the Spirit and suppress the Spirit's free work? A new community out of masters and servants, mistresses and maids, arises from the experience of the Spirit. The Spirit of God does not respect the social differences, but abolishes them. All Spirit-filled revival movements in Christianity have spread these socially revolutionary dimensions of the experience of the Spirit and become dangerous to the patriarchy, to the male church, to the slaveholders, and to the military monarchies. The experiences of the Spirit today among the young and the elderly are dangerous to those who exclude the young and elderly from public life. The Spirit-filled fellowship of old and young, men and women, and masters and servants is in its very existence a witness to the world of "deliverance in the midst of danger." Its life points to that which remains in a world that is passing away.[21]

The Trinitarian Experience of Community

At this point we turn to the other aspect of the trinitarian experience of God: community. Here the classical text is the high-priestly prayer of Jesus in John 17:21: "That they may all be one. As you, Father, are in me and I am in you, may they also be in us, so that the world may believe that you have sent me."

The unity of the disciples for which Jesus prays corresponds to the mutual indwelling of the Father in the Son and the Son in the Father. Their unity is based neither on the monarchy of the Father nor in the example of the Son, but on the mutuality of their indwelling—the trinitarian perichoresis. Cyprian understood this very well when he claimed "that Church is by the unity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit a united people." The community of the disciples of Christ not only "corresponds" by analogy to the divine trinitarian community, but also is to become a community *in* the divine community of the triune God so that "they [may] also be in us" (John 17:21). This is the mystical dimension of the church. The unity of Jesus with the Father and of God with Jesus is not an exclusive, but an open and inviting community. Here too we find a form of

121

mutuality: the human community in the divine community, and the divine community in the human community in mutual indwelling (see also John 14:23). *Love* is another word for this community of mutual indwelling. Those who love are not in themselves but in others; those who are loved give others free space to live in them.

What does this community of human beings, which corresponds to God and lives in God, look like? Here the classical text is the report of the first Pentecost community, who led their lives in the Trinity:

> Now the whole group of those who believed were of one heart and soul, and no one claimed private ownership of any possessions, but everything they owned was held in common. . . . There was not a needy person among them . . . [everything] was distributed to each as any had need. (Acts 4:32-35)

This so-called "primitive Christian communism" was not a new social program but rather the social expression of the new trinitarian experience of God, of oneself in God, and, in particular, of the Spirit of the resurrection. Those who have found resurrection and eternal life no longer have any need to cling to the goods of this world and to accumulate property.[22] Once the fear of death has disappeared from one's life, the greed for life disappears as well.

The Holy Spirit is experienced as the communal Godhead, as the "God among us," the "go-between God" who tears down the walls and fences that separate human beings from one another, built out of anxiety and arrogance. In the Spirit of God the struggle of competition that ignites the struggle of all against all, which turns one human person into the "wolf" of the other, and which isolates us from one another, comes to an end. In the Spirit of life, human beings become "one heart and soul" in the midst of this heartless and soulless world of struggle and violence. We may argue that this early Christian "communism" did not work and that it is better to cling to a "healthy egotism." However, the original Christian communism did not die out. It continued to exist in the monastic orders within Christianity, and still exists in radical groups of Christian discipleship. People experience this "community of the Holy Spirit" today in Latin American base communities. For example, Leonardo Boff reported that at a meeting of base communities in Trinidade, Brazil, in July 1986, Christians put up a banner saying, "The most Holy Trinity is the best community."[23]

"The Trinity Is Our Social Program" (Nicholas Fedorov)

Nicholas Fedorov was a friend of Dostoyevsky. I suppose that he proposed with this slogan a third way in Russia between the autocracy of the tsar and the anarchism of Kropotkin. Fedorov offered the Trinity in God and the *sobornost* in the orthodox church as models for a human society of freedom and equality. His argument ran as follows: The unity of the triune God is the personal community of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The divine persons have everything in common, except their personal characteristics. Their trinitarian community has an inclusive dynamic for every creature. The presence of the trinitarian community of God in human history overcomes the perversions and privileges through which the various differences among human beings have turned into inequality and oppression.[24]

What does this trinitarian community mean for the church? I believe that it is the task of Christian congregations to strengthen the Spirit of community within the hierarchical and bureaucratic form of the church. We need a strong congregational reality within large church organizations so that people on the local level can experience not only a community of worship and Eucharist but also a serving and diaconic community of trust. Priests and pastors need an active community that supports them. An open and inviting congregation releases new energies, through which people may enjoy more acceptance and greater participation. "The trinitarian principle replaces the principle of power with that of agreement," as Orthodox theologians say. The entire people of God become the guardian of the divine truth, not only bishops or Cardinal Ratzinger. By witnessing to the gospel, all members of the church, each in his or her own way, exercise the "magisterial office." The one baptism of men and women constitutes the church-community, not one single office. Only through freedom and equality of all can the congregation of Christ become a healing community in our violent society.

Today's society is marked economically by the "globalization" of industry and markets, and socially by a growing individualism. The market society isolates people, destroys their communities, and infects them with the poison of competition. Can this progressive individualism safeguard human dignity and increase our freedom? No, because a person is not an "individual." This distinction is simple, but widely unknown. An "individual," like an "atom" in Greek, is literally that ultimate element of indivisibility.[25] What can no

longer be divided has no relationships; it cannot communicate any-more. Hence Goethe was correct with his dictum: *Individuum est ineffabile*. If a human individual has no relationships, he or she also has no characteristics and no name. Such a person is unrecognizable and cannot even know himself or herself.

To call a human person "a certain individual" was an insult in the old German and Spanish culture. An "individual" is an anony-mous being, without name and family. A "person" is, by contrast, a human being in the resonance-field of his or her relationships of I-you-we or I-myself or I-it, as Martin Buber said. Within this net-work of relationships the human subject becomes a subject of giving and taking, hearing and responding, touching and experiencing. Modern individualism does not serve the freedom of human per-sons, but more their new enslavement. Divide and conquer was the well-known Roman method of domination. If you want to rule over people, you must separate, isolate, and individualize them as much as you can. If their separation reaches an ultimate element of indivis-ibility, then they can be considered totally subjugated. The modern "individual" is, in this respect, the end-product of a certain "divide-and-rule method" to which we all are subjected, especially by televi-sion, as Noam Chomsky has demonstrated.[26]

How can human persons defend their dignity and freedom over against the pressures of modern individualism? By becoming able and willing for community, and by defending their communal life. Is true human freedom really nothing but the "free choice" of the indi-vidual? The old German word for "freedom" has the same root as kindness. One is "free" who is friendly, kind, open, liking, and lov-ing, says Kluge's famous *Etymologisches Wörterbuch*.[27] Whoever orders "alcohol-free" drinks receives no alcohol, but in German who-ever is *gastfrei* (which means "hospitable") has many guests and is *freigebig*—that is, "generous and capable of fellowship with strangers." This is the social side of human freedom. In contempo-rary terms this is the concept of communicative freedom. The differ-ence is simple. Where do I feel personally free? In a supermarket where I can buy whatever I want as long as I have the money for it, but where no one knows me and not even the cashier looks into my eyes? Or in a community where I am accepted, where people know me and look into my eyes and affirm me as I am? The first is the expe-rience of individual free-choice; the second is the reality of commu-nicative freedom. The first focuses on things; the second on persons.

We need to recognize, finally, the corresponding analogies of the inner-trinitarian mystery of the triune God in God's creation. All things are created in order to reflect God's life, beauty, and community. The Spirit of God fills the earth and holds all things together. This is the creation-community. God's creation is a community of creatures. Each creature in its own way participates and contributes to the rich and colorful community. The universe is not a monarchical pyramid, as Aristotle thought, but rather a covenanted, democratic community, consisting of living beings and environments. Modern human civilization has separated itself from the creation-community, the web of life on earth, in order to dominate the earth, and is in fact beginning to destroy it. We need a new integration of human culture in the nature of the earth if we want to survive, because we are dependent on the nature of the earth, but nature is not dependent on us.

The church of the triune God lives in the "community of the Spirit." When this Spirit is "poured out on all flesh," the community of the Spirit encompasses the whole creation-community, and the church in its catholicity becomes an ecological church. When we worship the Holy Trinity, we hear not only the cries of imprisoned human beings but also the sighs of the enslaved creatures, as did Paul (Romans 8). To live in the Trinity and to lead a trinitarian life brings us into the creation-community and gives us hope for a "new earth and a new heaven."

125

75. *Hymns*, no. 250, *Works* 7:391.

76. Among Methodist and Wesleyan theologians prescribed for study by preachers, see the following on providence and miracles: Watson, *Theological Institutes* 1:266; Summers, *Systematic Theology* 1:115-20; Pope, *Compendium* 1:437-40; Miley, *Systematic Theology* 1:309-49; and Wiley, *Christian Theology* 1:477-87. For a survey of the nineteenth-century theologians, see Dunlap, "Methodist Theology," 153-54, 293-95. Among contemporary Methodist theologians, see Williams, Wesley's *Theology Today*, 98 and 108; and Maddox, *Responsible Grace*, 60.

77. See the MC (GBr) *Hymns and Psalms* 1983, subsection on "God's Creating and Sustaining Power" (nos. 21-29); *Hymnal*/AME 1984, subsection on "His Presence" (nos. 81-87); and *Hymnal*/UMC 1989, subsection on "Providence" (nos. 126-143).

78. Civilla D. Martin, "His Eye Is on the Sparrow," cited from *Hymnal*/AME 1984, no. 435.

79. Here I have in mind the work of Robert Cushman and Albert Outler and the generation of Wesley studies spawned by them. Both were students of Robert L. Calhoun at Yale, a scholar and teacher of the history of Christian thought.

80. See stanza 1 of Charles Wesley's famous hymn "Love Divine, All Loves Excelling," *Hymns*, no. 374, *Works* 7:545.

6. Perichoresis (Moltmann)

1. See also M. Douglas Meeks, *Origins of the Theology of Hope* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974); Christopher Morse, *The Logic of Promise in Moltmann's Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979); and A. J. Conyers, *God, Hope, and History* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1988).

2. See Steve Bouma-Prediger, *The Greening of Theology: The Ecological Models of Rosemary Radford Ruether, Joseph Sittler, and Jürgen Moltmann* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995); and Richard Bauckham, *The Theology of Jürgen Moltmann* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995), 183ff.

3. Jürgen Moltmann, *God in Creation: A New Theology of Creation and the Spirit of God*, trans. Margaret Kohl (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985), chapter 9, "The Sabbath: The Feast of Creation," pp. 276-96.

4. An exception is Max Jammer, *Concepts of Space* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1954).

5. Arnold Goldberg, *Untersuchungen über die Vorstellung von der Schekhinah in der frühen rabbinischen Literatur* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1969); and Bernd Janowski, *Gottes Gegenwart in Israel: Beiträge zur Theologie des Alten Testaments* (Neukirken-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1993).

6. Petr Alekseevich Kropotkin, *Gegenseitige Hilfe in der Tier-und*

Menschenwelt, trans. Gustav Landauer (Leipzig: Thomas, 1920). Landauer and Kropotkin were anarchists and pacifists.

7. I am following the study of Ciril Sorč, "Die Perichoretischen Beziehungen im Leben der Trinität und in der Germeinschaft der Menschen," *Evangelische Theologie* 58 (1998): 100-19.

8. See A. Deneffe, "Perichoresis, Circumincessio, Circuminsessio," *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie* 47 (1923): 497-532; and C. A. Disandro, "Historia Semántica de Perikhóresis," *Studia Patristica* 15.1 (1984): 442-47.

9. Heinrich Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, 20th ed. (Freiburg: Herder, 1937), no. 704.

10. I have developed the idea of the "God who can be inhabited" further in *The Coming of God: Christian Eschatology*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 299-302.

11. "A person is an enduring individual rational being."

12. See M. Douglas Meeks, "Trinity, Community, and Power" (chapter 1 of this volume).

13. I have analyzed these metaphysical doctrines of the Trinity in *The Trinity and the Kingdom: The Doctrine of God*, trans. Margaret Kohl (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981), 129-50.

14. See Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Problemgeschichte der Neueren Evangelischen Theologie in Deutschland* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 168-204.

15. See Dumitru Staniloae, *The Experience of God* (Brookline, Mass.: Holy Cross, 1994), 260-78.

16. Moltmann, *Trinity and the Kingdom*, 177.

17. C. G. Jung, *Zur Psychologie westlicher und östlicher Religion, Werke* (Olten/Freiburg 1972) 11:179-82.

18. Fe, *Cautiverio y Liberación*. Acta del 1. Congreso Trinitario de Granada (Cordoba 1996).

19. See Jürgen Moltmann, "I Believe in God the Father: Patriarchal or Non-Patriarchal Talk of God?" in *History and the Triune God: Contributions to Trinitarian Theology* (New York: Crossroad, 1992), 1-18.

20. See Jammer, *Concepts of Space*, 26.

21. See Jürgen Moltmann, *The Spirit of Life: A Universal Affirmation* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 58-82; Michael Welker, *God the Spirit* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), 108-82; and Geiko Müller-Fahrenholz, *God's Spirit: Transforming a World in Crisis* (Geneva: WCC, 1995).

22. See also M. Douglas Meeks, *God the Economist: The Doctrine of God and Political Economy* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989).

23. See Leonardo Boff, *Trinity and Society* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1988), 148-54.

24. See Miroslav Volf, "'The Trinity Is Our Social Program': The Doctrine of the Trinity and the Shape of Social Engagement," *Modern*

Theology 14 (1998): 403-23; and Geevarghese Mar Osthathios, *Theology of a Classless Society* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1959).

25. See Gideon Freudenthal, *Atom and Individual in the Age of Newton* (Boston: Reidel, 1986); and Moltmann, *Spirit of Life*, 114-22.

26. Noam Chomsky, *Deterring Democracy* (New York: Verso, 1991).

27. See also Friedrich Kluge, *Etymologisches Wörterbuchder deutchen Sprache*, 23d ed. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995).

7. Essence and Energies (Young)

1. For the terse diary entries from which I have composed this narrative, see Wesley, diary (30 July 1736), *Works* 18:405-406.

2. See *Christian Library* 1:81-154.

3. This quotation and the following come from §7 of Wesley's Introduction in *Christian Library*, 1:83.

4. Thomas Haywood, *Primitive Morality: or, The Spiritual Homilies of St. Macarius the Egyptian* (London: W. Taylor, 1721). Wesley's abridged republication draws on Haywood.

5. *Pseudo-Macarius: The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, trans. George A. Maloney, S. J. (New York/Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1992). This work will be cited hereafter as *Macarius*.

6. Wesley, Homily 4.4-9, *Christian Library* 1:99-102. (*Macarius*, Homily 5.4-8, 64-73).

7. *Macarius*, Homily 25, 159-64; here p. 161.

8. Sermon 3, "Awake, Thou That Sleepest," §2.8, *Works* 1:149. This sermon is actually by Charles Wesley but was included by John in his earliest collection of published sermons.

9. Sermon 1, "Salvation by Faith," §2.4, *Works* 1:122. See also Sermon 9, "The Spirit of Bondage and of Adoption," *Works* 1:249-66.

10. *A Plain Account of Genuine Christianity*, §3.11-12, *John Wesley*, 195.

11. Ibid., §2.12, *John Wesley*, 191.

12. Wesley, Homily 5.1-3, *Christian Library* 1:102-103 (*Macarius*, Homily 8.1-3, 81-82).

13. Wesley, Homily 6.3-4, *Christian Library* 1:106-107 (*Macarius*, Homily 10.1-5, 88-90).

14. Wesley, Homily 1, *Christian Library* 1:84-90 (*Macarius*, Homily 1, 37-44).

15. This quote and the following are from *Christian Library* 1:85.

16. Wesley, Homily 1.3, *Christian Library* 1:86 (*Macarius*, Homily 1.2, 38).

17. Wesley, Homily 1.13, *Christian Library* 1:90 (*Macarius*, Homily 1.12, 44).

18. *A Plain Account of Genuine Christianity*, 1.2, *John Wesley*, 183.