Theology in Scotland
32.2 (2025): 35–47
https://doi.org/10.15664/tis.v32i2.3035

Beyond theodicies:
Responding to suffering and the stubborn persistence of theological complexity

Graham Meiklejohn

Dr Graham Meiklejohn is the Academic Director of the Scottish Baptist College. His research interests are in public, political, and practical theology.

Abstract

Theodicies are often criticised for making concrete suffering into an abstract exercise in theological conjecture. The common response is that complex theodicies are not as important as responding to suffering. This paper, however, contends that responding to suffering still presents theological complexities, as illustrated by James Cone's rebuttal of Reinhold Niebuhr's Christian Realism. At the heart of the debate is a recurrent theme throughout theological history that considers the extent to which human action can overcome rather than just ameliorate suffering. This article argues that the persistence of sin and the irruption of God into creation are helpful reminders about the limitation of human action and the necessity of God for overcoming suffering.

One of the more persistent questions in theology is the problem of evil. By considering the limitations of theodicies, this article seeks to address situations of systemic suffering and the necessity of a Christian response to them. Through interacting with Christian Realism and Liberation Theology, the central discussion argues that responding to suffering raises theological questions about the limitation of humans to overcome suffering. While limited in scope to systemic situations of suffering and primarily to Reinhold Niebuhr's Christian Realism and James Cone's

Liberation Theology, it is nevertheless a helpful reminder that injustice and suffering must be challenged through acknowledging the present in-breaking of God's eschatological future.

The place of theodicies in responding to suffering

In any rudimentary theological foundations class, one would expect to see significant discussion given over to theodicies. Theodicies are, as Migliore states, a way that we can 'continue to affirm the lordship of God in the face of such horrendous evil.'[1] In short, they are a defence of God's character and God's love for God's world.

Theodicies can provide reasoning to explain the presence of suffering, but understanding alone does not resolve the reality of suffering. German Catholic priest and theologian Johann Baptiste Metz goes one step further, with Losada-Sierra commenting that Metz believes theodicies are 'an attempt to make God innocent, which can lead to a trivialization of human pain.'[2] Metz rejects theodicies by acknowledging that if we explain away suffering, then it is as if those suffering do not matter. Rather than looking for justifications of suffering or constructing a defence for God, we should seek to alleviate the suffering around us and, for Metz, hold God to account for it.[3]

Metz advances his position arguing that Augustine writes God out of suffering altogether. For Metz, Augustine 'locates the cause as well as the responsibility for evil and suffering in the world exclusively in humanity.'[4] Consequently there is no defence of God required and there is no questioning of God required. Metz continues 'in Augustine, the question of God that is guided by the hunger and thirst for righteousness, that is, the eschatological question about the justice of God, is replaced by the anthropocentric question of human sinfulness.'[5] A second influence on

[1] Daniel L. Migliore, *Faith Seeking Understanding: An Introduction to Christian Theology*, 3rd ed. (Eerdmans, 2014) 167.

[2] Manuel Losada-Sierra, "Memory and History: The Overcoming of Traditional Theodicy in Levinas and Metz", *Religions* 10, no. 12 (2019): 10, https://doi.org/10.3390/rel10120657.

[3] Metz calls this a disturbing question. Johann Baptist Metz, "Suffering Unto God", translated by J. Matthew Ashley, *Critical Inquiry* 20, no. 4 (1994): 612.

[4] Metz, "Suffering unto God", 616.

[5] Metz, 617–18.

Metz's argument comes from his experiences in World War II. Drafted by the German military, he was profoundly impacted by the horrors of war and especially the Holocaust, thus developing a theology after Auschwitz in the post-war years. Metz considers theodicies that seek justification of God as 'blasphemy' since attempts to understand or give meaning to suffering miss the injustice and incomprehensibility of the evil in Auschwitz.[6]

Losada-Sierra helpfully summarises Metz's position:

> Metz criticizes how theology disposed of the disturbing problem of justice for those who suffer unjustly, transforming it directly into a problem about the redemption of the guilty. For Metz, there was a shift from the biblical concern with human suffering to a concern for individual sins.[7]

Not only are theodicies limited to understanding suffering rather than responding to it; some theodicies limit justice for those who suffer by locating the problem (and potentially the solution) in humans.[8]

Overcoming suffering as a theological conundrum

If our aim is not so much to understand suffering or to justify God, is it simply to respond to suffering? When considering large-scale injustices and systemic suffering the practical relief of suffering is not straightforward. It is also not straightforward from a theological perspective. Even when thinking about practical responses, there are theological and theoretical motivations that arise from them. The following contrasts Christian Realism, which recognises the tension between human freedom and human sinfulness and therefore the limitations of human progress, with Liberation Theology, which sees God's transcendence displayed in concrete actions throughout history, seeking to transform the present in

[6] John K. Downey, ed., *Love's Strategy: The Political Theology of Johann Baptist Metz* (Trinity Press International, 1999), 41.

[7] Losada-Sierra, "Memory and History", 11.

[8] Karen Kilby has an excellent chapter on the limits of theodicy in her book *God, Evil, and the Limits of Theology* (Bloomsbury Publishing, 2020), Chapter 6. Drawing on Kenneth Surin and Terrence Tilley, she writes that theodicies 'try to reconcile us to evils, that is, in a way which we should not be reconciled.' (71).

view of ultimate realities. This discussion, therefore, holds in tension the limitations of humans to overcome suffering, but significantly, the possibility of God breaking into the suffering in creation.

I first considered this discussion while reading *The Cross and the Lynching Tree*. Cone's work reflects on the Black experience of living in the lynching era, suggesting it had parallels to the cross of Christ, with both being representations of suffering and racial injustice. Cone underlines that the paradox of the cross shows there is hope and the possibility of liberation amidst injustice. In the second chapter, Cone reflects that although Niebuhr was 'unusually attuned to social reality',[9] ultimately Niebuhr 'sounds like […] a southern moderate more concerned about not challenging the cultural traditions of the white South than achieving justice for black people.'[10] In Cone's opinion, 'the problem of race was never one of his central theological or political concerns'[11] and, significantly, 'Christian realism was not only a source of Niebuhr's radicalism but also of his conservatism.'[12] In terms of systemic change, Cone identifies his preference for gradualism over and against the struggle to overcome, as the key issue in Niebuhr's Chrisitan Realism that hinders his response to suffering. Consequently, Cone criticises gradualism as preserving the status quo and, in terms of suffering, lacking the radical approach necessary to adequately challenge systemic injustices which promulgate suffering.

Cone's chapter is a microcosm of a wider theological question. While there are a variety of 'flavours' of both Christian Realism and Liberation Theology, in different ways both address responses to systemic suffering. The following discussion is not intended to be a detailed examination of Niebuhr or Cone nor a new or novel exploration of Christian Realism and Liberation Theology (indeed, much of the material is secondary comment upon these themes), nor is it a practical guide to the relief of suffering. Rather, the discussion highlights that even if one agrees to dispense with abstract theodicies and 'simply' respond to suffering, complexities remain. More specifically, I will consider the grounds of Cone's criticism of Christian Realism by way of Metz's arguments against theodicies.

---

[9] James H. Cone, *The Cross and the Lynching Tree* (Orbis Books, 2011), 32.
[10] Cone, *Cross*, 39.
[11] Cone, 41.
[12] Cone, 48.

On the one hand, Christian Realism seeks to balance 'the optimism generated by the Renaissance utopias and the defeatism too often encouraged by Reformation eschatologies.'[13] In light of the persistence of sin, Christian Realism dismisses talk of progress towards a world without suffering in the present age. On the other hand, Liberation Theology 'is a narrative proclaiming the liberating God's role in overcoming limit-situations of oppression.'[14] Liberation Theologies, therefore, recognise the struggle against injustice but nevertheless are proactive in overcoming suffering.[15]

Theological threads – a persistent issue

As a starting point, Christian Realism and Liberation Theology respond to deficits in liberal theology, but their differing approaches lead them into conflict. While a detailed account is beyond the scope of this discussion, it is worth noting the broad parameters of the responses to liberal Christianity.[16] Niebuhr, for example, criticised liberal Christianity and rejected 'a naive faith in the inevitability of gradual progress based on steadily increasing human intelligence and moral virtue; reason and personal morality […] would guarantee the achievement of justice.'[17] In short, Christian Realism rejects the fusion of modernism's hope in 'progress' with Christian eschatological hope of redemption. Liberation Theology, on the other hand, rejects liberal theology's fusion with politics,

[13] Dennis P. McCann, *Christian Realism and Liberation Theology: Practical Theologies in Creative Conflict* (Orbis Books, 1981), 55.

[14] McCann, *Christian Realism*, 204.

[15] As will be explored below, Liberation Theology recognises the persistence of sin, but significantly the role of liberation in overcoming suffering. Gutiérrez writes 'sin demands a radical liberation [...]. This radical liberation is the gift which Christ offers us. [...] to liberate all [people] from all slavery to which sin has subjected them: hunger, misery, oppression, and ignorance.' Gustavo Gutiérrez, *A Theology of Liberation: History, Politics and Salvation*, rev. ed., trans. Sister Caridad Inda and John Eagleson (Orbis Books, 1988), 103.

[16] By liberal Christianity I mean the theological approach starting in the eighteenth century that seeks to draw on insights of modernity from science, psychology, politics and so on and to adapt theological ideas to match.

[17] Joshua L. Cherniss, "A Tempered Liberalism: Political Ethics and Ethos in Reinhold Niebuhr's Thought", in *The Review of Politics* 78, no. 1 (2016): 63.

which often results in the demands of the political overcoming the demands of Christ.

Christian Realism and the rejection of liberal Christianity

Niebuhr roots much of his theology and anthropology in the persistence of humanity's sinful condition. He describes humanity as having an 'anxiety' problem defining it as 'a universal mood [...] a pervasive insecurity in the face of our own limits and possibilities.'[18] Dennis McCann suggests that 'there is no final cure; for to eliminate anxiety would be to eliminate humanity itself.'[19] In other words, the limits that come with finitude create an anxiety which cannot be overcome without changing the ontology of human nature. Similarly, for Niebuhr sin is woven into human ontology and Christ's cross does not remove sin in the present age. In McCann's words, 'it cannot eliminate anxiety and sin so much as offer a way of coping with them.'[20] McCann continues 'sin, in Niebuhr's view, is overcome "in principle but not in fact," so grace does not miraculously transform human nature.'[21]

Not only does Niebuhr recognise the persistence of sin within individuals, but he also considers it to be magnified in society. An individual may recognise his or her shortcomings, but society is less likely to see their collective flaws. The result for Niebuhr is that 'no human association, Christian or otherwise, can claim to have established a perfect society—a kingdom of God—on earth.'[22] This conclusion is deeply rooted in his claim that the New Testament rules out eliminating sin and selfishness, therefore, the ethic of Jesus will only ever be an approximation of the ideal when applied to humanity and especially to wider society.

Niebuhr's insistence on the persistence of sin is influenced by Augustine and while there are differences, Niebuhr clearly adopts this core Augustinian idea. Charles Lemert remarks that 'Augustine provided Niebuhr with a constructive way around his frustrations with liberalism and disappointments with Marxism.'[23] He traces threads of Augustinian

[18] McCann, 56.
[19] McCann, 56.
[20] McCann, 61.
[21] McCann, 61.
[22] McCann, 73.
[23] Charles C. Lemert, *Why Niebuhr Matters* (Yale University Press, 2011), 126.

thinking in Niebuhr and, in particular, a theory of history where the persistence of sin means no society or era will ever be without flaw. It is only through God's intervention at the fulfilment of time that creation will attain perfection. Lemert concludes that Niebuhr 'would remain, ever after, Augustinian in his strong claim to the limits of human nature and destiny.'[24]

To understand Niebuhr's Augustinianism, it is helpful to consider ideas of the *saeculum*. Robert Markus describes Augustine's *saeculum* as resisting any notion that the present situation is getting better or worse and is a mixed space of the sacred and profane.[25] He continues that 'in the most general terms, for Augustine political discourse is concerned, not with the ultimate realities of human fulfilment and salvation, but with what, in Dietrich Bonhoeffer's language, we might call the "penultimate".'[26] 'Penultimate' realities still contain suffering or joy, but do not determine the ultimate direction of human history. This is best articulated by Markus when he writes: 'For Augustine, no social arrangements, no human justice or ingenuity, could establish the Kingdom of God or bring us any closer to it; only God's saving acts could do that.'[27]

On the one hand, Augustine was reacting against the Manichaeism he once endorsed. Augustine rejected the dualism which imagined a cosmic battle of good against evil and in its place upheld God as the sole creator where all that flows from the Creator God is good. In turn this led Augustine to defend himself against Pelagianism, which suggested the inherent goodness of creation may result in human's self-salvation. The persistence of sin is a direct result of his response to Pelagian concerns. Charles Mathewes summarises Augustine's middle ground as a 'different ontology and cosmology' which rejects 'the received view of the cosmos as formed in an agonic struggle between two (or more) divine entities, replacing it with a cosmology of a single monarchic Deity from whom creation has tragically and inexplicably swerved.'[28]

---

[24] Lemert, *Why Niebuhr Matters*, 140.

[25] Robert A. Markus, *Christianity and the Secular* (University of Notre Dame Press, 2006), 37.

[26] Markus, *Christianity and the Secular*, 40.

[27] Markus, 55.

[28] Charles Mathewes, "Faith, Hope, and Agony: Christian Political Participation Beyond Liberalism", in *The Annual of the Society of Christian Ethics* 21 (2001): 145.

As a result, humans neither progress towards a utopia nor aid the path to destruction. There are instances when, as receptacles of grace, humans contribute to the relief of suffering and times when the corruption of sin means humans cause suffering. In language resonant of Christian Realism (or perhaps vice versa), Markus notes that while

> Augustine removes civil society from the sphere where perfect justice can be realised, he does not remove it from the realm where moral norms are applicable. [...] Augustine, as we have seen, defined the ideally perfect society in eschatological terms. [...] Actual societies are too disrupted by sin and always at the mercy of the play of power [...]. But though they cannot aspire to the peace and justice of the eschatological City, they can aim higher than the level of the den of robbers.[29]

In the case of Augustinianism – and of Christian Realism – suffering is addressed, but it cannot be eradicated. Creation is neither progressing, nor deteriorating, but rather the present is an interim time in which we struggle against inhumanity, ever only attaining an approximate version of God's eschatological vision.

Liberation Theology and the rejection of liberal Christianity

Some approaches to Liberation Theology use the concept of transcendent hope to reject liberal Christianity's uncritical approach to secular politics.[30]

[29] Markus, *Christianity and the Secular*, 64.

[30] While Liberation Theology is much indebted to some aspects of liberal Christianity, there is often the recognition that Liberation Theology moved beyond liberal Christianity in demanding a greater critical distance from the state. For a wider discussion see Gary Dorrien, *The Making of American Liberal Theology: Crisis, Irony, and Postmodernity 1950–2005* (Westminster John Knox Press, 2006) and especially Chapter 3. More specifically on Cone, Dorrien, in an interview, observes, 'When he condemned liberal theology, Jim [Cone] didn't mean that the doctrinal formulations of Schleiermacher and Tillich were always wrong. He meant that Schleiermacher corrupted theology by letting his over-educated, racist, Eurocentric, bourgeois, atheist friends define its agenda. [...] he [Cone] plainly said that he could not have become a liberation theologian if not for Karl Barth.' Layne Hancock, "Understanding Liberal Theology: An Interview with

Following a thread from Barth's transcendent theology, to Moltmann's eschatologically-shaped hope, liberative approaches combine this theology with a reading of 'Marx's texts as an ethical critique of human oppression.'[31] Despite Barth's theology being critiqued for not giving 'the appropriate reason for why Christians have an ongoing responsibility to work for a more nearly just society', there is still good reason to consider him as a starting point for liberative approaches to theology.[32]

Barth's theology is not shaped anthropologically but is Christo-centrically-focused on the revelation of God. Stanley Hauerwas, drawing on George Hunsinger, describes the contrast with Niebuhr well:

> Barth did not think in terms of real and ideal, but rather in terms of the real and the unreal. Niebuhr's concept of the real in contrast to Barth was grounded in his anthropology, which meant sin made love unattainable. In contrast, Barth's "reality" was theocentric, which means Barth thought it is God who sets the terms for what is real. As a result, Hunsinger argues, that Barth maintains God's love in Christ establishes what is real so that sin becomes unreal, making possible alternatives that otherwise would not exist.[33]

As will become evident, this illustrates the foundational difference between responses to systemic suffering by Christian Realism and Liberation Theology. Christian Realism's anthropocentric grounding in the reality of sin, for all it reflects the lived experience of many who suffer, defers transformation to the future. Barth's Christocentric theology, however, removes the limit on what can be achieved when confronting suffering.

It is Jürgen Moltmann who most clearly provides the link between the transcendence of Barth's theology and Liberation Theology. Moltmann

---

Gary Dorrien", *Ad Fontes*, August 15, 2023, https://adfontesjournal.com/interview/understanding-liberal-theology-an-interview-with-gary-dorrien/.

[31] Luis N. Rivera-Pagán, "Karl Barth and the Origins of Liberation Theology", in *Karl Barth and Liberation Theology*, ed. Paul Dafydd Jones and Kaitlyn Dugan (Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2021), 16.

[32] Stanley Hauerwas, "Barth and Reinhold Niebuhr", in *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Karl Barth; Volume 2: Barth in Dialogue*, ed. George Hunsinger and Keith L. Johnson (Wiley Blackwell, 2020), 635.

[33] Hauerwas, "Barth and Reinhold Niebuhr", 640.

agrees with Karl Barth's observation that 'God and Kaiser, religion and culture, [had become] so intertwined that they became effectively indistinguishable.'[34] Moltmann, however, moves beyond Barth's theological response, ensuring it does not lead to a retreat into ecclesial conclaves, but rather emphasises the potential for social change. Influenced by Bloch, Moltmann augments Barth's theocentric transcendence with an eschatological permeation of creation, where hope becomes the driver of social transformation. With Moltmann's reading of Bloch, 'the present is filled with possibilities and an openness because what is ultimately possible is not determined by the past, but by the anticipated future.'[35] The past is not ultimately determinative of the future and thus present conditions are open to change, transformation, and renewal. A theology of hope brings the otherness of God's anticipated future fused with the potentiality of a transformed present. This leads Moltmann to write that 'Christianity is eschatology, is hope, forward looking and forward moving, and therefore also revolutionizing and transforming the present.'[36] Where Moltmann differs from Bloch is in the guarantee of the kingdom of God. The present time, therefore, is 'full of latencies and potentialities which derive from the kingdom itself. […] a time which is shot through with the possibilities of the future kingdom which is understood by Moltmann as the transformation of the world.'[37] Crucially as an inspiration for Liberation Theology, Moltmann believes that hope, 'understood as the difference between what is and what is not yet is first a critique of the current sociopolitical situation.'[38] It is not surprising, then, that many of the early South American liberation theologians like Sobrino and Gutiérrez drew from Moltmann in forming their own transformative theologies.

---

[34] Robert T. Cornelison, "The Development and Influence of Moltmann's Theology", *The Asbury Theological Journal* 55, no. 1 (2000): 17.

[35] Cornelison, "Development and Influence", 19.

[36] Jürgen Moltmann, *Theology of Hope: On the Ground and the Implications of a Christian Eschatology*, trans. James W. Leitch (Harper and Row, 1967), 16.

[37] Cornelison, "Development and Influence", 22.

[38] Cornelison, 22. As Cornelison also explores, Moltmann shifted his thinking towards 'praxis' and whether the practice of theology was liberative. It is beyond the scope of this paper to weigh up the strengths and weaknesses of this approach, but nevertheless, it is an important connection to the centrality of praxis in Liberation Theology.

Liberation Theology, therefore, moves beyond liberal Christianity's blurring of the line between 'religion and culture' but moreover, provides a theology of hope to those who are suffering. Its revolutionary, future-orientated, vision of hope challenges situations of suffering by making possible resolutions that would otherwise be limited. It is the underlying theology of Liberation Theology which is hopeful and rooted in the reality of God's transcendence within a suffering world.

Returning to the 'disturbing' question of suffering

Having considered Christian Realism's Augustinian foundation and the challenge of Liberation Theology, Metz's critique on theodicies can be considered more fully. Metz blames Augustine for 'silencing' the theodicy question by shifting the problem of evil on to humanity's exercise of free will.[39] Metz writes that 'Augustine locates the cause as well as the responsibility for evil and suffering in the world exclusively in humanity and the history of guilt that is rooted in its no to God [...]. God's self, especially the creator God, is left out of the theodicy question.'[40] Metz argues that Augustine's approach to salvation is 'exclusively [...] as redemption of sin and guilt.'[41] In essence, Metz is arguing that Augustine's approach to salvation lacks a wider appreciation of the socio-structural consequences of sin that lead to systemic suffering. Metz concludes 'the eschatological question about the justice of God, is replaced by the anthropocentric question of human sinfulness.'[42] Losada-Sierra summarises the argument well:

> From Metz's perspective, the biblical view of salvation, the promise of salvation in God's name, refers not only to salvation from sin and guilt, but to the liberation of human beings from the inscrutable situations of human suffering. In this way in classical theodicies, in line with Augustine, the victims of history are forgotten and the possibility to respond to the cry of justice that arises from their suffering is missed.[43]

[39] Metz, "Suffering unto God", 616.
[40] Metz, 616.
[41] Metz, 617.
[42] Metz, 617–18.
[43] Losada-Sierra, "Memory and History", 12.

While Augustine's theology answers very specific charges of Manichaeism and Pelagianism, it is also easy to see the shortcomings that Metz observes. This brings the discussion back to Cone's initial criticism of Niebuhr. While it would be unfair to speculate on Niebuhr's response to any individual episode of suffering, Cone's comments on Christian Realism's response to systemic suffering are justified in light of the above analysis.[44]

Conclusion

Is there any way to reconcile these approaches to the problem of suffering? A potential rapprochement is possible if the two approaches are considered from a present-future perspective. Christian Realism considers the eschatological future in 'ultimate' terms while Liberation Theology relies on the eschatological now as God's irruption into the present. With some theological gymnastics, these two approaches need not contradict one another.

Cartwheels aside, holding these two approaches as complementary may be a stretch, but a more viable solution would see them function as reminders to one another. Cone's criticism of Niebuhr was that his 'imagination' ran out and that his 'focus on realism ("facts of experience")' should have helped him to see the suffering of the lynching era as a more pressing concern than he did.[45] Cone suggests that Niebuhr's own analysis points to the reason for Niebuhr's failure: 'groups are notoriously selfish and have limited capacity to step outside of their interests and see the world from another group's standpoint.'[46] In the end, Cone suspects that Niebuhr does not fully recognise the depth of suffering, and as such the need for radical change: 'Rather than challenging racial injustice, he believed it must "slowly erode" [...] he did not choose to be among those to support

[44] It would be wholly unfair to paint Niebuhr as unmoved by suffering. Cherniss gives a more favourable reading of Niebuhr which notes 'in Detroit, Niebuhr was struck by the suffering of the workers', and goes on to observe that Niebuhr complained liberalism was '"too intellectual and too little emotional" to be "an efficient force in history"; liberals refused to "take a chance and accept a challenge."' (Cherniss, "A Tempered Liberalism", 67). It is, however, fair to say that while Cone's critique of Niebuhr is particularly focused on issues of race, he blames inaction on Niebuhr's underlying ideology.

[45] Cone, *Cross*, 38.

[46] Cone, 40.

actively and passionately the black struggle for justice.'[47] Liberation Theology like Cone's is a vital reminder to see the suffering before us and to continue to challenge injustice rather than defending a gradualism that constrains the presence of God in God's creation.

Likewise, Christian Realism can remind Liberation Theology of its distinctiveness. While approaches like the Social Gospel movement believed humans could build the kingdom of God on earth, Liberation Theologies are at their best when they attest to God alone as liberator.[48] While the capacity of humanity is constrained by its finite, sin-bound existence, it is God who makes liberation possible. It was not Moses who liberated the people from Egypt, but God. Like Moses, we may confront oppression and be an agitator for justice, but Christian Realism reminds us of the need to let it be God who reorders social structures without replacing one system of injustice with another. As Sobrino notes, Liberation Theology's root is 'God breaking through.'[49]

When suffering arises, we must respond; to not respond is a dereliction of duty both as a human and as a Christ-follower. As this discussion has shown, however, there are still theological complexities in responding to suffering. These might seem as abstract as theodicies, but nevertheless, they highlight the potential pitfall of believing too much in human capacity and believing too little in the possibilities within God. In our response to suffering, we must avoid both human hubris and complete despair.

---

[47] Cone, 48.

[48] Cone, 33.

[49] Jon Sobrino, "Political Theology and the Theology of Liberation", English translation, accessed online: https://johannbaptistmetz.com/resources/; published in German in a book entitled *Theology in Perilous Times: Letters to Johann Baptist Metz on the occasion of his 90th Birthday / Theologie in gefährdeter Zeit: Stichworte von nahen und fernen Weggefährten für Johann Baptist Metz zum 90. Geburtstag*, ed. Hans-Gerd Janßen, Julia D. E. Prinz and Michael J. Rainer (Lit Verlag, 2018).