

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

I.S.B.N.

THESES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE



National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

KARL BARTH'S THEOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT

A RESPONSE TO LIBERALISM

by Alice M. Collins

A thesis submitted to the School of
Graduate Studies and Research of the University of Ottawa
as partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Religious Studies)

Corner Brook, Newfoundland, 1982.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere appreciation is extended to Professor Benoit Garceau, Chair, Department of Philosophy, University of Ottawa, who supervised this thesis. I am indebted to him for his valuable critiques and encouragement.

I wish to thank Dr. Elisabeth Lacelle of the Department of Religious Studies, University of Ottawa, for assistance and suggestions in the preparation of this thesis. To Ms. Elizabeth Behrens, Librarian, Sir Wilfred Grenfell College, Corner Brook, I express thanks for her generous efforts.

CURRICULUM STUDIORUM

Alice Maureen Collins was born in Corner Brook, Newfoundland, April 8, 1949. She received the Bachelor of Arts degree in History and Religious Studies and the Bachelor of Education degree from Memorial University of Newfoundland in May, 1971. She received the Master of Arts degree in Religious Studies from the University of Ottawa, October, 1975.

Abbreviations for Frequently Used Works

Barth's Works:

<u>CD</u>	<u>Church Dogmatics</u>
<u>KD</u>	<u>Kirchliche Dogmatik</u>
<u>ChD</u>	<u>Prolegomena zur christlichen Dogmatik</u>
<u>Rom I</u>	<u>Der Römerbrief</u> 1919
<u>Rom II</u>	<u>Der Römerbrief</u> 1926, C 1922
<u>Romans</u>	<u>Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans,</u> 6th edition
<u>The Word of God</u>	<u>The Word of God and The Word of Man</u>
<u>"Schicksal und Idee"</u>	<u>"Schicksal und Idee in der Theologie"</u>
<u>Anselm</u>	<u>Anselm, Fides Quaerens Intellectum</u>
<u>PT</u>	<u>Protestant Theology in the Nineteenth Century</u>
<u>ET</u>	<u>Evangelical Theology: An Introduction</u>
<u>"PS"</u>	<u>"Concluding Unscientific Postscript on Schleiermacher"</u>

Nineteenth Century Works:

<u>CF</u>	<u>Schleiermacher, The Christian Faith</u>
<u>Speeches</u>	<u>-----, On Religion, Speeches to its Cultured Despisers</u>
<u>Outline</u>	<u>-----, Brief Outline on the Study of Theology</u>
<u>Religion</u>	<u>Kant, Religion Within the Limits of Reason Alone</u>
<u>Groundwork</u>	<u>-----, Groundwork of The Metaphysic of Morals</u>

<u>Ess Chr</u>	Feuerbach, <u>The Essence of Christianity</u>
<u>Lectures</u>	-----, <u>Lectures on the Essence of Religion</u>
<u>System</u>	I. A. Dorner, <u>A System of Christian Doctrine</u>
<u>Institutiones</u>	Wegscheider, <u>Institutiones Theologiae Christianae Dogmaticae</u>
<u>E Th W</u>	Hegel, <u>Early Theological Writings</u>
<u>Justification</u>	Ritschl, <u>The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation</u>
<u>Sin</u>	Müller, <u>The Christian Doctrine of Sin</u>
Other Works:	
<u>CJT</u>	<u>Canadian Journal of Theology</u>
<u>SJT</u>	<u>Scottish Journal of Theology</u>
<u>JR</u>	<u>Journal of Religion</u>
<u>Th E T</u>	<u>Theological Existence Today</u>
<u>Th E H</u>	<u>Theologische Existenz Heute</u>
<u>ZTK</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</u>
<u>ZZ</u>	<u>Zwischen den Zeiten</u>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
CURRICULUM STUDIORUM	iii
Abbreviations of Frequently Used Works	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter	
I. THE METHOD OF NINETEENTH CENTURY GERMAN PROTESTANTISM - A SYNOPSIS	15
(i) Approaches to Theology	
(ii) Terminology	
II. BARTH'S RELATIONSHIP TO LIBERALISM TO 1931	29
(i) Formative influences	
(ii) Ambiguity toward liberalism	
(iii) Corrective attempts	
III. A THEOLOGY IN OPPOSITION, BARTH'S POLEMIC, 1932 - 1942	57
(i) Polemic of the <u>Dogmatics</u>	
(ii) Extra-dogmatic works	
IV. A THEOLOGY IN CONCILIATION, BARTH'S MODIFIED POLEMIC, 1942 - 1968	102
(i) Modified polemic of the <u>Dogmatics</u>	
(ii) Acknowledgement of contributions	
(iii) Extra-dogmatic works	
(iv) Reasons for modification	

Chapter

V.	BARTH, LIBERALISM AND THEOLOGY OF IMMANENCE	138
	(i) Lordship	
	(ii) Covenant-partner	
	(iii) Analogy	
	(iv) Dialectic	
VI.	BARTH, LIBERALISM AND PNEUMATOLOGY	169
	(i) Spirit as Illuminator	
	(ii) Realistic anthropology	
	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	195
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	199
	Barth's works in chronological order	
	Other works	
	Articles	
	ABSTRACT	214

INTRODUCTION

This thesis will show that the development of Karl Barth's theology was a response to the theological method of nineteenth century German Protestantism. The relationship to liberalism is sometimes negative, sometimes positive, and at times ambiguous, but the response to liberal theology is ever present in Barth's theological development. We suggest that this on-going relationship provides the best and most comprehensive framework for the study of the latter's theology both in the dimension of its corrective task to the errors of the nineteenth century and its unique contribution to religious thought. To attempt any analysis of Barth's theology either in a general way or with regard to specific themes and doctrines without reference to his response to liberalism will only limit and impair the results.

No thorough-going study of Barth's relation to liberalism exists. Some writers have indicated the relevance of such an evaluation. According to Sykes, there is a need to understand "the contribution of this continuous wrestling with Schleiermacher [which] has not yet been given a fully sophisticated assessment."¹ Charles Morrison and Ronald Goetz

¹G. W. Sykes, "Barth on the Centre of Theology," in Karl Barth, Studies of His Theological Method, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1979, p.32.

claim that Barth's theology has much in common with liberalism.²

Goetz states:

I have often felt that one of the keys to the understanding of Barth's so-called neo-orthodox theology lay in his early liberalism. Many of his liberal beliefs - the human origin of Scripture, his political socialism, his coming within a hair-breadth of universal salvation - were convictions that never left him.³

Robert Hood speaks of a 'latent' liberalism in Barth, a thorn planted by Schleiermacher but especially by Feuerbach.⁴

. . . I would submit that Feuerbach's anthropology is a major, if not the major, undercurrent in Barth's theological position - an influence which has hitherto been overlooked by both 'Barthians' and 'critics' of Barth.⁵

This thesis will address specifically this continuous wrestling with Schleiermacher and the liberals and its results in Barth's theology. In the first chapter, "The Method of

²Charles Clayton Morrison, "The Liberalism of neo-Orthodoxy," Christian Century, Part I, June 7/50, p.697ff, Part II, June 14/50, p.731-33, Part III, June 21/50, p.760-763; Ronald Goetz, "Barthians on Parade," second colloquium of the Karl Barth Society of North America, Christian Century, #91, May 15, 1974, p.525f. See also F. E. Mayer, "Barth, Brunner, Niebuhr - Orthodox or Liberal?" Concordia Theological Monthly, Vol. 21, #8, 1950, p.618, a response in agreement with Morrison.

³Goetz, op. cit., p.525f.

⁴Robert E. Hood, "The Thorn of Liberalism in Karl Barth," Anglican Theological Review, Vol. 44, Oct '62, p.405.

⁵Ibid.

Nineteenth Century German Protestantism - a Synopsis," we will describe the presuppositions and the criterion for interpretation of theological statements of the period, providing an account of the method to which Barth responded in his theological development. In Chapter II, entitled "Barth's Relationship to Liberalism to 1931," we will analyze his early concerns with nineteenth century theology through to his attempt to purge his thought of its influences. We shall be concerned in Chapter III, "A Theology in Opposition, Barth's Polemic, 1932-1942," to document his extensive polemic against liberalism in the 1930's and his resultant theological development over against the nineteenth century. This will be followed in Chapter IV, "A Theology in Conciliation, Barth's Modified Polemic, 1942-1968," by the presentation of a significantly reduced polemic as well as Barth's acknowledging of the contributions of liberalism suggesting reasons for the emergence of the modification. In Chapters V and VI, "Barth, Liberalism and Theology of Immanence" and "Barth, Liberalism and Pneumatology," it will be shown that just as the negative polemic of the thirties produced a theology in opposition, there is likewise an association between the modified polemic and the development of Barth's theology from 1942-1968 which as formerly remains a response to liberalism. This will be demonstrated in Chapter V by elucidating principles of immanence which as they emerge in

his theology from 1942-1968 have a reference point in liberalism and finally in Chapter VI, his theology of the Holy Spirit will be articulated in terms of its relation to nineteenth century theology. This will be followed by "Summary and Conclusions."

On the basis of a thorough documentation of Barth's continual response to liberalism and his resultant theological development, the thesis will challenge a number of prevalent views. Firstly, we consider the on-going response to nineteenth century theology as the best means for understanding Barth over against the major studies of the 1950's and 1960's which interpreted him from one central doctrine, an approach questioned also by Sykes.⁶ These studies have determined the orientation of Barthian studies even to this day. For the most part his theology has been interpreted in the light of its christology, as is the case for instance in the works of Hans Urs von Balthasar,⁷ Henri Bouillard,⁸

⁶Sykes, op. cit., p.40.

⁷von Balthasar, The Theology of Karl Barth, tran. by John Drury from the 1951 German title, New York, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

⁸Bouillard, Karl Barth, I, Genèse et évolution de la théologie dialectique; II et III, Parole de Dieu et existence humaine, Paris, Aubier, 1957.

Jérôme Hamer,⁹ David Mueller,¹⁰ Colm O'Grady,¹¹ and more recently John Thompson.¹² G. D. Berkouwer has interpreted Barth in the light of grace,¹³ and Hans Küng through justification.¹⁴ Eberhard Jüngel understands him from the standpoint of the Trinity¹⁵ and more recently F. W. Marquardt has analyzed Barth in the light of the latter's political socialism.¹⁶

The majority of these studies, products of the 1950's and 1960's, suffer the serious limitation of the unavailability

⁹Hamer, Karl Barth, tran. by D. M. Maruca, from the 1949 French title, London, Sands, 1962.

¹⁰Mueller, Karl Barth, Waco, Texas, Word Books, 1972.

¹¹O'Grady, The Church in Catholic Theology: Dialogue with Karl Barth, London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1969.

¹²Thompson, Christ in Perspective in the Theology of Karl Barth, Edinburgh, Saint Andrew Press, 1978.

¹³Berkouwer, The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth, tran. by Harry R. Boer from the 1954 German title, London, Paternoster Press, 1956.

¹⁴Küng, Justification, The Doctrine of Karl Barth and a Catholic Reflection, tran. by J. Collins from the 1957 German title, London, Burns and Oates, 1964.

¹⁵Jüngel, The Doctrine of the Trinity, God's Being is in Becoming, tran. from the 1965 German title, Grand Rapids, Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1976.

¹⁶Marquardt, Theologie und Sozialismus. Das Beispiel Karl Barths, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1972.

of not yet completed Dogmatics and other works.¹⁷ Herbert Hartwell stated in 1964 that "Only a few books contain an analysis as well as a critical evaluation of Barth's mature theology . . . "¹⁸ a point reiterated by E. J. Lacelle in 1977 who points to the fact that most studies of Barth stop before the publication of the completed fourth volume of the Dogmatics.¹⁹

This limitation as well as the entrenched attitude that Barth is to be interpreted from one central doctrine has led to the virtual neglect of research in the area of his relation to liberalism. The general, but incorrect consensus and the second view to be challenged, is that Barth's

¹⁷For the most part CD IV and in some cases CD III, and ET from the German Einführung in die evangelische Theologie, Zürich, EVZ Verlag, 1962, and little account is given to the following which point directly to Barth's re-assessment of liberalism: "The Humanity of God," in The Humanity of God, London, Collins Press, 1961, p. 37ff, from the German "Die Menschlichkeit Gottes," Evangelischer Verlag Zollikon, Theologische Studien, 48, 1956; "Evangelical Theology in the Nineteen Century," 1957, in The Humanity of God, from Evangelische Theologie im 19 Jahrhundert, Zollikon - Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag AG, 1957; "Liberal Theology: Some Alternatives," in The Hibbert Journal, Vol. 59, Apr '61, p. 211-219, from the German "Möglichkeiten liberaler Theologie heute," in Schweizerische Theologische Umschau, Vol. 30, 1960, p. 95-101; "PS" from the German "Nachwort" in Schleiermacher - Auswahl, Siebenstern Taschenbuch Verlag, München, 1968, ed. by Henri Bolli, p. 290-312.

¹⁸Hartwell, The Theology of Karl Barth, An Introduction, Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1964, p. 178.

¹⁹Elisabeth J. Lacelle, La réconciliation, Un événement de Parole dans la pensée de Karl Barth entre 1953 et 1968, unpublished Th.D. thesis, Strasbourg, 1977, p. 9.

relationship to liberalism is a negative one in which the polarization is so clear that one must choose either Barth or Schleiermacher.²⁰ According to Jack Forstman the two are at odds and "Barth surely recognizes Schleiermacher as the major source of that against which he stands."²¹ In Hamer's view Barth has given a negative injunction in his discrediting of liberalism.²² The few studies which have assessed Barth and the liberals have delivered a generally negative conclusion²³ although in the case of Gustav Enss' 1955 study the finding that there was hardly a single point of agreement

²⁰Ralph G. Wilburn, "The Theology of Karl Barth, Its Genesis, Motif and Method," in Encounter, Vol. 20, Wint'59, p.53ff; Robert E. Cushman, "Barth's Attack Upon Cartesianism and the Future in Theology" JR, Vol.36, Oct'56, #4, p.210; Gordon Clarke, "Barth's Critique of Modernism," Christianity Today, Vol.6, Jan.5, 1962, p.315-317.

²¹Jack Forstman, "Barth, Schleiermacher and The Christian Faith," Union Seminary Quarterly Journal, Vol.21, M'1966, p.305.

²²Hamer, op. cit., p.290.

²³David Tak-Yan Chan, The Critique of Schleiermacher's Theology by Emil Brunner and Karl Barth, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Edinburgh, April'59, p.296ff; Donald R. White, Karl Barth's Reaction to Liberalism, Barth's Response to the Theology of Schleiermacher, Ritschl and Herrmann as Reflected in their Theological Method, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1964, p.40ff; Hans Wilhelm Frei, The Doctrine of Revelation in the Thought of Karl Barth, 1909 to 1922: The Nature of Barth's Break with Liberalism, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Yale University, 1962, Ch.III.

between the two²⁴ was not incorrect at the time but is now outdated in the light of Barth's later works. Even more damaging than the assessment that Barth's on-going relationship to liberalism is negative, is the closed-door attitude which speaks of Barth's 'break' with liberalism usually dating the rejection around World War I or the early 1920's.²⁵ With the former view, albeit a negative one, there remains the possibility of continued evaluation of Barth's liberalism whereas the assessment that there was a 'break' precludes further study of the relationship.

Thirdly, we question the thesis of a specific turning-point, a Kehre, in Barth's theology, questioned also by Martin Rumscheidt who suggests we should dispense with talk of the 'young' and 'mature' Barth.²⁶ Similarly Joseph McLelland

²⁴Heinrich Gustav Enss, Barthian Theology in Its Relation to Schleiermacher's System, unpublished Th.D. thesis, South-western Baptist Theological Seminary, 1935, p. 149.

²⁵Wilfred Härle, "Der Aufruf der 93 Intellektuellen und Karl Barths Bruch mit der liberalen Theologie," ZTK, Vol. 72, #2, 1975, p. 205 and p. 205ff; Gerald A. Butler, "Karl Barth and Political Theology," SJT, Vol. 27, Nov. 1974, p. 442; Frei, op. cit., Ch. I; Bouillard, "A Dialogue with Barth: The Problem of Natural Theology," Cross Currents, Spr. 1968, tran. by Gerald Farley, p. 206.

²⁶Martin Rumscheidt, "Review" Karl Barth und die Pietisten: Die Pietismuskritik des jungen Karl Barth und ihre Erwiderung, by Eberhard Busch, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1978, in Studies in Religion, Vol. 9, #3, 1980, p. 372.

questions whether the early Barth is determinative for the later, "despite the apparently dramatic shifts from the first Romans to the second, and the first Dogmatics to the second . . ."²⁷ In this thesis we will attempt to show that these innuendoes may be substantiated by studying the development of Barth's theology through his response to liberalism. Within this framework his thought finds continuity with sufficient leverage for the various shifts and nuances spread over his fifty years of writing. The turning-point thesis is artificial and clouds or even negates the continuity within Barth's theological development. In this regard the most widely-held premise is that Barth's work on St. Anselm in 1930-31 constituted a major change. Barth's own assessment of Anselm²⁸ as the book "written with the greatest satisfaction"²⁹ has unfortunately given credibility to the claim of Torrance and others that this work constitutes

²⁷ Joseph C. McLelland, "Philosophy and Theology - A Family Affair, (Karl and Heinrich Barth)," Footnotes to a Theology, the Karl Barth Colloquium of 1972, ed. by Martin Rumscheidt, p.31 (my emphasis).

²⁸ Anselm, from the Ger., Fides Quaerens intellectum; Anselms Beweis der Existenz Gottes, im Zusammenhang seines theologischen Programms, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1931.

²⁹ How I Changed My Mind, Virginia, John Knox Press, 1966, p.43.

a dramatic turning point.³⁰ In a similar vein Heinz Zahrnt speaks of the former's "complete theological volte-face,"³¹ as a result of his pastoral experience at Safenwil. Likewise a prevalent view that Barth's work developed in stages has jeopardized and distorted the principle of continuity in his thought and development. There is von Balthasar's positing of three respective stages of (a) the dialectic (b) toward analogy and (c) analogy in which the christology culminates;³² of Bouillard's statement of the three periods in Barth's development of (a) crisis theology (b) Word of God theology and (c) coherent christology.³³ James Kenneth Wilkerson posits four stages, namely (a) the liberal to 1916 (b) 1916 to first Romans (c) the period to second Romans and its

³⁰ Torrance, Karl Barth, An Introduction to His Early Theology, 1910-1931, London, SCM Press, 1962, p.83, 182; Donald Dixon Wood, Anselm's Contribution to Barth's Doctrine of the Knowledge of God, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Fuller Theological Seminary, 1974, p.39; Gordon Watson, "Karl Barth and St. Anselm's Theological Programme," SJT, Vol. 30, 1977, p.31, 42; Colin Gunton, "Karl Barth and the Development of Christian Doctrine," SJT, Vol.25, #2, May'72, p.171.

³¹ Zahrnt, The Question of Protestant Theology in the Twentieth Century, tran. by R. A. Wilson, New York, Harcourt, Brace and World, 1969, p.19.

³² von Balthasar, op. cit., p.94ff.

³³ Bouillard, Karl Barth, Vol. I, Ch. 1, 3, 5.

aftermath and (d) 1927 onwards.³⁴ Jung Young Lee speaks of "two radical turning points in the history of Barth's thinking"³⁵ from liberal to dialectical and dialectical to analogical thinking.³⁶ Finally Georges Casalis' talk of a 'consistent inner structure'³⁷ after second Romans reflects the general neglect of studies in dealing with the Barth of pre-Romans as a principle in his theological development. Such conclusions prevent an analysis of Barth's theology within a comprehensive framework enveloping his total opus and development, a limitation this thesis hopes to correct.

As a result of the disregard for the importance of Barth's response to liberalism, certain developments in his theology, particularly in the 1950's and 1960's have been overlooked. The thesis will indicate and discuss specific themes which are indebted at least partially in their development to liberalism. These include firstly clear principles

³⁴James-Kenneth Wilkerson, Transcendence and Language: A Study of the Theology of Karl Barth, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Nashville, Vanderbilt University, 1967, p.13f, 15, 32, 39.

³⁵Jung Young Lee, "Karl Barth's Use of Analogy in His Church Dogmatics," SJT, Vol. 22, 1969, p.131f.

³⁶Ibid, p.132.

³⁷Georges Casalis, Portrait of Karl Barth, tran. by Robert McAfee Brown, Garden City, Doubleday, 1963, p.83, See also Bouillard, Karl Barth, I, p.261f.

of immanence, the cornerstone of liberalism, which having retreated into the background re-emerge in Barth's theology in the last two decades of his life. The presence of the concept of immanence has received little attention due perhaps to the paucity of research in the area of his response to liberalism wherein such a theme emerges. In the second place we will show that the development of Barth's pneumatology, an area virtually ignored in Barthian studies, has direct relation to liberalism and by Barth's own admission represents the real possibility of liberal theology.³⁸ The development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit itself is not only a result of his sustained relationship to liberalism but also an indispensable tool in completing his corrective immanentist theology.

In addition it will be shown that through pneumatology, Barth's life-long struggle to speak adequately of the liberal stronghold of religious experience and anthropology is brought to fruition. Because research has for the

³⁸CD I/2, p. 208f, (KD, p. 228); "Liberal Theology," p. 217, Ger., p. 98; "PS," p. 134, Ger., p. 310f.

most part ignored this continuous quest, pronouncements made on his anthropology based predominantly on the Dogmatics I and II have resulted in damaging negative conclusions. Wilkerson has branded Barth's anthropology as inadequate, claiming that he portrays man as passive with no significant rôle.³⁹ According to Zahrnt "it lacks any correlation between man's question and God's answer;"⁴⁰ similarly D. R. White states that "Barth cannot adequately relate the activity of God and the activity of man."⁴¹ Hamer concludes that this methodology is "indemonstrable[and] irrational"⁴² by virtue of a line moving only from God to man, the result of which can only be agnosticism.⁴³ A few applaud the emergence of Barth's 'realistic anthropology',⁴⁴ and Emil Brunner welcomed the Dogmatics III/2 as the 'most human',⁴⁵ of Barth's attempts to date in which the latter

³⁹Wilkerson, op. cit., p.100ff.

⁴⁰Zahrnt, op. cit., p.121.

⁴¹White, op. cit., p.44.

⁴²Hamer, op. cit., p.210.

⁴³Ibid, p.211.

⁴⁴ Francis Schüssler Fiorenza, "The Responses of Barth and Ritschl to Feuerbach," in Studies in Religion, Vol.7, #2, 1978, p.155. We will borrow Fiorenza's term 'realistic anthropology' the emergence of which he dates about 1931 with Anselm.

⁴⁵Brunner, "The New Barth, Observations on Karl Barth's Doctrine of Man," SJT, vol.4, #2, 1951, p.135.

"arrives at a new positive valuation of the concept of human nature."⁴⁶ We shall verify this development and show that Barth's realistic anthropology is contingent on pneumatology which in turn is a response to liberalism.

It is our hope, therefore, that this analysis of Barth's relationship to liberalism will serve to correct the shortcomings of most previous studies of his work: It will in the first place provide a fundamental clue to his basic theological development. Secondly, it will challenge the conventional approach of interpreting Barth from one central doctrine as well as the myth that his relationship to liberalism was essentially negative. Further it will allow the continuity within Barth's theological task to come forward and thereby question the too-prevalent view of a radical turning-point. Finally considering the development of his theology with reference to liberalism will allow the full scope of his work with its many nuances and shifts to become obvious. Then and only then, in our opinion, can Barth's theology be viewed both in its corrective perspective to the nineteenth century and also in its unique and monumental contribution to theology.

⁴⁶ Ibid, p.128; see also Cushman, op. cit., p.218.

CHAPTER I

The Method of Nineteenth Century German Protestantism - A Synopsis

The substance of this thesis grew out of an interest in Barth's critique of nineteenth century German Protestantism. As that century was rich and prolific in theological writing, it is necessary to outline its general tenor in a precise way that is relevant to the scope of our study. We do not claim to reconstruct the age but rather establish a framework which is concise and pertinent to Barth's critique. Our tools for this synopsis have been, first of all, Barth's on-going commentary throughout his works of nineteenth century German Protestantism such as his Protestant Theology in the Nineteenth Century.¹ This work in addition to describing the eighteenth century mind, politics, history and writing with special emphasis on the problem of theology during the Enlightenment, offers a biographical profile

¹PT, from the Ger., Die Protestantische Theologie im 19 Jahrhundert, Ihre Vorgeschichte und ihre Geschichte, Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag, A. G. Zollikon, 1947.

of the major theological writers of the last century. In the second place I have used the work of others such as Tillich and Löwith,² and finally thoughts from my own study of the period.

Recognizing certain overlapping in time periods, we suggest for historical reference that the German Protestantism which Barth addressed in the nineteenth century, extended from Kant to Ritschl. Although in his Protestant

²Tillich, Perspectives on Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Protestant Theology, ed. by Carl E. Braaten, London, SCM Press, 1967; Karl Löwith, From Hegel to Nietzsche, The Revolution in Nineteenth-Century Thought, tran. from German by David E. Green, Garden City, Doubleday, 1964, C 1941; H. R. Mackintosh, Types of Modern Theology, Schleiermacher to Barth, London, Collins Press, 1969, C 1937; Bernard Reardon, Religious Thought in the Nineteenth Century, Illustrated from Writers of the Period, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1966; B. A. Gerrish, Tradition and the Modern World, Reformed Theology in the Nineteenth Century, The Zenos Lectures, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1977, (this work investigates specifically the fidelity of five nineteenth century theologians to the Reformation.) Studies from the nineteenth century include J. A. Dorner, History of Protestant Theology Particularly Germany, Viewed According to Its Fundamental Movement, Vol. I and II, tran. by George Robson and Sophia Taylor, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1871; Otto Pfleiderer, The Development of Theology in Germany Since Kant, tran. by J. Frederick Smith, London, Swan Sonnenschein, 1890; F. Lichtenberger, History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century, tran. by W. Hastie, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1889, and George Matheson, Aids to the Study of German Theology, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1877.

Theology, he places Kant in the "Background,"³ the latter is even by Barth's admission a true son of the nineteenth century as one who "stands at the turning point of his own age."⁴ Furthermore, Kant's presence is apparent throughout the nineteenth century and he occupies a prominent place in Barth's critique over the years. He places Ritschl at the end of the age and appropriately so as the one who tried to consolidate the gains of the nineteenth century and bring about the 'perfect enlightenment.'⁵

Despite differences among the theologians themselves, the most obvious tendency that is common to German Protestantism in the nineteenth century was its acceptance of the principle that the theological enterprise must adhere to the scientific method. In so doing theology borrowed from the newly-born historical sciences. In their talk of explaining and interpreting the Christian faith, theologians viewed philosophy, critical exegesis and historical recon-

³Barth, "Kant," Ch. 7, p. 266-312, in PT, Ger., p. 237-278.

⁴PT, p. 266, Ger., p. 237. See also Mackintosh, op. cit., p. 31, and Gerald R. Cragg, The Church and the Age of Reason, Great Britain, Hazell, Watson and Viney, 1970, p. 250f.

⁵PT, p. 656, Ger., p. 600.

struction of the documents as essential tools in carrying out their task. In addition to the application of these extra-theological tools in the religious discourse, the Protestant thinkers were involved in establishing presuppositions appropriate to the endeavour and the resultant criterion for the interpretation of the faith. Our study indicates that the scientific theology of nineteenth century German Protestantism produced three approaches, each with a different set of presuppositions and it is these which comprise the essence of Barth's critique. A brief analysis of these approaches will help us understand the scientific theology as it applies to this thesis as well as the nature of Barth's reaction to the period. Following this we shall address the question of the terminology to be used in this thesis. This exercise is necessitated by the general lack of clarity in designations referring to nineteenth century thought.

(i)

Approaches to Theology

A first approach was represented in Schleiermacher and his followers for whom the validity of theological investigation resides in the religious self-consciousness. These theologians applied the latter to interpret the contents of

Christian doctrine from the given fact of religious experience. Schleiermacher, it will be recalled, described religion as the "feeling of absolute dependence"⁶ which constitutes the essence of all religious emotions.⁷ Christian doctrines are determined by the human immediate self-consciousness.⁸ Throughout Schleiermacher's works religion is consistently rooted in human experience originating in the profoundest of human depths⁹ from the centre of the human¹⁰ resulting in the immediate consciousness of the Eternal.¹¹ In

⁶ Speeches, p. 106, from the Ger., Über die Religion Reden an die Gebildeten unter ihren Verächtern, Leipzig, F. Brockhaus, 1968, first published 1799, p. 96, [. . . einer absoluten Abhängigkeit.] Due to large amount of German entries, we will dispense with underlining in footnotes.

⁷ Ibid, p. 105f, Ger., p. 96.

⁸ CF, Vol. I, S29, p. 123, 'We shall exhaust the whole compass of Christian doctrine if we consider the facts of the religious self-consciousness, . . . ' from the Ger., Der christliche Glaube Nach den Grundsätzen der evangelischen Kirche im Zusammenhange dargestellt, Vol. I, Berlin, Walter De Gruyter, 1960, p. 161, [Selbstbewusstseins]; see S32, p. 131, ' . . . immediate self-consciousness . . . is always presupposed . . . in . . . Christian religious self-consciousness . . . ', Ger., p. 171, [unmittelbaren Selbstbewusstsein]; for Schleiermacher's definition of immediate self-consciousness see p. 6, Ger., p. 16.

⁹ Speeches, p. 11, Ger., p. 12.

¹⁰ Ibid, p. 13, Ger., p. 13.

¹¹ Ibid, p. 43f, Ger., p. 40. [immediate - unmittelbare]

his synopsis of the meaning of religion, Schleiermacher emphasizes the centrality of feeling:

The sum total of religion is to feel that in its highest unity, all that moves us in feeling is one; . . . to feel . . . that our being and living is a being and living in and through God.¹²

In this scientific theology Jesus is the perfect human archetype having humanly acquired the perfect "God-consciousness,"¹³ and revelation is a conscious unique moment of insight.¹⁴ Thus in the experiential school, Jesus and revelation are submitted to the presupposition of the religious consciousness by which the tenets of the Christian faith are interpreted.

A second approach to theology in the last century was designed by the biblical critical schools, represented for example in the work of Baur, Strauss and Ritschl. Theirs was an attempt to present a completely scientific investigation of Christian doctrine by submitting scripture to the tools of historical criticism in an attempt to disclose the earthly Jesus. In this task every part of the "whole history

¹²Ibid, p. 49f, Ger., p. 46. [Gefühl, fühlen]

¹³CF, Vol. II, S94, p. 385, Ger., p. 43. [Gottesbewusstsein]

¹⁴Speeches, p. 89, Ger., p. 80.

of Jesus . . . is to be subjected to a critical examination . . ."¹⁵ This the biblical exegetes did in order to devise new modes of analysing the life of Jesus over against the "antiquated systems of supernaturalism and naturalism."¹⁶ In bringing the study of the Bible into line with the modern sciences, the biblical scholars invoked a presupposition attaching unqualified and prime importance to historical documents for reconstruction of the life of Jesus which in turn determined the criterion for interpretation of the Christian faith.

A third major approach in the theological task of the previous century involved borrowing from the presuppositions of philosophy, particularly Kantian rationalism and Hegel's speculative philosophy. In both, as with the other schools, Jesus and scripture were accommodated to the presuppositions of the respective philosophies. According to Kant in his religion of moral reason one "can be convinced [of duty] through his own reason."¹⁷ Jesus as the

¹⁵D. F. Strauss, The Life of Jesus Critically Examined, ed. by Peter Hodgson, tran. by George Eliot, Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1972, p. xi.

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷Religion, p. 143.

"archetype of the moral disposition"¹⁸ is knowable through our reason¹⁹ and scripture is interpreted and judged by reason.²⁰ In Hegel's system, Jesus, in whom "the relation of different to one another, . . ."²¹ is resolved, satisfies Hegel's quest for the reconciliation of reason and inclination not as a moral teacher but as one concerned with the spirit of love in all humans. In this system, God and his revelation are inseparable and revealed religion manifests the spirit living and working toward "the consciousness of itself as embracing all truth."²² Kant and Hegel's respective philosophies of religion found not only exponents in the latter field such as Wegscheider and Marheineke but also followers among members of the biblical school. Baur's method relied on the Hegelian synthesis and Ritschl's was a Kantian - moralistic approach. Along with the presuppositions of religious consciousness of the experiential school and

¹⁸ Ibid, p. 54.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid, p. 103.

²¹ Hegel, "The Spirit of Christianity" in E Th W, p. 215.

²² Hegel, On Art, Religion, Philosophy, Introductory Lectures to the Realm of Absolute Spirit, ed. by J. Glenn Gray, tran. by Bernard Bosanquet et al, New York, Harper and Row, 1970, p. 206.

historical reconstruction of the biblicists, this third approach in which theology borrowed from philosophy in establishing presuppositions for the task was added.

It was not so much the theological content of the previous century but more specifically its presuppositions which comprised Barth's critique. Both the nineteenth century theologians and Barth have acknowledged with equal tenacity the importance of Jesus and revelation in their scholarly pursuits, but the former made them subservient to the presuppositions of tools outside of theology. The odious result, in Barth's estimation, was that the criterion for interpretation of the Christian faith was human-determined, anthropocentric. Even where they differed in the use of presuppositions, Schleiermacher, Kant, Hegel and Ritschl merged in their method in invoking the anthropos to interpret Christianity. Barth's scientific theology, specifically a result of his understanding of the errancy in the starting-point of the nineteenth century, posited the Word of God over against the method of his predecessors as the sole presupposition and criterion for the interpretation of theology.

We believe the spirit of German Protestant theology in the nineteenth century is preserved in the presuppositions

and criterion for interpretation of Christian doctrine as outlined in this synopsis. They provide a valid and comprehensive framework for the understanding of the scientific method of the century as well as Barth's critique. Furthermore, this thesis will show that it was this framework to which Barth responded in the development of his theology.

(ii)

Terminology

In conclusion we render a note on the confusion which surrounds the use of terms to be used in the thesis, namely liberalism, modernism and neo-Protestantism which allude to the movement in nineteenth century thought. For the most part the term 'liberalism' will designate the general thrust of the period encompassing the scientific theology of all three schools described in the synopsis. The word enjoys wider usage than the others and is chosen in compliance with what appears to be its general acceptance in describing the movement in nineteenth century German Protestant thought.²³

²³ O'Grady, *op. cit.*, p. 1, 5 and *passim*; Goetz, *op. cit.*, p. 526; Wilhelm Pauck, *The Heritage of the Reformation*, New York, Union Theological, Free Press of Glencoe Inc., 1961, p. 312-316; and Karl Barth's "Lebenslauf Schweizerköpfe," 1945, in Eberhard Busch's KB, p. 46, from the Ger., *Karl Barths Lebenslauf, Nach seinen Briefen und autobiographischen Texten*, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1976, p. 58.

Some have indicated there is a lack of precise explanation surrounding these oft-used terms. Referring to liberalism, Christopher Dawson says ". . . there is no word - not even democracy - that has been used so loosely to cover such a variety of divergent elements."²⁴ Bernard Meland speaks of liberalism in theology as a confused term, "well-nigh unmanageable."²⁵ Added to this is the often-interchangeable use of liberalism, modernism and sometimes neo-Protestantism,²⁶ as well as the neglect of commentators to define these designations.²⁷ Even Barth despite his long-time preoccupation with these terms does not address

²⁴ Dawson, The Judgment of the Nations, New York, Sheed and Ward, 1942, p. 58.

²⁵ Bernard Eugene Meland, "The Persisting Liberal Witness," Christian Century, Vol. 79, # 39, Sept. 26, 1962, p. 1157.

²⁶ To name a few: Rev. John McConnachie, The Significance of Karl Barth, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1931, p. 15, and Barthian Theology and the Man of Today, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1933, p. 24, 25, 28, 286. Uses 'modernism' in the second work to apply to what he called 'liberalism' in the first. J. Gresham Machen, Christianity and Liberalism, Grand Rapids, Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1923, W. W. Fenn, "Modern Liberalism," American Journal of Theology, Vol. 17, 1913, p. 509, Mackintosh, op. cit., p. 257, 258.

²⁷ Tillich, op. cit., see "Introduction," p. 1-8, especially p. 3, offering a loose suggestion of liberalism as the movement in nineteenth century thought classically represented in von Harnack; Löwith, op. cit., p. 191, alludes to liberalism but does not define same.

their precise meaning and uses them interchangeably.²⁸ In addition he indiscriminantly applied the terms liberal, modernist and neo-Protestant to representatives from all schools, Schleiermacher, Hegel, Ritschl, Strauss, Feuerbach, and A. E. Biedermann.²⁹ Finally his descriptions of the essence of neo-Protestantism, modernism and liberalism are congruous.³⁰ Even when his efforts are directed specifically at the nineteenth century as is the case in his Protestant Theology, Barth does not exhibit any tendency to differentiate terms and although he refers often to liberal theologians,

²⁸The prevalent use of modernism (Modernismus) is noticeable in CD I/1, KD I/1, and neo-Protestant (Neuprotestantismus) in CD I/2, KD I/2, with no discernible difference; modern Protestantism (modernistischer Protestantismus) neo-Protestantism and liberalism (Liberalismus) have roots in the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, see CD I/2, p. 4ff, (KD, p. 5ff), CD I/2, p. 284ff, (KD, p. 309ff), CD III/1, p. 82, (KD, p. 89), CD IV/Fragment, p. 5, (KD, p. 5), CD I/2, p. 288, (KD, p. 313); modernism, liberalism, and neo-Protestantism are used interchangeably in the same passage, CD I/1, p. 252ff, (KD, p. 266f), (theologischer Modernismus, Liberalismus, neuprotestantischen . . .)

²⁹CD I/1, p. 36, (KD, p. 35), CD I/2, p. 542, (KD, p. 602), CD I/2, p. 560, (KD, p. 623), CD IV/1, p. 391, (KD, p. 433), CD I/1, p. 528, (KD, p. 272f), CD I/2, p. 12, (KD, p. 14).

³⁰CD I/2, p. 6, (KD, p. 6f), CD I/1, p. 35, (KD, p. 34), CD I/1, p. 251f, (KD, p. 265), CD II/1, p. 232, (KD, p. 262), CD I/1, p. 253, (KD, p. 267). He speaks of pietistic and rationalistic modernism and rationalistic-pietistic neo-protestantism, CD I/1, p. 35, (KD, p. 35), (pietistisch-rationalistischer Modernismus), CD II/2, p. 332, (KD, p. 365), (rationalistisch -pietistischer Neuprotestantismus).

remains reticent as regards a precise application of the word.³¹

Based on its more prevalent usage the thesis will lean more toward the designation of liberalism to refer to theology in the nineteenth century dispensing with any attempt at definitive classification in order, where applicable, to allow terms to be understood within the context used.

³¹PT, p. 169ff, p. 172, p. 576, p. 439, (Social Liberalism), corresponding German references, p. 148ff, p. 152, p. 522, p. 392.

CHAPTER II

Barth's Relationship to Liberalism to 1931

According to McLelland Barth's early writings though having "been examined almost ad nauseam, . . . [remain] one of the clues to Barth's position."¹ As a result of his investigation of the relationship between philosophy and theology in Barth's thought, McLelland concluded that the Kantian problematique "remains a decisive orientation throughout his career."² In this chapter we shall expand McLelland's thesis and demonstrate that Barth's writings up to 1931 are a response not only to the presuppositions of the philosophical schools of the nineteenth century but those of the experiential and the biblical critical schools also.

The initial engagement with liberal theology discloses a pattern which pervades the balance of his career and theological development, namely positions which correspond to his attitude toward the method of nineteenth century religious thought. The shift and nuances in his theology up to 1931 notwithstanding, the underlying continuity with liberalism can be discerned in the following patterns:

(i) formative influences disposing him to liberal theology

¹McLelland, op. cit., p.31.

²Ibid.

(ii) ambiguity from 1909-1914 toward nineteenth century Protestantism (iii) corrective attempts from 1914-1931 to establish theology on its own foundations over against the anthropocentric method of the previous century. Each of these as well as Barth's contingent theological positions will be investigated in turn.

(i)

Formative influences

Barth's initial introduction to theology was familial. Born in Basle, Switzerland on May 10, 1886, he was the son of Fritz Barth (1856-1912), a minister of the Swiss Reformed Church and teacher of the Evangelical School of Preachers in Basle. Both of Karl's grandfathers, Franz Albert Barth (1816-1879) and Karl Achilles Satorius (1824-1893) were also ministers. Of this background Thomas Torrance states that:

deep and lasting foundations were laid at home, in church, and at school where [Barth's] faith was nourished in positive evangelical theology, and there too sacred scholarship in the service of the gospel entered, . . . , into his very blood.³

³Torrance, op. cit., p.15.

Barth himself states:

On the eve of the day of my confirmation (23 March 1902) I made the bold resolve to become a theologian: not with preaching and pastoral care . . . , but in the hope that through such a course of study I might reach a proper understanding of the creed in place of the rather hazy ideas I had at that time.⁴

Prior to beginning his formal education at University, two influences on the young Barth can be demonstrated retrospectively to have had permanent marks on the direction of his theology. One was his attention to the parish sermons especially in Berne where the family had taken up residence in 1889. The preaching task was the initial theme to which Barth addressed himself when he began writing theology, remaining for the duration of his career a central concern. The second lasting influence was that of the father who was appointed to the Berne Theological Faculty in 1889. Fritz Barth, whose alignment was with the positive, conservative school, standing as it did in opposition to the liberal school, believed in the Bible as the Word of God, yet not

⁴ Barth, 'Systematische Theologie' in Lehre und Forschung an der Universität Basel, p.35f, in Busch, KB, p.31. Torrance makes reference to this, see p. 15. Also Mueller, Karl Barth, p.15.

synonymous with God, and the peculiar sonship of Jesus and his resurrection.⁵ These ideas abandoned by the son in favour of the teachings of liberal theology re-appeared in his later dogmatic theology.

The single greatest influence on Barth consisted of a total immersion in the liberal school of thought from 1901 to 1908 when studies at Berne, Berlin and Marburg brought him into contact with the three presuppositions which characterized nineteenth century German Protestantism, those of the experiential school, philosophy and biblical criticism. The first plunge came at Berne where he was introduced to the liberal thought of Wilhelm Lüdemann and began to veer away from his father's positive theological attitude and tendency.⁶ Kant and Schleiermacher engaged him intensely and he claimed that "the first book which really moved me as a student was Kant's Critique of Pure Reason."⁷ From Kant he moved on to Schleiermacher who "was for years the leading light in his

⁵ Peter Halman Monsma, Karl Barth's Idea of Revelation, Somerville, NJ, Somerset Press, 1937, p.9.

⁶ "PS," p.117, Ger., p.290.

⁷ Barth, "Fakultätsalbum der evangelisch - theologischen Fakultät Münster," 1927, in Busch, KB, p.34.

thought."⁸ The reading of Schleiermacher's Speeches disclosed what "I had evidently been looking for 'The Immediate.'"⁹

Studies at Berlin which commenced in 1906 found him totally devoted to Adolf von Harnack, the leading exponent of the historical-critical school, and the young Barth sacrificed all social and cultural life to study and prepare work for his teacher.

My admiration [for Harnack] reached such a pitch that because of the work which I had to do for his seminar and with which I was occupied virtually night and day for months, I almost completely neglected to take proper notice of the Kaiser Friedrich Museum and the other Berlin sights.¹⁰

Additional work on Kant and Schleiermacher as well as further exposure to liberal theology continued when Barth enrolled at the University of Marburg in 1908 realizing a dream to study with Wilhelm Herrmann, a neo-Kantian and Ritschlian. Reading the Ethics of Herrmann, "the theological teacher of my student years"¹¹ started him off in

⁸ Busch, KB, p.40.

⁹ "PS," p.118, Ger., p.291. [Das Unmittelbare]

¹⁰ Letter from Barth to Agnes von Zahn, December 23, 1935, in Busch, KB, p.39.

¹¹ Barth, Theology and Church, Shorter Writings, 1920-1928, tran. by Louise Pettibone Smith, London, SCM Press, 1962, p.239 from Die Theologie und die Kirche, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1928, p.240.

perpetual motion¹² and this experience marked the beginning of "my own deep interest in theology."¹³

By the end of his formal education Barth had come full circle with liberalism in the study of its founders of the leading branches, namely Schleiermacher, Kant and Ritschl as well as the unchallenged liberal exponents of his own time for example, von Harnack and Herrmann. It is little wonder that he was committed to the 'modern' theology of the time.¹⁴ Essentially he had been exposed to no other and like other young students, embraced the presuppositions of the respective branches of the liberal schools where he had been educated.

(ii)

Ambiguity toward liberalism

When he left the cloistered academic world of the young student, Barth found the significance and application of liberal theology took on a different perspective. Upon ordination to the Church of Berne he sensed that his grounding in nineteenth century thought had ill-prepared him to

¹² Ibid, (Eng. and Ger.).

¹³ Ibid, (Eng. and Ger.).

¹⁴ Barth, "Selbstdarstellung," from Busch, KB, p.51; see also p.46.

assume pastoral duties. Consequently he returned to Marburg and worked with Martin Rade on the liberal periodical Die Christliche Welt. In his writings of the time we detect Barth's ambivalent attitude depicting general acceptance coupled with doubts as to the ability of liberal theology to prepare pastors for the preaching task. In 1909 he expressed his concern for the novice minister who, relative to his predecessor governed by the austere and authoritative law of Moses and the church, enters the parish and pulpit on shaky foundations. Modern theology with its emphasis on religious individualism and historical relativism, offers feeble guidance to the new preacher. With no absolute remaining in historical phenomenon and with the individual as the focus of modern theology, Barth wondered how one is to preach to each individual and if there was any standard for theology beyond personal experience. Lacking an adequate alternative, Barth endorsed the premise of liberal theology that

religion is experience conceived of in strictly individual fashion, and we deem it our duty . . . to come to grips with general human cultural awareness on its scientific side.¹⁵

¹⁵"Moderne Theologie und Reichsgottesarbeit," in ZTK, 19, 1909, p.321. [Religion ist uns streng individuell gefasste Erfahrung, und wir empfinden es als Pflicht, uns . . . mit dem allgemein menschlichen Kulturbewusstsein nach seiner wissenschaftlichen Seite hin auseinanderzusetzen.]
Note: Full German text will be given for Barth's untranslated works, or where terminology demands.

When Barth began pastoral work in Geneva in 1909, followed by Safenwil in 1911, his worst fears of being poorly prepared for the task were confirmed. In an address at a pastors' conference in 1910 in Neuchâtel, Barth re-iterated his concern for liberal theology with regard to its inadequacy in aiding the preacher, yet he continued to accept the teaching of modernism that faith and history are relative and continuous, and in keeping with his predecessor Friedrich Schleiermacher, concluded that faith has its origin in the individual. According to Barth, faith is "experience of God, immediate consciousness of the presence and efficacy of the superhuman . . . power of life."¹⁶ This experience of God is made possible through the historical Jesus who is known "according to the flesh."¹⁷

In 1914 Barth attempted to articulate the meaning of the personality of God, a task characteristic of the experiential school.¹⁸ According to Barth this must be done by

¹⁶"Der Christliche Glaube und die Geschichte" in Schweizerische Theologische Zeitschrift, 1912, p.5. [Glaube ist Gotteserlebnis, unmittelbares Bewusstsein von der Gegenwart und Wirksamkeit der übermenschlichen, . . . Lebensmacht.]

¹⁷Ibid, p.7. [nach dem Fleisch]

¹⁸CF, Vol. I, S50 - S56, p.194-232, ascribing attributes to God from the human viewpoint.

the "scientific method of dogmatics, . . . wherein statements are as precisely as possible an interpretation of religious reality."¹⁹ Though not defined, this unfolds as Schleiermacherian in that the investigation of the human's relationship to God is a result of the "strength of immediate religious experience."²⁰ Barth posits Jesus as relative and continuous with human nature. Jesus is personality recognizing its infinite worth.²¹ "And what is the life of Jesus if not the purest representation of personality?"²² Barth's writings disclose that despite reservations he is predominantly liberal in his theology emphasizing as he does the historical Jesus and religious experience. The criterion for the interpretation of theology, like the philosophical, experiential and biblical schools of the nineteenth century, is the anthropocentric viewpoint.

¹⁹Barth, "Der Glaube an den persönlichen Gott," in ZTK, 1914, Part I, p. 23f. [Die Wissenschaftlichkeit der Dogmatik . . . dass ihre Sätze möglichst genaue Interpretation der religiösen Wirklichkeit sind.]

²⁰Ibid, p. 22. [Die Kraft des unmittelbaren religiösen Erfahrens . . .]

²¹Ibid, Part II, p. 89.

²²Ibid, p. 91. [Und was . . . ist das Leben Jesu selbst, . . . , als die reinste Darstellung der Persönlichkeit.] For similar statements see CF, Vol. II, S94, p. 385. Religion, p. 120. Hegel, "The Positivity Essay," Part I, in E TH W, p. 71; the Life of Jesus accounts of the 19th century.

However, Barth adds a unique element uncharacteristic of the liberal school in speaking not only of the immanence of God as did his predecessors, but also of His transcendence. "His transcendence is simply his superiority, his immanence is simply his lordship."²³ This statement though arrived at in the manner of the nineteenth century from human reflection marks Barth's theology as different. The concept of transcendence would become more and more an integral and central focus in Barth's thought as the gap widened between himself and the liberals.

Barth's ambiguity toward liberalism was dispelled when in 1914 he saw ninety-three intellectuals in Germany, many of them his teachers in the liberal tradition, endorse the war policy of Kaiser Wilhelm II.

It was like the twilight of the gods
when I saw the reaction of
Harnack, Herrmann, Rade . . . and
company to the new situation.²⁴
To me they seemed to have been hopelessly
compromised by what I regarded
as their failure in the face of
the ideology of war.²⁵

²³"Der Glaube an den persönlichen Gott," p.74. [Seine Transzendenz ist seine schlechthinige Überlegenheit, seine Immanenz ist seine schlechthinige Herrschaft.]

²⁴Barth, Letter to W. Spoendlin, Jan.4, 1915, in Busch, KB, p.81.

²⁵Barth, "Fakultätsalbum der evangelisch-theologischen Fakultät," in Busch, KB, loc. cit.

He declared in September, 1914, that "the unconditional truths of the gospel are simply suspended for the time being and in meantime a German war-theology is put to work, . . ."²⁶ His suspicions were confirmed as to the inadequacy of liberalism and although this is the point in Barth's career which critics refer to as his break or rejection of liberalism, such talk must be taken loosely. The complexion of his attitude to the theology of the nineteenth century changed, he proceeded to correct its errors and find an alternative. In so doing he measured his theology against liberalism never completely forsaking it, but remaining always cognizant of the method of his predecessors in developing his own theology. Just as the ambiguities in Barth's mind were reflected in the ambivalent theological statements combining an anthropocentrically-based theology of immanence with the contrary statement of transcendence, the change in attitude notwithstanding, the similar pattern continues as Barth now seeks to correct liberal theology.

²⁶Barth to Thurneysen, Revolutionary Theology in the Making, Barth - Thurneysen Correspondence 1914-25, ed. by James D. Smart, London, Epworth Press, 1964, p. 26. Karl Barth - Eduard Thurneysen Briefwechsel, Vol. I, 1913-1921, ed. by Thurneysen, Zürich, TVZ, 1973, p. 10.

(iii)

Corrective attempts

For the next few years from 1914-1931 Barth's focus was his attempt to penetrate and correct the errors of liberal theology. Biblical study with his pastor friend, Eduard Thurneysen, along with re-assessment of Plato, Kant, Anselm, Kierkegaard, Dostoevsky and Overbeck, constituted the myriad of directions taken in his examination of theology. As a result of his involvement with a group of religious socialists, namely Leonhard Ragaz, Christoph and Johann Blumhardt, and Hermann Kutter whose movement had its roots in liberalism, he was drawn into the cause of the workers in his pastorate and officially joined the Social Democratic Party in 1915. These efforts both intensified his convictions of the errors of liberal theology and also armed him with the tools to launch an offensive against the latter. In 1919 he delivered a lecture at the Tambach conference warning against experiential religion. He explicitly spoke against the religion of Schleiermacher stating "The step from the experience of the Lord to the experience of Baal is a short one."²⁷ His line aroused the ire of the liberals, but the

²⁷"The Christian's Place in Society" in The Word of God, p. 286, from Das Wort Gottes und die Theologie, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1925, p. 42, "Erlebnis zum Baal."

surprise of it all was the emergence of many young theologians and pastors, such as Rudolf Bultmann, who supported Barth's position. In 1920 Barth re-iterated that where religion is experiential, there "man has taken the divine into his possession; he has brought it under his management."²⁸ Such religion has fallen from truth, from its other-worldliness and non-historicity; it is relative, psychological religion.²⁹ At the same time he developed a sense of the errors of religious socialism, which although embraced by him earlier, Barth now perceived as in danger of secularizing Christ.³⁰ However he retained the revelatory message of eschatology, originally transmitted by the Blumhardts and their colleagues, emerging later in the doctrines of creation and reconciliation.

With these criticisms of liberalism we associate Barth's resultant theological position in which he attempted to contravene the this-worldly anthropocentric method in his insistence on the transcendent Lord initially posited while a liberal, albeit a doubting one. With focus on the Lord as Wholly Other in an address in 1916 he stated that God's "will

²⁸"Biblical Questions, Insights and Vistas," in The Word of God, p.68, Ger., p.81.

²⁹Ibid, p.68f, Ger., loc. cit.

³⁰"The Christian's Place in Society," op. cit., p.277, Ger., p.36.

is not a corrected continuation of our own. It approaches ours as a Wholly Other,"³¹ and later of the world of God which is within the Bible as a world "other" than ours.³² But the crux of the counter-attack on liberal theology came in the form of Barth's commentaries on Romans in 1919 and 1921 respectively, in which there is both a settling of accounts with the biblical critical schools and the positing of dialectic theology, which unlike the relativity between the divine and the human in the anthropocentrism of the nineteenth century, presupposes the utter distinction between God and man.

With reference to biblical criticism, Barth's 1919 and 1921 positions are consistent and are re-iterated in his 1923 correspondence with von Harnack and in the Church Dogmatics. "The historical-critical method of biblical investigation has its rightful place: it is concerned with the preparation of the intelligence which is never superfluous."³³ It is both

³¹"The Righteousness of God," in The Word of God, p. 24, Ger., p.15, "gänzlich anderer;" see also "Biblical Questions, Insights and Vistas," p.64, 74f, 91f, Ger., p.79, 85, 95 and "The Christian's Place in Society," p.323, Ger., p.67.

³²"The Strange New World Within the Bible," in The Word of God, p.39, see also p.37; from "Die neue Welt in der Bibel," p.27, 26.

³³Rom I, p.V. [Die historisch - kritisch Methode der Bibelforschung hat ihr Recht: sie weist hin auf eine Vorbereitung des Verständnisses, die nirgends überflüssig ist.]

necessary and justified"³⁴ but reveals merely "the first draft of a paraphrase of the text and provides no more than a point of departure for genuine exegesis."³⁵ Historical criticism is preliminary to theological work. Used alone it fails the student and preacher for it does not bring him

Beyond that well-known 'Awe in the presence of History' which means in the end no more than all hope of engaging in the dignity of understanding and interpretation has been surrendered.³⁶

In his 1923 confrontation with von Harnack Barth reaffirms the position that historical criticism can be applied meaningfully to theology in a preliminary way, disclosing that "communication of the 'content of the gospel' can be accomplished."³⁷ But it is not scientific for it can never reveal that the true object of theology is also its subject.³⁸ Biblical criticism can open one to the insights of the Bible,

³⁴Romans, p. 4, Rom II, p. 6.

³⁵Ibid, p. 8, Rom II, p. xi f.

³⁶Ibid, p. 9, Rom II, p. xiii.

³⁷Barth's correspondence to von Harnack in Revelation and Theology, An Analysis of the Barth-Harnack Correspondence of 1923, by H. Martin Rumscheidt, Cambridge, The University Press, 1972, p. 31.

³⁸Ibid, p. 32. See also Barth, Epistle to the Philippians, London SCM Press, 1962, p. 102, lectures to pastors 1926-27, from the German Erklärung des Philipperbriefes, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1928.

but more than that it cannot do.³⁹ Throughout his career Barth's fidelity to the place of biblical criticism remains intact and prepares the way for his understanding of the Bible as indirect witness, a position in contradistinction to the biblical school's treatment of scripture as the direct revelation of God.

The fruit of his labours in both editions of Romans shows Barth totally committed to the dialectic method in theology. Based on the Kierkegaardian dynamic and Hegelian tripolar dialectic, the Barthian method is described by von Balthasar as a process of setting one statement against another. And where the divine is part of this process, dialectic assumes its highest possibilities.⁴⁰ In 1922 Barth described the dialectic as the best method for theology over the dogmatic and self-critical approaches.⁴¹ Dialectics is satisfied with indirect knowledge realizing the "Center cannot be apprehended."⁴² This method wavers between yes and no, question and answer, negative and affirmative.

³⁹CD I/2, p. 64, 464, 466ff, 494f, 526, (KD, p. 71, 513, 516f, 547f, 584f).

⁴⁰von Balthasar, op. cit., p. 59ff; see also Albert C. Knudson, "The Theology of Crisis - I," in Methodist Review, May, 1928, p. 334f.

⁴¹Barth, "The Task of the Ministry," in The Word of God, p. 206, Ger., p. 171.

⁴²Ibid, (Eng. and Ger.).

Never striving to utter the Word of God, it warns of the mortal limit. It disposes the human to receive and hear the Word ceasing where the latter is spoken. Given the time and circumstances surrounding his choice of the dialectic, we view it as a method specifically chosen by him to contravene any attempt to penetrate the divine Word, the real offense of liberal theology.

The first Römerbrief contained the feeble beginnings of the dialectic in which the polarization of sin and grace, old and new world, Christ and Adam is stressed.

Reality against reality, nature against
nature, cosmos against cosmos,
power against power, king against
king! . . .⁴³ Christ against Adam.
Adam the antitype, . . . Christ the
Ideal, . . .⁴⁴

The revised commentary appearing two years later was the result of studies on Paul, Kierkegaard, Overbeck, Plato, Kant and Karl's brother Heinrich.⁴⁵ This "completely rewritten"⁴⁶

⁴³ Rom. I, p.136. [Realität gegen Realität, Natur gegen Natur, Kosmos gegen Kosmos, Kraft gegen Kraft, König gegen König! . . .]

⁴⁴ Ibid, [Der Christus gegen den Adam. Adam das Gegenbild, . . . Der Christus das Urbild.]

⁴⁵ Romans, Preface, p.3f, Rom II, p. vii.

⁴⁶ Ibid, p.2, Rom II, p. vi.

work exhibits "the Kierkegaardian 'qualitative difference',⁴⁷ as the presupposition for the dialectic task in which the Lord is understood over against man in this absolute distinction which leaves no room for positive relation between the two. This "other from which we have come and which is contrasted with all . . . human existence can be in no manner wholly distinct unless it is in every manner wholly distinct."⁴⁸ Barth can speak only in negative and nebulous terms of the "positive relation between God and man, . . . , disclosed to men when they perceive the utter separation between here [world] and there [eternity]"⁴⁹ a relation which can only be described as "staid, sober and colorless."⁵⁰

Hardly a line of Romans is written without the "straining of sinews, by a relentless elastic application of the 'dialectical' method,"⁵¹ coupled often with the use of paradox

⁴⁷ Ibid, p.10, Rom II, p.xiii, [qualitative Unterschied von Gott und Mensch]; see also Romans, p.39, 57, 84, 365, Rom II, p.14, 32, 58, 349; and Epistle to the Philippians, p.64, Ger., p.58.

⁴⁸ Romans, p.115, Rom II, p.90.

⁴⁹ Ibid, p.91, Rom II, p.65.

⁵⁰ "Biblical Questions, Insights and Vistas," p.69, Ger., p.82.

⁵¹ Romans, p.8, Rom II, p.xi-xii.

borrowed from Kierkegaard.⁵²

Men are forgiven by God only when He condemns them; life rises only from death; the beginning stands at the end and the 'yes' proceeds from the 'no.'⁵³

Barth's use of the Kierkegaardian 'Moment' reconfirms the 'impossible possibility' of the divine-human encounter. In the eschatological 'Moment' occurs the "disclosure of nonsense which is the revelation of sense. What is new is also the deepest truth of what was old."⁵⁴

Barth continued to use dialectic and paradox, advocating it in lectures to preachers⁵⁵ and using it himself in sermons.⁵⁶ He banished Schleiermacher from the line of those true to transmitting Christian message, namely Kierkegaard, Luther, Calvin, Paul and Jeremiah.⁵⁷ This apparent severing of the ties in 1922 and his lectures on Schleiermacher

⁵²Romans, p. 29, Rom II, p. 5.

⁵³Ibid, p. 112, Rom II, p. 86. Many other examples of paradox, Romans, p. 31, 75, 103, 126, 165, 216, corresponding in Rom II, p. 7, 50, 78, 102, 142, 197; dialectic, Romans, p. 38, 108, 109, 112, 114, 125, 156, 169, 201, 229, 275, corresponding in Rom II, p. 13, 82, 83, 86, 88, 101, 132, 147, 181, 212, 258.

⁵⁴Romans, p. 77, Rom II, p. 51. Other references, p. 110f, 498ff, Rom II, p. 85, 482ff.

⁵⁵"The Task of the Ministry," p. 200-207, Ger., p. 167ff.

⁵⁶Barth and Thurneysen, Come Holy Spirit, Sermons, New York, Round Table Press, 1933, p. 44, 69.

⁵⁷"The Task of the Ministry," p. 195, Ger., p. 164.

during the winter semester 1923-24 encapsulate Barth's general negativism for his predecessor. Though great, both as the representative of his era⁵⁸ and the most influential theologian since the Reformers,⁵⁹ Schleiermacher did much damage to Protestant theology.⁶⁰ But the use of the dialectic in combatting the method of the nineteenth century was only partially successful. While it challenged the relativity and continuity between divine and human it was in itself a product of the liberals particularly in its use of Kierkegaardian dialectic and paradox, the use of which "became merely a modification of the older idealistic concepted scheme . . . , not a new one."⁶¹ Having pushed the dialectic to its extremity Barth was no longer convinced of its adequacy in the theological and preaching tasks. According to von Balthasar, he saw the inferiority of the dialectic to dogmatics,⁶² and Torrance states that Barth now saw the need

⁵⁸Barth, Die Theologie Schleiermachers, Zürich, Theologischer Verlag, 1978, p.1.

⁵⁹Ibid, p.462.

⁶⁰Ibid, p.461ff.

⁶¹Wilkerson, op. cit., p.32.

⁶²von Balthasar, op. cit., p.72.

for positive dogmatic theology.⁶³

Not unlike the pattern of the later Church Dogmatics, Barth's first attempt which appeared in 1927 is comparable to the prolegomenon of 1932 in its polemical nature, a point overlooked by Heino Kadai whose work compares the two versions of Barth's prolegomenon.⁶⁴ At every turn in Die christliche Dogmatik, he renders his position in contradistinction to the nineteenth century. As prolegomena it is "the attempt to thoroughly comprehend the meaning and the potential of the dogmatic task."⁶⁵ It is the question of what constitutes "the proper content of Christian speech."⁶⁶ Whereas for Barth preaching is the goal of dogmatics,⁶⁷ this is opposed to the dogmaticians of the nineteenth century. Schleiermacher's point of reference for dogmatics, "the

⁶³Torrance, op. cit., p.83.

⁶⁴Heino Olavi Kadai, A Comparative Study of the Prolegomena in Karl Barth's Christliche Dogmatik of 1927 and the Kirchliche Dogmatik of 1932-1938, St. Louis, Concordia Seminary, unpublished Th.D. Thesis, 1969, p.5, p.517.

⁶⁵ChD, p.10. [den Versuch einer grundsätzlichen Verständigung über den Sinn und die Möglichkeit der dogmatischen Aufgabe.]

⁶⁶Ibid, p.18. [dem rechten Inhalt der christlichen Rede.]

⁶⁷Ibid, p.29.

Christian devout state of mind"⁶⁸ is repudiated as unscientific for "devout consciousness . . . is a fact to which science cannot relate."⁶⁹ Unlike the nineteenth century prolegomena which consists of statements outside of dogmatics,⁷⁰ prolegomena for Barth is the explication of a dogmatic statement, the Word of God.

An introduction to dogmatics, . . .
can only be realized . . . by a
jump into the subject itself.
Thus we shall have nothing
to do with things which lie beyond
the usual subject area of
dogmatics, but with a few . . .
selected and anticipated loci
of dogmatics itself . . .⁷¹

Over against the consciousness theology of Kant, Schleiermacher and Ritschl,⁷² the prolegomenon "will consist exclusively of an explicated lesson about the Word of God."⁷³ As opposed

⁶⁸ Ibid. [den christlich frommen Gemütszuständen]

⁶⁹ Ibid., p.32. [das fromme Bewusstsein . . . ein Faktum ist, auf das sich eine Wissenschaft beziehen kann.]

⁷⁰ CF, Vol I, s33, p.133.

⁷¹ ChD, p.16. [Einleitung in die Dogmatik, . . ., kann nur geschehen in Form eines vorläufigen Sprungs in die Sache selbst hinein. Wir werden es also hier durchaus nicht mit Dingen zu tun bekommen, die ausserhalb des gewöhnlichen Stoffgebietes der Dogmatik liegen, sondern mit einigen . . . ausgewählten und vorweggenommenen Loci der Dogmatik selbst, . . .]

⁷² Ibid., p.97f. [Bewusstseins - theologie]

⁷³ Ibid., p.17. [sondern exklusiv bestehen in einer ausgeführten Lehre vom Worte Gottes.]

to the theology of neo-Protestantism which claimed to penetrate its object, the Word of God theology recognizing that its subject is also object does not claim knowledge in the usual fashion.⁷⁴ One can proceed to knowledge only from faith in the spirit of Anselm and not vice versa.⁷⁵ As Anselm taught "there is a way from above to below, from God to man . . . , and this way is in fact the recognition of God's Word."⁷⁶

Despite his attempt to overcome the errors of the nineteenth century Barth's work was entangled in philosophical presuppositions particularly the Kierkegaardian acknowledged in the preface.⁷⁷ He is still tied to the Danish philosopher's 'difference'⁷⁸ as well as the use of paradox⁷⁹ in his quest to overcome the problems of relativity between divine and human as well as direct knowledge of God prevalent in liberal theology.

⁷⁴ Ibid, p.96.

⁷⁵ Ibid, p.97.

⁷⁶ Ibid, p.102. [dass es einen Weg von oben nach unten, von Gott zum Mensch gibt . . . , und dieser Weg ist eben die Erkenntnis des Wortes Gottes.]

⁷⁷ Ibid, Vorwort, p.VI.

⁷⁸ Ibid, p.72, 409. [die unendliche und unbedingte Distanz.]

⁷⁹ Ibid, p.388.

In the three years prior to the Church Dogmatics, from 1929-1932, Barth set out to "rid myself of the last remnants of a philosophical, i.e., anthropological . . . foundation and exposition of the Christian doctrine."⁸⁰ In his "Schicksal und Idee in der Theologie"⁸¹ Barth considered the methodological and epistemological problems of a scientific theology through consideration of the relation between theology and philosophy. It is not Barth's intention to purge theology of philosophy for the former borrows rightly from philosophy as idealism or realism.⁸² But unlike philosophy, theology must not attempt to utter the final word. Barth states that

. . . theology cannot wish to be in any sense or under any pretext, anthropology, or reflection on the reality and truth of man, because it is a reflection on the reality and truth of the Word of God which has been spoken to man.⁸³

⁸⁰ Barth, How I Changed My Mind, op. cit., p. 42f.

⁸¹ Barth, "Schicksal und Idee" in ZZ, 1929, p. 308-348.

⁸² Ibid, p. 338-341.

⁸³ Ibid, p. 341. [. . . Theologie in keinem Sinn und unter keinem Vorwand Anthropologie, Besinnung auf die Wirklichkeit und Wahrheit des Menschen sein wollen darf, weil sie Besinnung ist auf die Wirklichkeit und Wahrheit des dem Menschen gesagten Wortes Gottes.]

The one who attempts to find the last word in theology knows only illusion.⁸⁴

There are then two choices or directions one may take in theology, the one we see clearly as that of the nineteenth century anthropological attempts, the other Barth's opposing choice:

between the God whom we ourselves like to think of as the longed for satisfying conclusion of our self-searching and the God who gives himself to us to think about through His Word . . .⁸⁵

The path Barth advocates is that of theological dialectic which guarantees the freedom of God's Word over against the dialectic of philosophy which aims at synthesis.

Theological dialectic is real theological dialectic to the extent that it is open to this thought [God's Word is not limited] to the extent that it finally wants to serve precisely this . . . thought, and the freedom of God's Word.⁸⁶

⁸⁴ Ibid, p. 341; also p. 343, thinking he has said the last word, remains alone, estranged by sin from God.

⁸⁵ Ibid, p. 342 [. . . zwischen dem Gott, den wir selbst uns zu denken vermögen als den ersehnten befriedigenden Abschluss unserer Selbstbesinnung und dem Gott, der sich uns durch sein Wort zu denken gibt.]

⁸⁶ Ibid, p. 346. [Theologische Dialektik ist insofern echte theologische Dialektik, als sie für diesen Gedanken offen ist, [Gottes Wort ist nicht gebunden] ja als sie letztlich gerade diesem . . . Gedanken, als sie der Freiheit des Wortes Gottes dienen will.]

Ultimately theology would be theology of the Word "where it was absolutely and completely Christology."⁸⁷ In time Barth's Dogmatics would increasingly emphasize the doctrine of Christ derived from attempts to clarify the presuppositions of theology in relation to philosophy and to correct the anthropologically-determined christology of the nineteenth century. According to David Mueller, "Barth's Christocentric theology may be seen as the realization of the abortive attempts at Christological theology in the nineteenth century."⁸⁸

But "The real document of this farewell [to anthropological foundations] is, . . . the book about the evidence for God of Anselm of Canterbury, . . ."⁸⁹ Wood describes Anselm as a "bridge across a difficult stream which crossed [Barth's] path."⁹⁰ From the medieval thinker whose "credo ut intelligam is completely out of place on the title-page of Schleiermacher's Glaubenslehre"⁹¹. Barth learned that

⁸⁷ Ibid, p.348. [wo sie ganz und gar eben Christologie wäre]

⁸⁸ Mueller, "The Theology of Karl Barth and the Nineteenth Century," in Religion in Life, #34, Wint' 1964-65, p.92.

⁸⁹ How I Changed My Mind, op. cit., p.43.

⁹⁰ Wood, op. cit., p.180.

⁹¹ Anselm, p.26, fn 1; Ger., p.18, fn 1.

theology as intellectus fidei is knowledge desired by faith. Contrary to the liberal starting-point he recognized that the science of God cannot lead to but rather proceeds from faith. The latter is the result of the preached Word of God received in grace. This divine side of things alone, and not human initiative, must constitute the presupposition for theology. The Word reaches man through the Bible and extra-biblical sources faithful to scripture.⁹² Faith does not render its object true but is made true by its object Christ, who is also its subject.⁹³ "It is true that the Word appropriated in faith is also in itself, . . . the whole saving truth full of meaning and with its own basis and content."⁹⁴ In this way it must be grasped. Anselm was important to Barth, not only because he taught the proper understanding of the relation between faith and knowledge but also at the time provided him with the tools to posit a correct theological method over against that of the nineteenth century.

⁹²Ibid, p. 22f, Ger., p. 14f.

⁹³Ibid, p. 25, Ger., p. 17.

⁹⁴Ibid, p. 42, Ger., p. 39.

In his early education, through his university days, in pastoral work and in writings and activities from Romans to Anselm the shadow of liberal theology is present to Barth. From commitment to ambiguity to a general negativism toward liberalism, these attitudinal variations produce changes in his theology. He moves from an immanentist position stressing the historical Jesus and the relativity of the divine-human encounter to the opposed side of the transcendent, Wholly Other. When the dialectic method is perceived as inadequate to combat liberal theology Barth adopts the dogmatic approach. Thus despite changes in attitude toward the theology of the nineteenth century, the latter remains a reference point for his subsequent theological positions.

CHAPTER III

A Theology in Opposition, Barth's Polemic, 1932 - 1942

According to Berkouwer, "It is very difficult, . . . adequately to circumscribe Barth's polemic against modern Protestantism because of the undeniable variations within this area."¹ This being the case, Berkouwer opted "to describe his [Barth's] more uniform polemic against Rome."² It is the former confrontation, central to Karl Barth's theological development, which we address in this chapter.

Following his work on Anselm, Barth was once again involved in the dogmatic task, the result of which was the publication of the first two volumes of the Church Dogmatics between 1932 and 1942. In these works the polemic is stronger than at any other time in Barth's career. The liberal influence pervades these volumes within the framework we have posited, namely, (i) its understanding of scientific theology (ii) its use of presuppositions from the philosophical, experiential and biblical schools, and (iii) its anthropocentric criterion for the interpretation of doctrine. Responding to these methodological errors Barth places over against them his scientific theology invoking the Word of God

¹Berkouwer, op. cit., p.168.

²Ibid.

as the sole presupposition and criterion for the task.

In order to document the polemic and his resultant position, this chapter will investigate eight major topics of the Dogmatics I and II. These include (a) scientific method (b) Bible (c) epistemology (d) use of analogy (e) christology and pneumatology (f) religion (g) perfections of God (h) ethics. Although it is not within the scope of the thesis to determine whether Barth's critique of the nineteenth century is correct we will give appropriate reference to the liberal positions to which he takes exception.

Although his extensive critique, including the polemic, has never been examined for its correctness, we suggest, based on our own study as well as commentaries, that Barth is true to the spirit of the last century and that his critique has not distorted it.

Subsequent to this detailed documentation of the polemic we shall examine the content of Barth's extra-dogmatic writings of the time. These theological-political works in which he associates the rise of Nazism and German Christianity with liberalism provide us with a key in order to understand the intensity of the polemic and his resultant theological positions in the Dogmatics.

(i)

Polemics of the Dogmatics

(a)

As early as 1914, Barth had claimed, like his predecessors in the nineteenth century, that in dogmatics the scientific method must be used, ~~the~~ task of which is to interpret experientially-based religious reality.³ He will never abandon his conviction that dogmatics is a "Wissenschaft" but will gradually recognize that nineteenth century dogmatics conditioned by religious consciousness is unscientific.

By 1932 Barth recognized the fundamental methodological errors of the previous century. In the Dogmatics he criticizes what we consider to be the three dominant aspects of this theology: its claim to be scientific, its use of presuppositions and its own criterion for interpreting religious documents. Over against the dogmatics of the nineteenth century, particularly Schleiermacher's which was a partner to other sciences,⁴ Barth

³Barth, "Der Glaube an den persönlichen Gott," op. cit., p. 23.

⁴CD I/1, p. 10, (KD, p. 8f.) See Schleiermacher, Speeches, "Defence," first speech which calls the bourgeois class to elevate religion to the level of other intellectual pursuits, p. 1-25, and CF, Introduction, p. 3-93, which advocates that theology borrow its presuppositions from ethics, philosophy of religion, apologetics and piety, yet in Outline, S1, p. 19, Schleiermacher insists that theology must have its own subject matter and language and must be done within the Church for otherwise it dissolves into various other sciences.

posits 'scientific dogmatics,'⁵ which must reject all claims of submitting to rules valid for other sciences.⁶ Nor as regards method can theology learn anything from these other sciences. The nineteenth century ignored the fact that dogmatics is a special science⁷ and its error was made from the start.

Since the days of Schleiermacher, many encyclopedic attempts have been made to include theology in the sciences. But the common objection may be made against all of them that they overlook the abnormality of the special existence of theology and therefore essay that which is radically impossible. The actual result of all such attempts has always been the . . . destructive surrender of theology to a general concept of science. . . .⁸

Some of these destructive attempts would include R. Rothe's repetitive exposition of church proclamation,⁹ Schleiermacher's presentation of the faith based on self-determined presuppo-

⁵ KD I/1, 'Wissenschaft der Dogmatik', p. 1ff and passim.

⁶ CD I/1, p. 10, (KD, p. 8).

⁷ Ibid, see also p. 5, 'particular' science, (KD, p. 3).

⁸ Ibid, p. 10, (KD, p. 8f.).

⁹ R. Rothe, Zur Dogmatik, Leipzig, Verlag von G. Reuter, 1898, see especially p. 25-70, which constitutes an exposition of evangelical Protestant dogmatics, that is, its principal sources, structures and methods. Rothe outlines the use of inspiration and historical criticism as it has been applied to evangelical dogmatics.

sitions,¹⁰ and Alexander Schweizer's phenomenological approach.¹¹

The unscientific nature of nineteenth-century dogmatics produced the two-fold error of incorrect presuppositions and criterion for interpretation of Christian principles. On the one hand it created various prolegomena as groups of prior presuppositions outside dogmatics, a point earlier criticized by Barth in Die christliche Dogmatik.¹² While for Schleiermacher prolegomena, constituted by the feeling of absolute dependence, lies outside of dogmatics,¹³ Barth on the other hand corrects this to say that

the place from which the way of dogmatic knowledge is to be seen and understood can be neither a prior anthropological possibility nor a subsequent ecclesiastical reality but only the present moment of the speaking and hearing of Jesus Christ Himself . . .¹⁴

¹⁰ Schleiermacher, CF, Vol I, S15, p.75, S29, p.123, S32, p.131, S33, p.133f, and see above Ch. I, fn. 8 & 9, p.20. In summary, Schleiermacher states that the religious self-consciousness can account for all Christian doctrines.

¹¹ Alexander Schweizer, Die Glaubenslehre der Evangelisch-Reformirten Kirche, Zürich, Orell Füssli und Comp., 1844, Vol I & II, 1847. In which Schweizer lists the main contributors to doctrine since the Reformation, outlining the position of Calvin, Luther, Zwingli, Schleiermacher, et al. See also his praise of Schleiermacher's successful attempt to follow the tradition of the Reformers, Die Christliche Glaubenslehre nach protestantischen Grundsätzen, Vol I, Leipzig, G. Hirzel, 1877, p.69.

¹² See above, Ch. II, p.50.

¹³ CD, I/1, p.36, (KD, p.35).

¹⁴ Ibid, p.41, (KD, p.41).

Over against this the Word of God for Barth is simultaneously the prolegomena to dogmatics and a doctrine per se. "The prefix pro in prolegomena is to be understood loosely to signify the first part of the dogmatics rather than that which is prior to it."¹⁵ In "the prolegomena to dogmatics, therefore, we ask concerning the Word of God as the criterion of dogmatics."¹⁶

The second error resulting from incorrect scientific dogmatics was the criterion for interpretation used by nineteenth century German Protestantism. The nineteenth century admitted a dogmatic task which was inner-directed in the pietist tradition; over against which Barth called for a scientific dogmatics outer-directed by faith alone, which results when the divine acts on the human. The determining force in Schleiermacher's dogmatics, "the irresistible inner necessity of his nature"¹⁷ must be overturned by faith, the result of God's working on man, "opened from above . . . , not from below."¹⁸ In Schleiermacher and his followers the "anthropologizing of theology was complete"¹⁹ using as they

¹⁵ Ibid, p. 42, (KD, loc. cit.).

¹⁶ Ibid, p. 43, (KD, p. 43).

¹⁷ CD I/1, p. 20, (KD, p. 19). See Speeches, p. 3., Ger., p. 5.

¹⁸ CD I/1, p. 242, (KD, p. 255).

¹⁹ Ibid, p. 20, (KD, p. 19).

did any secular criterion to stand alongside the singular position and authority of the Church. "It [the nineteenth century] forgot to look to this and this alone [the church] in the question as to the Word of God by which Church proclamation must be measured. In this question it constantly looked elsewhere."²⁰ The nineteenth century placed other criteria alongside the Church such as philosophical and ethical propositions:

It could see no further possibility of viewing the Word of God as an entity distinct from Church proclamation, but it could clearly see other entities distinct from Church proclamation and at least very normative. Their epitome was modern cultural awareness. It therefore set up this cultural awareness as a surrogate in place of the Word of God which had now lost all concreteness for it and had volatilised into a mere idea. And it now judged according to this surrogate.²¹

Barth's strict definitions of scientific dogmatics and prolegomena form the basis of his dogmatic task. In his insistence on its status as a special science and the use of

²⁰ Ibid, p. 251, (KD, p. 265). Schleiermacher however insisted on 'Church' dogmatics. See Outline, p. 20, S5 & S6. "When this same knowledge is acquired and possessed without relation to the 'government' of the Church, it ceases to be theological and develops to those sciences to which it belonged according to its carried content;" B. A. Gerrish says Schleiermacher's dogmatics are ecclesiastical. See "Friedrich Schleiermacher on the Task of Theology," in Gerrish, op. cit., p. 47.

²¹ CD I/1, p. 251f, (KD, loc.cit.).

the Word of God as the presupposition and criterion, Barth's position lies over against that of nineteenth century dogmatics. This method is applied throughout the Dogmatics I and II forming the basis of Barth's corrective to liberalism as well as his own theological statements.

(b)

Barth further develops his already posited opposition to the nineteenth century's treatment of the Bible.²² Unlike the latter which viewed the Bible as direct revelation, for Barth Holy Scripture is a witness to revelation which alone is the original Word of God. The Bible is a sign which must be treated seriously, a sign ignored by liberalism and Roman Catholicism.²³ According to Barth, "We thus do the Bible poor and unwelcome honour if we equate it directly with this Other, with revelation itself."²⁴ The Bible and the biblical witnesses point beyond themselves to the revelation of God and it is only when scripture becomes event for the Christian witness, when it addresses one to act as the Christian person, that it is revelation.

²²See above, Ch. II, p.42ff.

²³CD I/2, p.457, (KD, p.504).

²⁴CD I/1, p.112, (KD, p.115). See also CD I/2, p.463, (KD, p.512), "We distinguish the Bible as such from revelation."

Although there are those who disagree,²⁵ Barth claims his position is in the tradition of the Reformers and a call away from the errors of the past two hundred years:

Our task to-day must be the different one of re-adopting Luther's concepts and taking proclamation seriously again as the word of the Church in and through which God is to be served and not man, and God is to speak. On that basis we must then try to understand once again in what sense first the Bible and even before that revelation, is really the Word of God. It was here the forgetfulness set in before the disaster of the 18th century.²⁶

In spite of the fact that the Bible is a witness, it has authority above and beyond any other in the Christian community - the Church, the Fathers, the confession of faith. They must submit as lesser, though genuine authorities to the Bible. The Church owes obedience to the Holy Scripture and not vice versa. Schleiermacher erroneously placed the doctrine of Holy Scripture within the doctrine of the

²⁵ Cornelius van Til, "Has Karl Barth Become Orthodox?" Westminster Theological Journal, May 1954, 137ff. Van Til denies that Barth is orthodox on a number of issues including Scripture, and A. D. R. Polman argues that Barth's concept of indirect revelation suggests that God deceives; this was not God's intention in revealing Himself nor is it the position of the Christian Church's understanding of revelation, in Barth, tran. by Calvin D. Freeman, Philadelphia, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1968, p. 21ff.

²⁶ CD I/1, p. 124, (KD, p. 128).

Church.²⁷ Barth describes the result:

In the course of it, at least in its neo-Protestant form, it developed into a pseudo Church.²⁸ Under the Word, which means Holy Scripture the Church must and can live, whereas beyond or beside the Word it can only die. It is this its salvation from death which it attests when it makes, not the Catholic or Neo-Protestant, but the Evangelical decision.²⁹

Adding further to the injury in liberalism was the Church's submission to the final authority of the individual presupposition of the theologians. Every authority including the Word of God was placed under this anthropological criterion.³⁰ It is not that Barth wants the eradication of individual presuppositions per se from biblical studies. This is not a problem provided the exegete does not submit the Word of God to a system but rather the Word must act on the mode of thought.³¹

²⁷CD I/2, p.541ff, (KD, p.601f). Schleiermacher, CF Vol II, S129, p.594. Schleiermacher accords the New Testament pre-eminence in a series of presentations of the Christian faith and the norm for succeeding presentations. However, it is treated as a doctrine under that of the church generally. In addition, Schleiermacher ignored the Fathers, see S113-S172, p.525-751.

²⁸CD I/2, p.557, (KD, p. 620).

²⁹Ibid, p.585, (KD, p.652).

³⁰Ibid, p.607-612, (KD, p.678-684).

³¹Ibid, p.734f, (KD, p.823f), see ChD, p.405ff.

It is only in a middle position between Scripture and the Church, their authority properly understood, that scientific theology can emerge. Lying between the two, it is constantly checked by both authorities and can unfold as dogmatic knowledge. Thus in contradistinction to the nineteenth century, "when the middle position occupied by dogmatics and theology, between Scripture and proclamation of the Church was hidden from the theologians themselves,"³² Barth's theology understands its position between the two since it is only within this genuine framework that theology paradoxically "receives poise and movement, freedom and strictness in its work."³³

When the Bible is treated as witness, a relative and mediate authority to revelation, only then is the mystery of God not compromised.³⁴ When recognized as "God's revelation in the human word,"³⁵ Scripture "is distinguished from everything else that is said to us by men by the fact that a majesty belongs to the one which obviously is radically

³²CD I/2, p. 772, (KD, p. 863).

³³Ibid, (CD & KD).

³⁴Ibid, p. 469f, (KD, p. 519f).

³⁵Ibid, p. 472, (KD, p. 522).

lacking in the other, . . ."³⁶ The distinction is safeguarded only where scripture is understood as a witness, and not, as in liberal theology, as direct revelation.

Barth's concept of the biblical witness is in direct opposition to liberalism. The insistence of his theology on mystery, majesty and distinction of God over against man, challenges the immanence theology of the nineteenth-century which saw only relative differences between God and man. The terminology of the 'Wholly Other' has disappeared but its spirit of the 'utter difference' between the divine and the human, crucial to his critique of liberalism in the twenties, remains in Barth's work in the following decade.

(c)

Epistemology has long been a contentious issue in Barthian studies. For Barth the only knowledge one can have of God is through revelation. The human can claim no self-certainty in matters of theological epistemology. Whereas Schleiermacher and the liberals attributed to man a special faculty for knowing God,³⁷ Barth denies this possibility.³⁸

³⁶ Ibid, (CD & KD).

³⁷ Schleiermacher, Speeches, "Defence" and "Nature of Religion," first & second speeches, p.1-118, Ger., p.3-111, CF, Vol I, S3, p.5 & S4, p.6, p.12, and passim, p.1-78, referring to the human capacity to know God through piety and self-consciousness.

³⁸ CD I/1, p.204, (KD, p. 212f).

Knowledge of the divine "is grounded in the God revealed in His Word."³⁹ Furthermore, "of ourselves we do not come to know Him, . . . , on the contrary, this happens only as the grace of the revelation of God comes to us"⁴⁰

The attempts of Kant and others to know God through an a priori concept which Barth labelled as intolerable,⁴¹ or to disclose Him as an historical figure do not honour revelation which indicates that God "remains a mystery to us because He Himself has made Himself so clear and certain to us."⁴² The source of epistemology of the divine is revelation given at God's good pleasure which in turn can be heard only within the Church through grace, and in faith and obedience. Knowledge of God is finally realized as paradox. "He unveils Himself as the One He is by veiling Himself."⁴³

³⁹ CD II/1, p. 44, (KD, p. 47).

⁴⁰ Ibid, p. 223, (KD, p. 252).

⁴¹ Ibid, p. 310, (KD, p. 349). Kant, Critique of Pure Reason, tran. by J. M. D. Meiklejohn, London, Dent & Sons, 1978, p. 25-50, and especially p. 28 which refers to the a priori capacity to know God alongside freedom and immortality.

⁴² CD II/1, S25, p. 3, (KD, p. 1).

⁴³ Ibid, p. 52, (KD, p. 56), see also the following for Barth's use of mystery and paradox in discussion of the knowledge of God, CD II/1, p. 38-41, and summary p. 43, (KD, p. 40-43, p. 46).

Barth's antithetical position on the issue of the knowledge of God is clear; his solution ambiguous. There are those who speak favourably of Barth's method and view it as scientifically sound. Thomas Torrance says that in the new Dogmatics of 1932, Barth "swept aside all the language of idealist philosophy, of Kierkegaard and the existentialist misunderstanding of Kierkegaard."⁴⁴ Robert E. Cushman contends that Barth's epistemology successfully lets God be known only through God.⁴⁵ Reverend Alfred Anthony Glenn, R. G. Crawford, and David Morgan Lochhead compare Barth's system to Wittgenstein's language game.⁴⁶ Glenn claims that Barth's methodology is a sound basis for an epistemology for theological prolegomena in that Barth's special science and Wittgenstein's language game both rest on the meaning of the language used within a specific context. Glenn points to four features operating in Barth's method which satisfy the

⁴⁴Torrance, "Karl Barth," The Expository Times, Vol. 66, Oct., 1954 - Sept., 1955, p. 207f.

⁴⁵Cushman, op. cit., p. 216.

⁴⁶Rev. Alfred Anthony Glenn, The Relationship Between Theology as a Special Science and Analytic Philosophy With Special Reference to the Theology of Karl Barth, unpub. Ph.D. Thesis, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., 1967, R. G. Crawford, "Karl Barth and Philosophy" in Modern Churchman, Vol. 20, #1-2, 1977, p. 36-43, and David Morgan Lochhead, The Autonomy of Theology, A Critical Study with Special Reference to Karl Barth and Contemporary Analytical Philosophy, unpub. Ph.D. thesis, McGill, 1966.

criteria of scientific method: objectivity, methodological rigour, self-critical inquiry and a problematic form of thinking.⁴⁷ According to Crawford there is a parallel between Barth and Wittgenstein in that the former's method shows a logical use of grammar in its attempt to elucidate the conceptual structure of biblical language.⁴⁸ However, Crawford points to Barth's weighty use of reason in determining the biblical statements.⁴⁹ Lochhead claims that Barth's theology is autonomous in that "the true value of its propositions are not logically determined by the true value of the presuppositions of any other discipline."⁵⁰ Barth identifies God solely within a theological, and that specifically a Christological framework.

There can be no question, however, that Barth is not free of Kierkegaard and ultimately must resort to the use of paradox to preserve the mystery of God. Both Jérôme Hamer and Alastair McKinnon point to Kierkegaard's permanent influence on Barth⁵¹ despite the latter's own claims to have

⁴⁷ Glenn, op. cit., p.15.

⁴⁸ Crawford, op. cit., p.36.

⁴⁹ Ibid, p.42, see also Crawford, "The Theological Method of Karl Barth," SJT, Vol. 25, #3, Aug.72, p.332.

⁵⁰ Lochhead, op. cit., p.4.

⁵¹ Hamer, op. cit., Ch. 12, Alastair McKinnon, "Barth's Relation to Kierkegaard: Some Further Light," CJT, Vol. 13, 1967, #1, p.31, and passim, p.31ff.

gone past Kierkegaard.⁵² There is also the claim of Joseph McLelland and others that Kantianism permanently influenced Barth. According to McLelland "the Platonic-Kantian base provides a constant, a permanent element in Barth's thought"⁵³ passed on probably through Barth's philosopher-brother, Heinrich. McLelland claims that rather than proceeding from the Kantian synthetic a priori theory, Barth proceeds from the analytic a posteriori judgments of the revealed God.⁵⁴ Reverend Dr. Robert Crawford and R. F. Aldwinckle view Barth as resorting to judgment calls on revelational propositions⁵⁵ and self-certainty.⁵⁶ According to D. D. Williams "Barth's whole system is something different from what he says it is. It is an appropriation by human experience of a revelation which enters into direct contact with the structure of our creaturely existence."⁵⁷

⁵²Barth, "Kierkegaard and the Theologians," CJT, Vol. 13, Jan., 1967, p.64f.

⁵³McLelland, op. cit., p.32; see also Giovanni Miegge, "A Roman Catholic Interpretation of Karl Barth," SJT, Vol. 7, 1954, p.61.

⁵⁴McLelland, op. cit., p.34.

⁵⁵Crawford, "The Theological Method of Karl Barth," op. cit., p.332.

⁵⁶R. F. Aldwinckle, "Karl Barth and Religious Language," CJT, Vol. II, 1965, p.166.

⁵⁷Daniel D. Williams, "Brunner and Barth on Philosophy," JR, Vol. 27, 1947, p.254.

In his attempt to develop an epistemology which avoids the anthropocentric criterion of the nineteenth century and establish theological statements on the scientific basis of the Word of God alone as the source of knowledge, Barth is only partially successful. While on the one hand keeping the divine and human separate in a counter-attack on liberalism, Barth ironically relies on the Kierkegaardian paradox to secure his claim of the mystery and otherness of God. According to Hamer, "In his battle against liberalism, Barth can make use of only one of the weapons placed at his disposal by Kierkegaard: . . . the paradox."⁵⁸ In the area of epistemology Barth's theology is the result of a counter-statement to the nineteenth century while at the same time, through Kierkegaard, invoking part of its method.

(d)

Closely linked with these presuppositions and criterion for theological interpretation in the nineteenth century is the conviction, based on Genesis 1:26⁵⁹ that there is an inherent ontological similarity between the divine and

⁵⁸Hamer, op. cit., p.252.

⁵⁹The Jerusalem Bible, "Let us make man in our own image," p. 6.

the human. This conviction is at the root of the Thomistic doctrine of analogia entis and it has constantly inspired, in Barth's view, all enterprise of natural theology. He rejects any concept which posits an ontological similarity between God and the human in a polemic which is quite extensive.⁶⁰

Over against the analogia entis Barth develops the analogia fidei whereby faith as the basis of the divine-human analogy is the result of God's acting on the human, and not the result of inherent human capacity.

If there is real analogy between God and man - an analogy which is a true analogy of being on both sides . . .
- what other analogy can it be than the analogy which is posited and created by the work and action of God Himself, the analogy which has its actuality from God and from God alone; . . .⁶¹

Based on the analogia fidei is the analogia attributionis⁶² which indicates the similarity of attributes between the divine and the human is possible through the grace of revelation. As with the faith of the analogia fidei the

⁶⁰CD II/1, "The Readiness of God," p. 63ff, (KD, p. 68ff), and "The Readiness of Man," p. 128ff, (KD, p. 141ff); p. 225-254, (KD, p. 254-287), CD I/1, p. 243f, 437, 457, (KD, p. 257, 459f, 479f). For Barth natural theology is all-embracing and includes any and all claims of the human to know God, CD II/1, p. 164ff, (KD, p. 184ff).

⁶¹CD II/1, p. 83, (KD, p. 91).

⁶²Ibid., p. 237ff, (KD, p. 267ff).

justifying grace of revelation is bestowed, as Anselm had taught Barth, only from above to below, and is not gained as the liberals had taught, through human merit.

Barth's opposition to the teaching of the nineteenth century is clear, but his solution ambiguous as is indicated by the polarization of opinion from his critics. Some like Bouillard have argued that the analogia entis is at the heart of Barth's analogia fidei⁶³ while Torrance and others claim that Barth's is not the Thomistic ontological analogy.⁶⁴ Unfortunately the tenor of the debate has impeded the study of Barth's doctrine of analogy for the purpose, as Berkouwer says, of its place in Barth's total theology.⁶⁵

We submit that the primary purpose of analogy in the Dogmatics I and II is to oppose liberalism. As a result it creates in Barth's Dogmatics, along with his concepts of scientific theology, the Bible and epistemology, a growing repertoire of statements which without reference to the

⁶³Bouillard, Karl Barth, Vol. III, p. 208ff; Brunner op. cit., p. 127; Jung Young Lee, op. cit., p. 150.

⁶⁴Torrance, Theology in Reconstruction, London, SCM Press, 1965, p. 113ff; Berkouwer, op. cit., p. 186.

⁶⁵Berkouwer, op. cit., p. 190.

'Wholly Other' nevertheless stress the distinction between God and human, further re-enforcing a theology of transcendence in opposition to the nineteenth century.

(e)

Barth dismissed liberal christology and pneumatology ignoring as they did the proper scriptural understanding, as he perceives it, of the objective and subjective reality and possibility of revelation. Over against the nineteenth century, he investigates christology and pneumatology as mutually-related doctrines, God's freedom for man and man's freedom for God respectively. The first part of the doctrine of Christ, the Incarnation, considers the objective side, while the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, as the first part of pneumatology, investigates the subjective dimension.

Christology was vital to the nineteenth century as evident in its centrality in the dogmatic tasks and the focus of the biblical schools.⁶⁶ But its error was that it did not take Jn1:14 seriously enough⁶⁷ and in ignoring the starting point, - God's Word became a man - emphasized.

⁶⁶CF, Vol. I, SII, p.52; Life of Jesus accounts.

⁶⁷CD I/2, p.123, (KD, p. 135). "The Word was made flesh," Bible, p. II4.

only the second part of an indissolubly-connected formula. By-passing the objective reality and proceeding directly to the possibility of revelation, liberal theologians spoke primarily not of the fact of revelation of the Incarnate One but of Jesus as the pinnacle of creation, "as the revelation of the deepest and final reality of man."⁶⁸ This procedure, considering the objective possibility before and sometimes to the exclusion of the objective reality, produced a christology which was arbitrary. Such a theology, not heeding Holy Scripture, fashioned Jesus according to the needs and capacities of the human, leaving God's revelation bounded by anthropological structures. Man became superior to God and "the essence of such thought and language consists practically in man creating God for himself after his own image."⁶⁹

Barth corrects liberal theology in once again considering Jn 1:14 in its totality. Over against the claims of the nineteenth century to disclose the historical Jesus Barth approaches christology fundamentally as mystery.⁷⁰ His

⁶⁸CD I/2, p.12, (KD, p.14). CF, Vol II, S89, p.365, "... the appearance of Christ ... would have to be regarded as the completion of human nature."

⁶⁹CD I/2, p.6, (KD, p.7).

⁷⁰Ibid, S15-1, p. 122ff, (KD, p. 134ff).

is an attempt to understand the unio hypostatica of Chalcedon in which neither the divine nor the human nature is compromised in the miraculous union in the Incarnation, the latter being the starting-point for the mystery. Schleiermacher on the other hand expresses Christmas as a festivity which celebrates family, motherhood and children through the models of Christ and the Blessed Mother resulting in neglect of the deeper, far more important aspect of the Incarnation as mystery.⁷¹ Over against this, Barth's fidelity to John 1:14 insists that Word and flesh refer each to the other without the Word surrendering its divinity or flesh being compromised. At no point can Jesus be considered apart from the Word.⁷² In his preserving of the two natures, Barth combats the error perpetuated by the liberals that Jesus as historical figure was merely a continuum in the world process.⁷³

Barth's early writings on the Holy Spirit contain the seeds of fuller development in the doctrine of reconciliation. But whereas pneumatology will later provide the means

⁷¹Schleiermacher, Christmas Eve, Dialogue on the Incarnation, tran. by Terrence N. Tice, Richmond, John Knox Press, 1967, p.34ff.

⁷²CD I/2, S15.2.2, esp. p.149ff, (KD, p.163ff).

⁷³Ibid, p.134f, (KD, p.147f), Schleiermacher, CF, Vol. II, p.365f, and his christology generally, p.374ff, stressing historicity of Jesus.

to speak of positive relation between God and man as well as a realistic anthropology, initial attempts remain polemical and corrective to liberalism. Insisting on the Holy Spirit as uniquely the Spirit of God⁷⁴ Barth confronts Schleiermacher who spoke of the spirit common to all men.⁷⁵ In the Dogmatics the former engages in lengthy discussion of the third Person as the locus of true religion over against the anthropocentric attempts of the previous century.⁷⁶ Whereas Barth insists that "the Word is never apart from the Spirit"⁷⁷ liberalism ignored this indissoluble link between christology and pneumatology.

According to Barth, the other side of God's freedom for man is man's freedom for God, the subjective reality of revelation in the outpouring of the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of Christ. In this context the Christian is addressed by revelation in the cosmos to respond to the Word of God. Instead of finding the answer of the subjective reality and possibility of revelation in the Holy Spirit, liberalism

⁷⁴ Barth, "Der Heilige Geist und das christliche Leben," 1929, p.65f, in Zur Lehre vom Heiligen Geist, by Karl and Heinrich Barth, München Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1930, CD I/2, p.252, (KD, p.275).

⁷⁵ CF, S121, p.535.

⁷⁶ CD I/2, S17, p.280ff, (KD, p.304ff).

⁷⁷ Ibid, p.244, (KD, p.266).

thought it could find the answer in man himself and not the divinity of the Holy Spirit, thus once again by-passing revelation for the anthropological choice.

There is an element of tragicomedy in the development of neo-Protestantism. Its desire was to enforce the problem of man in his relation to God. But in its polemic, it unwittingly rejected the only branch on which it might have sat with honour . . . but it was so interested in man's freedom that it forgot the divinity of the Holy Spirit. At the outset the 'freedom from man's side' was still problematically confronted with a freedom from God's side. But logically the latter freedom was drawn in and sucked up by its opposite pole. Man came to be understood quite apart from all mystery or revelation.⁷⁸

Liberalism in its disregard of this second aspect of revelation, set the knowledge and life of faith in Christ as autonomous and separate from the knowledge and faith deriving from the Holy Spirit. It missed the insight that the Holy Spirit was the spirit of Jesus Christ. "By abandoning it, it opened the doors . . . to a recognition of all possible idols, . . ."⁷⁹

In his discussion of the reality of man's freedom in the doctrine of the Spirit, Barth strongly reinforced the fact

⁷⁸CD I/2, p.208-209, (KD, p.228).

⁷⁹Ibid, p. 252, (KD, p. 275).

that movement is from above to below. Remaining consistent to the analogies of faith and grace, he continues to hold that man on his own can do nothing, tenaciously interpreting Luther and rejecting the liberal anthropological possibilities.

There is no question of something in the divine act in revelation which emanates 'from man's side' but only of something which is 'directed' towards man! The fact that man's existence is involved does not mean that we can ascribe to man, . . . the role of autonomous partners or workmates with God co-operating in the work of revelation . . . We are concerned with the existence of man . . . only as an existence posited from God's side . . . The basis of it all is the divine movement towards man . . .⁸⁰

Although he is speaking of man Barth stresses the place of divine initiative in a reminder that "we are not free for God except in the Holy Spirit."⁸¹ From the human side he can speak only of depravity and helplessness. "He [Spirit] tells us that we could not do it ourselves, that of ourselves we are blind and deaf. To receive the Holy Spirit means an exposure of our spiritual helplessness."⁸² The result of the receiving of the Holy Spirit is our openness to receiving the revelation of God and the starting point for Barth's anthropology which is as yet little developed.

⁸⁰ Ibid, p. 235, (KD, p. 256).

⁸¹ Ibid, p. 243, (KD, p. 265f).

⁸² Ibid, p. 244, (KD, p. 266).

As the final part of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, believing and perceiving man, the one to whom God has been revealed, is addressed. Barth's anthropology reinforces all earlier doctrinal statements of movement from above to below through the grace of revelation.⁸³ Man is determined by revelation in which he understands the distinct realities of the divine and the human. "He [God] is not we, . . . He is God and we are men. He is in heaven and we are on earth . . . There is always this eschatological frontier between Him and us."⁸⁴

For the most part the confrontation with liberalism pervades the doctrines of christology and pneumatology in the Dogmatics I and II. Mindful of their errors, Barth's theology corrects the starting-point and criterion for interpretation used by his predecessors in the nineteenth century. Even where he posits the unique mutual relation of the doctrines of Christ and the Holy Spirit, Barth's insight is partially the result of continual examination of the liberal standpoint which neglected this indissoluble relationship between christology and pneumatology.

(f)

Barth's direct polemic against religion originated in the Römerbrief of 1919. As a human quest and possibility

⁸³Ibid, p. 364f, (KD, p. 400).

⁸⁴Ibid, p. 368, (KD, p. 405).

which ignores the grace of God, it is the last human frontier placing man at the centre and making him the possibility of all things.⁸⁵ As the supreme human limit, religion is a quest for meaning. The nineteenth century did not recognize the limitation that religion could lead only to man and not to God. Barth's critique is all-inclusive of the major nineteenth century thinkers:

Schleiermacher tried to find in religion as feeling the essence of theology, revelation being a definite impression which produces a definite feeling and then a definite religion. Then according to Hegel and D. F. Strauss, both Christian and natural religion are only a dispensable prototype of the absolute awareness of philosophy. . . . Then according to L. Feuerbach in particular, there is room only for natural religion and the illusory expression of the natural longing and wishes of the human heart. Then A. Ritschl taught that the Christian religion must be regarded as the revealed and true, because in it the supreme value of human life . . . its liberation from the world regarded as sensible nature, is most perfectly realized.⁸⁶

⁸⁵ Rom I, "Freiheit," Kapitel 7, p.181ff, Rom II, p. 211ff, Romans, "Freedom," Ch 7, p.229ff.

⁸⁶ CD I/2, p.290, (KD, p.316). Schleiermacher, Speeches, CF and Outline, all of which have been referred to with regard to Schleiermacher's use of feeling as the essence of theology, above, Ch I, p.19ff., Hegel, "On Philosophy" in On Art, Religion, and Philosophy, op. cit., p.266ff, "We must comprehend religion as philosophy . . ." and "The Positivity Essay," Part III, in E Th W, p.167-181, as there is one human nature there is one nature religion; Strauss, op. cit., see "Concluding Dissertation," p.757-784, esp. p.780f, "But mind having once taken occasion by this external fact, to bring under its

con't.....

The nineteenth century was wrong because it ignored the fact that it is the grace and faith of God which alone enable man to enter into relationship with God. This is the sin of unbelief for its centre of faith which is illusory, is man and not Jesus Christ. "The only ultimate and really serious determination for the believer is that which proceeds from Jesus Christ."⁸⁷ Liberal religion did not allow Jesus to be Lord, but assumed a singular authoritative position for itself:

The real catastrophe was that theology lost its object and revelation in all its uniqueness. And losing that, it lost the seed of faith with which it could remove mountains, even the mountain of modern humanistic culture. That it really lost revelation is shown by the very fact that it could exchange it . . . for the concept 'religion.'⁸⁸

⁸⁶ (con't) consciousness the idea of humanity as one with God, sees in the history only the presentation of that idea; the object of faith is completely changed; instead of a sensible, . . . fact, it has become a spiritual . . . idea, which has its confirmation no longer in history but in philosophy . . ."; Feuerbach Ess Chr, p.270, theology is anthropology, and Lectures, for full development of his concept of religion as nature religion, Lecture 3, p.90; "I find within myself the motive of nature religion," p.21, "My doctrine can be summed up in two words: Nature and man, and theology is anthropology and physiology;" Ritschl, Justification, S67, p.646-660, esp. p.648, "For the perfection meant by Jesus is that which distinguishes the Christian Life in general from the imperfection to be found in other religions," and S68, p.661-670, discussion of the principles of perfection in Christianity.

⁸⁷ CD, I/2, p.313, (KD, p.342).

⁸⁸ Ibid, p.294, (KD, p.320).

Over against 'religion' Barth proposes the theology of revelation. It is only through the revelation of God in Jesus Christ that the reconciliation of man with God is possible through the justifying grace which comes to man in the event of the God-man. There is no path from man to God, but only the irreversible one from God to man.

'Religion' produced two fundamental errors which include its treatment of Jesus and that of the Trinity respectively. Jesus came to be viewed as a historical figure only, the one in whom humanity realized its culmination. The anthropocentricity of 'religion' destroyed the mystery of Jesus which can be known only in the revelation of the Word of God. With regard to the Trinity, Schleiermacher treated this doctrine last because it is not an immediate utterance of the religious consciousness.⁸⁹ The theology of revelation on the other hand, guided as it is by the Bible, understands that God reveals Himself initially as the True God and therefore proceeds from this point.

Barth's polarization of religion and revelation is the result of his objection to liberalism. In turn this theology shows a clear demarcation between the human side and the divine and only from the latter can theology move in a unilateral direction.

⁸⁹Schleiermacher; CF, Vol. II, S170, p. 738.

(g)

Scripture reveals God as the One who loves in freedom. This guideline alone can serve as the basis for the discussion of the perfections of God.⁹⁰ The perfections of the deity must be related to His loving in freedom and cannot be the result of anthropological projections. Schleiermacher defined the perfections of God in relation to the feeling of dependence to Him at various stages of the religious self-consciousness.⁹¹ This religio-genetic attempt to interpret and discover the attributes of God from religious human self-consciousness results in error:

What is found is just what is sought, but only what is sought, viz., the gigantic reflections or projections of the human religious consciousness. What is found is man himself and as such on his supposed way to God which in reality is only the way to his own inner self.⁹²

God is a projected image corresponding to our feelings and the very existence of God's perfections is contingent on one's experiencing the appropriate feelings of religious self-consciousness which disclose specific perfections. This method was epitomized in Feuerbach for whom God is the measure of the

⁹⁰CD II/1, p. 322, (KD, p. 362).

⁹¹CF, Vol. I, p. 194, §50, 'All attributes which we ascribe to God are to be taken as denoting something special to God, but only something special in the manner in which the feeling of absolute dependence is to be related to Him.'

⁹²CD II/1, p. 339, (KD, p. 381).

species.⁹³ Barth wants to reverse the treating of these perfections anthropologically, so that God may remain God in his attributes. "A fully restrained and fully alive doctrine of God's attributes will take as its fundamental point of departure the truth that God is for us fully revealed and fully concealed in the self-disclosure."⁹⁴ This paradoxical principle of self-disclosure and self-concealment is the cornerstone for Barth's development of the doctrine of the perfections of God. According to Barth,

The unity of self-disclosure and concealment, of the knowability and unknowability of God, constitutes the biblical idea of the revelation of God, just as the unity of love and freedom constitutes the biblical idea of the being of God.⁹⁵

The perfections of the divine loving, grace, mercy, and patience, and related to these, holiness, righteousness and wisdom, speak of God's fellowship with humanity, whereas those of the divine freedom, unity, constancy and glory constitute His transcendence. Yet even in this heuristic distinction, they are mutually related, for in His transcendence God demonstrates His fellowship to the world.⁹⁶

⁹³ Feuerbach, *Ess Chr*, *passim*. In that Feuerbach can say that theology is anthropology, then what can be said of the species in the absolute degree is what can be attributed to God.

⁹⁴ *CD* II/1, p. 341, (*KD*, p. 384).

⁹⁵ *Ibid*, p. 343, (*KD*, p. 386).

⁹⁶ *Ibid*, p. 344, (*KD*, p. 387).

Based on the critique of the nineteenth century's approach, three differences result in Barth's treatment of the divine perfections. Firstly, as opposed to Schleiermacher's interest in attributes per se, and his concern to define omnipotence, omnicausality and others,⁹⁷ Barth treats the subject and predicate together, i.e., God as omnipotent, God as omnicausal, in an effort to relate them to the divine loving and freedom.⁹⁸

Second, Barth attacks Feuerbach's reversal of subject and predicate. When one proceeds from the predicates as does Feuerbach, the concepts become absolutized rather than the One to whom they belong. "The relation between subject and predicate is an irreversible one when it is a matter of God's perfections."⁹⁹ By reversing the attributes and thus becoming the "reflection of creaturely unities,"¹⁰⁰ the "mystery of God's majesty"¹⁰¹ is violated.

⁹⁷Schleiermacher, CF Vol. I, S54, p.211, S55, p.219.

⁹⁸CD II/1, S30, p.351 and S31, p.440, (KD, p. 394, 495).

⁹⁹CD II/1, p.448, (KD, p.504). See Feuerbach, Ess Chr, p.25, "The necessity of the subject lies only in the necessity of the predicate," p.14. "All attributes of the divine nature are, . . . attributes of the human nature."

¹⁰⁰CD II/I, (KD), loc. cit.

¹⁰¹Ibid, (CD & KD).

Thirdly, the perfections of God's eternity and omnipresence have been erroneously treated together by Schleiermacher and Kant as concepts of space and time.¹⁰² According to Barth, this choice to treat the two together is arbitrary and anthropological, and the error has occurred because time and space have been treated together in philosophy.¹⁰³ This approach not only subjects God to interpretation by philosophy, but also makes Him contingent on human limitations of space and time; this leads also to an overlapping of infinite and finite time and space. Contrary to this Barth directs us to view God as one, constant and eternal in Himself and His work. This is His freedom. In His unity He is omnipresent, in His constancy, omnipotent and in His eternity, glorious.¹⁰⁴ Thus Barth severs the traditional connections of space and time in dealing with the perfections of God and posits over against

¹⁰² Schleiermacher, CF, Vol. I, S50, p. 194ff, "All attributes are related to the feeling of absolute dependence," see p. 203, S52, eternity of God is related to the timelessness and temporal, and p. 206, S53, omnipresence is related to the spaceless and spatial. See also the dogmatics of the Kantian Wegscheider, treating space and time together as physical attributes of God, Institutiones, S63, p. 271ff. See also D. F. Strauss, Die christliche Glaubenslehre in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und im Kampfe mit der modernen Wissenschaft, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973, (written 1840,) S36, p. 548-563.

¹⁰³ CD II/1, p. 464-468, (KD, p. 522-527).

¹⁰⁴ Ibid, p. 441, (KD, p. 496f).

this the relation between unity and space, time and glory. As with other themes, Barth's approach to the attributes of God, despite the methodological invocation of the Kierkegaardian paradox, dramatically opposes liberal theology, the result of which is reflected in his dogmatic statements.

(h)

The doctrine of election and its completion in the doctrine of command (ethics), as the final part of the doctrine of God, depend on christology in order to be understood correctly. Related as it is to the attributes of God, election must adhere to the principle of the love of God as his grace and the freedom of God as his election. Barth does not direct a polemic against the liberal understanding of election but in his fundamental principle of relation to attributes we may assume that his doctrine is a reversal of the nineteenth century. Understandably Barth is more concerned with Calvin and Roman Catholic doctrines of election respectively as both developed more fully in this area than did liberalism.

However, his doctrine is not entirely without reference to liberalism. For Barth, it is indispensable to the correct understanding of election that any part of it, individual or community, (Israel and Church) be explicated with reference to the election of Jesus Christ and each other. The order of discussion is not important, but the nineteenth century was

the apotheosis of secular individualism in the theology of Schleiermacher, Kierkegaard and Stirner. The connection with Jesus became remote. "The only correction which is basically important is the recognition that the election of the individual must be discussed in the closest possible relation to the election of Jesus Christ and the election of the community of God."¹⁰⁵

Ethics is man's response to the electing grace of Jesus Christ, "The command directed to man."¹⁰⁶ Ethics is part of The Doctrine of God because only within the framework of the doctrine can the answer to the ethical question "the supremely critical question concerning the good . . . in human actions . . . be given."¹⁰⁷ As such ethics is related directly to man's life and thereby is related to dogmatics which also is directly related to man's life; otherwise, it is mere intellectual frivolity.¹⁰⁸ Ethics then, must be treated as part of dogmatics, and not as in the nineteenth century,

¹⁰⁵ CD II/2, p.309, (KD, p. 340).

¹⁰⁶ Ibid, p.512, (KD, p.567).

¹⁰⁷ Ibid, p.515, (KD, p.571).

¹⁰⁸ CD I/2, p.787f, (KD, p.881).

treated as something separate.¹⁰⁹

Treating ethics outside of dogmatics as did liberal theology results in treating the ethical command as human and not divine. In the case of Schleiermacher where religious emotions display themselves in activity (ethics)¹¹⁰ and Kant, whose categorical imperative is inner-determined,¹¹¹ these anthropocentric decisions are as such mere human decisions of behaviour, but they have nothing to do with the divine command. "What begins with the human self cannot end with the knowledge of God and His command. Nor can it end with the knowledge of the real man in his real situation."¹¹²

¹⁰⁹ CD II/2, p. 540-542; (KD, p. 600-603); and "The Command of God," CH VIII, CD II/2, p. 509-781, passim, (KD, p. 564-875), Schleiermacher, CF, Vol. I, "Christian Doctrine and that of Christian Morals have long been separated; and so here . . . we eliminate from the totality of the dogmatic material such propositions as are elements of the Science of Christian Morals." See also Vol II, p. 384-385, and Outline, S223, p. 79, Dogmatic. . . theology is divided into the theoretical side (dogmatics) and the practical side (ethics), but Schleiermacher goes on to say that the separation of the two is not essential; and he concurs with Barth that "rules of Christian life are also theoretical propositions," p. 79f.

¹¹⁰ CF, Vol I, p. 111.

¹¹¹ Kant, Groundwork, p. 70. See also Lectures on Ethics, tran. by Louis Infield, New York, Harper and Row, 1963, p. 36f.

¹¹² CD II/2, p. 541, (KD, p. 601).

There is one categorical imperative - Jesus Christ. That imperative alone is self-grounded, transcendent and unconditioned.¹¹³

The idea of the divine command is the idea of something which is incomprehensible to man of himself - that he is not his own master, and that it does not lie in his competence to think out and prescribe the rule under which he lives.¹¹⁴

Kant's attempt to equate the divine command with the anthropological rationally-determined idea of the good, while valid within the limit of some parallel, is in error by its claim that man can articulate or fathom God's command. Placing the ethical command with Jesus disqualifies all claims to a universal rule, a formula. We stand under one judgment and command, namely the divine, attested by the biblical witness.

In the final part of the doctrine of God, Barth continues to point out the errors of his immediate predecessors and correct their theology which in its secular individualism lost reference to Christ, now the centre of his doctrine of election.

At its root, Barth's polemic as it pervades the

¹¹³Ibid, p. 625, (KD, p. 726ff).

¹¹⁴Ibid, p. 666, (KD, p. 742).

Dogmatics I and II, confronts the fundamental understanding of the scientific theology of the nineteenth century. Consequently, the theology of the Word corrects and opposes the anthropocentric method. Not content to lay the polemic to rest at this level, Barth continues to contravene the specific errors in liberal theology as they resulted from the erroneous starting-point. In turn not only Barth's prolegomena but also his other dogmatic statements are a product of his anti-thetical engagement with liberalism.

In spite of the Word of God starting-point, Barth is not entirely successful in eradicating the methodological tools used by the previous century. The Kierkegaardian paradox is invoked and his epistemology has been judged as neo-Kantian. But the more predominant feature is the polemical style of Barth's work. In the development of every theme in the two doctrines he opposes the liberal standpoint and subscribes to another view over against his predecessors. Whereas the nineteenth century took the immanentist anthropocentric approach, Barth's is a theology of transcendence proceeding from the Word of God. As such his first two volumes of the Dogmatics may be described as a theology in opposition.

(ii)

Extra-dogmatic works

In the extra-dogmatic writings of the thirties we find a clue to the interpretation of the polemical nature and resultant theology of the Dogmatics I and II. In the former Barth blames liberalism for the growth of the Nazi and German Christian movements. In the same way that the endorsement of the liberals in 1914 affected Barth's attitude toward his teachers and had direct impact on his theology, so too in the 1930's there is an association between the abhorrent events of the time with their roots in liberal theology and Barth's polemical dogmatics.

From 1933-34, Barth's non-dogmatic works finger Schleiermacher and the liberals contending that the "doctrine and attitude of the German-Christians is nothing but a particularly vigorous result of the entire neo-Protestant development since 1700 . . ."¹¹⁵ The present problems of the church lie "in the existence of the Protestant modernism."¹¹⁶ The errors

¹¹⁵ Barth, "The Church's Opposition in 1933" in The German Church Conflict, Richmond, John Knox Press, 1967, C 1965, p. 16 from "Kirchliche Opposition 1933" in TH E H, Neue Folge, 49, p. 7, [neu-protestantische] a series in Karl Barth zum Kirchenkampf, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1956, originally in TH E H, 4, 1933.

¹¹⁶ Barth, Forward "God's Will and Our Wishes," in The German Church Conflict, p. 25 from "Gottes Wille und unsere Wünsche," in Karl Barth zum Kirchenkampf, TH E H, Neue Folge, 49, p. 15, originally TH E H, 7, 1934.

existing in the German Christian Church in 1934 originated with Schleiermacher and the nineteenth century and there is no tracing this back to Calvin or Luther.¹¹⁷ He spoke of the German Christians as a re-penetration of liberal theology in the Church¹¹⁸ and of the line running from neo-Protestantism to the slough of the German Christian movement of 1933.¹¹⁹ Further "I cannot see anything in German Christianity but the last, fullest and worst monstrosity of neo-Protestantism."¹²⁰ This whole terrible evolution, having its roots in Schleiermacher's modernist-Protestantism,¹²¹ culminated in Emil Brunner's support for natural theology,¹²² threatening as it did the foundations of the German Church in the 1930's.

¹¹⁷ Ibid, p. 27, Ger., p. 17.

¹¹⁸ Barth, Theological Existence Today! A Plea for Theological Freedom, tran. by R. Birche Hoyle, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1933, p. 66, from Theologische Existenz Heute, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1933, p. 31. [. . . einer liberalistischen Theologie.]

¹¹⁹ CD II/1, p. 633f, (KD, p. 714).

¹²⁰ Barth, "Abschied," ZZ, Vol. II, 1933, p. 539. [Ich kann in den Deutschen Christen nichts, aber auch gar nichts anderes sehen als die letzte, vollendetste und schlimmste Ausgeburt des neuprotestantischen Wesens.]

¹²¹ Barth, "No," in Natural Theology, London, Geoffrey Bles, Canterbury Press, 1946, p. 101, from "Nein!" Antwort an Emil Brunner, Th E H, 1934, #14, p. 37.

¹²² Ibid, p. 67f, 72, Ger., p. 4f, 8.

Coupled with his thrusting of the blame to liberal theology, there are in addition writings of a theological-political nature which in their opposition to worldly leaders who challenge divine leadership parallel the theme in Barth's dogmatic works and those of the twenties which place God over against man. Specifically it is the lordship of Jesus which is posited over against Hitler whose appearance in Germany and that of his followers of the German Christian Church represent in their politics and theology an abandonment of the lordship of Jesus Christ. Gerald Butler claims that "Barth opposed Nazism because the Nazis sought to make Hitler, not Jesus Christ, the Lord of the Church."¹²³ At all points in Barth's references to Hitler it is the latter's futile attempt as a temporal leader to usurp the absolute rule of the sovereign Lord which is condemned. Hitler's claims to power, as well as his installing of a Reichs-Bishop as the one, spiritual, authoritative leader modelled after the political leader was innocuous.¹²⁴ Over against this the church must recognize that it has and can have one leader only, Jesus Christ.¹²⁵ The freedom of the

¹²³Butler, op. cit., p. 457.

¹²⁴Barth, Theological Existence Today, 1933, p. 31f, Ger., p. 14f. [einem geistlichen autoritären Führer!]

¹²⁵Ibid, p. 45f, Ger., p. 21, (Leader - Führer). See also "The Confessing Church in National Socialist Germany," in German Church Conflict, p. 42, from "Bekennende Kirche im national-sozialistischen Deutschland," in Th E H, Neue Folge, 49, p. 31.

gospel can be assured only if Jesus is Lord.¹²⁶ The insistence on the singular and sovereign lordship of Jesus Christ which we believe is inspired by Barth's opposition to Hitler is common and central to three other works from 1933-1936. To affirm the first commandment which is the purpose of his "Das erste Gebot als theologische Axiom" is to recognize that Jesus the Lord is God which must in turn be held out to the Church as the sole biblical dictum.¹²⁷ And the Barmen Declaration which contained the official position of the German Confessing Church, the final draft for which Barth was responsible, contained as its central message, "the one Lord of the Church, Jesus Christ."¹²⁸ Barth's Credo of 1936 insists that the second article of the creed, Jesus is Lord, means Jesus is the only Lord.¹²⁹

¹²⁶"Für die Freiheit des Evangeliums," in Th E H, Heft 2, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1933, p. 4f; see also "Gottes Wille und unsere Wünsche," op. cit., p. 28f, "Our will must comply with the will of Jesus, the only Lord."

¹²⁷"Das erste Gebot als theologische Axiom," (1933) in Theologische Fragen und Antworten, Zollikon, 1957, p. 129f.

¹²⁸Barth to Agnes von Zahn, in Busch, KB, p. 247.

¹²⁹Credo, A Presentation of the Chief Problems of Dogmatics with Reference to the Apostles Creed, tran. by J. Strathern McNab, New York, Scribners, 1936, p. 51, and Ch VI, "Dominum Nostrum," from Credo, Die Hauptprobleme der Dogmatik dargestellt im Anschluss an das Apostolische Glaubensbekenntnis, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1936.

Finally there are other non-dogmatic writings which though not of a political nature further reinforce the theology of transcendence which opposes the anthropocentric theology of liberalism. In lectures to the Protestant Theological Faculty in France in 1934, Barth re-iterates the Kierkegaardian position that knowledge of God and man as described by revelation is knowledge "where the infinite differences between God and man becomes manifest."¹³⁰ This statement is made, like those in the Dogmatics, over against the condemnation of modernism which treats man as a 'free religious personality'¹³¹ and the Church as a "religious society"¹³² rather than a divinely elected event.¹³³ And in the Gifford Lectures in 1937-38 he spoke of God as a Person, that is the one different from us by virtue of his lordship. "Precisely as this Person He is Lord," is above us, the God of majesty, the hidden God."¹³⁴

¹³⁰ God in Action, tran. by E. G. Homrighausen and Karl J. Ernst, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1937, p. 12, from "Offenbarung, Kirche, Theologie," in Th E H, Heft 9, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, p. 19. See also, p. 10, Ger., p. 18.

¹³¹ Ibid, p. 22, Ger., p. 25.

¹³² Ibid, p. 21, Ger., loc. cit.

¹³³ Ibid, Ger., p. 24.

¹³⁴ The Knowledge of God and The Service of God According to the Teaching of the Reformation, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1938, p. 31, from Gotteserkenntnis und Gottesdienst nach reformatorischer Lehre, Zollikon, Verlag der Evangelischen Buchhandlung, 1938, p. 65. See also p. 31f, Ger., p. 65, on the radical difference of God as Person and the human as person.

When Magistrate A. Jäger was appointed State Commissar of the Prussian Church by Hitler Barth wrote that in spite of everything, theology and only theology must be done. We must go on "as if nothing had happened."¹³⁵ Contrary to this, all of Barth's writings indicate he was profoundly influenced by all that happened. His theological enterprise is coloured by his response to liberalism - from the polemic of the Dogmatics, the association made between Schleiermacher and Nazism, and the polarization of Hitler's rule and the sovereign transcendent lordship of Jesus. Barth did not proceed 'as if nothing had happened.' He interpreted the 1933 struggle as a re-emergence of events in 1914 both of which were rooted in liberalism. The enemy was again at the door in theological and political form and his dogmatic theology of 1932-42 could not be conciliatory toward nor resemble liberalism. Given the circumstances surrounding the writing of the Dogmatics I and II, circumstances about which Barth was intensely concerned as evidenced in his extra-dogmatic writings, we contend that the polemical nature and resultant theology of the Dogmatics is a response to liberalism. It is a theology which in its insistence on the transcendence of God and the human incapacity and weakness of man, is one in opposition to that of his predecessors.

¹³⁵ Theological Existence Today, op. cit., p. 9, Ger., p. 4.

Barth's unyielding and untiring opposition to the German Christians along with his refusal to take the oath of allegiance to Hitler earned him dismissal from the University of Bonn. He returned to Basle in 1935 where he uttered the cry - Resistance - a political and theological evocation for the two were inexorably bound in those days. He took up home guard duty and planned for further work on the Dogmatics and continued to affirm the lordship of Jesus over against any political ruler.¹³⁶

¹³⁶Barth, The Church and The War, tran. by Antonia H. Froendt, New York, Macmillan, 1944, p. 5, 7, 29, and passim.

CHAPTER IV

A Theology in Conciliation, Barth's Modified Polemic, 1942-1968

We have argued that up to 1942 Barth's theology is a response to liberalism, first in its immanentist anthropocentric viewpoint followed by an ambiguous tone and finally as a theology in opposition. Despite shifts in his attitude toward the nineteenth century, Barth's writings use the latter as a reference point. In this chapter we will continue to investigate Barth's relationship to liberalism which unfolds as a conciliatory one. There is firstly a much reduced polemic in the Dogmatics III and IV which will be addressed under the following headings of (a) creation (b) creature (c) angelology (d) incidental references. This will be followed by the documentation of Barth's acknowledgement of the contributions of liberal theology to be discussed under (a) sin (b) christology and (c) incidental references. As with the previous chapter the substance of his extra-dogmatic writings will be examined disclosing an attitude similar to the modified tone of the dogmatic works from 1942-1968. Finally we shall attempt to penetrate the reason for Barth's move from opposition to conciliation. Only when this modification has been substantiated can we proceed in the subsequent chapters to examine the impact on Barth's theological development.

(i)

Modified polemic of the Dogmatics

(a)

Upon completion of the first two volumes of the Dogmatics, Barth immediately began work on the doctrine of creation, a task approached with a waning of confidence. He would like to have entrusted the job to those more qualified "if only I could have had more confidence in their presuppositions."¹ The "Work of Creation" Volume III/1 proceeds from the scriptural-christological presupposition and in that starting-point opposes the anthropologically-determined doctrines of creation of the nineteenth century. But Barth's confrontation is less evident than before and his statements are not anti-thetical at all points.

At the outset Barth posits the key to creation in the person of Jesus Christ as Redeemer, Reconciler and Lord. Whereas Schleiermacher and his followers derived notions of creation from themselves, Barth holds that the doctrine of creation is one of faith, knowledge of which is grounded in Jesus Christ.² Faith proceeds from the Lord Jesus Christ who extends his

¹CD III/1, Preface, p. ix.

²Ibid, p. 8f, (KD, p. 7f). Schleiermacher, CE, Vol. I, S39, p. 148, and S40, p. 149f. "The religious consciousness which is here our basis [for creation] contradicts every origin of the world which excludes anything whatever from origination by God."

sovereignty over the whole of creation and thus "faith in Jesus Christ is this understanding [of the benevolence of the Creator] and as such it is a powerful instrument for the knowledge of the mystery of God the Creator."³

God's sovereignty over his creation, that is of all things distinct from Himself,⁴ must be understood as a series of events beginning with creation which in turn is a preparation for the covenant with its beginning and culmination in Jesus Christ. Over against the biblical schools which admitted only empirical fact, Barth posits the concept of saga whereby creation accounts can be treated as non-historical or pre-historical.⁵ In this way the accounts are not limited to historical documentation but also allow creation as pre-history to be understood as the wider divine vision and as such as a preparation for the covenant.

The indissoluble bond between creation and covenant is the basic vital premise of Barth's doctrine. The former comes first so that God's work may be done, and the covenant of grace which is really the basis and presupposition of creation can be seen to follow. Creation, as God's sovereign domain fashioned for his purpose, has as its goal the redemption of humanity and

³CD III/1, p. 41, (KD, p. 44).

⁴Ibid, p. 95, (KD, p. 104).

⁵Ibid, p. 82, (KD, p. 89f).

consummation of the world. Loss of the understanding of the creation-covenant bond leads to errors made by thinkers of the nineteenth century who by neglecting the covenant examined creation in relation to the human and did not grasp its goal. For Kant the purpose of the world was "a union of men under merely moral laws . . ." and according to I. A. Dorner "the end in view is a rich life of love and this constitutes the motive of creation."⁶

Beyond this Barth's development of the creation-covenant relation is an exegesis of Genesis 1 and 2. Neither direct references to liberalism nor a polemical tone pervades this work as with former Dogmatics, although insistence on the distinctness of God remains intact.

In his description of creation as benefit, actualization and justification, it is only with the first of these that Barth takes exception to the nineteenth century theology. The benefit aspect was ignored because the liberals did not understand the bond between creation and covenant. When this relation is perceived then creation in its preparation for the covenant between God and man must be understood as benefit.⁷ In his

⁶ Ibid, p. 42-71, (KD, p. 44-75). Religion, p. 86, Dorner, System, Vol II, p. 5. It is true in looking at Schleiermacher and Dorner for example that the bond between creation and covenant is not considered in inter-relation. They presuppose the origin of the world by God from the religious self-consciousness.

⁷ CD III/1, p. 334ff, (KD, p. 382ff).

explication of creation as actualization Barth holds that this implies creaturely reality is confirmed and rooted in the reality of God, not human self-consciousness, although Barth makes no direct reference to the nineteenth century.⁸ Similarly in his rendering of the justifying aspect of creation, that is its goodness, Barth in his insistence on the revelatory starting-point, makes no reference to the errors of the nineteenth century.⁹

In these few references are constituted the polemic against liberalism in its entirety in the Doctrine of Creation III/1.

(b)

Of all Barth's dogmatic works one would anticipate the strongest and most developed polemic to pervade "The Creature," Volume III/2. The anthropocentricity of liberalism resulted in its most abhorrent theological error, namely the deification of man at God's expense. Whereas the nineteenth century spoke of relative distinctions between divine and human, it was incumbent upon Barth to restore the absolute difference. Such a polarization between liberal and Barthian anthropology is absent and only a few items, which we shall examine, are of polemical nature.

⁸ Ibid, p. 350ff, (KD, p. 401ff).

⁹ Ibid, p. 369, (KD, p. 422).

Whereas liberal theology was itself anthropology and spoke incorrectly of Christ and the human, Barth claimed that one can proceed to anthropology only from christology.¹⁰ Jesus Christ is the ground of the creature and this the nineteenth century forgot. Ignoring the starting-point the liberals attempted to understand the human from other disciplines such as biology, physiology and psychology. Such a view is incomplete:

When it is simply a question of man as a phenomenon - an exact science as such can go no further - there can be no perception of man as the creature and covenant-partner of God, and therefore of his true reality and essence, and the task of theological anthropology is thus untouched.¹¹

The attempts therefore of Feuerbach and others to know man from the anthropological and physiological viewpoints are rejected.¹² Theological anthropology alone is equipped to understand that the essence of human reality is at once its combined sinfulness and covenant-partnership with God.¹³

Similarly there is the Kantian error which posits autonomous rational nature, over against which Barth claims that biblical anthropology discloses that to be human implies a

¹⁰CD III/2, p. 44, (KD, p. 50), CD I/I, p. 131, (KD, p. 135).

¹¹CD III/2, p. 26, (KD, p. 28).

¹²Ibid, (CD & KD), Feuerbach, Lectures, p. 21, p. 90f.

¹³CD III/2, "Man as an Object of Theological Knowledge," p. 19-54, (KD, p. 20-63).

a number of things - rationality, percipience and activity none of which are autonomous but are derived from and grounded in Jesus Christ. Thus Kant's claim that the categorical imperative has its source in the human must be overturned to state that the categorical imperative is the result of God's acting on man.¹⁴

In contradistinction to Hegel who claims that man has the potential to be spirit, Barth claims that "man exists because he has spirit".¹⁵ According to Barth, man has spirit because he is soul and body, and is humanly determined and constituted by God whose spirit comes to him as an act of God. But man himself is not Spirit, for that would be to call him God. "To call man spirit . . . as modern theology likes to do, especially in the school of Hegel, always involves at least an indirect identification of man with God, or must sooner or later lead to such identification."¹⁶

The nineteenth century made the further mistake of trying to understand not only man but also the cosmos from the anthropological viewpoint. Liberal theologians adopted philosophical world-views, such as the Kantian and Hegelian, to

¹⁴Ibid, p. 402ff, 421, (KD, p. 481ff, 505f), Kant, Groundwork, p. 70.

¹⁵CD III/2, p. 344, (KD, p. 414).

¹⁶Ibid, p. 354, (KD, p. 425).

understand the cosmos. Mingling the world-view with faith, evident in Schleiermacher, is incongruous for the two are not necessarily compatible. Knowledge of the cosmos as of the creature, can come only from its source, Jesus Christ, Lord and Creator of the cosmos.¹⁷

A further truncated view held in the nineteenth century resulted because philosophy or the human sciences cannot disclose that humanity implies fellowship. This error was classically represented in Nietzsche whose philosophy posited humanity in the lone individual.¹⁸ According to Barth, "A humanity without the fellow man will necessarily be abandoned as inhuman at the very first step."¹⁹ Jesus Christ, as the basis of anthropology, reveals that He is man, fully and real man, because He is man for other men.²⁰

¹⁷Ibid, p. 10f, (KD, p. 9f). See Schleiermacher, CF, Vol. I, S62, p. 259, the concepts of sin and grace are viewed philosophically as antithetical, and Vol. I, S39, esp. p. 148, his understanding of the relation between God and the world is rooted in the religious self-consciousness, and Vol. I, S40, p. 149, Schleiermacher sees God as Creator but knowledge of same derives from religious consciousness. Dörner, System, Vol. II, p. 22, knowledge of the origin of the world is related to the religious consciousness.

¹⁸Nietzsche, Ecce Homo, tran. by Walter Kaufmann, New York, Vintage Books, 1969; for some examples of this emphasis on self, p. 217, 253.

¹⁹CD III/2, p. 229, (KD, p. 273).

²⁰Ibid, S45.1, p. 203ff, (KD, p. 242ff).

With the exception of these few general comments, Barth's discussion of theological anthropology is free of negative overtones, either directly or implicitly.

(c)

With regard to the dogmatic works from 1950 onwards, the only section Barth develops in diametrical opposition to liberalism is that of angelology.²¹ The quarrel here is not strictly a doctrinal one but instead he faults the nineteenth century for its not taking angels seriously. Barth concedes the doctrine has no content of its own, for unlike God and humans, 'autonomous',²² creatures, the angels are not autonomous. They are to be seen in relation to something else, specifically as messengers of God. But even as marginal figures, they perform a ministry in the divine action of Jesus Christ. They cannot be documented historically in the historical-critical sense, but angels belong as part of the saga of creation.²³

The nineteenth century ignored or lightly treated angels. D. F. Strauss dismissed them.²⁴ For Schleiermacher,

²¹ CD III/3, S51, p. 369-531, (KD, p. 426-623).

²² Ibid, p. 371, (KD, p. 428).

²³ Ibid, p. 374, (KD, p. 432).

²⁴ Ibid, p. 413, (KD, p. 480). See D. F. Strauss, Die christliche Glaubenslehre, p. 661-675.

the reality of angels is questionable. Their existence is assumed in scripture but nothing is taught concerning them. Angels do not enter into the sphere of Christian doctrine proper, and whether they exist or not has no influence on one's conduct.²⁵ Dorner's attitude may be surmised in his treating of angels as an appendix. He acknowledges that angels are attested by scripture, although angelology lacks complete dogmatic verification. However Dorner presses for the retention of angelology because it involves no contradiction and because it opens up to the Christian spirit, that is, combats a complete this-worldly, fully human world.²⁶

In these attitudes of tolerance, in the case of Schleiermacher, and incorrect understanding of the role of angels, in the case of Dorner, lie the reasons for Barth's critique of the liberal approach toward angelology. The nineteenth century has not paid attention to the biblical message. Where the Bible was not altogether clear and explicit, there was need for probing and the liberals allowed themselves to be halted. Unlike Barth who makes extensive use of the biblical references in his development of the doctrine of angels,²⁷

²⁵CD III/3, p. 413-414, (KD, p. 480f). CF, Vol. I, S42 and S43, p. 156-60.

²⁶Dorner, System, Vol. II, S44, p. 96, p. 100.

²⁷CD, III/3, p. 499ff, (KD, p. 586ff).

this neglect by the liberals prevented them from either affirming or denying angels completely:

This, then, is the angelology of the shrug of the shoulders, . . . , which is a necessary consequence when an attempt is made in this matter to do something other than that which is alone possible in theology.²⁸

For the most part Barth's is an exegetical development of the doctrine of angels and his castigation of the liberals concerns their lack of seriousness in treating angels.

(d)

The balance of the Dogmatics contains merely incidental references of a polemical nature to liberalism and these have negligible impact on Barth's doctrinal positions. He develops the doctrine of divine providence in relation to creation as the unique act of the lordship of God, rejecting attempts to interpret providence from any philosophy of history such as that used by Hegel.²⁹ In his treatment of the divine accompanying as one aspect of providence, Barth holds that one can speak of a correspondence between God's activity in the universe and that of man's, but this cannot be done through the presuppositions of ontological similarity between divine and human as the nine-

²⁸ Ibid, p. 418, (KD, p. 486). However Wegscheider considers the biblical and ecclesiastical treatment of angels, Institutiones, S101, p. 383ff.

²⁹ CD III/2, p. 22, (KD, p. 24).

teenth century taught.³⁰ Yet his positing of the analogia operationis not only corrects the liberal position but also contains the means to speak realistically of the Creator and creature as will be seen in Chapter V.

Barth presents special ethics,³¹ accompanied by biblical references, as a second branch of the doctrine. Having dealt with the first, the command of God, which included an extensive polemic against liberalism,³² Barth describes special ethics as a person's real-life response to the command of God. It is the subjective response to the objective divine command, the latter of which the nineteenth century ignored because of its subjective individualistic inner-determining of the ethical viewpoint. This led to the kind of errors Ritschl made when he could see no need of the distinction between homage to God and homage to man.

[Ritschl] could see no place nor necessity for an activity specifically directed to God apart from the general respect paid to His general position . . . And this prohibition played no small part in giving Ritschlian theology such a notable miserable character.³³

³⁰ Ibid., p. 90-154, (KD, p. 102-175).

³¹ CD III/4.

³² CD III/2.

³³ CD III/4, p. 48, (KD, p. 52). Ritschl, Instruction in the Christian Religion, tran. by Alice Mead Swing in The Theology of Albrecht Ritschl, by Swing, New York, Longmans, Green, 1901, S6, p. 175, and fn 61. Love is a universal law applied to God and neighbour. Love for God is not separate from love for one's neighbour. Also S78, p. 265 and fn 781; purpose of worship is fulfilment of an individual need and unity of the community.

Over against this Barth insists that specific duties be paid to the Lord, such as observance of the Holy Day, confession and prayers.³⁴

The final volume of the Dogmatics constitutes the culmination of the development of Karl Barth's theology. His polemical engagement with liberalism is virtually absent from this work. He makes a few negative references to the nineteenth century - to its inadequate christology³⁵ and anthropocentric theology.³⁶ In A Fragment, Volume IV/4, Barth upholds the view that baptism changes one due to the Holy Spirit and not because of any innate capacity as held by Schleiermacher.³⁷ Although the latter's ecclesiology is generally correct, it fails to account for the Church in its three dimensions. While acknowledging its invisibility, that is the unseeable presence of the Holy Spirit on earth in its totality, and its visibility, Schleiermacher referred to one dimension of the latter, namely its earthly-historical form of existence, whereas this must be

³⁴ CD III/4, S53, p. 47ff, (KD, p. 51ff).

³⁵ CD IV/1, p. 181-183, (KD, p. 197-199); CD IV/2, p. 82-85, (KD, p. 89-91); CD IV/3/1, p. 72f, (KD, p. 78-80).

³⁶ CD IV/3/2, p. 498, (KD, p. 572).

³⁷ CD IV/Fragment, p. 26, (KD, p. 29); Schleiermacher, CF, Vol. I, p. 631.

treated as two-fold. It is visible firstly in its presence alongside other churches, but also as the Christian Church with its own creed and worship, it displays a "very special visibility."³⁸

Compared to the first two volumes of the Dogmatics, Barth's polemic, both in tone and direct references against liberalism, is appreciably reduced. In addition the objections are less developed in the doctrines of creation and reconciliation and do not significantly affect doctrinal statements. It is not simply that there is a lack of dogmatic material from the nineteenth century which explains the demise of the confrontation. There are many opportunities to continue the opposition, for example in the detailed exposition of man as soul and body³⁹ ignored by the liberals, as well as Schleiermacher and Kant's respective ecclesiologies the origin of which is rooted in human fellowship⁴⁰ and an ethical commonwealth⁴¹ as against Barth's christological-pneumatological foundation.⁴² In addition there is the latter's discussion of the Christian life of faith, love and hope grounded in the

³⁸CD IV/1, p. 654, see p. 650ff, (KD, p. 726ff); CF, Vol. II, p. 676f.

³⁹CD III/2, S46, p. 325ff, (KD, p. 391ff).

⁴⁰CF, Vol. II, S113, p. 525 and S115, p. 532.

⁴¹Religion, p. 85ff, esp. p. 87f, 90.

⁴²CD IV/3/2, p. 759, (KD, p. 868f).

Spirit⁴³ unlike the liberal concept which saw religious life as activity originating in piety.⁴⁴ Compared to the Dogmatics I and II, which confronted liberalism at every turn, the doctrines of creation and reconciliation exhibit a substantially reduced polemic. This modification comprises one aspect of Barth's attitude of conciliation toward the nineteenth century.

(ii)

Acknowledgement of contributions

More striking, though less apparent, than the demise of the polemic is Barth's acknowledging from about 1950 onwards in the Dogmatics the merits and contributions of liberal theology. In themselves the acknowledgements do not directly affect Barth's theological statements significantly. Their importance lies in the fact that they indicate an unprecedented change of attitude which in turn affected his theological development. In addition it is surprising that he points to the merits of liberalism in the areas of sin and christology, both of which were the major focus of his corrective task. For Barth, sin was that which was forgotten by his predecessors when they erroneously viewed the difference between Christ and man as relative rather than absolutely and infinitely distinct.

⁴³CD IV/1, S63, p. 740ff, (KD, p. 826ff), CD IV/2, S68, p. 727ff, (KD, p. 825ff), CD IV/3/2, S73, p. 902ff, (KD, p. 1035ff).

⁴⁴Speeches, p. 27ff.

(a)

Sin constitutes the radical distinction between God and man⁴⁵ and Barth criticized Schleiermacher's positing of sin as that which indicated a relative difference between God and man.⁴⁶ Sin for Schleiermacher was merely that which arrested the free development of the God-consciousness.⁴⁷ Yet in his lengthy discussion of nothingness and sin in 1950 and 1953⁴⁸ Barth in unprecedented fashion points to the contributions of Julius Müller and Schleiermacher on this doctrine.

In 1868 Julius Müller published The Christian Doctrine of Sin in two volumes, a work which Barth applauds for its critique of the current doctrines of sin. Barth refers to Müller's work as "the most significant literary work which has as yet been devoted to this difficult theme."⁴⁹ Throughout the two volumes, Müller refers critically to various doctrines of sin in the nineteenth century with special attention given to

⁴⁵Rom I, p. 128ff, Rom II, p. 145ff, Romans, p. 167ff, CD I/1, p. 410, (KD, p. 431).

⁴⁶CD I/1, p. 410, (KD, p. 431).

⁴⁷CF, Vol. I, S66, p. 271, and S67, p. 273, the latter refers to the presence of sin indicating the God-consciousness has not fully emerged.

⁴⁸CD III/3, S50, "God and Nothingness," p. 289-368, (KD, p. 327-425), and CD IV/1, S60.1, "The Man of Sin in the Light of the Obedience of the Son of God," p. 358-413, (KD, p. 395-458).

⁴⁹CD III/3, p. 312, (KD, p. 355). See also PT, p. 588f, Ger., p. 535f.

Schleiermacher and Hegel.⁵⁰ Yet Müller's own understanding of the problem does not lead him to any better solution. Like Hegel, Schleiermacher and others, Müller views sin as a human, this-worldly phenomenon, knowledge of which is possible through human efforts. For Müller, sin is a phenomenon among other phenomena, and not as part of the phenomena of nothingness.⁵¹ It is nothingness, the 'reality' opposing God which is overcome in the Incarnation and Redemption, the most important part of this reality being the sin of man and this was ignored by the liberals.⁵² Müller erroneously grounds the knowledge of sin in the moral law and not Jesus Christ, the ground of all knowledge.⁵³ However, as Barth says, "We may ignore these doubtful features in Müller's exposition in view of the fact that he so sharply perceived and propounded the problem itself and that he was the first and only scholar of his day to do so."⁵⁴

. . . the most outstanding and enduring significance of his work is that he confronts this dark stain nothingness on the psychological, sociological and historical picture of man with

⁵⁰Müller, Sin, Vol. I and Vol. II, passim, see Vol. I, Ch. 3, p. 341-359, "Schleiermacher," and Ch. 4-6, p. 390-407, "Hegel."

⁵¹CD III/3, p. 313, (KD, p. 356). Müller, Sin, Vol. I, p. 28.

⁵²CD III/3, p. 305, (KD, p. 346f).

⁵³Ibid, p. 313, (KD, p. 356f), Müller, Sin, Vol. I, p. 30.

⁵⁴CD III/3, p. 313, (KD, p. 356).

greater thoughtfulness, perplexity, and alarm, that he investigates and explores this sphere with greater thoroughness and that he weighs and evaluates the dialectic and limitation of the various ancient and modern theories with greater exactitude not only than his contemporaries but also than most of the representatives of the earlier tradition.⁵⁵

Following a lengthy synopsis of Schleiermacher's doctrine of sin,⁵⁶ Barth states that his predecessor's "teaching is untenable as a whole and thus contains much that is obscure and artificial."⁵⁷ Schleiermacher's doctrine contains a number of deficiencies - an inadequate christology which in turn affects the doctrine of sin by failing to see it as the radical rather than relative distinction between God and man; sin is viewed subjectively in the consciousness theology, wherein sin and the consciousness of sin (and grace) are equated; and the philosophical framework of antithesis is at the basis of the doctrine, rather than the biblical-theological. "But it is true that merely to indicate the failings of his teaching is insufficient."⁵⁸ In fact, Schleiermacher's teachings have "certain definite and positive merits."⁵⁹ Despite the errors, sin was real for

⁵⁵ Ibid, (KD, p. 357).

⁵⁶ Ibid, p. 319-323, (KD, p. 365-370), and CD IV/1, p. 376-378, (KD, p. 415-418).

⁵⁷ CD III/3, p. 323-324, (KD, p. 370).

⁵⁸ Ibid, p. 324, (KD, p. 370).

⁵⁹ Ibid, (CD & KD).

Schleiermacher and he was right in describing God as its author.⁶⁰ Schleiermacher saw the reality of nothingness and correctly related nothingness and redemption.⁶¹ According to Barth, "Schleiermacher has here made a contribution to the apprehension of sin and nothingness which we usually seek in vain even in orthodox theology."⁶²

As a result of these merits, Barth claims that Schleiermacher's concept of sin has possibilities unrealized by the latter where the understanding of sin and grace, as part of his general theology of self-consciousness, could be successfully reworked as aspects of the subjective reality and possibility in the theology of the Holy Spirit.⁶³

He believes Schleiermacher's doctrine correctly carries with it a concept of sin which involves corporate and individual act and guilt. This is not a passive inherited form of the human condition but rather sin carries actual consent as voluntary action.⁶⁴

⁶⁰ Ibid, p. 327, (KD, p. 374); CF, Vol. I, S79, p. 325, S80, p. 326.

⁶¹ CD III/3, p. 326, (KD, p. 373); CF, Vol. I, p. 326-330.

⁶² CD III/3, p. 327, (KD, p. 375).

⁶³ Ibid, p. 324, (KD, p. 370f). See further account CD, IV/1, p. 376f, (KD IV/1, p. 415-417).

⁶⁴ CD III/3, p. 325, (KD, p. 372), CF, Vol. I, S69, p. 279, p. 281.

Furthermore according to both, punishment is real.⁶⁵ Of Schleiermacher's concept of sin, Barth can say:

It is considerable testimony both to the formal originality and material value of Schleiermacher's conception that, though its rejection is patently necessary, this cannot be accomplished without conceding its great merit and following up as it were some of its insights If we look closely the objections present themselves as a vast complex which curiously enough confronts us at the exact point where we cannot but first and foremost acknowledge and admire his positive achievements. In other words, he is extremely weak where he is so very strong; he is catastrophically wrong where he is most convincingly and instructively right.⁶⁶

Despite Barth's praise of Müller and Schleiermacher, he continues to reject the unbiblical doctrines of sin, as well as Wegscheider's view of man's inherent rational ability to rise above sin⁶⁷ and Kant's failure to disclose the source of his knowledge with regard to radical evil.⁶⁸ For Ritschl, sin "can be understood as the contrary of . . . the highest moral good."⁶⁹ It is developed as part of the doctrine of ethics in which knowledge of sin reaches peculiar expression in Christianity for

⁶⁵CD III/3, p. 325, (KD, p. 373), CE, Vol. 1, p. 290(4).

⁶⁶CD III/3, p. 326, (KD, p. 373).

⁶⁷CD IV/1, p. 374, (KD, p. 414). Wegscheider, Institutiones, p. 420-451. Although Wegscheider uses Scripture extensively, see S118, p. 447ff.

⁶⁸CD III/3, p. 314, (KD, p. 357), Religion, Book 1, p. 40ff.

⁶⁹Ritschl, Justification, p. 329, and Instruction in the Christian Religion, p. 205.

here "there obtain ideas of God, of the supreme good, of the moral destiny of man, . . . , different from those . . . in any other religion."⁷⁰ Barth condemns not only this non-biblical rendering but also the treatment of sin and Christianity as mere historical phenomena.⁷¹

Whereas we might have anticipated much admonition from Barth in this area, we are struck by his mellowed attitude of acknowledging merits in the nineteenth century doctrines of sin.

(b)

Although he does not deal with the topic at length, Barth points to the contributions of liberalism in the area of christology, a direction which could hardly have been anticipated in earlier works. In 1953 he remarks there is some truth in Schleiermacher's christology in that from the revelation of Jesus we may understand something of the relation between the being of Christ and that of man, provided the revelatory starting point is used.⁷² He applauds Schleiermacher's correct understanding of the roles of Jesus as kingly and priestly, showing fidelity to the early Church.⁷³ And on a broader scale

⁷⁰Justification, p. 328.

⁷¹CD IV/1, p. 381-383, (KD, p. 421-423).

⁷²Ibid, P. 49, (KD, p. 51f).

⁷³CD IV/3/1, p. 6, (KD, p. 4f); CF, Vol. II, S102, p. 438.

Barth acknowledges that the errors of liberalism belong to a whole history of doctrinal development and should be viewed in that perspective.⁷⁴

(c)

Despite Barth's criticism that liberal theology ignored the two-fold aspect of ethics as the command of God and the response of the Christian, he points to certain insights which are laudable. There is firstly Schleiermacher's depth of dealings and knowledge with regard to ethics.⁷⁵ His understanding of the role of the male and female, epitomized in marriage, concurs in many ways with Barth's views. For both, the male-female relationship is necessary for humanity's growth, for full development. Marriage allows for the growth and completeness of the man and woman. It is full-life partnership and implies social interaction not allowing the couple to retreat from the world.⁷⁶ But whereas for Barth, personal development is realized in the unique and individual growth of each through the other, for Schleiermacher it implies identity of thought and feeling.⁷⁷ For the former, neither must become a law unto each other but

⁷⁴ CD IV/2, p. 84f, (KD, p. 89f).

⁷⁵ CD III/4, p. 122, (KD, p. 134).

⁷⁶ Ibid, (CD & KD), See also p. 225, (KD, p. 252f).

⁷⁷ Ibid, p. 190, (KD, p. 213), See "Introduction," by Tice, to Schleiermacher's Christmas Eve, p. 9.

"Both have perhaps to learn in a marriage how to have one, -- another in . . . freedom."⁷⁸

Barth applauds Schleiermacher's regard for women apparent in Christmas Eve, in which womanhood is celebrated and motherhood is described in terms of Mary's relation to the child Jesus.⁷⁹

Although Schleiermacher's preoccupation with womanhood is unusual;

It is not for us to criticize or judge. There have always been far too many male or masculine theologians. And in Schleiermacher, for all our reservations, we can learn so much with regard to the understanding of women and the whole question of sex-relationship . . . What is beyond doubt is that it makes Schleiermacher more interesting and loveable than the majority of those who despise him.⁸⁰

Supplementary to the statements regarding doctrine, Barth indicates a change in his view of the place of Schleiermacher in the history of theology. In 1922 Barth refused to place Schleiermacher in the line running back through Kierkegaard to Luther and Calvin and to Paul and Jeremiah:

And to leave nothing unsaid I might explicitly point out that this ancestral line -- which I commend to you does not include Schleiermacher. With all due respect to the genius shown in his work, I cannot consider Schleiermacher a good teacher in the realm of theology . . . I ask only that they do not appeal both to Schleiermacher and the Reformers, . . .⁸¹

⁷⁸CD III/4, p. 191, (KD, n. 213).

⁷⁹Schleiermacher, Christmas Eve, p. 36, 48 and "Christmas Themes," p. 35ff.

⁸⁰CD III/4, p. 155, (KD, p. 171f).

⁸¹Barth, "The Task of the Ministry," p. 195f, Ger. p. 164.

Yet in 1953, Barth refers to Schleiermacher and the Reformers' correct treatment in the doctrine of reconciliation of regeneration (conversion and justification) and sanctification in that order.⁸² In faith man is first justified making him a potential covenant-partner followed by and preparing for the sanctification of love in which the partnership is actualized.

Along with the modification of his criticisms, these concessions to the merits of liberalism further strengthen the pattern of Barth's conciliatory attitude toward his predecessors. Though not extensive, his recognition of their contributions is a key to a new spirit of accord with the liberals.

(iii)

Extra-dogmatic works

In the same way that the extra-dogmatic writings from 1932-42 displayed an opposition to liberalism in a fashion resembling the polemical tone of the Dogmatics, conciliation pervades these two branches of the Barthian opus from 1942 onwards. The tenor of the conciliatory tone in the extra-dogmatic works is one which not only salutes the merits of the nineteenth century as in the Dogmatics III and IV, but also probes liberal theology for points of contact with his own positions.

⁸²CD IV/1, p. 108, (KD, p. 117), CF, Vol. II, S106, p. 476 and S107, p. 478.

In this section we shall examine articles which appeared from 1956 to 1968, namely, "The Humanity of God," "Evangelical Theology in the Nineteenth Century," "Liberal Theology: Some Alternatives," and "Postscript."

Barth's 'change of direction' to evangelical theology is one "not in opposition to but none the less in distinction from an earlier age."⁸³ The description of his evangelical theology in 1962 as that which is faithful to Scripture and the Reformation,⁸⁴ echoes his earlier investigation of nineteenth century theology as evangelical, that is, theology "informed by the gospel of Jesus Christ as heard in Holy Scripture."⁸⁵ Furthermore this new theological direction is one which focuses on the positive relation between God and man, of "God with us,"⁸⁶ a position which recalls the explication of nineteenth century evangelical thought as the "science and doctrine of the commerce and communion between God and man."⁸⁷ Barth pays tribute to the theologians of the nineteenth century, scholars, conscientious,

⁸³"The Humanity of God," p. 37, Ger., p. 3.

⁸⁴ET, p. 5, Ger., p. 11.

⁸⁵"Evangelical Theology in the Nineteenth Century," p. 11, Ger., p. 3.

⁸⁶ET, p. 12, Ger., p. 18.

⁸⁷"Evangelical Theology in the Nineteenth Century," loc.cit. (Eng. and Ger.)

pious men deserving our highest respect and our ear.⁸⁸ Their theology gave new insights into the Christian religion and illuminated the historical phenomena which set it apart from other religions "This is the merit and achievement of this theology."⁸⁹

In "Liberal Theology" Barth looks at the potential in three liberals, namely, Biedermann, Schleiermacher, and Ragaz, and a fourth in the succession of Feuerbach, namely Buber. What may be retrieved in Biedermann, despite his Hegelian route which could be tolerated as a necessary evil, is his always keeping the limitations of the finite in mind coupled with his approach to Christian doctrine in which the true principle of the sonship of Jesus of Nazareth could unfold. In Schleiermacher's work, Barth holds the liberals have overlooked what may be the real fruits of the modern father's contributions, namely a theology of the third article of the Creed, a valid and justifiable pneumatology. Whereas Barth's critique had attacked the ego-centricity of liberalism, classically represented in Nietzsche, this stands corrected in Buber's I-Thou alongside of Ragaz's social consciousness which even within the errant anthropocentric theology, represents a move away from individualistic concerns.

⁸⁸Ibid, p. 16f, Ger., p. 8; CD IV/2, p. 11, (KD, p. 10).

⁸⁹"Evangelical Theology in the Nineteenth Century," p. 28, Ger., p. 19.

From one who formerly had opposed liberal theology at every turn we now hear, "I would certainly not recommend to my liberal friends the way of inertia, of renouncing all further effort and simply drifting on, . . ."⁹⁰

His "Postscript" in 1968, an afterward to a selection of Schleiermacher's writings, is testimony to the commanding presence of the latter who is "a not unimportant segment in the course of my own life."⁹¹ The relationship between the two theologians is a complex one evoking from Barth both a theological quarrel and human admiration. The latter recalls his attitude from 1916 onwards when his going it "without Schleiermacher" implied a sharp "against him,"⁹² the bitter comments of these earlier times now being cause for lament.⁹³ But even when the distance between the two was widening, the love remained,⁹⁴ allowing now for a different perspective. Barth suggests that even at the apex of the confrontation, he never considered himself finally done with Schleiermacher.⁹⁵ Granted

⁹⁰"Liberal Theology," p. 219, Ger., p. 101.

⁹¹"PS," p. 117, Ger., p. 290.

⁹²Ibid, p. 122, Ger., p. 296

⁹³Ibid, p. 118, Ger., p. 291.

⁹⁴Ibid, p. 123, Ger., p. 297.

⁹⁵Ibid, p. 122, Ger., p. 296.

the two are at odds but with reservations, ' a genuine uncertainty.'⁹⁶ But "The door" is in fact not latched. I am actually to the present day not finished with him. Not even with regard to his point of view."⁹⁷ The position we are maintaining in this thesis regarding the continuous response of Barth to Schleiermacher and the liberals is articulated in the following statement:

Through my probings into Schleiermacher, I also learned to appreciate from afar certain matters where I stood (or again came?) much closer to him theologically than I had ever supposed could be the case after 1916.⁹⁸

The spirit of renewal recognized, Barth examines areas to recover in Schleiermacher what may constitute common ground for both.⁹⁹ Firstly, is Schleiermacher attempting a theology concerned with preaching and pastoral care, a theology unfortunately clothed in the garment of philosophy, or is Schleiermacher's theology truly philosophy? If the former is the case, intentions are the same; if the latter, he can have nothing to do with the liberal theologian. Secondly, is the relation between God and man as represented in Schleiermacher one in which there is a superior Being or is he positing a unity of being, a relative

⁹⁶ Ibid, p. 131, Ger., p. 307.

⁹⁷ Ibid, (Eng. and Ger.).

⁹⁸ Ibid, p. 123, Ger., p. 297.

⁹⁹ Ibid, p. 131-133, Ger., p. 307-309.

continuity between the two? If the former, then Barth is in accord; if the latter, the two cannot converse. Thirdly, does Schleiermacher hold that human acting and feeling are contingent on particular reality, namely the divine from which they are derived and determined, generalizations about reality issuing from that view, or does Schleiermacher reverse this? If the former, the two are of one mind; if the latter, there is division. Fourthly, is the spirit which moves people an absolute and particular, that is the Holy Spirit, or some universally effective spiritual power? If the former, Barth and Schleiermacher agree; if the latter, they part company.

But the conciliation, both in the Dogmatics and these works is not total and Barth is not returning to his position as a liberal completely reconciled to his predecessors. He has not veered from his condemnation of the anthropocentric starting-point and criterion for interpretation used by liberalism. "I am in no position to take the responsibility of thinking on the basis of their common presuppositions."¹⁰⁰ It is fundamentally in this that "I can no longer be a liberal theologian. . . ."¹⁰¹ At its worst it is a theology too this-worldly, drawing its life-blood from philosophy and the culture, one which ignored the

¹⁰⁰"Liberal Theology," p. 219, Ger., p. 101.

¹⁰¹Ibid, p. 211, Ger., p. 95.

absolute and in its developing a religion around historical phenomena, paved the way for the catastrophic event of 1933.¹⁰²

In these extra-dogmatic writings we detect not only an attitude which has mellowed as in the Dogmatics III and IV, but also efforts to review and perhaps re-new the relationship with his predecessors though not in Barth's becoming a liberal again.

(iv)

Reasons for modification

By Barth's admission he continually probed Schleiermacher only to discover a theological closeness which he now wants to articulate more specifically. Though he would never be a liberal again in the conventional sense, he leaves no doubt as to the complexity and intensity of this long-standing relation with the theologians of the last century.

That there is a change in Barth's attitude from opposition to conciliation toward the liberals gives rise to the question of the reason. Without claiming to explain this solely through an external event, I would like to suggest that the political situation in which he lived was no less a factor in his abandoning the polemic after the second world war than it was in his understanding of its errors as a result of the

¹⁰²"Evangelical Theology in the Nineteenth Century," p. 19ff, Ger., p. 11ff.

first war. In this we are in accord with Marquardt's insistence on the importance of Barth's political involvement in his theology, but whereas for the former "Barth's theology is . . . rooted . . . in his political involvement (praxis)"¹⁰³ we contend that liberalism is more fundamental to the roots of Barthian thought, and politics serves as a catalyst for his insights into liberal theology which in turn has impact on the development of Barth's thought.

Barth's sense of the errors of liberalism crystallized for him when he saw his liberal teachers endorsing the war policy of Kaiser Wilhelm I. It was not a theological-biblical insight or any theological statement or work on the part of the intellectuals which marked for Barth the end of the period of nineteenth century theology but the political stance of the theologians.¹⁰⁴ Against this background, his concerns for liberalism deepening, Barth's writings spoke of the 'Wholly Other' and the 'infinite distance' between God and man. His criticism grew and "began to develop and extend to nineteenth century theology as far back as Schleiermacher."¹⁰⁵ Barth

¹⁰³Marquardt, "Socialism in the Theology of Karl Barth," in Karl Barth and Radical Politics, ed. by George Hunsinger, Philadelphia, Westminster Press, 1976, p. 49.

¹⁰⁴"Evangelical Theology in the Nineteenth Century," p. 14, Ger., p. 6.

¹⁰⁵Busch, KB, p. 82.

recalls believing that "the entire theology which had unmasked itself in that manifesto [of the ninety-three German intellectuals], and everything which followed after it . . . was grounded, determined and influenced decisively by him [Schleiermacher]."¹⁰⁶

With the events of the first war behind him Barth's writings from Romans to Anselm attempted to correct the errors of liberal theology and to set theology on its right foundations. With the terrifying appearance of the Nazis in the thirties, Barth joined the Social Democratic Party in 1931 to vent his frustration and engaged in a series of political/theological writings in retaliation to Hitler and the German Christian Church. Against this background, deeply convinced that the line from Nazism could be traced back to liberalism and that Hitler represented an earthly attempt to usurp the divine lordship of Jesus Christ, he wrote the Dogmatics I and II, which could hardly escape the influence of the struggle with which Barth was embroiled.

In 1942 he began work on the Doctrine of Creation, the discussion of which he held in dread. But it was time to press on and speak of matters which must be understood against the background of the Dogmatics I and II. In a sense it was during

¹⁰⁶"PS," p. 120, Ger., p. 293.

the next few years that he truly began to approach theology 'as if nothing had happened.' A modified polemic characterizes the first part of Volume III although Barth remains guarded in any acknowledgement of liberalism.

When Barth began work on the Dogmatics III/2 in December of 1944, the turning point in the war had come. France had been liberated a few months previously and we note Barth's tempered views toward the German people. According to Busch,

'When a German defeat seemed certain' Barth felt that after his sharp warnings against an aggressive National Socialistic Germany, by contrast he should 'challenge the general bitterness against Germany.'¹⁰⁷

Barth insisted that Germany needed to be befriended.¹⁰⁸ Simultaneously his views toward the liberals were also tempered. While continuing to maintain that there was a line from "Schleiermacher and his followers to the heresy of the German Christians,"¹⁰⁹ and an association between the immanentism and subjectivism of liberalism and Hitler¹¹⁰ he was moving toward reconciliation with the liberals. In a less condemning mood than before, Barth

¹⁰⁷Busch, KB, p. 322, Ger., p. 337.

¹⁰⁸"Die Deutschen und wir," (1945) in Eine Schweizer Stimme, 1938-1945, Evangelischer Verlag AG, Zollikon-Zürich, 1945, p. 355.

¹⁰⁹CD III/2, p. 9, (KD, p. 8).

¹¹⁰CD III/3, p. 33, (KD, p. 37).

states that Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Dörner, and others were not responsible for the ethics of the German people which allowed for the events of 1914-1933.

Neo-Protestantism has much to answer for, but it is not guilty in this regard. It had no positive share in this new development. To be sure, it did not provide the necessary safeguards against it. And in virtue of its presuppositions it could not do so. Where the recognition of the distinctive sovereignty of the Word of God spoken in Jesus Christ is as weak as it was in Evangelical theology from the beginning of the eighteenth century, we must be prepared for the intrusion of false gods. And where this penetration takes place in the evaluation of the state and culture, the erection of a further false god is at least negatively prepared . . . But we cannot seriously argue that Schleiermacher, his disciples or the theology of the age of Harnack . . . prepared the way positively for what followed.¹¹¹

There is a certain actualizing of this conciliatory attitude which occurred while on a guest semester at Bonn in 1946 when he discovered among the rubble "an undamaged bust of Schleiermacher, which was rescued and somewhere restored to honour again."¹¹² Wherever the bust has been placed, Barth himself restored honour again to Schleiermacher in the Dogmatics III and IV and other writings from 1945-1968, in recognition and praise of his contributions and those of liberalism generally.

¹¹¹ CD III/4, p. 307, (KD, p. 347).

¹¹² Barth, Dogmatics in Outline, London, SCM Press, 1959, p. 7; Dogmatik im Grundriss, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1947, p. 3.

The Nazis and the German Christians disappeared. No threat of this magnitude, either politically or theologically had to be faced by Barth again during his lifetime. In 1946, although he wanted to be directly involved in German reconstruction, he opted to work toward the completion of the Dogmatics. He was involved in political questions secondarily. In this regard he paid careful attention to East-West negotiations and visited East Germany and Hungary in 1948. In addition there were some theological problems and distractions. He engaged in correspondence with Rudolf Bultmann whose demythologizing theology disturbed Barth.¹¹³ He was occupied with the ecumenical movement through the World Council of Churches from 1945-1953. In 1966 he visited Pope Paul VI at the Vatican and was involved in discussion with Roman Catholic theologians such as von Balthasar for many years. But none of these activities presented the critical problems to Barth as did the world wars and their odious direct connection to liberal theology.

From 1945 onwards Barth's main thrust was the completion of his dogmatic task which no longer suffered from the restraints or threats of a theological-political enemy in the form of Nazism and the German Christians, the bearers of the liberal perspective.

¹¹³Barth, "Rudolf Bultmann - An Attempt to Understand Him," in Kerygma and Myth, A Theological Debate, Vol. II, ed. by Hans-Werner Bartsch, tran. by Reginald H. Fuller, London, SPCK, 1962, p. 83-132.

Without compromising his fundamental quarrel with the starting-point and criterion for interpretation of the nineteenth century, his conciliatory attitude is manifested in the reduced polemic in the Dogmatics III and IV as well as the acknowledgements of the contributions to liberalism in dogmatic and extra-dogmatic works. The discrepancy between Barth's statements regarding the last century, sometimes faulting his predecessors for the apotheosis of Nazism and German Christianity and other times exonerating them of any blame, can be explained with reference to the world situation which in turn he believed at its nadir to be a result of liberalism. In turn the demise of Nazism and the German Christian Church as well as the worldly lordship of Hitler must have further confirmed his conviction of the supremacy of the biblical viewpoint and the lordship of Jesus Christ. The worst of liberalism's results having been destroyed, the triumph freed Barth to treat the nineteenth century in a conciliatory light articulating its achievements and merits.

CHAPTER V

Barth, Liberalism and Theology of Immanence

It remains now to demonstrate that from 1942-1968 . . . Barth's theology was a response to liberalism. Whereas formerly his concern for its errors and the catastrophic historical events from 1914-1945 help account for the theological confrontation with his predecessors, Barth's attitude after the wars is of a different complexion which in turn dramatically affects his theology. In an atmosphere far less threatening, theologically and politically, he is not only conciliatory in remarks toward the nineteenth century but also in his Dogmatics and other works there are indications of his attempt to integrate the best fruits which may be reaped from liberal theology. His advice to young theologians to become "a little liberal again"¹ coupled with his elucidation of alternatives within liberal theology influenced his own work. His conciliatory and investigative attitude in mind we suggest two ways in which Barth pays more than lip service to the liberals. These include the emergence of principles of immanence and the development of pneumatology in the doctrines of creation and reconciliation to be examined in this and the subsequent chapter respectively.

¹Barth, "Christian Doctrine According to the Heidelberg Catechism," in The Heidelberg Catechism for Today, tran. by Shirley J. Guthrie, Jr., Richmond, John Knox Press, 1964, p. 85, from Die christliche Lehre nach dem Heidelberger Katechismus, Zollikon-Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag AG, 1948, p. 78.

We believe the particular mode of development of these themes reflects a response to liberal theology, a response which is on-going in Barth's work, its complexion only having been modified.

Without compromising at any point the aspects of his theology of transcendence of the Dogmatics I and II, Barth widens the scope of his work with principles of immanence, the cornerstone of liberalism. While his critique was concerned that the latter was exclusively this-worldly and proceeded from the anthropological sphere, he did not deny the validity of a theology of immanence provided it be correctly posited. Circumstances being what they were, however, Barth avoided any remarks or theological statements suggesting approval of liberalism and the result was a dogmatic attempt over against his predecessors emphasizing the transcendent Lord and virtually neglecting the immanent.

Co-incidental with the disappearance of the Nazi threat is the emergence of this-worldly language in the doctrines of creation and reconciliation. We are in accord with James Wilkerson who, while not accounting for the reasons, holds that Barth's language moves from a position of immanence as a liberal to one of transcendence in Romans to a mid-position.² Testing our supposition that one dimension of Barth's renewal with

²Wilkerson, op. cit., p. 54.

liberalism is in the sphere of immanent theology, we submit that in the doctrines of creation and reconciliation he strives to speak of 'God with us' and 'we with God,' the over-against notwithstanding but providing a backdrop to the 'with.' Barth develops these themes in his presentation of the this-worldly Lord, not only as the One who entered the cosmos but also as He who is in active, immediate and direct, positive relation to the creature. The dynamic of a theology of immanence unfolds through the biblical and non-biblical categories of lordship, covenant-partner, analogy and dialectic and it is this aspect of Barth's work which we will presently address.

(i)

Lordship

In his 1914 attempt to speak correctly of the personal God Barth offered the concept of 'transcendence in His superiority, immanence in lordship.'³ Due to political and theological circumstances he moved afield in the twenties and thirties of his reflection on the immanence of God, this development being re-negotiated only when the threat of Nazism and the German Christians, rooted in liberalism, was dispelled. In 1956 Barth addressed retrospectively the content of his theology in the 1920's and 1930's as a time when he was 'compelled' to talk of 'A God absolutely unique in His relation to man and the world

³See above, Ch. II, p. 38.

overpoweringly lofty and distant, strange, yes, even wholly other."⁴ Talk of humanism in theology, that is full discussion of the relation between God and man and subsequently, fellowmen, talk of 'God with us' possible in 1949 was not admissible forty or fifty years previously.⁵ And in 1962 he stated the following:

The God of the Gospel is no lonely God, self-sufficient and self-contained. He is no 'absolute' God. . . He is not imprisoned by His own majesty, as though He were bound to be no more than the . . . 'wholly other'.⁶

When Barth approached the doctrines of creation and reconciliation, written between 1942-1968, the demise of the odious world situation and its associated theology, which he had felt forced to counter, was apparent. In the lordship which pervades the Dogmatics III and IV there emerges the immanentist language of the this-worldly lord, which includes the One in and of this world, and the Lord with his creatures. According to Clarence Abercrombie, Barth's concept of lordship is "not confined the 'spiritual' side of life, for Christ is Lord of all, Lord

⁴"The Humanity of God," p. 37f, Ger., p. 3f.

⁵"The New Humanism and The Humanism of God," in Theology Today, #8, May, 1951, p. 157, from "Humanismus" in Theologische Studien, 28, Zollikon-Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag, AG, 1950, p. 3.

⁶ET, p.10, Ger., p. 66.

of the world."⁷ Its place in Barth's theology, not unlike the other concepts we will investigate namely, covenant-partner, analogy and dialectic, are rooted in christology, for 'Christ alone' must be held in full view "at each and every point"⁸ in the development of Christian doctrine. The manifestation of the lordship of God in history is accomplished in "the Word which became flesh and is called Jesus Christ."⁹

We shall examine two aspects of Barth's concept of lordship which are pertinent to this thesis, namely (a) as a means to discuss the immanentist principle of this-worldly God and (b) as a prominent place in his corrective and unique christology.

(a)

Traditionally the doctrine of providence has insisted over-against the teachings of some, for example the deists, that God having created the world did not abandon His creation to its own devices. Providence is a doctrine of the lordship of God, as the Lord of history, guiding and preserving creation and co-existing with the creature, all differences notwithstanding.

⁷Clarence L. Abercrombie III, "Barth and Bonhoeffer: Resistance to the Unjust State," in Religion in Life, Vol. 42, Autumn, 1973, p. 347.

⁸CD III/3, Preface p. xi, (KD, p. V).

⁹Ibid, p. 26, (KD, p. 29).

Bromiley and Torrance in an editorial commentary describe Barth's fidelity to the traditional viewpoint:

Providence is the faithfulness to the creature of Him who has joined Himself to it. It is His continuing affirmation of it as the Lord of its history. [In this] . . . God co-exists with the creature.¹⁰

As it develops, providence is a strong and convincing statement of the presence of the Lord in his creation and human history? Presupposing the superior dealings of God in a reality distinct from His own,¹¹ Barth develops less the distinctions and more the 'with' of the Lord and His creature. Implied in providence is the three-pronged (1) association of Creator-Lord with the creature in this-worldly history; (2) co-existence of Creator and creature; and (3) direct and superior co-operation of the lordship of God.¹²

In this history, therefore, we need not expect turns and events which have nothing to do with His lordship . . . This Lord is never absent, passive, . . . , but always present, active, . . . In this consists His co-existence with the creature . . . He co-exists with it actively, and in an action which never ceases. . . .¹³

¹⁰G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, editors' preface, CD III/3, p. ix.

¹¹Ibid, p. 3, 6, 10, (KD, p. 1, 4, 9). [verschiedenen Wirklichkeit]

¹²Ibid, p. 12f, (KD, p. 12f).

¹³Ibid, p. 13, (KD, p. 13).

The threefold depiction of the providential God's preserving, accompanying and ruling and its resultant possibility of actualization in Christian living has its presupposition in the One above, yet not so above as not to be with the creature, emphasis on the 'with.' The Lord of creation is not solely the transcendent One, but the Ruler, Reconciler and Redeemer who reveals Himself and acts in this world. "God fulfills His fatherly lordship over His creature by preserving, accompanying and ruling the whole course of its earthly existence."¹⁴ In His ruling God does not treat the world as something which is over against and foreign to Him, but as a sphere prepared for His lordship.

The divine preserving, that is the upholding and sustaining of individual existence, is "the work of real, genuine, authentic and true lordship."¹⁵ In His being the guarantor of creaturely existence as Lord of the covenant He is both "with and above the creature,"¹⁶ not preserving from afar but with "direct initiative and activity."¹⁷ In this direct act, He deemed it appropriate to take up the cause of the creature's preservation "not from the safe height of a supreme world-governor, but in the closest possible proximity, with the

¹⁴ Ibid, S49, p. 58, (KD, p. 67).

¹⁵ Ibid, p. 59, (KD, p. 68).

¹⁶ Ibid, p. 60, (KD, p. 69).

¹⁷ Ibid, p. 65, (KD, p. 74).

greatest possible directness, i.e., Himself to become a creature."¹⁸

The divine accompanying is the three-dimensional unfolding of lordship as the side-by-side operation and co-operation of the fatherly Lord with the free and autonomous activity of His creature. In this accompanying of the Lord, the activity of the creature takes place (1) "in its co-existence with God"¹⁹ (2) "Alongside His activity"²⁰ and (3) in the Creator's going "with it as Lord."²¹ In this occurrence of the divine accompanying, in His co-operation with all creaturely activity, God is immanent.²²

In the final aspect of the description of providential lordship, divine ruling implies that God alone rules,²³ in absolute majesty²⁴ and transcendence.²⁵ But it is a divine rule "over and with the temporal history of that reality which is distinct from God."²⁶ This rule or order of God comprises the

¹⁸ Ibid, p. 79, (KD, p. 89).

¹⁹ Ibid, p. 92, (KD, p. 104).

²⁰ Ibid, (CD & KD).

²¹ Ibid, p. 93, (KD, p. 105).

²² Ibid, p. 110, (KD, p. 124).

²³ Ibid, p. 157, (KD, p. 177).

²⁴ Ibid, p. 159, (KD, p. 180).

²⁵ Ibid, p. 164, 165, (KD, p. 186, 187). [in der Höhe.]

²⁶ Ibid, p. 164, (KD, p. 186).

control of creaturely activity, giving it freedom, directing it to relation with other creatures and incorporating it into history and creation as a whole. His lordship in world occurrence, attested in the Old and New Testaments, is rooted solidly in the normative biblical concept of King of Israel. The lordship and rule of Jesus Christ is the standard for everything else.²⁷ No other rules in this world; "All actual rule in this world can be only the rule of this one Subject," ²⁸

The other side of the direct intervention of the Lord in history is the actualization of the life of the Christian under this lordship. The one chosen by the Lord to be preserved, accompanied and ruled himself "participates in the divine lordship."²⁹ Lordship, which has presented this possibility of participation from without, in preserving, accompanying and ruling, now allows for participation from within, enabling the Christian not only to perceive this earthly lordship as knowledge but also to affirm and live by it. The Lord and the real life of the Christian meet when the creature responds to the universal lordship in faith, obedience and prayer. In this the "providence and universal lordship of God are not merely true to him, but ... they are actual."³⁰ To participate in faith is to participate

²⁷ Ibid, p. 183, (KD, p. 207).

²⁸ Ibid, p. 182, (KD, loc. cit.).

²⁹ Ibid, p. 239, (KD, p. 271).

³⁰ Ibid, p. 245, (KD, p. 277).

in divine providence and universal lordship,³¹ and obedience implies the response of the Christian to the Word of God in works, righteousness and a sanctified life whereby he participates in divine providence and universal lordship.³² And finally prayer is the response of the human to his Lord, to the Word and work of "this great . . . God [who] draws so near to the man who is . . . unworthy . . ."³³ In prayer man moves toward the One who has moved toward him, and the community participates in the life of Jesus as Lord, the result of which is the direct relation of the Lord and community. "Thus the asking community stands together with its Lord before God on behalf of all creation."³⁴

Providential lordship with its biblical starting-point is the means to speak correctly of that which the liberals took for granted in their anthropocentric theology of immanence, namely the presence of God in this world and the resultant response of the Christian to the Creator made possible through divine lordship.

³¹Ibid, p. 248, (KD, p. 282).

³²Ibid, p. 255, (KD, p. 289).

³³Ibid, p. 268, (KD, p. 304).

³⁴Ibid, p. 279, (KD, p. 316).

(b)

Reconciliation is presented at the outset of Volume IV of the Dogmatics as the doctrine of "God with us"³⁵ which conversely implies "We with God."³⁶ The Lord of reconciliation becomes more clearly and dynamically the One who bridges the gap between God and man rather than He who stands over against the human. "What takes place in this work of inconceivable mercy, is, therefore, the free over-ruling of God . . . a real closing of the breach, gulf and abyss, between God and us . . ."³⁷ Reconciliation is the Lord crossing over to man.³⁸

Among the many elements in Barth's Christology as it reaches fruition in the doctrine of reconciliation, the theme of lordship enjoys a vital and special place particularly in the exposition of Jn 1:14 and Chalcedon in Chapters XIV and XV, "Jesus Christ, The Lord as Servant"³⁹ and "Jesus Christ, The Servant as Lord."⁴⁰ In relation to liberalism, lordship has a reference point in two ways. In the first instance Barth continues to wage a major corrective of the nineteenth century's

³⁵CD IV/1, S57.1, "God with us," p. 3ff, (KD, "Gott mit uns," p. 1ff).

³⁶Ibid, p. 14ff, (KD, p. 13ff).

³⁷Ibid, p. 12, (KD, p. 11).

³⁸Ibid, p. 82, (KD, p. 86).

³⁹Ibid, S59-S63, p. 157ff, (KD, p. 171ff).

⁴⁰CD IV/2, S64-S68.

complete disregard for the divinity of Jesus. In his fidelity to John and Chalcedon, he posits lordship to protect the doctrine of the two natures. As Lord, Jesus is the divine Word, the Son of God humbled as a servant who is simultaneously the servant, the Son of Man, exalted as Lord. To safeguard against any imbalance on the historical side, Barth reaffirms that in the lordship of Jesus Christ is implied His utter distinctness from all other humans: ". . . in the man Jesus of Nazareth . . . we have to do with the One who is qualitatively different and uplifted in relation to all other men and the whole cosmos."⁴¹

The second dimension of the lordship-christology, the humanity of God, little developed in the Dogmatics I and II, is now by Barth's admissions able to be discussed. According to Goetz "Barth gives the gracious intention of liberalism a truer foundation in its witness to the humanity of God."⁴² The Lord as servant is the one who took "His place with the transgressor"⁴³ and in the development of this theme "at every point we shall be dealing with the action and work of the Lord God."⁴⁴ The mystery of the christological tradition hinging on Jn 1:14 can be under-

⁴¹CD IV/1, p. 176, see 160, 161, (KD, p. 192, 174, 176), CD IV/2, p. 28, 61, (KD, p. 29, 65).

⁴²Goetz, op. cit., p. 526.

⁴³CD IV/1, S59, p. 157, (KD, p. 171).

⁴⁴Ibid, p. 159, (KD, p. 173).

stood with reference to the lordship of Jesus Christ. The impenetrable reality of 'The Word became flesh' is actualized not in a feat overcoming Him but in His own "sovereign act of divine lordship."⁴⁵ The apparent contradiction in the unalterable deity entering into unity with flesh, causing no diminution or confusion, is possible in the lordship of Jesus. "He acts as Lord over this contradiction even as He subjects Himself to it."⁴⁶

In his earthly lordship, Jesus Christ neither abandons nor acts over against the world, but "takes it to Himself, entering into the sphere of it as the true God."⁴⁷ At the same time the exaltation of the servant as Lord is represented in the royal man, the one present among us who is like us yet unlike us in his lordship.⁴⁸ Among his fellow-men He was the Lord, the royal man⁴⁹ remaining still "the living Lord, present today."⁵⁰ This Lord-servant and servant-Lord is "our Lord, Dominus noster, even in our own anthropological sphere."⁵¹

In Barth's explication of lordship is developed through

⁴⁵ Ibid, p. 179, (KD, p. 196).

⁴⁶ Ibid, p. 185, (KD, p. 202).

⁴⁷ Ibid, p. 198, (KD, p. 216).

⁴⁸ CD IV/2, p. 28f, (KD, p. 29f).

⁴⁹ Ibid, p. 154ff, (KD, p. 173ff).

⁵⁰ Ibid, p. 164, (KD, p. 182).

⁵¹ Ibid, p. 265, see p. 268, (KD, p. 293, 297).

christology we learn that to

believe that God can and must only be absolute in contrast to all that is relative, . . . , transcendent in contrast to all immanence, and therefore divine in contrast to everything human, in short that He can and must be only the 'Wholly Other' . . . is untenable.⁵²

What we must embrace on the other hand is that

He is all this as the Lord, and in such a way that He embraces the opposites of these concepts even while He is superior to them. He is all this as the Creator, who has created the world as a reality distinct from Himself, . . . , in relation to which He can . . . act as God in an absolute way and also a relative, . . . , in a transcendent and also an immanent, in a divine and also a human . . .⁵³

Barth's lordship-christology counters the liberal error of emphasis on the historical Jesus, while at the same time balancing his own christology with due regard for humanity of Jesus which along with His divinity is grounded and preserved in the biblical lordship.

Lordship in the doctrines of creation and reconciliation represents neither a complete return to Barth's liberal position nor is it an expression counteracting the nineteenth century. Occupying a middle point the Lord in this-earthly existence and human history is understood with reference to His title as the absolute, transcendent One. Lordship is inextricably part of the larger

⁵² CD IV/1, p. 186, (KD, p. 203).

⁵³ Ibid, p. 187, (KD, p. 204).

doctrine of christology serving as a corrective in its reminder of the divinity of Jesus while at the same time speaking, like the liberals, in strong tones of the immanent Lord and the humanity of God. God has once more been brought to earth, though not in the anthropological manner of the nineteenth century, but correctly in Barth's view in the biblical presupposition of lordship.

(ii)

Covenant-partner

According to Heino Kadai the appearance of the covenant-partner in Barth's theology was very important in that "This covenant-partner concept significantly balances the Kierkegaardian qualitative distinction statement of Barth's earlier years."⁵⁴

But to balance is not to compromise or supersede the earlier, still valid statement of the difference between God and man. This as well as the sinfulness of man must be presupposed in order to speak correctly of the covenant-partnership. God alone is the transcendent ground of the covenant, He is the sole initiator, the only means by which the creature can partake.⁵⁵ As Lord, God is the superior though no less or more of a partner in the covenant.⁵⁶ That the starting-point for God's dealings with man can come from

⁵⁴Kadai, op. cit., p. 141.

⁵⁵CD III/1, p. 96, (KD, p. 105).

⁵⁶CD III/3, p. 108f, (KD, p. 122).

the divine side alone is reinforced in Barth's continued insistence that the human one has no innate capacity to enter into or initiate any relation with the divine. "His creaturely essence has no power to do this. He can do it only as God makes him His partner."⁵⁷ However, the emphasis in Barth's theology is shifting in that the covenant takes precedence over man's sinfulness. "The grace of God, the covenant of God with man is primary. The sin of man is secondary."⁵⁸ Sin is decidedly a second factor "enclosed and embraced by the latter [covenant]."⁵⁹

It may be said that the use of the covenant-partner in Barth's theology provides a means to discuss (a) the this-worldly positive relation between God and man; (b) God's partnership with man; and (c) man's partnership with God.

(a)

In the covenant Barth has found a solid scriptural viewpoint from which to articulate the means by which Lord and creature can enter into this-worldly, positive relation. As the Lord of the covenant, "He can not only bridge but cross the distance which separates Him from that which He is not . . ."⁶⁰ The concept

⁵⁷ CD III/2, p. 224, (KD, p. 267), CD III/3, p. 45, (KD, p. 52).

⁵⁸ CD III/2, p. 32, (KD, p. 36).

⁵⁹ Ibid, p. 36, see also p. 319 - as sinner he remains partner in the covenant, (KD, p. 41, 385), CD IV/1, p. 480, (KD, p. 534).

⁶⁰ CD IV/2, p. 513, (KD, p. 581).

of covenant must be understood in relation to creation and reconciliation, the former the technical preparation for the covenant which in turn is the presupposition for reconciliation. Creation of its own accord has no meaning except as the external basis of the covenant, preparing a sphere for the actualizing of the partnership between God and man.

The covenant which is achieved is the bond, the presupposition of reconciliation, that is 'God with us.'

The fellowship which originally existed between God and man, which was then disturbed and jeopardized, the purpose of which is now fulfilled in Jesus Christ and in the work of reconciliation, we describe as the covenant.⁶¹

The covenant is the key, the means, the vital tool, the bridging of the gap between God and man. It is the presupposition of reconciliation as "the event which unites God and man."⁶² Reconciliation is the renewal of the covenant with the faithful one overriding the gap and reinstating "the unity of man with God."⁶³

The fact of the covenant is materially the fact of the intercourse which God has freely willed . . . between Himself and . . . man The . . . reality of this intercourse is declared and represented by this fact - the overcoming of the distance, but also the distance itself between God and man.⁶⁴

⁶¹CD IV/1, p. 22, (KD, p. 22).

⁶²Ibid, p. 18, (KD, p. 18).

⁶³CD IV/2, p. 6, (KD, p. 4).

⁶⁴CD IV/3/1, p. 222f, (KD, p. 253f).

The covenant is the basic scriptural presupposition used by Barth to articulate the immanent relation of the Lord and creature. It suggests a modification from the earlier works which insisted on the differences between God and man, now balanced in the talk of the covenant relation as a partnership.

(b)

In this "covenant of the free Creator with a free creature,"⁶⁵ there is genuine partnership from both sides. Despite all that may be said, the Lord can be a partner to man, and man through grace, a genuine partner.⁶⁶ The covenant of grace as the direct act of God in history and with his people, was first actualized in His kingship over Israel, preserved and continued to the present in the Church of the people of God.⁶⁷ As the covenant-Lord, He preserves, accompanies, and rules the creature⁶⁸ and this association between Lord and covenant is an indissoluble bond: "The faithfulness of God is that He co-ordinates creaturely occurrence under lordship with the occurrence of the covenant, . . ."⁶⁹ The culmination of the actualization of

⁶⁵ CD III/2, p. 194, (KD, p. 232).

⁶⁶ Ibid, p. 320f, 32ff, (KD, p. 386f, 36).

⁶⁷ CD III/3, p. 65, (KD, p. 74).

⁶⁸ Ibid, p. 62ff, (KD, p. 71ff).

⁶⁹ Ibid, p. 41, (KD, p. 47). Other references to covenant-Lord, CD III/1, p. 231, (KD, p. 261), CD III/2, p. 324, (KD, p. 390), CD IV/3/1, p. 138, 225, (KD, p. 156, 258).

the covenant in human history is realized in Jesus Christ in a position demonstrating the importance of the covenant concept in christology.

The whole witness and revelation of the man Jesus in time, the whole point of His life and existence, is that within the cosmos there should be declared as good news . . . the fact that God Himself⁷⁰ is for man (and is his covenant-partner.

The tone of Barth's christology as expressed here in the covenant-partner, that the point of Jesus' existence is that He is for man, is not unlike that of his liberal counterparts for whom Jesus was for man, specifically as the archetype of humanity and a model for human existence. This reference of the human to Jesus was a strong and attractive element in nineteenth century theology, now incorporated into Barth's Dogmatics, the anthropocentric starting-point replaced by the biblical concept of covenant.

(c)

It is in Barth's doctrine of the creature that covenant-partner develops on the anthropological side. Whereas theological anthropology is grounded in Christ, covenant-partner is the means to pass from christology to anthropology, that is, from Jesus as the "Man for Other Men,"⁷¹ to the anthropology of "The Basic Form of Humanity."⁷² Life with God and life as real man is possible in

⁷⁰CD III/2, p. 217, (KD, p. 259).

⁷¹Ibid, S45.1, p. 203ff, (KD, p. 242ff).

⁷²Ibid, S45.2, p. 222ff, (KD, p. 264ff).

the covenant-partnership⁷³ which in turn is the channel through which correspondence and similarity of Jesus to all other men, despite the ultimate distinction,⁷⁴ is realized. As the being determined by God, his is a "life with God . . . existing in the history of the covenant which God has established with him."⁷⁵ From this basis of man's relation with God in the covenant-christology, is posited the relation of man with another, and man with others.⁷⁶ It is the presupposition of the human's response in faith, obedience and prayer to the Lord who directs everything for the best.⁷⁷ In the divine-human this-worldly partnership ordained in baptism, "we find dialogue and dealings between two who stand in clear encounter, God on one side and man on the other."⁷⁸ In correct understanding of the covenant from the anthropological side, man realizes positive relation, true and genuine 'friendship'⁷⁹ to his Creator, to his fellowmen and actual human response.

In the biblical concept of the covenant-partner is the

⁷³Ibid, p. 203, (KD, p. 242).

⁷⁴Ibid, p. 47-52, 70, 222, (KD, p. 54, 80, 81, 265).

⁷⁵Ibid, p. 204, (KD, p. 243).

⁷⁶Ibid, p. 243, (KD, p. 291).

⁷⁷CD III/3, p. 288, (KD, p. 326).

⁷⁸CD IV, A.Fragment, p. 163, (KD, p. 180).

⁷⁹Ibid, p. 4, 13, 18, (KD, p. 4, 14, 20).

fundamental tool explaining how the gap between lord and creature is bridged. Though the partnership must be initiated from the divine side, the relation is no less genuine and the covenant is primary over sin. Like lordship, covenant is rooted in Jesus who actualizes and brings to culmination the partnership.

(iii)

Analogy

Barth's use of analogy in the early Church Dogmatics was a combative statement against the nineteenth century's natural theology and Roman Catholicism's analogia entis. The analogiae fidei and attributionis, while methods to discuss the relation between God and man, were primarily counter-statements; the first insisted that this possibility of relation is divinely initiated and the second emphasized the likeness as extrinsic rather than likeness itself. These are not ontological statements but the result of God's justifying grace. They cannot add to a science of being for Barth rejects ontology as a basis for theological statements for such "a comprehensively explicated self-understanding of human existence"⁸⁰ may at any point become "the preunderstanding and criterion of theological knowledge."⁸¹

In the doctrine of creation his view of ontology is modified and co-incidentally is his analogy which according to Lilburne

⁸⁰ CD I/1, p. 36, (KD, p. 35f).

⁸¹ Ibid. (KD, p. 36).

is the primary image of Barth's ontology.⁸² Whereas Lilburne's concern is to address the change in ontology in relation to Barth's method, the conclusion being that a combined theological-ontological component makes up the distinctive fabric of Barth's theology, we are pursuing this change, best expressed by analogy as part of a wider spectrum of modifications in Barth's work. We are in accord with Lilburne, that Barth changed his mind rather than the definition of ontology⁸³ but we regret this writer does not account for the reason for the attitudinal variation.

In his theological anthropology developed in the doctrine of the creature Barth admits the possibility of ontology, which properly rooted in the Word of God, gives an ontology of man,⁸⁴ ". . . and we shall be concerned with this in the doctrine of the creature, i.e., with the ontology of man living under heaven and earth."⁸⁵ According to George Kehm, Barth's talk of the creature moves from anthropology based on existence (analogia fidei) to one on essence through the covenant partner.⁸⁶ We concur with this position generally but would add that the move is from one

⁸² Geoffrey Richard Lilburne, The Ontological Fabric of Karl Barth's Mature Theology: An Elucidation of a Distinctive Method, unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, Emory University, 1979, Ch. IV.

⁸³ Ibid, p. 8.

⁸⁴ CD III/2, p. 6, (KD, p. 5).

⁸⁵ Ibid, (CD & KD).

⁸⁶ George Harry Kehm, The Christological Foundation of Anthropology in the Theology of Karl Barth, unpublished Th.D. Thesis, Harvard, 1966, p. 100.

kind of analogy, that of faith, to the analogiae relationis and operationis which in turn belong to the biblical concept of the covenant.

Like lordship and covenant, the presupposition for analogy is christology. What can be said of man is rooted in the premise that "The ontological determination of humanity is grounded in the fact that one man among all others is the man Jesus."⁸⁷ As long as the human is measured by this ontology, that of Jesus, then a valid anthropology of real man, and not simply a mere phenomena of man, is possible. To understand the human with reference to the one like and unlike us, is to perceive real man as one "with God"⁸⁸ and this is accomplished in the covenant-partnership of the Lord Jesus Christ and man. It is the non-biblical construction of the analogia relationis which Barth invokes to describe how Jesus, the God-man can meet the sinful one in the covenant, elucidating at the same time that aspect of anthropology wherein man is simultaneously partner and the one distinct from God with emphasis on the former.

Even in his distinction from God, . . . , man cannot be man without being directed to . . . the fulfilment of his determination, his being in the grace of God, by his correspondence and similarity to this determination for the covenant with God.⁸⁹

⁸⁷CD III/2, p. 132, (KD, p. 158).

⁸⁸Ibid, p. 136, 139, (KD, p. 162, 166).

⁸⁹Ibid, p. 207, (KD, p. 247).

As in other statements of this-worldly relation between God and man, analogy carries with it the presupposition that "There is total sovereignty . . . on the part of God, but total dependence and need on that of man."⁹⁰ The analogia relationis begins with the being of God on one side and that of man on the other. The analogy is drawn between the essential Trinitarian relationship reflected in the relation God has with man. The primary bond of the freedom and love of God the Father to the Son and vice versa and the Father's being loved by the Son and vice versa corresponds to the love addressed by God to man. Barth firmly insists that this is not identity, for this relation can be reserved alone for God the Father and God the Son, but, despite the disparity there is room for a similarity, analogy between the covenant-partners. ". . . [It] is this relationship / in the inner divine being which is repeated and reflected in God's eternal covenant with man as revealed . . . in the humanity of Jesus."⁹¹

That the transcendent Lord can accompany a reality distinct from Himself in this-worldly existence, that is in world occurrence, is explained in the analogia operationis. The traditional concursus doctrine which Barth examines concerns the

⁹⁰ Ibid, p. 219, (KD, p. 262).

⁹¹ Ibid, p. 218f, (KD, p. 261).

"mutual' relationship"⁹² expressed in the biblical view of "the action of God as 'Lord of the creature as a living relation to the action in which the creature . . . is also involved."⁹³ In this analogy of operation God alone can be understood as causare, the one who absolutely posits, but in His operation on the creature, grants limited autonomy to the human who like the Lord can condition and alter things. In this intervention of the Lord, the creature is a cause of the second order, causing and being involved in results of causes in the earthly scheme of things which are in turn part of the total divine operation. Analogy allows one to speak of creaturely activity in the divine operation in world occurrence, not as one estranged from the Creator for the analogy of operation further clarifies the possibility of divine accompanying of the Lord with his creature. Through analogy one may perceive the reality of divine and creaturely activity in fulness and as one indivisible operation.⁹⁴

Tied to christology and specifically to the covenant, analogiae relationis and operationis, describe how, despite sin, God and man can enter into partnership. In addition to a positive statement of the immanent relation between Lord and creature, these analogies in the doctrine of creation shed more light on the

⁹² CD III/3, p. 95, (KD, p. 108).—

⁹³ Ibid, (CD & KD).

⁹⁴ Ibid, p. 131, (KD, p. 149).

human, speaking of his limited similarity with the divine and his operation in the universe. With Kehm we agree that this analogy has an ontological character.⁹⁵ This ontology, while not claiming comparison between the essential being of God and that of man, produces a statement of the human in the clarification of its correspondence to Christ and the resultant relation with humanity and one's place in the universe.

(iv)

Dialectic

One of the oldest forms of Barth's anti-thetical statements against liberalism was the use of the dialectic. With a dramatic shift from the 'Yes-No' form of the dialectic, the wavering between an irreconcilable question and answer, keeping apart the human and the divine, the doctrines of creation and reconciliation express the relationship between God and man by means of a predominantly 'Yes' dialectic. Just as analogy is a means to explain the potential for partnership between God and man, the dialectic of the Dogmatics III and IV describes the results of the covenant relation in the divine 'Yes' and limited human affirmative response.

In the 'Yes-No' of Romans and other writings of the twenties, there was talk of crisis and confusion. "With the yes

⁹⁵ Kehm, op. cit., p. 192.

and no, the no and the yes in which we find ourselves, we are thrown into the perplexity, into the crisis of the Scriptures."⁹⁶ The furthest extremity Barth will venture in 1921 in talk of the divine-human encounter is presented in the statement that "At best, the truth of God and the truth of sin are ever balanced against one another as 'Yes' and 'No!'"⁹⁷

The audible tension of the 'Yes-No' is replaced by a resounding 'Yes' from 1942-1968. As with lordship, covenant-partner, and analogy, the positive dialectic is grounded in christology. "He[Christ] is this Yes, . . . The concrete particularity of this Yes is identical with the concrete particularity of His name . . ., of His person and work."⁹⁸ In this 'Yes' Barth describes the content of the relation between God and man in the covenant not as a confusing and irreconcilable dialectic but rather as a creation for man which he shares with God. Creation is "The Yes of God the Creator"⁹⁹ as three-fold benefit, actualization and justification. Creation has as its purpose the justification and election of the creature and carries with it "the Yes of God to that which He creates. Divine creation is divine

⁹⁶"Biblical Questions," *op. cit.*, p. 57, Ger., p. 94, see p. 59, Ger., p. 75; "Task of the Ministry," *op. cit.*, p. 207, Ger., p. 172.

⁹⁷*Romans*, p. 212, *Rom II*, p. 194.

⁹⁸*CD* IV/3/2, p. 797, (*KD*, p. 912).

⁹⁹*CD* III/1, S42, p. 330ff, (*KD*, p. 377ff).

benefit."¹⁰⁰ To express this benefit is to have the 'Yes' supersede the 'No' in the 'unqualified Yes,' not a 'No' nor a 'Yes' and No.¹⁰¹ Subsequently it can be said that because the "Creator has not said No, or Yes and No, but unequivocally Yes to what He has created, means . . . He has actualised it."¹⁰² As such the 'Yes' affirms creation and creature, not as illusion but as reality. It is toward this real creature that the Lord directs His justification taking humanity out of the dark and evil, disclosing a reality that is good, one affirmed and elected by God. God's 'Yes' in justification confirms His all-embracing 'Yes' to creation and although justification must also carry His 'No,' "the No is not said for the sake of the No but for the sake of the Yes."¹⁰³ In the human participation of the 'Yes' and 'No,' of justification achieved in Jesus Christ, the covenant-partnership is realized for it is only as men stand before this judgment that they are affirmed as real creatures.

Reconciliation as the ultimate act of unity between Creator and creature achieved in Christ, "is God's active and superior Yes to man."¹⁰⁴ In spite of the 'No' included in the 'Yes,'

¹⁰⁰ Ibid, p. 330, (KD, p. 378).

¹⁰¹ Ibid, p. 332, (KD, p. 380).

¹⁰² Ibid, p. 344, (KD, p. 395).

¹⁰³ Ibid, p. 384, (KD, p. 440).

¹⁰⁴ CD IV/3/1, p. 3, (KD, p. 1).

"it is predominantly, decisively, originally and definitively a Yes and not a No."¹⁰⁵ The life of the Christian reconciled to Christ is that of an unqualified 'Yes.' In the liberation of the Christian, that is the private life of the creature, Jesus invites the witness "not to say No, nor Yes and No, but in faith to say Yes to God."¹⁰⁶ In turn the Christian witness announces to all humankind, "the news of God's . . . Yes to His creation."¹⁰⁷

The modification in the use of this tool is apparent in extra-dogmatic works which celebrate Christ and man in positive relation in the 'Yes' dialectic.¹⁰⁸ In 1962 he describes the 'Yes' concept as important in his move to "evangelical theology which responds to this gracious Yes, to God's self-proclamation made in His friendliness toward man."¹⁰⁹ As such, it is concerned "with God as the God of man,"¹¹⁰ of Immanuel, God with us!¹¹¹

¹⁰⁵ CD IV/3/2, p. 797, (KD, p. 913); also p. 822, (KD, p. 942).

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 659, (KD, p. 755).

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 660, (KD, p. 757). See also CD IV/1, p. 40, 221, 309, 347, 356, 360, 482, 489, 506, 516, 537, 542, 591, (KD, p. 41, 243, 341, 394, 397, 537, 544, 564, 576, 599, 605, 659); CD IV/2, p. 180, 285, 527, (KD, p. 200f, 316, 596), CD IV/3/1, p. 3, 251, 379, 416, (KD, p. 1, 288, 438, 480).

¹⁰⁸ Barth, Deliverance to the Captives, London, SCM Press, 1961, sermons, 1954-59, p. 123 from Den Gefangenen Befreiung, Zürich, EVZ Verlag, 1959, p. 141; see also p. 56f, 62ff, and corresponding Ger. references, 54f, 61ff.

¹⁰⁹ ET, p. 11, Ger., p. 18.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., p. 11f, Ger., loc. cit.

¹¹¹ Ibid., p. 12, Ger., loc. cit.

In the Yes-dialectic the tension of the divine-human relationship has been removed, and God and man experience positive relation as actual event. The 'Yes' of Jesus the Lord spoken to the covenant-partner gives meaning and reality to creation and creature. His 'Yes' is an unequivocal affirmation that what has been created is for the human to which he can respond as the liberated Christian.

In each of these inter-related categories, namely lordship, covenant-partner, analogy and dialectic, we believe Barth has found appropriate means to develop a theology of immanence. Whereas the liberals assumed the presence of the Lord in the world and the positive relation of the Lord and the creature from the anthropocentric viewpoint, Barth's discussion corrects this by grounding the immanentist theology in christology. In addition the categories of analogy and dialectic, formerly employed over against liberalism have been modified and applied in a positive way in Barth's this-worldly theology.

We associate the emergence of Barth's immanentist theology, a corrective to liberalism, with the appearance of the modified polemic, 1942-1968, in turn related to the waning of the threat of nineteenth century theology. More disposed to acknowledge the contributions of his predecessors and less concerned to confront and correct their errors, he balances the former transcendent theology of God over against man with the language of 'God with us' in a correctly grounded theology of immanence.

Whereas formerly he avoided such talk due to the threat of liberalism, he was able to proceed in the direction of renewal with his predecessors from 1942-1968. The pattern prevails throughout the opus, from acceptance and ambivalence toward liberalism, to opposition and conciliation, each of which in turn directly affect Karl Barth's theological development.

CHAPTER VI

Barth, Liberalism and Pneumatology

An area little researched in Barthian studies, that of pneumatology, is perhaps the single most vital link between liberal theology and Barth's. In his attempt particularly in later years to interpret his predecessors in a better light, he consistently pointed to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as the great possibility of their theology. Although Barth alluded to this potential as early as 1938¹ he was at the time involved in a confrontation with the liberals and not until later did he seriously address their contribution of pneumatology.

Barth's recognition of the direction nineteenth century theology might take and its resultant affect on his own theological development become prominent in dogmatic and extra-dogmatic works from 1942-1968. In his guest lectures in Bonn in 1946 where he restored the bust of Schleiermacher to a 'place of honour' again, he stated that to understand the third article of the faith, to understand "I believe in the Holy Spirit" is to recognize Schleiermacher. If this be the case, if their theology be interpreted in that light

We may perhaps no longer need to think with
wrathful indignation of him [Schleiermacher]
and the theologians of the nineteenth century

¹See above, Ch. III, p. 80.

with their 'God in us' and everything connected with it. We may know the real conquest of liberalism. . . .²

Similarly in his 1950 analysis of Schleiermacher's doctrine of sin, he concluded that despite its perils it

might well be adapted and developed in a very different direction as a theology of the subjective reality and possibility of revelation which is not exclusive but inclusive of its objective reality, . . . , a theology which beginning with man, is intended as a theology of the Holy Spirit.³

Although Schleiermacher was unaware of the potential pneumatological direction in his theology⁴ Barth considers this as a point of contact between the two.

As to a clarification of my relationship to Schleiermacher, what I have occasionally contemplated . . . would be the possibility of a theology of the third article, in other words, a theology predominantly and decisively of the Holy Spirit.⁵

All theological statements could conceivably be made from that vantage point, for example, God the Father, God the Son, anthropology, sanctification, justification and christology, that is, all can be illuminated by the Spirit.⁶

²"Christian Doctrine According to the Heidelberg Catechism," op. cit., p. 84f, Ger., p. 78.

³CD III/3, p. 324, (KD, p. 370f).

⁴"PS," p. 134, Ger., p. 311.

⁵Ibid, (Eng. and Ger.).

⁶Ibid, (Eng. and Ger.).

In this final chapter we shall investigate how Barth became 'a little liberal again' through his doctrine of the Spirit. In the first instance we shall show that this illuminating aspect of the third Person unfolds in the doctrine of reconciliation principally in the sphere of his emerging theology of immanence which along with pneumatology has a reference to liberalism. Secondly we shall show that his life-long struggle to say correctly what the liberals had said so forcibly about man is resolved through a 'Christian anthropocentrism' based on the Holy Spirit.

(i)

Spirit as Illuminator

Before we can proceed to elucidate our theme in a positive way, we must dispense with any notion of a comparison between Schleiermacher and Barth's pneumatologies per se. Like others of the nineteenth century such as D. F. Strauss, Alexander Schweizer, Dorner, and Wegscheider, Schleiermacher did not develop a comprehensive doctrine of the Holy Spirit.⁷ And where the latter does posit pneumatology, Barth's is a counter-statement which we have observed in the documentation of the polemic.⁸ His consistency to the principle of the Spirit as the Spirit of God,

⁷Schleiermacher, CF, Vol. II, S121, p. 560ff.

⁸See above, Ch. III, p. 28ff.

the One proceeding from the Father and Son⁹ over against Schleiermacher's talk of the common spirit as an inward impulse producing co-operative activity¹⁰ is affirmed in 1953.

It is rather Schleiermacher's theology in toto as a theology of religious consciousness yet one no longer determined by the anthropocentric but the pneumatological starting-point which Barth advocates. As this insight becomes prominent in his extra-dogmatic writings when he is specifically addressing his relationship to liberalism in the 1950's and 1960's, it is not surprising that his own Spirit theology in the doctrines of creation and reconciliation reaches fruition and reflects his latest investigations into Schleiermacher. Although it appears as the conclusion to the Dogmatics in the final sections of each of the three parts of Volume IV and is a major component of A Fragment, the pneumatology is more than an end piece. On the contrary, it has significance for all that has been said before as an illuminating principle and it is in this regard that Barth completes the theology Schleiermacher started.

By his own admission Barth was moving more toward a theology of the Holy Spirit. While on a lecture tour of the

⁹CD IV/1, p. 646, (KD, p. 722).

¹⁰Schleiermacher, CF, Vol. II, S121, p. 560.

United States, he presented evangelical theology as an advance toward a less formal, more material, more concrete kind of theology¹¹ in what may essentially be described as pneumatology. Discussing "The Place of Theology,"¹² Barth considered the Spirit as the vital power, bringing forward and together the Word, the witness to the message and the Christian community. These are suspended loosely under the power of the Spirit who brightens the revelation of the Word, selects the witnesses to hear and speak and commissions and guides the Church.¹³ Theological work depends on the Holy Spirit,¹⁴ and "It is clear that evangelical theology itself can only be pneumatic spiritual theology."¹⁵ Therein it is the "happy science of the God of the Gospel."¹⁶

As a general principle, Barth's pneumatology is a development of Matthew 18:20.¹⁷ Whereas immanentist concepts emerge in relation to christology in the doctrines of creation and recon-

¹¹"A Theological Dialogue," Questions and Answers in Princeton University Chapel, Warfield Lectures, 1962, in Theology Today, 19, July, 1962, p. 177.

¹²ET, p. 15ff, Ger., p. 21ff.

¹³Ibid, "The Spirit," Ch. V, p. 48-59, Ger., "Der Geist," p. 57-68.

¹⁴Ibid, p. 169f, Ger., p. 186.

¹⁵Ibid, p. 55, Ger., p. 64f.

¹⁶Ibid, Ger., p. 65.

¹⁷CD IV/1, p. 680, (KD, p. 759), "For where two or more meet in my name, I shall be there with them," Bible, p. 28.

ciliation, it is through pneumatology that immanentism is solidified and concretized. This is without jeopardizing or retracting earlier statements of the transcendent, 'Wholly Other' God, although such talk is not in evidence. Nor does he revoke or undermine the christological starting-point; there can be no abandonment of christology.¹⁸ In this regard it is important to clarify that while we suggest the on-going response to liberalism as the best vehicle for the analysis of Barth's theological development, this does not impair the centrality of the christological viewpoint which in turn was a response to liberalism learned as early as 1908 from teacher Wilhelm Herrmann¹⁹ and evident in writings of the time.²⁰

In the this-worldly sphere, pneumatology illuminates Barth's theology, most pointedly in his christology, brightening and bringing it to fruitful culmination. The Holy Spirit is the awakening power and continual renewal and reminder of the earthly-historical form of the existence of Jesus Christ. The Holy Spirit is God in this self-attestation,²¹ He who actualises the history of

¹⁸CD IV/1, p. 644, (KD, p. 719), CD III/2, p. 44, (KD, p. 50).

¹⁹Barth, Theology and Church, op. cit., p. 249ff, 263ff, Ger., 254ff, 273ff.

²⁰"The Righteousness of God" (1916), op. cit., p. 26, Ger., p. 17, "The Christian's Place in Society" (1919), op. cit., p. 273f, Ger., p. 33f.

²¹CD IV/1, p. 646ff, 652f, 714, (KD, p. 722ff, 728f, 797), CD IV/2, p. 651, 653f, (KD, p. 737, 739f).

Jesus.²² Although Jesus remains the cornerstone of the Christian life, the disclosure of Jesus as the True Witness is realized in the presence and work of the Spirit. "It is in the work of the Holy Spirit that He [Jesus Christ] is present in our sphere of time and history as this speaking Witness . . ."²³ The return of Jesus as the mediator "is His coming in the promise of the Spirit."²⁴ In this presence of the Spirit we have the immanent power of the resurrection until the second coming of Jesus. "The revelation of Jesus Christ, His work . . . in this intervening time, is the promise of the Holy Spirit."²⁵

In the Spirit the immanentist principles of covenant-partner, analogy and dialectic are brought to fruition. The third Person of the Trinity is the instrument for the relation and fellowship between God and the human.²⁶ In His gathering of the Christian community, He provides a place for the fulfilment and completion of the covenant.²⁷ "Spirit is, . . ., the operation of God upon His creation; and especially the movement of God

²²CD IV/1, p. 649, (KD, p. 725).

²³CD IV/3/1, p. 420, also p. 421, (KD, p. 485, 485f).

²⁴Ibid, p. 350, (KD, p. 405).

²⁵Ibid, p. 373, (KD, p. 431).

²⁶CD III/2, p. 356f, 394f, (KD, p. 428p., 473f).

²⁷CD IV/1, p. 651, (KD, p. 727).

towards man. Spirit is thus the principle of man's relation to God, of man's fellowship with Him."²⁸ The covenant relation actualized, the two-way Yes of God to man and vice versa is accomplished in the Spirit, whereas formerly Barth, adamant about the irreversible route from christology to anthropology, avoided discussion of human response. Through the vehicle of the Spirit Barth now offers the following, "He is God intervening ~~and~~ acting for man, addressing Himself to him, in such a way that He says Yes to Himself and this makes possible and necessary man's human Yes to Him."²⁹

In addition to mediating the covenant relation and actualizing the Yes of the Lord, Spirit is the instrument for the analogical relation between God and man.³⁰ On the basis of the Spirit's love which in turn is the basis of human love, we are placed "in an internal and essential fellowship in which our existence cannot continue to be alien to His but may become . . . analogous."³¹ This act of correspondence between God and man is the work of the Holy Spirit.

²⁸CD III/2, p. 356, (KD, p. 427).

²⁹CD IV/1, p. 646, (KD, p. 722).

³⁰CD IV/2, S68.2, "The Basis of Love," p. 751ff, (KD, p. 853ff).

³¹Ibid, p. 757, (KD, p. 858).

And it is the power of the Spirit, in which God gives Himself to man, to free him for this imitation, response and correspondence and therefore to make His action the reflection of His own.³²

In his attestation of Jesus Christ the Spirit does not live above human history "addressing Himself to it only from above and from afar and from without."³³ Rather He "lives in an earthly-historical form of existence within it,"³⁴ that is, in the Christian community as the Lord in our midst.³⁵

Although the Christian Church has its roots in christology specifically in the historical presence of Jesus in the Incarnation, ecclesiology is completed in pneumatology. The continuation and renewal of the earthly-historical form of Jesus' existence is sustained in the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit. As the One who orders the growth of the Christian community, the Spirit as Sanctifier is the presence of the real activity of the Lord with His people in which Jesus Christ discloses His unity to men. In the sanctifying activity of the Holy Spirit it is affirmed that Jesus Christ has a relationship to His community specifically in this pneumatological-ecclesiological development which is the culmination of the christological-ecclesiological:

³² Ibid, p. 779, (KD, p. 883).

³³ CD IV/1, p. 661, (KD, p. 738).

³⁴ Ibid, p. 661, 671, (KD, p. 738, 750).

³⁵ Ibid, p. 671, 674, 651, (KD, p. 750, 753, 727).

Both statements denote one and the same reality. But neither renders the other superfluous. Neither can be reduced to the other. Hence neither is dispensable. Again, neither can be separated from the other.³⁶

It is in baptism as the final part of the Dogmatics, that Spirit is clearly posited as the presupposition for initiation into the Christian life. It is in this sacrament that the real entry of the Spirit into the individual and collective Christian life accrues, initiating a life of faithfulness of the human to God, a possibility accomplished in the history of Jesus, illuminated and awakened in baptism in the Spirit.³⁷

The doctrine of the Spirit penetrates every aspect of Barth's immanence theology, the covenant-partner, analogy and dialectic and actualizes the talk of the relation of God and man in this world. As Illuminator the Spirit ties each of these immanentist principles to christology at the same time clarifying the earthly-historical existence of Jesus, completing the doctrine of Christ.

(ii)

Realistic anthropology

Barth's anthropology has long been a source of controversy with most judging his doctrine of man as inadequate and

³⁶ CD IV/3/2, p. 759, (KD, p. 869).

³⁷ CD IV/A Fragment, p. 2, (KD, p. 1).

unrealistic.³⁸ We believe that the resolution to the problem has long been a target in his work and, according to Hood, ". . . Barth is primarily concerned with anthropology. He is willing to assert and preserve the essential dignity belonging to man."³⁹ Although anthropology is rooted in christology,⁴⁰ its culmination occurs in pneumatology and not as most contend in Barth's christology only. Although Stanley Lott perceives the anthropology to have developed against the nineteenth century background,⁴¹ he, as well as T. D. Parker, analyse Barth's doctrine of man through christology alone. According to Parker, "Barth's way of relating anthropology to christology does not give the human element its proper freedom, dignity or sphere or co-operation in relation to God."⁴² This judgment is the unfortunate result of not connecting anthropology to pneumatology in addition to christology. In the latter Barth correctly grounds the doctrine of man and in this alone can the reality of the

³⁸See Introduction, p. 13.

³⁹Hood, op. cit., p. 405.

⁴⁰CD I/1, p. 130f, (KD, p. 135).

⁴¹Stanley George Lott, The Significance of Man in the Theology of Karl Barth, unpublished Th. D. Thesis, New Orleans Baptist Seminary, 1968, p. 178.

⁴²Thomas Dunklin Parker, The Concept of the Human in Karl Barth's Theology, In the Context of His Theological Method, unpublished Th. D. Thesis, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1965, p. 341.

human be addressed. However, it is in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit wherein the real life of the autonomous Christian, that is, anthropology, is completed. In two ways his doctrine of the human is a response to liberalism, firstly, in his solving a problem with its roots in nineteenth century which while offering a strong anthropology at the same time was incorrect in Barth's estimation, and secondly, in finding the vehicle for correct talk of the human through pneumatology which became the closest link between Barth and his predecessors.

Barth's quarrel had always been not with the validity of religious experience as part of the human dynamic but its anthropocentric starting-point in consciousness theology. In two ways, which we shall presently discuss, the human dimension of experience exhibits itself as a significant feature in Barth's theological development, (a) in the decisive role which personal experience played in his thought, and (b) in his continuous attempts in the Dogmatics to speak adequately and correctly of the liberal stronghold of human religious experience which culminates in his anthropology through the doctrine of the Spirit.

(a)

Personal experience

Throughout his life, experience often served as a catalyst for Barth's theological decisions and statements. His disposition to theology was whetted due to home circumstances and the confir-

mation experience precipitated his resolve to become a theologian. The ambivalence he had toward liberalism was dispelled as a result of the experiencing of two events, namely his initiation into and unpreparedness for pastoral work at Geneva and Safenwil in 1909 and 1911 respectively and the endorsing of the war policy of Kaiser Wilhelm II by his teachers of the liberal school. The impact of these events upon Barth was profound and provided the impetus for a life-long search and commitment to find an adequate and correct theological method.

In his initial search while a young pastor, Barth became involved with the leading religious socialists of his day. This experience resulted in political involvement coupled with concern for the workers. Marquardt attests to the significance of experience in this pastoral-political situation:

Barth really began to formulate his ideas as he encountered the proletarian situation directly. He first experienced this situation as a vicar in Geneva and a pastor in Safenwil. His theology originated as he conceptualized from this experience.⁴³

Despite a close relationship Barth later tempered his views and dissociated himself from religious socialism. However, the eschatological note transmitted via the socialists and Albert Schweitzer who taught that eschatology was the missing link in

⁴³Marquardt, "Socialism in the Theology of Karl Barth," op. cit., p. 59.

the christology of the historical critical schools⁴⁴ remained an important element in Barth's theology with special reference in its corrective to the liberal doctrine of Christ. Barth insisted that the Son of God, different from all others, who ventures into the far country as the Messiah, the Kyrios, is the One in whom and by whom the eschatological message is transmitted.⁴⁵ The apostles and the whole Christian community are related to Jesus on the basis of his messianic message. In the eschatological event which supplies the reason why the Lord became a servant his followers recognized Jesus as different.⁴⁶

Barth's Romans, the first attempt to turn around liberal theology, was the result not only of the biblical viewpoint wherein the Word of God theology is found, but also of these experiences and extra-biblical study for example of Kant, Overbeck, Plato, and Kierkegaard. In the thirties the rise of Nazism had impact on Barth's theological development, as did the disappearance of the Nazis and the absence of any great world or local catastrophe. In 1958 Barth, writing upon request to a pastor in the German Democratic Republic, advised the latter to rely on his experience and personal knowledge with regard to the question of

⁴⁴ CD II/1, p. 636, (KD, p. 717), Albert Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, A Critical Study of Its Progress From Reimarus to Wrede. tran. from the German by W. Montgomery, New York, Macmillan, 1973, Ch. 19, 20, p. 330ff.

⁴⁵ CD IV/1, p. 161, (KD, p. 176).

⁴⁶ Ibid, p. 161ff, p. 215, (KD, p. 176ff, 236).

Christian existence in the German East Zone.⁴⁷

The significance of personal experience has not traditionally been considered in studies of Barth's theological development yet his reflection on and interpretation of events in his lifetime often precipitated his theological insights. The associations between the world wars, pastoral experience, religious socialism and Barth's theological development cannot be denied.

(b)

Theological expression of religious experience

To rely on the validity of experience in the theological endeavour was one matter, but to articulate religious experience, which comprises Barth's initial anthropological statements, within the framework of the dogmatic task was another. Its difficulty was heightened for Barth given the background against which he wrote, namely the errors of liberalism and its abhorrent results in two world wars.

Like Schleiermacher, Barth wanted to speak of religious consciousness. While accepting the intent of the nineteenth century formula of 'religious consciousness',⁴⁸ Barth abandoned this

⁴⁷"Letter to a Pastor in the German Democratic Republic" in How to Serve God in a Marxist Land, New York, Association Press, 1959, p. 47, from Brief an einen Pfarrer in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, Evangelischer Verlag, AG, Zollikon, 1958, p. 7f.

⁴⁸CD I/1, p. 198f, (KD, p. 207). [religiösen Bewusstsein]

in favour of the more comprehensive 'religious experience.'⁴⁹ Whereas consciousness implied a human capacity, experience on the other hand could be understood as human ability for religious consciousness as a result of the Word of God. In this it is a 'being determined'⁵⁰ which is similar to Schleiermacher's 'being affected.'⁵¹ Essentially, Barth wanted to speak of human response within the scope of the Word of God theology and by his terminology could speak correctly of what liberalism similarly wanted to address. As a result of the corrective "the way is open for a more precise explanation of our statement that man can have experience of God's Word. This statement must now mean that men in their self-determination can be determined by God's Word."⁵²

The inner dimensions of Barth's early anthropology and that of the liberal viewpoint display some similarities and few differences. Both concur that religious experience cannot be transmitted. According to Barth ". . . if we claim even for a moment that experiences are valid and can be passed on, we find that they are marshy ground upon which neither the preacher nor the hearer can stand or walk."⁵³ Similarly his predecessor states

⁴⁹ Ibid, (CD & KD). [Erfahrung]

⁵⁰ Ibid, p. 199, (KD, p. 207). [Bestimmtsein]

⁵¹ Ibid, (CD & KD). [Affiziertsein]

⁵² Ibid, p. 201, (KD, p. 210).

⁵³ CD I/2, p. 249, (KD, p. 272).

that "Instruction in religion, meaning that piety itself is teachable, is absurd" ⁵⁴ Furthermore learning from others by imitation, arousing of emotions is limited. ⁵⁵ Barth rejected Schleiermacher's premise that there was a faculty of religious consciousness and spoke instead of the unspecified "anthropological locus at which the experience of the Word of God is possible." ⁵⁶ Over against this one specified faculty of religious consciousness as claimed by liberal theology, Barth posits the will, conscience and feeling and all other anthropological areas as centres of human determination by God. He argues not for the rejection of one centre in favour of any number, but against the presumption that there is a human capacity for religious experiencing. This possibility must be treated essentially as God-given..

The objections to Schleiermacher stated, he proceeds to describe religious experience, the discussion of which in 1932 is one-sided, explicating its origin from the divine side. The "primary point to be made" ⁵⁷ is to define experience so that it is not understood in the liberal sense of human capacity. Consequently

⁵⁴ Speeches, p. 122.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ CD I/1, p. 202, (KD, p. 210).

⁵⁷ Ibid, p. 199, (KD, p. 207).

Barth did not deal effectively with experience from the human side and when he addressed the result of divine determining upon concrete existence, he responded that it produces a human acknowledgement which is "determination by God's person"⁵⁸ and "submission to the purposes of God."⁵⁹ Acknowledgement as active human movement is described as "letting oneself be continually led. . ."⁶⁰ Barth's anthropology was successful only as a corrective to the errors of liberal theology but it left the human deficient and passive as his critics indicated.

As we have seen, the modifications of the polemic affected dogmatic changes in Barth's theology not the least of which was his commitment to develop his doctrine of the creature. For the most part his anthropology grounded in christology as the key to the whole⁶¹ was a detailed exposition of the ontological determination of man by Christ.⁶² But the human side of things as act, autonomy and decision was left undeveloped and the completed Christian anthropocentrism was finally posited in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit which for Barth became the "Basic anthropological

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 205, (KD, p. 214).

⁵⁹Ibid., (KD, p. 214f).

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 207, (KD, p. 216).

⁶¹CD IV/1, p. 138, p. 644, (KD, p. 151, p. 719).

⁶²Ibid., p. 45, (KD, p. 47), CD III/2, p. 132ff, (KD, p. 158ff). See also Barth, "The New Humanism and the Humanism of God," op. cit., p. 159, 161, and passim.

insight with which we have to start"⁶³ and the "presupposition for other anthropological statements."⁶⁴ The real life-act of the Christian when interpreted in the light of the Holy Spirit, makes possible a legitimate Christian anthropocentrism:

There is no reason why the attempt of Christian anthropocentrism should not be made . . . There is certainly a place for legitimate Christian thinking starting from below and moving up from man who is taken hold of by God to God who takes hold of man. Let us interpret this attempt by the 19th century theologians in its best light! Provided that it in no way claims to be exclusive and absolute, one must well understand it as an attempt to formulate a theology of the third article of the Apostles' Creed, the Holy Spirit.⁶⁵

In the Holy Spirit Barth found the correct means to speak of man from the human side as well as the divine. Whereas formerly he excluded "Any possibilities of moving from man to God,"⁶⁶ he offers the following in 1962: "In his movement from below to above and from above to below, the one Holy Spirit achieves the opening of God for man and the opening of man for God."⁶⁷

We have discerned three general aspects of Barth's anthropology in the Holy Spirit which include (i) unity between Jesus

⁶³CD III/2, p. 344, (KD, p. 414).

⁶⁴Ibid, p. 354, (KD, p. 425).

⁶⁵"Evangelical Theology in the Nineteenth Century," p. 24f, Ger., p. 16.

⁶⁶CD I/1, p. 131, (KD, p. 135).

⁶⁷ET, p. 169, Ger., p. 186.

Christ and the individual Christian and the community: "In sum, the Holy Spirit is nothing other than the relationship between Christ and us. . . . Wherever this relationship is actualized and becomes a fact in men's lives, He is present and acting,"⁶⁸ (ii) union of humans in the possibility of Christian fellowship. "These men. . . . who live and act in the communion of the one Holy Spirit, and therefore in communion with one another, are Christians,"⁶⁹ (iii) emphasis on the human side of experience and action in the making of the new man, man as a Christian⁷⁰ by the power of the Spirit.

The dynamic of the Christian life, anthropology in the Holy Spirit is the life of faith, love and hope. Whereas formerly discussion of faith revolved around the divine side of things, faith in the Holy Spirit to which anthropology belongs⁷¹ is that which makes man free to the choice of faith, to utter a human Yes to the choice.⁷² The Spirit who makes man free and awakens him

⁶⁸Barth, The Faith of the Church, A Commentary on the Apostles' Creed according to Calvin's Catechism, ed. by Jean-Louis Leuba, tran. by Gabriel Vahanian, New York, Meridian Books, 1958, (1940), p. 124.

⁶⁹CD IV/2, p. 642, p. 643, (KD, p. 726, 727).

⁷⁰CD IV/1, p. 645ff, (KD, p. 721ff)

⁷¹Ibid, p. 740f, (KD, p. 827).

⁷²Ibid, p. 748, (KD, p. 835).

to faith makes the human Yes possible.⁷³ In this occurs the birth of "a new and particular being of man."⁷⁴

Given this basis, Barth can now talk of Christian faith as "a free human act,"⁷⁵ "the act of the Christian life,"⁷⁶ as "the most central and decisive act of his heart."⁷⁷ This human act makes possible acknowledgement, recognition and confession as "a spontaneous, a free, an active event."⁷⁸ Standing in faith is doubly rewarding: firstly, man, as a result of this intimate and direct relation to Jesus Christ, recognizes that despite the sin, his justification is achieved in the likeness he shares with God; secondly, in the analogous conformity of human existence to that of Jesus, one is both justified and sees the emergence of "true manhood."⁷⁹ Thus in faith man stands in relation to Jesus on the one side and sees himself as the being he is on the other.

⁷³Ibid, p. 646, (KD, p. 722).

⁷⁴Ibid, p. 749, (KD, p. 837).

⁷⁵Ibid, p. 757, (KD, p. 846).

⁷⁶Ibid, (CD & KD).

⁷⁷Ibid, (KD, p. 847).

⁷⁸Ibid, p. 758, (KD, loc. cit.).

⁷⁹Barth, "God's Word and the Decision of Faith," in God Here and Now, tran. by Paul M. Van Buren, New York, Harper and Row, 1964, p. 21.

Whereas the analogia fidei of the Dogmatics I and II considered faith from the divine side, this is now balanced through pneumatology in faith as a human dynamic. Without suggesting a theology of relativity between God and man, through the doctrine of the Holy Spirit Barth has found a scriptural reference point for the completion of his doctrine of faith so pertinent to his anthropology.

With Jesus recognized as the source and object of love the latter may correctly be translated into human act by the Holy Spirit whose work "consists in the liberation of man for his own act and therefore for the spontaneous human love whose bitterness and frailty are his own responsibility and not that of the Holy Spirit."⁸⁰ Christian love "will leave its mark upon the character of his life-act as a whole."⁸¹ Corresponding to the love of Jesus it is a free act of man⁸² directed to the Lord and one's fellow-man. As act, love is outward, the result of the power of the Holy Spirit, making the covenant-partnership and reconciliation possible from the human side. Because of love, "the covenant of grace, becomes two-sided instead of one-sided."⁸³ God's Word does not fall on empty ears but the "word and work of human gratitude en-

⁸⁰ CD IV/2, p. 785, (KD, p. 891).

⁸¹ Ibid, p. 783, (KD, p. 888).

⁸² Ibid, p. 785, (KD, p. 890).

⁸³ Ibid, p. 790, (KD, p. 896).

counter and respond and correspond to the Word and work of God's grace."⁸⁴ Through this "free act of man in the liberating power of the Holy Spirit, . . . the reconciliation of man with God attains in its provisional goal and end."⁸⁵

In answering his critics as regards an inadequate anthropology, Barth insists that the human is no mere puppet in all of this. Love is not the effluence of divine love, but real human love resulting from the quickening power of the Spirit.⁸⁶ There can be no talk of genuine covenant partnership unless there be a corresponding human act⁸⁷ and the mystery of reconciliation is as great from the human as from the divine side.⁸⁸ There remains little doubt in his explication of love that Barth was concerned to address the question of autonomous human act overcoming the aridity of an earlier anthropology which disregarded the human dynamic. In human love through the power of the Holy Spirit, the covenant as partnership is completed from the human side and reconciliation as man's decision is actualized.

And in hope, in the expectation of the parousia, man becomes real man in this address to the personal and existential

⁸⁴ Ibid, (CD & KD).

⁸⁵ Ibid, (CD & KD).

⁸⁶ Ibid, p. 800, (KD, p. 907).

⁸⁷ Ibid, (KD, p. 908).

⁸⁸ Ibid, p. 800f, (KD, loc. cit.).

question of the individual.⁸⁹ In his looking in hope toward the eschaton, the human becomes here and now a witness to Jesus Christ in ministering his Word to all men. In this hope and work, the Christian is awakened by the Holy Spirit to prophetic existence. In this act of the Spirit, the Christian is not overpowered but treated as a free subject; "He sets him on his own feet as a partner."⁹⁰

Parallel to the positing of baptism as the sacramental entry of the Spirit into the Christian life, is the understanding of this holy initiation as the individual's being ordained in a life of faith, hope and love, of covenant partnership, positive relation and friendship with God. In this work of the Holy Spirit he is the free, independent, new man, the one open to the work of God upon him and in turn the one who can utter 'Yes' to God, not an arbitrary, concocted response but the "Yes of his human work."⁹¹

Barth's lifelong dedication to posit scientific theology rooted in the Word of God goes hand-in-hand with his commitment to speak correctly and adequately of the human. This he did amidst criticisms of a deficient anthropology and with reference to

⁸⁹ CD IV/3/2, p. 930, (KD, p. 1068).

⁹⁰ Ibid, p. 941, (KD, p. 1082).

⁹¹ CD IV/A Fragment, p. 42, (KD, p. 46).

an incorrect liberal starting-point which while elevating man did so at the expense of God. A valid Christian anthropocentrism giving full credit to the human dynamic, namely autonomy, decision and act, is negotiated through pneumatology. In this he can finally allow talk of the movement from man to God as did the liberals by displacing their anthropological for the pneumatological starting-point.

The doctrine of the Holy Spirit which unfolds fully in Volume IV of the Dogmatics is an important dimension of Barth's thought in itself and in relation to the whole of his theology. His pneumatology has a reference point in liberalism in a number of ways. Firstly, it emerges strongly at a time when Barth is reassessing his relationship to his predecessors with particular attention to the possibility of pneumatology as a point of contact. Secondly, as Illuminator the Spirit is an essential tool in the completion of Barth's immanentist theology, actualizing the this-worldly relation between God and man in the covenant-partner, analogy and dialectic with especial reference to christology. In this time of conciliation Barth balances his former transcendent theology in opposition to liberalism with a correct starting-point for his theology of immanence in the third article of the creed. Finally the great triumph of his pneumatology is in his developing a viable Christian anthropocentrism, the thorn and heart of liberalism. This continuous struggle and engagement to clarify the

theological expression of the human in its full dynamic in relation to God, self and fellow-man is resolved in replacing the anthropological starting-point with the pneumatological.

Appropriately the end of Volume IV, essentially the doctrine of the Spirit, places Barth and the liberals in a far different light than the first two volumes of the Dogmatics. The relationship, ever-present and always with resultant impact on his-theology, has come full circle. Although the attitude and complexion have been modified throughout his career as reflected in dogmatic and extra-dogmatic writings, liberal theology was constantly a reference for the development of Karl Barth's thought.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this thesis we have addressed Karl Barth's theological development as a response to that of nineteenth century German Protestantism. Such a principle allows his thought to be examined with due consideration for the continuity of his task with the liberals as well as the nuances and shifts in his unique contribution to theology. We believe this comprehensive approach provides a viable means for the examination of Barth's thought in its general development or with reference to specific themes and doctrines.

We have indicated that throughout the Barthian opus there is an association between his attitude toward liberalism and resultant theological positions and statements both in dogmatic and extra-dogmatic works. Wavering between commitment and ambiguity, Barth's earliest writings reflect these attitudes. This is followed by the emergence of a negative tone toward the errors and results of liberalism precipitated by the occurrence of the first world war and his initial pastoral experiences at Geneva and Safenwil. His resultant writings couple a critique of liberalism and a search for a corrective theology. Convinced of the inadequacy of nineteenth century Protestant theology, Barth's Dogmatics I and II produced an extensive negative polemic and a predominantly opposition theology. This negativism is

apparent in his extra-dogmatic writings of the thirties against Hitler and the German Christians which in turn Barth associated with liberal theology.

Inspired by a more settled world situation in the forties, Barth re-investigated the potential of the liberal task no longer perceived as a political/theological threat. His changed attitude produced a modified polemic in the Dogmatics III and IV and a theology in conciliation in which in the dogmatic and extra-dogmatic works, he acknowledges the contributions of liberal theology. Whereas his opposition theology emphasized the transcendence of God over against the this-worldly theology of liberalism, the direction toward conciliation reveals elements of Barth's ties with his predecessors particularly in the emergence of a theology of immanence and in his pneumatology. The tools of lordship, covenant-partner, analogy and dialectic help balance the centrality of transcendence of the earlier works, while at the same time correct the liberal anthropocentric theology of immanence. Barth's pneumatology, which is partially a result of his re-assessment of the liberals and a possible point of contact with them, is an important tool in his immanentist theology and is the means for a correct Christian anthropocentrism.

Despite the tone of his attitude, Barth's theological development and statements are at all points a response to liberalism. Understood in the light of his relation to his predecessors,

the full scope of Barth's thought is apparent. The result is a balanced product: neither elements of transcendence supersede those of immanence nor vice versa but rather both must be considered as constituting the full dimensions of his thought; it is a scientific theology with due regard for God and man, man and his fellowmen. Finally, his pneumatology, a central link to the liberals, brings Barth's theology to fruition and provides a corrective to the nineteenth century anthropocentric starting-point.

We recommend a re-appraisal of the traditional approach to Barth's relation to liberalism considered by most to be negative. Contrary to this we have shown that Barth was not at any point finished with, nor did he reject, liberal theology. His continuous wrestling with the errors and merits of the nineteenth century approach was finally resolved in Barth's conciliatory theology integrating the best fruits of liberalism. In addition, this more comprehensive method of interpreting Barth is recommended over more limited models which for the most part interpret Barth from one central doctrine. Finally, the thesis of a radical turning-point in Barth's thought needs re-assessment as his theology discloses continuous negotiations with liberalism, which as an underlying thread pervading the opus, must be given due regard.

To date, there has been little research in the area of

Barth's immanentist theology as it develops in the doctrines of creation and reconciliation. The themes of lordship, covenant-partner, analogy and dialectic need be analysed for their specific contributions to Barth's theology. Further, there is a paucity of research in the sphere of his pneumatology. This doctrine needs be addressed in its full development as well as its unique relation to christology, ecclesiology, and anthropology. We believe the full dimensions of Barth's theology can be appreciated only with reference to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit which in turn reflects his continuous relationship with liberalism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barth's works in chronological order:

"Moderne Theologie und Reichsgottesarbeit," in ZTK, 19, 1909,
p. 317-321.

"Der christliche Glaube und die Geschichte," in Schweizerische
Theologische Zeitschrift, Vol. 29, 1912, p. 1-72.

"Der Glaube an den persönlichen Gott," in ZTK, 1914, Part I,
p. 21-32, Part II, p. 65-95.

Action in Waiting, (1916), including "Joy in the Lord" by
Christoph Blumhardt, Rifton, New York, Plough Publish-
ing House, 1969, 69p.

Der Römerbrief, Bern, B. A. Baschlin, 1919, 440p.

The Epistle to the Romans, tran. from the sixth edition by
Edwyn C. Hoskyns, London, Oxford University Press,
1965, 547 p. from Der Römerbrief, München, Chr. Kaiser
Verlag, 1926, C 1922, 528p.

The Word of God and The Word of Man, New York, Harper and Row,
1957, 327p., lectures 1916-24, tran. from Das Wort
Gottes und die Theologie, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag,
1925, 212p.

Barth - Thurneysen Correspondence, in Revolutionary Theology in
the Making, Barth - Thurneysen Correspondence, 1914-25,
by James D. Smart, London, Epworth Press, 1964, 249p.

Barth and Edward Thurneysen, Come Holy Spirit, Sermons, New
York, Round Table Press, 1933, 287p., sermons 1920-24.

Barth, Die Theologie Schleiermachers, Zürich, Evangelischer
Verlag, 1978, 480p., lectures, 1923-24.

Theologische Fragen und Antworten, Evangelischer Verlag AG.
Zollikon, 1957, 315p., writings 1923-42.

Barth and Thurneysen, God's Search for Man, Sermons, tran. by
George W. Richards et al, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark,
235p.; from Die grosse Barmherzigkeit, München, Chr.
Kaiser Verlag, 1935, 236p., 1924-1934.

Barth, The Epistle to the Philippians, London, SCM Press, 1962, 128p., from Erklärung des Philipperbriefes, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1982, 120p., lectures 1926-27.

Christmas, tran. by Bernard Citron, London, Oliver and Boyd, 1959, 108p., sermons 1926-33.

Die christliche Dogmatik, Die Lehre vom Worte Gottes, Prolegomena zur christlichen Dogmatik, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1927, 473p.

Theology and Church, Shorter Writings, 1920-28, tran. by Louise Pettibone Smith, London, SCM Press, 1962, 358p., from Die Theologie und die Kirche, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1928, 391p.

"Schicksal und Idee in der Theologie," in ZZ, 1929, p. 309-348.

Barth, Karl and Heinrich, Zur Lehre vom Heiligen Geist, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1930, 105p.

Barth, Karl, Anselm: 'Fides Quaerens Intellectum; Anselm's Proof of the Existence of God in the Context of His Theological Scheme, London, SCM Press, 1960, 173p., from Fides quaerens intellectum, Anselm's Beweiss des Existenz Gottes in Zusammenhang seines theologischen Programms, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1931, 199p.

Church Dogmatics, hereafter CD, The Doctrine of the Word of God, Prolegomena to Church Dogmatics, Vol. I/1, tran. by G. W. Bromiley, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, pub. of English editions, 1975, 503p., from Die Kirchliche Dogmatik, hereafter KD, Die Lehre vom Wort Gottes, Prolegomena zur Kirchlichen Dogmatik, I/1, Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag, 1964 (1932), 528p.

"Abschied," ZZ, Vol. 11, 1933, p. 536-554.

Theological Existence Today! A Plea for Theological Freedom, tran. by R. Birch Hoyle, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1933, 85p., from Theologische Existenz Heute, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1933, 40p.

"Für die Freiheit des Evangeliums," Th E H, Heft 2, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1933, 24p.

"Reformation als Entscheidung," Th E H, Heft 3, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1933, 24p.

"Lutherfeier," Th E H, Heft 4, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1933, 21p.

"Die Kirche Jesu Christi," Th E H, Heft 5, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1933, 24p.

"Gottes Wille und unsere Wünsche," Th E H, Heft 7, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1934, 39p.

God in Action, tran. by E. G. Homrighausen and Karl J. Ernst, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1937, 149p., from "Offenbarung, Kirche, Theologie," Th E H, Heft 9, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1934, 43p.

"Der gute Hirte," Th E H, Heft 10, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1934, 23p.

The German Church Conflict, Richmond, John Knox Press, 1967, C 1965, 77p., from Karl Barth zum Kirchenkampf, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, Heft 49, in Th E H, Neue Folge, 41-50, p. 3-96, writings 1933-39.

"No!" in Natural Theology, London, Geoffrey Bles, The Centenary Press, 1946, p. 67-128, from "Nein!" Antwort an Emil Brunner, Th E H, München, 1934, # 14, p. 4-63.

Fürchte Dich nicht, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1949, 333p., sermons, 1934-48.

Credo, A Presentation of the Chief Problems of Dogmatics with Reference to the Apostles' Creed, tran. by J. Strathern McNab, New York Scribners, 1936, 203p. from Credo, Die Hauptprobleme der Dogmatik dargestellt im Anschluss an das Apostolische Glaubensbekenntnis, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1936, 173p.

The Knowledge of God and The Service of God According to the Teaching of the Reformation, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1938, 255p., Gotteserkenntnis und Gottesdienst nach reformatorischer Lehre, Zollikon, Verlag der Evangelischen Buchhandlung, 1938, 226p.

CD, Vol. I/2, tran. by G. T. Thomson and Harold Knight, 1970, 905p., from KD, Verlag der Evangelischen Buchhandlung Zollikon, 1938, 1011p.

"Introduction to the Heidelberg Catechism," in The Heidelberg Catechism for Today, tran. by Shirley C. Guthrie Jr., Richmond, John Knox Press, 1964, 141p., from Einführung in den Heidelberger Katechismus, Zürich, EVZ - Verlag, 1938, 23p.

CD, The Doctrine of God, Vol. II/1, tran. by T. H. L. Parker et al, 1976, C 1957, 699p., from KD, Die Lehre von Gott, Evangelischer Verlag Zollikon, 1958, (1940), 782p.

The Faith of the Church, A Commentary on the Apostles' Creed according to Calvin's Catechism, ed. by Jean-Louis Leuba, tran. by Gabriel Vahanian, New York, Meridian Books, 1958, (1940), 188p.

A Shorter Commentary on Romans, London, SCM Press, 1959, 184p., from Kurze Erklärung des Römerbriefes, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1956, C 1941, 226p.

CD, Vol. II/2, tran. by G. W. Bromiley et al, 1967, C 1957, 806p., from KD, Evangelischer Verlag AG, Zollikon, 1959, (1942), 898p.

The Teaching of the Church Regarding Baptism, tran. by Ernest A. Payne, London, SCM Press, 1948, 64p., from Die kirchliche Lehre von der Taufe, Th E H, Neue folge 4, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1947, (1943), 48p.

The Church and the War, tran. by Antonia H. Froendt, New York, Macmillan, 1944, 49p.

"Die Deutschen und wir," (1945), p. 334ff, in Eine Schweizer Stimme, 1938-1945, Zollikon-Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag, 1945, 432p.

CD, The Doctrine of Creation, Vol. III/1, tran. by J. W. Edwards, et al, 1970 C 1958, 428p., from KD, Die Lehre von der Schöpfung, Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag, 1970, (1945), 488p.

Against The Stream, Shorter Post-War Writings, 1946-52, London, SCM Press, 1954, 252p.

Protestant Theology in the Nineteenth Century, Its Background and History, tran. by Brian Cozens and John Bowden, London, SCM Press, 1972, 669p., from Die protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert, Ihre Vorgeschichte und ihre Geschichte, Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag, AG, Zollikon, 1947, 611p.

"Christian Doctrine According to the Heidelberg Catechism," in The Heidelberg Catechism for Today, from Die christliche Lehre nach dem Heidelberger Katechismus, Zollikon-Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag AG, 1948, (1947), 109p.

Dogmatics in Outline, tran. by G. T. Thomson, London, SCM Press, 1959, 155p., from Dogmatik im Grundriss, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1947, 181p.

CD, Vol. III/2, tran. by Harold Knight et al, 1968, C 1960, 661p., from KD, Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag, 1959, (1948), 800p.

How I Changed My Mind, Virginia, John Knox Press, 1966, 96p., (1928-1958).

God Here and Now, tran. by Paul M. Van Buren, New York, Harper and Row, 1964, 108p., (1949-64).

"The New Humanism and The Humanism of God," in Theology Today, # 8, May, 1951, p. 157-166, from "Humanismus," in Theologische Studien, 28, Zollikon - Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag, AG, 1950, (1949), 28p.

CD, Vol. III/3, tran. by G. W. Bromiley and R. J. Ehrlich, 1976, C 1960, 544p., from KD, Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag, 1961, (1950), 635p.

CD, Vol. III/4, tran. by A. T. MacKay et al, 1969, C 1961, 704p., from KD, Evangelischer Verlag, 1969, (1951), 810p.

"Rudolf Bultmann - An Attempt to Understand Him," in Kerygma and Myth, A Theological Debate, Vol. II, ed. by Hans-Werner Bartsch, tran. by Reginald H. Fuller, London, SPCK, 1962, (1952), p. 38-132.

CD, The Doctrine of Reconciliation, Vol. IV/1, tran. by G. W. Bromiley, tran. hereafter, 1974, 802p., from KD, Die Lehre von der Versöhnung, EVZ-Verlag, pub. hereafter for KD, 1960 (1953), 895p.

Deliverance to the Captives, London, SCM Press, 1961, 160p., from Den Gefangenen Befreiung, Zürich, EVZ-Verlag, 1959, 190p., sermons, 1954-59.

CD, Vol. IV/2, 1967, C 1958, 867p., from KD, 1964 (1955), 982p.

"The Humanity of God," p. 37-65, in The Humanity of God, London, Collins Press, 1961, 96p., from "Die Menschlichkeit Gottes," Evangelischer Verlag Zollikon, Theologische Studien, 48, 1956, p. 3-27.

- "Evangelical Theology in the Nineteenth Century," in The Humanity of God, p. 11-33; from Evangelische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert, Zollikon-Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag AG, 1957, 24p.
- "Letter to a Pastor in the German Democratic Republic," p. 45-80, in How to Serve God in a Marxist Land; New York, Association Press, 1959, from Brief an einen Pfarrer in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, Evangelischer Verlag AG, Zollikon, 1958, 45p.
- Call for God, tran. by A. T. MacKay, London, SCM Press, 1967, 125p., from Rufe Mich An!, Zürich EVZ-Verlag, 1965, 130p., sermons, 1959-64.
- CD IV/3/1, 1976, C 1961, 478p., from KD, 1959, 551p.
- CD IV/3/2, 1975, C 1962, 963p., from KD, p. 552-1107.
- "Liberal Theology: Some Alternatives," The Hibbert Journal, Vol. 59, Apr. '61, p. 211-219, from "Möglichkeiten liberaler Theologie heute," Schweizerische Theologische Umschau, Vol. 30, 1960, p. 95-101.
- "On Systematic Theology," tran. by Terrence Tice, in SJT, Vol. 14, #3, 1961, p. 225-228.
- Evangelical Theology: An Introduction, New York, Holt, tran. by Grover Foley, 1963, 206p., from Einführung in die evangelische Theologie, Zürich, EVZ-Verlag, 1962, 224p.
- "A Theological Dialogue," Questions and Answers in Princeton University Chapel, Warfield Lectures, Theology Today, 19: 171-177, J1'62.
- "A Thank You and A Bow, Kierkegaard's Reveille," CJT, Vol. 11, #1, 1965, p. 3-7.
- "Kierkegaard and the Theologians," in CJT, 13: 64-66, Ja '67.
- CD, Vol. IV/4, The Christian Life, (Fragment), 1969, 226p., from KD, Das christliche Leben, Die Taufe als Begründung des christlichen Lebens, 1967, 247p.
- "Concluding Unscientific Postscript on Schleiermacher," in Studies in Religion, tran. by Geo. Hunsinger, Vol. 7, #2, 1978, p. 117-135, from "Nachwort," p. 290-312, in Schleiermacher-Auswahl, ed. by Henri Bolli, Siebenstern Taschenbuch Verlag, München, 1968, 312p.

Fragments Grave and Gay, ed. by Martin Rumscheidt, tran. by Eric Mosbacher, Glasgow, Collins, 1971, 127p.

Letzte Zeugnisse, Zürich, EVZ-Verlag, 1961, 82p.

Registerband (of KD), prepared by Wolfgang Erk and Marcel Pfandler, Zürich, EVZ-Verlag, 1970, 676p.

Other Works:

Balthasar, Hans Urs von, The Theology of Karl Barth, tran. by John Drury, New York, Rinehart and Winston, 1971, 323p.

Berkouwer, G. C., The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth, tran. by Harry R. Boer, London, Paternoster Press, 1956, 414p.

Bouillard, Henri, Karl Barth, Vol. I, Genèse et évolution de la theologie dialectique, 284p., Vol. II, Parole de Dieu et existence humaine, Part 1, 288p., Part 2, 308p., Paris, Aubier, 1957.

Busch, Eberhard, Karl Barth, His Life from Letters and Autobiographical Texts, tran. by John Bowden, London, SCM Press, 1976, 569p., from Karl Barth's Lebenslauf, Nach seinen Briefen und autobiographischen Texten, München Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1976, 555p.

Casalis, Georges, Portrait of Karl Barth, tran. by Robert McAfee Brown, Garden City, New York, Doubleday, 1963, 135p.

Chan, David Tak-Yan, The Critique of Schleiermacher's Theology by Emil Brunner and Karl Barth, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Edinburgh, Apr. 1959, 335p.

Cragg, Gerald R., The Church and The Age of Reason, 1648-1749, Great Britain, Hazell, 1972, 289p.

Dawson, Christopher, The Judgment of the Nations, New York, Sheed and Ward, 1942, 222p.

Dorner, I. A., A System of Christian Doctrine, Vol. II, tran. by Alfred Cave and J. S. Banks, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1896-97.

Dorner, J. A., History of Protestant Theology Particularly Germany, Viewed According to its Fundamental Movement,

tran. by George Robson and Sophia Taylor, Edinburgh,
T. & T. Clark, 1871, Vol. I, 444p., Vol. II, 510p.

Enss, Gustav Heinrich, Barthian Theology in its Relation to Schleiermacher's System, unpublished Th.D. thesis, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1935, 150p.

Feuerbach, Ludwig, The Essence of Christianity, tran. by George Eliot, New York, Harper and Row, 1957, 339p.

-----, Lectures on the Essence of Religion, tran. by Ralph Manheim, New York, Harper and Row, 1967, 359p.

Frei, Hans Wilhelm, The Doctrine of Revelation in the Thought of Karl Barth, 1909 to 1922: The Nature of Karl Barth's Break with Liberalism, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Yale University, 1962, 603p.

Gerrish, B. A., Tradition and the Modern World, Reformed Theology in the Nineteenth Century, The Zenos Lectures, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1977, 263p.

Glenn, Alfred A., The Relationship Between Theology as a Special Science and Analytic Philosophy with Special Reference to the Theology of Karl Barth, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Evanston, Ill., Northwestern University, 1967, 154p.

Hamer, Jérôme, Karl Barth, tran. by D. M. Maruca, London, Sands, 1962, 300p.

Hartwell, Herbert, The Theology of Karl Barth, An Introduction, Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1964, 201p.

Hegel, G. W. F., Early Theological Writings, ed. by J. R. Silber, tran. by T. M. Knox, and "Fragment of a System," tran. by Richard Kroner, Philadelphia, University of Philadelphia Press, 1971, 340p.

-----, On Art, Religion, Philosophy, Introductory Lectures to the Realm of Absolute Spirit, tran. by Gernard Bosanquet et al, ed. by J. Glenn Gray, New York, Harper and Row, 1970, 324p.

The Jerusalem Bible.

Jüngel, Eberhard, The Doctrine of the Trinity, God's Being is in Becoming, trans. from the German, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1976, 110p.

Kadai, Heino Olavi, A Comparative Study of the Prolegomena in Karl Barth's Christliche Dogmatik of 1927 and the Kirchliche Dogmatik of 1932 - 1938, unpublished Th.D. thesis, St. Louis, Concordia Seminary, 1969, 558p.

Kant, Immanuel, Critique of Pure Reason, tran. by J. M. D. Meiklejohn, London, J. M. Dent, 1978, 483p.

----, Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals, tran. by H. J. Paton, New York, Harper & Row, 1964, 143p.

----, Lectures on Ethics, tran. by Louis Infield, New York, Harper & Row, 1963, 253p.

----, Religion Within the Limits of Reason Alone, tran. by T. M. Greene and H. H. Hudson, New York, Harper and Row, 1960, 190p.

Kehm, George Harry, The Christological Foundation of Anthropology in the Theology of Karl Barth, unpublished Th.D. thesis, Harvard, 1966, 372p.

Küng, Hans, Justification, The Doctrine of Karl Barth and A Catholic Reflection, tran. by T. Collins, London, Burns & Oates, 1964, 358p.

Lacelle, Elisabeth J., La Reconciliation, Un événement de Parole dans la pensée de Karl Barth entre 1953 et 1968, unpublished Th.D. thesis, Université de Strasbourg, 1977, 378p.

Lichtenberger, F., History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century, tran. by W. Hastie, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1889.

Lilburne, Geoffrey Richard, The Ontological Fabric of Karl Barth's Mature Theology: An Elucidation of a Distinctive Method, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Emory University, 1979, 250p.

Lochhead, David Morgan, The Autonomy of Theology, A Critical Study with Special Reference to Karl Barth and Contemporary Analytic Philosophy, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, McGill, 1966.

Lott, Stanley George, The Significance of Man in the Theology of Karl Barth, unpublished Th.D. thesis, New Orleans, Baptist Seminary, 1968, 196p.

Löwith, Karl, From Hegel to Nietzsche, The Revolution in Nineteenth Century Thought, tran. by David E. Green, New York, Doubleday, 1967, C 1941, 468p.

Machen, J. Gresham, Christianity and Liberalism, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1968, 180p.

Mackintosh, H. R., Types of Modern Theology, Schleiermacher to Barth, London, Collins Press, 1969, 307p.

Marquardt, F. W., "Socialism in the Theology of Karl Barth," p. 47-76, tran. by George Hunsinger in Karl Barth and Radical Politics, ed. by Hunsinger, Philadelphia, Westminster Press, 1976, 236p.

-----, Theologie und Sozialismus. Das Beispiel Karl Barths, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1972, 374p.

Matheson, George, Aids to the Study of German Theology, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1877.

McConnachie, John, The Barthian Theology and The Man of Today, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1933, 335p.

-----, The Significance of Karl Barth, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1931, 288p.

Monsma, Peter Halman, Karl Barth's Idea of Revelation, Somerville, NJ, Somerset Press, 1937, 218p.

Mueller, David L., Karl Barth, Waco, Texas, Word Books, 1972, 172p.

- Müller, Julius, The Christian Doctrine of Sin, tran. by Wm. Urwick, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1868, Vol. I, 417p., Vol. II, 440p.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, Ecce Homo, tran. by Walter Kaufmann, New York, Vintage Books, 1969, p. 215-367.
- O'Grady, Colm, The Church in Catholic Theology: Dialogue with Karl Barth, London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1969, 388p.
- Parker, Thomas Dunklin, The Concept of the Human in Karl Barth's Theology, In the Context of His Theological Method, unpublished Th.D. thesis, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1965, 454p.
- Pauck, Wilhelm, The Heritage of the Reformation, New York, Union Theological Free Press of Glencoe, 1961, 399p.
- Pfeiderer, Otto, The Development of Theology in Germany Since Kant and Its Progress in Great Britain Since 1825, tran. by J. Frederick Smith, London, Swan Sonnenschein, 1890.
- Polman, A.D.R., Barth, tran. by Calvin D. Freeman, Philadelphia, Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 1968, 68p.
- Reardon, Bernard M.G., Religious Thought in the Nineteenth Century, Illustrated from Writers of the Period, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1966, 406p.
- Ritschl, Albrecht, A Critical History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation, tran. by John S. Black, Edinburgh, Edmonston and Douglas, 1872, Vol. I, 605p.
- , "Instruction in the Christian Religion," p. 171-286, tran. by Alice Mead Swing, in The Theology of Albrecht Ritschl, New York, Longmans, Green, 1901, 296p.
- Rothe, Richard, Zur Dogmatik, Leipzig, Verlag von G. Reuter, 1898.
- Rumscheidt, H. Martin, Revelation and Theology, An Analysis of the Barth-Harnack Correspondence of 1923, Cambridge, The University Press, 1972, 219p.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich, Brief Outline on the Study of Theology, tran. by Terrence N. Tice, Richmond, John Knox Press, 1966, 132p.

- , The Christian Faith, ed. by H. R. Mackintosh and J. S. Stewart, New York, Harper and Row, 1963, Vol. I, p. i-354, Vol. II, p. 355-760, from the Ger., Der christliche Glaube, nach den Grundsätzen der evangelischen Kirche im Zusammenhange dargestellt, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1960, Vol. I, 459p., Vol. II, 580p.
- , Christmas Eve, Dialogue on the Incarnation, tran. by Terrence N. Tice, Richmond, John Knox Press, 1967, 92p.
- , On Religion, Speeches to its Cultured Despisers, tran. by John Oman, New York, Harper and Row, 1958, 287p. from Über die Religion, Reden an die Gebildeten unter ihren Verächtern, Leipzig, F. Brochhaus, 1868, 254p.
- Schweitzer, Albert, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, A Critical Study of its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede, tran. by W. Montgomery, New York, Macmillan, 1973, 413p.
- Schweizer, Alexander, Die christliche Glaubenslehre nach protestantischen Grundsätzen, Leipzig, G. Hirzel, 1877, Vol. I, 610p.
- , Die Glaubenslehre der evangelisch-reformierten Kirche, Zürich, Orell, Füssli, Vol. I, 1844, 498p., Vol. II, 1847, 755p.
- Strauss, David Frederick, Die christliche Glaubenslehre, in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und im Kampfe mit der modernen Wissenschaft, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973 (1840), 717p.
- , The Life of Jesus Critically Examined, tran. by George Eliot, Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1972, 812p.
- Sykes, S. W., (ed), Karl Barth, Studies of His Theological Method, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1979, 204p.
- Thompson, John, Christ in Perspective, Christological Perspectives in the Theology of Karl Barth, Edinburgh, Saint Andrew Press, 1978, 202p.
- Tillich, Paul, Perspectives On Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Protestant Theology, London, SCM Press, 1967, 245p.
- Torrance, Thomas F., Karl Barth, An Introduction to His Early Theology, 1910-1931, London, SCM Press, 1962, 231p.

-----, Theology in Reconstruction, London, SCM Press, 1965, 288p.

Wegscheider, Julius August Ludwig, Institutiones Theologiae Christianae Dogmaticae, Lipsiae, Sumptibus Librariae Gebaueriae, 1844, 774p.

White, Donald Robert, Karl Barth's Reaction to Liberalism, Barth's Response to the Theology of Schleiermacher, Ritschl, and Herrmann as Reflected in their Theological Method, unpub. Ph. D. thesis, Chicago, University Press, 1964, 210p.

Wilkerson, James Kenneth, Transcendence and Language: A Study of the Theology of Karl Barth, unpub. Ph. D. thesis, Nashville, Vanderbilt University, 1967, 237p.

Wood, Donald Dixon, Anselm's Contribution to Barth's Doctrine of the Knowledge of God, unpub. Ph. D. thesis, Pasadena, Fuller Theological Seminary, 1974, 207p.

Zahrnt, Heinz, The Question of God, Protestant Theology in the Twentieth Century, tran. by R. A. Wilson, New York, Harcourt, Brace and World, 1969, 398p.

Articles

Abercrombie, Clarence L. III, "Barth and Bonhoeffer: Resistance to the Unjust State," in Religion in Life, Vol. 42, Autumn, 1973, p. 344-360.

Aldwinckle, R. F., "Karl Barth and Religious Language," CJT, Vol. 11, 1965, p. 164-173.

Bouillard, Henri, "Dialogue with Karl Barth, The Problem of Natural Theology," Cross Currents, Spring '68, p. 203-228.

Brunner, Emil, "The New Barth, Observations on Karl Barth's Doctrine of Man," SJT, 4, #2, '51, p. 123-135.

Butler, Gerald A., "Karl Barth and Political Theology," in SJT, Vol. 27, Nov., 1974, p. 441-458.

Clark, Gordon H. "Barth's Critique of Modernism," in Christianity Today, Jan. 5, 1962, Vol. 6, p. 315-317.

- Crawford, R. G., "Karl Barth and Philosophy," in Modern Churchman, Vol. 20, #1-2, 1977, p. 36-43.
- , "The Theological Method of Karl Barth," in SJT, Vol. 25, #3, Aug. '72, p. 320-336.
- Cushman, Robert E., "Barth's Attack Upon Cartesianism and the Future in Theology," in JR, Vol. 36, Oct. 1956, #4, p. 207-223.
- Fenn, W. W., "Modern Liberalism," in American Journal of Theology, Vol. 17, 1913, p. 509-519.
- Fiorenza, Francis Schüssler, "The Responses of Barth and Ritschl to Feuerbach," in Studies in Religion, Vol. 7, #2, 1978, p. 149-166.
- Forstman, Jack, "Barth, Schleiermacher and The Christian Faith," in Union Seminary Quarterly Journal, Vol. 21, M' 1966, p. 305-319.
- Goetz, Ronald, "Barthians on Parade," second colloquium of the Karl Barth Society of North America, in Christian Century, #91, May 15, 1974, p. 525-526.
- Gunton, Colin, "Karl Barth and The Development of Christian Doctrine," in SJT, Vol. 25, #2, May '72, p. 171-180.
- Härle, Wilfred, "Der Aufruf der 93 Intellektuellen und Karl Barths Bruch mit der liberalen Theologie," in ZTK, Vol. 72, #2, 1975, p. 207-224.
- Hood, Robert E., "The Thorn of Liberalism in Karl Barth," in Anglican Theological Review, Vol. 44, Oct '62, p. 403-414.
- Knudson, Albert C., "Theology of Crisis," in Methodist Review, Vol. 3, #314, 1928, Part 1, p. 329-343, Part 2, p. 549-560.
- Lee, Jung Young, "Karl Barth's Use of Analogy in His Church Dogmatics," in SJT, 22, 1969, p. 129-151.
- Mayer, F. E., "Barth, Br  nner, Niebuhr - Neo-Orthodox or Liberal?" in Concordia Theological Monthly, Vol. 21, #8, Aug '50, p. 617-622.

- McKinnon, Alastair, "Barth's Relation to Kierkegaard: Some Further Light," in CJT, Vol. 13, 1967, #1, p. 31-41.
- McLelland, Joseph C., "Philosophy and Theology - A Family Affair (Karl Barth and Heinrich Barth)," p. 30-52 in Footnotes to a Theology, The Karl Barth Colloquium of 1972, Martin Rumscheidt, ed., Corporation for the Publication of Academic Studies in Religion in Canada, 1974, 149p.
- Meland, Bernard Eugene, "The Persisting Liberal Witness," in Christian Century, Vol. 79, #39, Sept. 26 '62, p. 1157-1159.
- Miegge, Giovanni, "A Roman Catholic Interpretation of Karl Barth," in SJT, Vol. 7, 1954, p. 59-72.
- Morrison, Charles Clayton, "The Liberalism of Neo-Orthodoxy," in Christian Century, Part I, June 7, 1950, p. 697ff, Part II, June 14, 1950, p. 731-733, Part III, June 21, 1950, p. 760-763.
- Mueller, David, "The Theology of Karl Barth and the Nineteenth Century," in Religion in Life, Vol. 34, Winter, 1964-65, p. 81-94.
- Rumscheidt, Martin, "Review," Karl Barth und die Pietisten: Die Pietismuskritik des jungen Karl Barth und ihre Erwiderung, by E. Busch, Munich, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1978, 308p.
- Torrance, T. F., "Karl Barth," in The Expository Times, Vol. 66, Oct. 1954-Sept. 1955, p. 205-209.
- Van Til, Cornelius, "Has Karl Barth Become Orthodox?" in Westminster Theological Journal, May, 1954, p. 135-181.
- Watson, Gordon, "Karl Barth and St. Anselm's Theological Programme," in SJT, Vol. 30, #1, 1977, p. 31-45.
- Wilburn, Ralph G., "The Theology of Karl Barth, Its Genesis, Motif and Method," in Encounter, Vol. 20, #1, Winter, 1959, p. 53-71.
- Williams, Daniel D., "Brunner and Barth on Philosophy," in JR, Vol. 27, 1947, p. 241-254.
- Late Entry: Karl Barth - Eduard Thurneysen Briefwechsel, Vol. I, 1913-1921, ed. by Thurneysen; Zürich, TVZ, 1973.

ABSTRACT OF
Karl Barth's Theological Development
A Response to Liberalism¹

The development of Karl Barth's theology was a response to the theological method of nineteenth century German Protestantism. Such a principle allows his thought to be examined with due consideration for the continuity of his task with the liberals as well as the nuances and shifts in his unique contribution to theology. Because of its comprehensive nature, this method of investigating his development is recommended over more limited models which for the most part interpret Barth from one central doctrine.

The thesis, which grew largely out of Barth's own critique of the nineteenth century, presents a synopsis in Chapter I of the method of liberal theology to which Barth responded in his development. Chapters II, III and IV demonstrate that in dogmatic and extra-dogmatic works Barth's theological statements were a result of his attitude to liberalism, whether it be positive, negative or ambivalent. Whereas his initial commitment to liberalism followed by ambiguity were reflected in his writings, a negative attitude produced a massive polemic against liberalism and a theology in opposition in the Dogmatics

¹Alice M. Collins, doctoral thesis presented to the Department of Religious Studies, University of Ottawa, Ontario, August, 1982.

I and II. Similarly a positive disposition resulted in a modified polemic and a theology in conciliation in the doctrines of creation and reconciliation. Whereas his opposition theology was predominantly one of transcendence over against the this-worldly theology of liberalism, the direction of conciliation reveals elements of Barth's ties with his predecessors particularly in the emergence of a theology of immanence and in his pneumatology. The tools of lordship, covenant-partner, analogy and dialectic help balance the emphasis on transcendence of earlier works, while at the same time correct the liberal anthropocentric theology of immanence. Barth's pneumatology, which is partially a result of his re-assessment of the liberals and a possible point of contact between them, is an important tool in his immanentist theology and is the means for a correct Christian anthropocentrism.

Understood in the light of his relation to liberalism, the full scope of Barth's theological development emerges, revealing principles of transcendence and immanence. In this balanced product, the result of a continuous reference to liberalism, Barth's scientific theology corrects the nineteenth century anthropocentric starting-point.

We recommend a re-appraisal of the traditional approach to Barth's relation to liberalism considered by most to be negative. The interpretation of his work from one central

doctrine as well as the thesis of a radical turning point need re-assessment. Further we suggest research in these areas of immanence theology and pneumatology would deepen our understanding of the full dimensions of Barth's thought.