

THE UNION SEMINARY REVIEW

Vol. XL.

OCTOBER, 1928.

No. 1.

FORTY YEARS OF NEW TESTAMENT RESEARCH.

BY REV. J. GREESHAM MACHEN, D. D.,
Princeton Theological Seminary.

The forty years that have elapsed since the founding of the UNION SEMINARY REVIEW have been a period of such activity in the field of New Testament research that even the barest cataloguing of what has been done would exceed the limits of the present article. The most that we can possibly attempt here is a brief characterization of certain tendencies that have been at work.

In the field of textual criticism, there has been tireless activity. The really decisive labors, it is true, were performed prior to 1888; for by the researches of Tischendorf, Tregelles and others the principal documentary materials of textual criticism were made available; and the epoch-making edition of Westcott and Hort, which appeared in 1881, established on a firm foundation the principles of the science and the methods of its application to the New Testament. Nevertheless, there has been work in plenty for more recent scholars to do. No new critical apparatus has, indeed, succeeded in taking the place of Tischendorf's monumental eighth edition: for von Soden's apparatus, despite its undoubted value, suffers from an unsatisfactory method of presentation and is generally felt not really to meet the need; while Casper René Gregory, who might well have accomplished what is required, met an untimely end in the Great War. But if a satisfactory critical apparatus is still lacking, the materials for its production are being collected with an ever-increasing fulness. Best known,

5. (The Apologies of Aristides and Quadratus, addressed to the Emperor Hadrian, twenty-five years after the death of the Apostle John.)

6. "*Lights from the Land of the Pharaohs.*"

(Gospel of Peter, Gospel of Paul, Akhinitim MSS. A Fragment of Matthew and one of Romans.)

7. "*Many Lights from Many Lands.*"

(Showing the historical truth of the New Testament in its geographical references.)

It is impossible to state thoroughly within the limits of this article the evidences which could be adequately given only in considerable volumes. But I cannot refrain from saying that the Diatessaron of Tatian proves that the four Gospels were written within the lifetime of the Apostle John, i. e., in the first century, and that the long hidden treasures of "Elephantiné", the letters of the Jews there, which are dated and written in Aramaic, prove that Ezra, Nehemiah and Daniel could have been written in the fifth century B. C., or even earlier; for one of these letters in Aramaic is dated almost at the beginning of the fifth century B. C.

THE THEOLOGY OF KARL BARTH A PROTEST AND A STANDPOINT.

BY REV. WILLIAM C. ROBINSON, A. M., Th. D.,
Professor of Church History, Columbia Theological Seminary,
Decatur, Ga.

Dr. Robinson desires it to be said that in the preparation of this article he derived some firsthand information from his colleague in Columbia Seminary, Dr. H. B. Blakely.—Editor.

"Germany is raging with the battle of the paradoxes." Thus an American theologian described the phenomenal popularity of Professor Karl Barth's new theological approach. With his associates Emil Brunner, of Switzerland; Eduard Thurneysen, of Basel; Friedrich Gogarten, of Jena; Karl

Barth, now professor at Munster, is upsetting the world of German "Kultur-protestantism". Unravelling the philosophy of Barth is like solving the riddle of the Sphinx. He professes to offer "a marginal gloss", "a spice", "a criticism"; his disciples describe his work as "a corrective for all current theologies"; Harnack, feeling his historicism quail before Barth's bludgeoning, cries out, "Marcionite sheet-lightning"; while a Roman Catholic onlooker describes *Der Römerbrief* as the most significant bombshell dropped on the playground of theology since the papal encyclical against Modernism. Barth wages unrelenting warfare against Mysticism; yet a recent biographer calls him a mystic. He crushes the sacred idols of German liberalism—Schleiermacher, Ritschl, the Pansubjectivism of Experience, Historicism, Evolutionism, Religious Romanticism—with the reckless abandon of a Hebrew prophet; but he assures us that he wears no prophet's garb—that he is only "a commonplace theologian". Epithets, "orthodoxy", "scholasticism" leave him unmoved. The movement's attack on evolution's program of progress by human achievement has earned for it the title, "German fundamentalism"; yet in the dialectic theological school is to be numbered Professor R. Bultman, of Marburg, perhaps the most radical New Testament critic. Barth's movement is itself a veritable paradox.

Barth uses dialectics in an attack that is baffling, and with a subtlety that is mystifying. He handles the categories and thought forms like a Scholastic. He turns out paradoxes like Tertullian, who firmly believed that the school of heaven is the paradox of the school of earth, and who affirmed *credo quia absurdum*. For instance, the Word of God is the task, the only real call and justification for a theologian (theos logos); but for the scholar it is the impossible task. Again, *Deus revelatus* requires the paradox *Deus absconditus*. Not straight lines, but the contradiction in thought alone enables us to probe the deep wells of truth. The "Yea" of the confessions must be opposed by the "Nay" of criticism. In the being of man himself there is this paradox, this contrarationality, a rasping discord caused by the contradiction between his yearnings after the image of God in which he was made

and his actual fallen condition. Revelation is *the* paradox against which reason and nature rebel; while to it alone faith clings.

Here and there in his bewildering paths, Barth inserts the parenthesis, "let him who can grasp this thought". Nor will he apologize for this complexity. The man who really seeks truth must bring to that pursuit the spirit which realizes the task is not simple. He expects his students to value the Word of God enough to pursue it through the kaleidoscopic movements and stresses of thought, to realize that in all life there is crisis hard to comprehend. Disciples must follow his work back through the contributions of those whom he acclaims his spiritual ancestors, *e. g.*: Franz Overbeck, Christopher Blumhardt, Soren Kierkegaard, Luther, Calvin, Paul, and Jeremiah. They should be familiar with the content and terminology of the great philosophic thinkers like Plato, Kant, and Hegel. For Barth believes that "the theme of the Bible and therefore of theology and the sum of philosophy is identical"! In opposition to the Ritschlian view he presents philosophy and theology as in "harmony and congruity". Their common endeavor is to press through from the pansubjectivism of the religious consciousness or the religious experience theology to the objectivity of knowledge. The chief pursuit of both is the thought of God, the thought of eternity; the theme of both the relation of God to man. That philosophy which understands itself—the philosophy from Plato to Kant—is a transcendental philosophy; not an immanence philosophy, not an identity philosophy.

Although he wear not the hairy mantle of the prophet, underneath the subtleties of thought Karl Barth has the burning conviction that his message to the world is "from God" (*apo tou theou*). One of his admirers writes, "He is a man upon whom the shadow of the Holiness of God has fallen". Out of his Bible a Holy Hand grips him and holds him in the deepest fear. Barth writes, "God is God, and must as such be known; not a new theology, nor piety, but the relation of all men to God". He would withdraw from pious endeavors and look up above to God. In sobriety he would look to God for an

answer for his lost, sinful condition; and from the miracle, the wonder of God's Revelation, he would speak to the world. With his associates he proposes to re-present the original Reformation point of view. In a world which had forgotten the real living God, Barth sets anew, as the center of thought, the holy transcendent God.

Barth's theology is described as a corrective of all current type of theological thinking. It may be best distinguished by its "*Protests*".

A. *Against Historicism.*

Professor Krüger, of Berlin, defines Historicism; as, "the systematic historicizing of all our thought about man, his culture, and his values, a process which was begun by the Enlightenment and continued and to a certain extent completed by the scientific labors of the nineteenth century". He declares that the "modern theology" takes its stand upon this 'historicism'. It is that rational and critical interpretation of Christianity which explains away the supernatural in terms of environment, psychology, philosophy, the logic of necessary evolution under natural historical conditions. In opposition Barth demands the paradox of the "un-historical" or the "super-historical". The Great Divide is, "The Word was made flesh". Divinity was clothed with a human form. K. B. declares that all his thought revolves around that one point which is called in the New Testament Jesus Christ, who was "born of the seed of David according to the flesh—declared to be the Son of God by the Resurrection from the dead (Romans 1:1-4)". The known world of the flesh, the horizontal plane of history and psychology has been intersected by a vertical plane straight from above—the world of the Father, of the Resurrection, and of Redemption. Christ is the unconditional new from above, the breaking through and appearing of the world of God in profane life.

One of Barth's most popular books is his *Die Auferstehung der Toten*. In fact, the Resurrection is the "Yes" of God's religion after the "No" of man's religion—the birthday and the birthmark of the new age.

The reign of naturalism is broken with the proclamation of

the super-historical Revelation. The Bible is a human document. But its chief value is not to be derived from studying its historic relativity. Its true significance, as suggested by its first and its last words, "In the beginning created God", "Amen, even so come, Lord Jesus", is, in presenting God as Creator and Redeemer, the Beginning and the Ending, the Source and the Purpose of all existence.

B. *Against Relativity.*

Revelation is to be distinguished from that study which would find a species of "revelation" in all comparative religion and religious psychology. The "round table" spirit is anathema to Barth. That relativity which finds in the whole history of religions, experiences of varying values, among which, perhaps, Christianity can offer the higher values, is woefully inadequate. When I profess that *my* religion is better than *yours*, I am guilty of unmitigated conceit; but in humility I can profess that *God's* religion, gratuitously revealed, is absolute, and therefore unqualifiedly good.

Religion is from God; directly, immediately from God. Man cannot feel after and find God. For man to attempt to bridge the gap of the transcendent God is titanism. God, the absolute, as against all that is relative, He, who is something strange dwelling in a light inaccessible, who is in no way a part of ourselves, can alone bridge the cleft and find man. Religion, the only religion entitled to that name, is the relationship established by the Holy God with the sinful soul.

Barth's purpose to replace all relativity with a new absoluteness is illustrated in the following incident. In reply to an invitation to state his theology in a magazine symposium of all varieties of Christian doctrine, he utterly declined to share in this "species of international orchestral concert". He declared that to give or strengthen the impression "that: (1) the unity of Christians in Christ is something actual that can be visibly represented by adding together as many and as different Christian standpoints as possible; (2) Christian truth consists in the sum total or in a cross section of all the various Christian ideas and opinions; (3) Christian knowledge is arrived at by means of a selection or mutual completion as be-

tween various Christian points of view", would be disastrous. Relativity in the relationship of God and man is contradictory to the genius of the Reformation and on the field of history is powerless to make headway against an absolute religion. *C. Against Pansubjectivism.*

Barth is opposed to basing religion upon Schleiermacher's religious consciousness or Ritschl's values of religious experience. Emil Brunner places in sharpest contrast Schleiermacher's doctrine, "Gefühl ist alles; Name ist Schall und Rauch" and Luther's conviction, "Verbum est principium rerum". Mysticism is defined as "the most sublime deification of nature, of heathenism, of the materialization of spirit". It substitutes for the clear, luminous revelation of God in the Word a "musical revelation" born of intoxicated feeling. All such religion is anthropomorphic, anthropocentric; a mere phase of psychology, utterly unable to satisfy the soul. For the Romantic Pietistic view of religion which masquerades our pulpits as "Churchliness", the dream that we can save men by "the aesthetic cleverness of our worship", he has no patience. The Church offering her own righteousness in place of the righteousness of God is converting the lightning of heaven to the heat of a slow combustion stove. The Church should be the place where human sickness comes to light that the Great Healer may lay His hand thereon; where real need is brought into contact with the Divine Word that between the two poles heaven's gracious lightning may flash. Religion ought to be a John-the-Baptist-Hand pointing to her Lord.

Even faith is not to be valued for its subjective, psychological processes or content. Faith is man's surrender as naked and helpless. Its "presumptive" object is God; but in reality God is always subject never object in His relationship with man. Positive faith is not an act of man; but the original Divine faith, the power of Divine truth, God with His righteousness interposing for the lost. Faith calls upon God and ever anew seizes God in His Righteousness, as the working Subject, giving the honor to God Himself, who giveth the prize. One is reminded of Dr. G. Vos' description of faith as "the unlimited willingness to let God do all the saving". Barth's

presentation makes faith God's act and activity even more than does Deissmann's description of Christianity as "a reacting cult". Thurneysen declares that faith is the name for the real work of the Holy Ghost.

D. *Against Evolution.*

In his epoch-making edition of *Der Römerbrief*, 1918, Barth directed his polemic against modern evolution's assumption that man, or nature as expressed in man, is the self-sufficient ground of human progress and redemption. Over against the naturalistic evolutionary world-view he placed the conception of a crisis, the eschatological or apocalyptic view, a new order brought by the advent of God into human life in Jesus Christ. Thurneysen declares that the very essence of sin is to be found in man's confident self-affirmation—yet this is the normal attitude for the advocate of "progress upward and onward by resident forces". The essence of Christian virtue, the true attitude of faith is humility, self-distrust, self-abnegation. Against the idea of God immanent in man and the world, and of man as himself divine, Barth and his associates have directed the whole energy of their attack. Religion is not the soul of culture, the acme of religious mysticism; it is the crisis, *i. e.*, the doom of culture. It is not what German transcendental idealism, evolution, and the Enlightenment represent it—the crown and fulfillment of humanity's upward path. The essence of religion is not to be found a "humanizing Christianity and Christianizing humanity". "The reality of religion is man's horror of himself." This "horror" is the recognition that he stands at the cleft of two ages. The parousia has already taken place. The hour is already here. The Word dwells among us; momentarily present. For every soul now is the eschatological moment. All the pressure of the eternal order is calling man to apprehend in the judgment upon the human the beginning of the Divine—to lay hold of the Resurrection—God's Yea. In distinction from the world of toil, burden, suffering and wrath—a world far from God—stands the world of the Father, of the Resurrection and of Redemption. Our efforts will never evolve this other world. *We wait for* a kingdom of God, strange and foreign to this

world; a kingdom which will swallow up, transform, shape anew this world. Eschatological crisis stands opposed to self-sufficient evolutionism; actual revelation confronts the idea that Christianity is the final religious product of evolution from animism.

The attitude of a German exchange student toward Evolution will illustrate the view of a representative of the dialectic theological school on this question. This student attended the Matther-Stratton Debate on Evolution held at Harvard, Session 1927-28. Returning therefrom, he expressed himself to this effect: "Well, you know that I am far from being a conservative; but (perish the thought!) I am not an Evolutionist." E. *Against Rational Orthodoxy.*

Barth prefers the powerful living supernaturalism of the creeds to "modern broken-windedness". But he affirms that Rational Orthodoxy errs in grouping God along with other matters of knowledge; instead of realizing that He is the fount of all knowledge. Rational Orthodoxy is much busied with apologetics, trying to prove certain statements of faith—the Word of God is its own self-vindication.

Again, Rational Orthodoxy falls into all kinds of religious idealism by claiming that certain human ideas can contain God. Such Idealism is only a revelation of what is deepest

Dr. Thornwell has answered by anticipation Barth's protest against rational orthodoxy, and that by admitting the correctness of a large part of these protests. He declares that God in Himself is indefinable; but that man's finite conceptions of Him can be expressed and those expressions systematized. He also posits a dualism between reason and special revelation, holding that reason is as ignorant of the world of special revelation as a blind man is of the world of sight, or as the embryo in the womb is incapable of predicting the world into which it will enter. He describes the supernatural world as above nature, as having its source in the bosom of God, and descending upon us immediately from heaven. While teaching that revelation is addressed to reason, Thornwell denied to reason either the competency or the right to pass a negative judgment upon the teachings of special revelation. Here reason can only affirm, never deny. The illumination of the Holy Spirit is required for the understanding of these superrational truths.

in man; not of what God is. Man stands related to things, to knowledge, to reason; but is intellectually disparate from God. It is not possible to express God's being in specific concepts, or in visible forms or symbols. Barth is interested solely in revelation, properly so-called. Revelation comes to us not by reason, but by faith. Therefore, there is no pure scientific theology; but only a theology of faith and revelation. The Word of God apprehended by faith is to be held, even though it have to oppose rationalism with the contradiction in thought.

Positively Barth describes his theology as a *Standpoint*. Students have given it several names, each more or less, suggestive of that point of view:

I. *Neo-Calvinism*.

In preference to the more recent theologians Barth and his school study, edit, quote and profess Luther and Calvin. Holding the theocentric rather than the Christocentric approach, Thurneysen defines them as Reformed rather than Lutherans. As the Reformation swept away saints, priests, indulgences and brought man face to face with God, so the New Reformation must reject Idealism's dream-gods and take in earnest the quest of the living God. Theology's business is with that which Luther described as "Das Wort Gottes" and Calvin named, "cognitio dei". Calvin's definition of theology is endorsed: "ein investigare deum in sua inscrutabili altitudine". With Calvin the "Barthites" emphasize the sovereign freedom and the sublimity of God.

Barth's view of God is the quintessence of transcendence. Religion is our consciousness of the distance which separates man with all his culture from God. God is not only the near God; He is also the far God. "If God does not remain alone—God, the unknown, the hidden, in all His eternal power and Deity, the only strength of the strong—then all things have become as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal." "God alone is God, and man is never and in no sense God too; and there is no transition from one to the other." "There is no point where the finite merges into the infinite for, *finitium non est capax infiniti*." God is the *totaliter aliter*; and to speak of Him is a totally different thing from speaking of man in a

somewhat lofty language. Thurneysen finds that by taking in utter earnest this separateness or disparateness of God the sixteenth century Reformers separated themselves from the Middle Ages; and by a similar recognition Barth has separated himself from the immanence mania of liberalism's religious consciousness or religious experience.

Transcendence may more positively be expressed as the holiness of God—His separation from man as earthy, His judgment upon the world and its history, His wrath burning against all sin. This movement advocates such a taking in earnest of the might of God's holiness, that only by a genuine dealing with sin can grace come to the side of holiness; and so God, the living God, really come into relation with man.

II. *The Theology of Crisis.*

As suggested above, in opposition to evolutionism Barth's teaching is described as "the theology of crisis". This world is not crammed with heaven; it is a fallen world, under judgment and the wrath of God. In crisis with developmental naturalism stands the supernatural Kingdom of God. The solidarity of the race, even with its culture and its ecclesiasticism, is opposed by God's *Reich*. There is "an endless qualitative difference" between time and eternity: Between the temporal works of man and the eternal works of God, between culture's religious-consciousness-Protestantism and genuine religion there is a radical cleft. Genuine religion is "the great disturbance"; the point where not man's health, but his sickness (that which separates him from God), becomes manifest. Sin must be taken in earnest. It is a wrong direction to our whole life. It is the ego, the "I live"; which the God must utterly convert into the glorious freedom of the children of God.

The pericope, 1 Corinthians 15:1-3, focuses this great crisis. Like two Alpine peaks stand Christ's death and resurrection, with His grave as the valley between. His death for our sins is the end of history; the Resurrection is the beginning of a new life, and apparition of the new age which sets an end to the old. In this mysterious paradoxical eruption of divine forces the Cross is the last word of despair, of judgment upon

human religion; the "Nay" of man's way, which leaves nothing possible save the "Yea" of God's salvation. The Cross stands over against all attempts of man to work out his own salvation. Similarly commenting on the second chapter of Philippians, Barth insists, the self-emptying, the humiliation must go their way to the bitter end—as far as death. The door must be shut until nothing more remains over except the Word which God alone can speak—the Word "Resurrection". Yet in the ethos of this obedience and self-abnegation faith finds a true exaltation; faith sees in the Cross the reflection of God's self-emptying Incarnation, the unity of the Crucified with the Father; faith finds her Lord.

Thurneysen declares that the recognition of sin is *Das Wesen der Reformation*. The Reformation began with the reality of sin in the soul of Martin Luther. This "reality of sin is based on the reality of the holiness of God"; and marks the fundamental and irreparable separateness of man from God. It is the self-glorying of man who will not fear God. Sin is guilt, our own personal guilt. Grace can only find entrance by a genuine act of God, who, in the might of His holiness taking sin in "dead" earnest, puts sin aside in this way, namely, by Himself lifting it up, taking it on Himself, bearing it away. "Even God, a righteous God, cannot blow sin away as a bubble." "A God, to whom sin means nothing, forgives nothing in me." "There is no such God." "The God who does not take sin in earnest may be the dream God of men, of wishful thinkers; He is certainly not the living God." "The removal of sin, even for God, was a work, a labour which Christ has accomplished." Therefore, Jesus Christ not only signifies our peace, He is Himself our peace, and apart from Him there is no peace. "It is by the full 'taking in earnest' of the reality of God that the reality of this unsymbolic 'taking in earnest' of the life and death of Christ comes to expression." "The Cross is what it signifies: the death of the Holy One for the sinner, the call to life of the sinner by the Holy One." The Cross shows sin to us. Our sin is there dealt with and judged. We are not to look at the Cross; but to submerge ourselves

there. There our life is founded. We are buried in His death and risen with Him from the dead.

R. Bultman finds in John's Gospel a dualism between life, which belongs to the sphere of God, and death, which belongs to the sphere of the world. Fallen man is in the darkness of the world, its sin and its godlessness. The Word of revelation judges the world. The Parousia has taken place in the coming of Christ. Revelation is followed by eschatological crisis. The Word dwells among us and is mighty through the vehicle of preaching. It is a present and a pressing call to man here and now to separate himself from death unto life, from the world unto God. But eschatology is not thereby exhausted. It also promises the resurrection from the grave (John 5:24). At that occasion the world will be no more and only two possibilities will exist—Heaven and Hell!

III. *"The Theology of the Word."*

The Revelation of God is the final judgment upon man's religion; the revelation of genuine religion. The Bible is no longer treated first and foremost as the record "of a great human experience", as the account of men who had "a genius for religion". Although the Bible and the human life of Jesus and preaching are to be subjected to critical, scientific and historic research; yea, though criticism find flaws and errors in the record; faith finds a real objectively valid Word of God. And this Word is in and of its own right self-evidencing; needing no human support; infallible; the one ground of faith.

Emil Brunner conceives of revelation strictly in accord with a view of the transcendence of God—not relative, but absolute; not continuous, but special. "Therefore, revelation is not a continuation of culture, or creation, not the blossom or kernel of humanity, not the culmination of evolution—but the interruption of continuity, the intrusion of the utterly dissimilar—in a word, it is miracle." A real, external, objective authority—somewhat indefinitely delineated to be sure, but really objective; and with some points in common with Luther's doctrine of the Word of God as the Gospel, the New Testament of promise, is thus presented as the seat of authority in religion.

In so far, it is a real advance upon pure subjectivism, whether of religious experience or of religious consciousness.

Revelation is a way from God to man, not the converse. The transcendent God is manifest in Christ. The proclamation of this becoming flesh of the Word of God is the central point of Barth's work. Christ is the overthrow of the dualism between time and eternity, the overthrow of the separation between the death of the world and the life of God. He dwells among us, judging and making alive now. He is the way from God to man, in whom comes the new order and the new world.

Commenting on Philippians 2:1-11, Barth declares, "The bearer of the Name which is above every name, at whose Name every knee shall bow, which by all disciples is known as Lord, He is clearly not less than He who is here designated as 'Father God' (theos pater), Himself is, to whose honor everything is done". Christ's essence is His being like God; His form is the incommunicable direct recognizability of God. The being on an equality with God is as surely His possession as the private properties of the Philippians are theirs. "One whose possession is absolutely secure does not need to lay His hand upon it in the gesture with which a robber grasps his booty." But in His sovereign Divine freedom He laid aside the form of God—all the recognizability of His being. He took the form of a servant, the appearance and value of an essence which is not God, which is not the Lord. "What we see is a man—not a Lord, but a servant." The whole royal freedom, the whole sovereignty of God, is the ground of this Incognito. As such, "flesh and blood cannot and ought not and will not reveal who He is". For historico-psychological treatment He has the form of a human being. Yet the last century's quest for the historical Jesus is a hollow study. He is no ideal, genial, religious man. He is God become man. As Calvin says, the humility of his flesh covers like a curtain the Divine Majesty. It is now the business of the Father to reveal Him in the unrecognizability in which He has placed Himself.

Just such a one as He who would empty Himself, as the one who would become a man without "skimmings" and with-

out ornamentation, is the Head of the Church. Faith, the work of the Creator Spirit, discerns that even so He is God. In considering Him who came down to us, who speaks to us, we stand before the whole wonder of the mercy of God. This Wonder, called Jesus Christ, is so very God that He can become man without ceasing to be God—who does just that for His love for us. Before this Wonder of God become man the Reformed stand always in deepest amazement and seek in humility and self-abnegation the likeness of the Divine Head of the Church. In human speech God's Word has been declared among us. Only by laying hold thereof can we know and understand. God has not left us alone.

The great blessedness which the Word of God speaks for man is Justification. Barth repudiates any idea of infused righteousness, physico-mystical righteousness, Pharisaic-Judaistic-law righteousness, any righteousness "of mine own" as the ground of justification. Commenting on Philippians 3:9 he identifies the righteousness which is not mine own with the righteousness of Christ, the righteousness "from God" (*ek theou*). The righteousness through faith is the righteousness of God. It ever remains in the hands of God and is not transformed into mine own righteousness. *Fides offert nudum hominem deo*. It is conditioned upon insight into the terrible necessity of the frustration of one's own power and will; a real giving one's self up as lost. It is as lost that one is justified and, by the righteousness of God, comforted. In fact, the forensic nature of justification is so pressed by Thurneysen that imparted righteousness is made strictly an eschatological realization.

IV. "The Church of the Word" and Her Mission.

The Church is the canal through which the water of Revelation has passed on down the centuries. The Evangelical Church exists wherever a preacher—lay or ordained—proclaims in humility before God the Word of God, as written in the Bible, in order that he may thereby strengthen his brother. The safety and authority of the Church is that she stands fundamentally on the Bible and has authority for us as speaking Divine truth from the Bible. In this doctrine of the Word the Reformers

separated themselves from the sixteenth century mystics (who had also separated themselves from Rome). The mystics, by lightly mingling their own word with God's Word, fell from the throne to the gutter.

Similarly, Rome errs in putting her own (the Church's) word alongside and above the Bible. Moreover, the Roman Catholic, by giving to the Sacrament that place which the Reformed give to the Word usurp to the Church (*i. e.*, the clergy) the sovereign control of the grace of God. "The Word, however, is something which no man and no priest can procreate." That Word God, Himself, alone, must and can speak; and He speaks it where and to whom He will. Thereby the sovereignty, freedom and power of God are preserved in the teaching of the Reformed Church. The Roman Catholic Church is the Church of the Sacrament—the Reformed, the Church of the Word.

Thurneysen, in behalf of the "Barthites", would add to the doctrine of the Reformers, "a new comprehension of God Himself who will allow that which He has *once* spoken to be for *new* life". God sends His Holy Spirit and makes this old Word from the Bible the new and powerful and living Word to His assembled Church; so that I then and there meet with God, directly, not through a Roman priest.

The Church's one purpose is to proclaim Christ—to be a John the Baptist finger pointing to Him. He must increase, the Church must decrease. She must be built in view of the coming of the Kingdom. She must accept the break in this world and the coming of the new age. Therefore, Barth's religion has been called a religion of desperation. But it is a religion with a real message.

Karl Hartenstein, in the Spring number of *Zwischen den Zeiten*, has pointed out what the theology of Karl Barth has to say of *Missions*:

1. Not religion and not Christendom, but the Revelation of the living God is the great factor which must bring back missions to its central thought, which is:—that God, the Lord of heaven and earth; the God who is qualitatively distinct from man and the fallen creation of this world, who has declared the whole creation to be His own doing—He has taken upon

Himself judgment and has placed man under the eternal promise of the new world—and that this God would become man for this cause. Judgment and Grace—that is the single significant message that will be proclaimed in all the world and will be heard unto the ends of the earth.

2. This act of God, in His sovereign freedom, has been revealed in the Word of Scripture and can only be testified and declared by us—not produced nor gained by knowledge. But through our human word God will reveal Himself. To the spectator it is not given; but to the children of God, to *you* it is granted to be the theatre where the message of God to men, where the Resurrection from the dead is spoken.

3. This missionary message alone is the duty of those servants who wait on their Lord. We cannot offer health for a sick world; our program is not the elevation of peoples out of their needs and sufferings by the Gospel. Rather missions will declare the *Feuerbrand* of the eternal world cast into this world that this world may be forgiven. Barth's charge to missions is: "As messengers of the Son, proclaim the Word, the Word which God has spoken in Christ, the Word which alone is of service for our evident need and blessedness, the Word on the last revelation of which we wait with a view to the promised kingdom. In this Word alone, the Word which we have, lies the blessing and the curse of the world. We do well to ground ourselves firmly in missions as the proclamation of this message, in every moment with the steadfast prayer for the Holy Spirit."

Evaluation.

Only in Germany, "the playground" of the kaleidoscopic movements of theological, philosophical and critical thought of the past century, would such a movement as Barth's be possible. Only to those who have some appreciation of the radical and far-reaching claims of comparative religion, criticism, "the new theology", will its conservative direction be appreciated. It differs from the position of the Reviewer in two great fundamentals, positions so fundamental that they color and give

tone to all else in one's theology. The first is that it lacks a doctrine of Divine inspiration, whereby the Scripture writers were so moved and supervised that they correctly recorded God's Revelation. The second is the centrality of that positive Pauline doctrine of the death of Christ, as the satisfaction of Divine justice, which Thornwell and Dabney have written so deep into the mind of our communion that ours is the religion of redemption rather than the theology of crisis.

These radical differences, as well as the elusiveness of Barth's words—one is never sure how far he is using the older terminology in the orthodox sense—cause one to hesitate in commending this new movement. But it certainly has some virile notes and some vital criticisms for our day. Amid the prevalent minimistic view of sin—whether Ritschlian or evolutionary, either as ontogenetic or as psychogenetic—Thurneysen's declaration that the essence of the Reformation is a taking in earnest of sin—sin as personal guilt, the reality of sin based on the reality of the holiness of God—is as refreshing as an ocean breeze. Again, we may well ask ourselves if, with our higher confessional foundations, we are really preaching with as much emphasis as this movement the supreme value of the Word of God and the absoluteness of the religion thus revealed.

But the chief value of Barth for our Church will probably be his criticisms. On the field of a century's history, in an environment of its own liking, the "Schleiermacher Renaissance" has been weighed and found wanting. Why then need professors insist on this outworn "religious consciousness" as the "necessary empirical" basis of religion? "The Modern Theology" of A. Ritschl held reign in Germany for a period roughly coterminous with the German Empire. In the year that the empire fell, 1918, appeared *Der Römerbrief*. The dialectic school and a revival of positive theology have successfully disputed that hegemony. As a result it may be shown that the liberal pulpiteer who insists on substituting value-judgments for historical fact, and religious experience for the Word of God as the seat of authority in religion, is not really "modern", but only a peddler of Germany's discarded antiques. In the light of Barth's polemic we ought to insist that the "Y"

Secretaries stop feeding our young people at Blue Ridge with immanence crudities that are Biblically, philosophically and theologically untenable (if not positively silly).^{*} Not in the interest of orthodoxy—for he is not orthodox—but because of its historical breakdown under strain, because of its sheer fallaciousness Barth has relegated “the modern theology” to the limbo of the obsolete. Surely no American student can afford to accept this “modern” theology without a serious consideration of the criticism levelled upon it in its native habitat.

THE UNION SEMINARY REVIEW—ITS BEGINNING AND CONTINUANCE.

BY THE EDITOR.

It was expected that Rev. Frank T. McFaden, D. D., would write for our Fortieth Anniversary Number an account of how and why the REVIEW began. He was a student in the Seminary at the time and had much to do with starting the movement which resulted in the decision to publish a magazine. However, at the last moment pressure of work compelled him to ask to be excused. And thus the task has fallen to the Editor.

The UNION SEMINARY REVIEW, then named the Union Seminary Magazine, began about forty years ago in the “good old days” when there were “giants in the land” (Dabney, Peck, Latimer, Alexander, Moore, Smith and Johnson); when the Seminary was located at dear old Hampden-Sydney, a spot fragrant with precious memories especially on the part of our older readers and now more beautiful and attractive than ever—an ideal place for a Christian college.

^{*} Discussing Luke 2:52, Dr. Kesler told a group, “Jesus advanced, cut his way forward step by step until he attained unto divinity. We ought to do likewise!”