

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](https://paypal.me/robbradshaw)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Theological Students Fellowship (TSF) Bulletin (US)* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_tsfbulletin-us.php



BULLETIN

THEOLOGICAL STUDENTS FELLOWSHIP

MAY-JUNE 1986

Vol. 9, No. 5 \$3.50

EDITOR

Vernon C. Grounds

ASSISTANT EDITOR

William Mangrum

ADVISORY EDITORS

Clark H. Pinnock, McMaster Divinity College

Paul A. Mickey, Duke Divinity School

Mark Lau Branson, Fellowship Bible Institute

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Ray S. Anderson, *Systematic Theology*

Fuller Theological Seminary

Stephen T. Davis, *Philosophy*

Claremont McKenna College

Donald Dayton, *News Analysis*

Northern Baptist Theological Seminary

Robert L. Hubbard, *Old Testament*

Denver Seminary

Scot McKnight, *New Testament*

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School

Stephen C. Mott, *Ethics*

Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary

Grant R. Osborne, *New Testament*

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School

David Lowes Watson, *Evangelism & Missions*

UMC Board of Discipleship

PERSPECTIVES EDITORS

Keith Bolton

Fuller Theological Seminary

Luis Cortes

Philadelphia Baptist Association

Thomas F. Stransky

Mt. Paul Novitiate

Sze-kar Wan

Harvard University

FACULTY CONTRIBUTORS

Bernard Adeney

New College, Berkeley

Donald Bloesch

University of Dubuque Theological Seminary

Geoffrey W. Bromiley

Fuller Theological Seminary

Richard Bube

Stanford University

Harvie M. Conn

Westminster Theological Seminary

Charles Ellenbaum

College of DuPage

Vernard Eller

University of LaVerne

Elouise Renich Fraser

Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary

David Gill

New College, Berkeley

Larry Hurtado

University of Manitoba

Susanne Johnson

Perkins School of Theology

Richard Mouw

Fuller Theological Seminary

Richard Lovelace

Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary

PHEME PERKINS

Boston College

Bernard Ramm

American Baptist Seminary of the West

Gerald Sheppard

Union Theological Seminary

Charles R. Taber

Emmanuel School of Religion

Keith Yandell

University of Wisconsin

COMMEMORATIVE ISSUE: A TRIBUTE TO KARL BARTH

Introducing This Issue	2
Vernon Grounds	
My Relation to Soren Kierkegaard	3
Karl Barth	
Barth As A Person and As A Theologian	4
Bernard Ramm	
The Legacy of Karl Barth	6
Donald Bloesch	
My Encounter with Karl Barth	10
Carl F.H. Henry	
A Letter of Thanks to Mozart	10
Karl Barth	
Is Karl Barth My Neighbor?	11
Elouise Renich Fraser	
"Re-Visioning America": Religion's Role in American Life	14
Joel Carpenter	
Antiphonal Readings For Summer	15
Steven Trotter	
Book Reviews and Comments	17
(Itemized on Back Cover)	
Readership Survey	35
Volume 9 Index	38

helped me out until I read Barth. To begin with, it must be said that Barth has repeatedly stressed that competence in philosophy is necessary for competence in theology and therefore every student of theology must also be a student of philosophy. Barth set up the relationship of theology and philosophy in three propositions. (1) Theology is an autonomous subject worthy within itself and does not need the imprimatur of any philosophy in order to achieve respectability. (2) No human philosophy is a perfect counterpart of divine revelation, and therefore no philosophy can claim the right to be the best companion of Christian theology (i.e., neither Plato, Aristotle, nor Whitehead). (3) We may learn something from any philosophy. Materialism warns us not to be given to excessive spiritualizing and idealism warns us not to overemphasize our knowledge of material reality.

(5) I have written elsewhere that the greatest contribution Barth made to my thinking was his constant emphasis in his seminars that, if we believe with all our hearts that the Christian faith is God's truth, we need not fear any other truth. We will then be fearless and not afraid to open any window or

any door, for truth cannot embarrass truth.

(6) Barth has forced me to take a longer look at certain texts in order to plumb their depths. This applies to many passages but especially to what is known in New Testament literature as "cosmic Christology." These are the texts which attribute creation to Christ, which a good Jew would only attribute to God (e.g. John 1:1-3, Col. 1:15-20, Heb. 1:1-3). Also, such texts attribute revelation to Christ as one would only attribute it to God (John 1:14, Heb. 1:1). Although this has generated the Christomonism versus Christocentrism controversy, one cannot deny that such texts have not historically received the attention they deserve. The result in my own theology has been to move very radically in that direction.

As I have again written elsewhere, one reads Barth not to become a Barthian. Theology is on the move, and he certainly did not want to present a fixed and settled theology but rather to be a stimulus to more theology. One reads Barth to learn how one can be a better theologian. In other words, Barth's greatest impact on my thinking has been more from his methodology than from particular doctrines.

The Legacy of Karl Barth

by Donald G. Bloesch

An Evangelical Theologian

On this 100th anniversary of the birth of Karl Barth, the eminent Swiss Reformed theologian, it is appropriate to reassess his theological contribution to the church universal. Pope Pius XII hailed Barth as the greatest theologian since Thomas Aquinas, surely a singular tribute by any standard.

We should see Barth first of all as an evangelical theologian. Whereas in his earlier phase he was heavily influenced by Kantian and existentialist philosophy, when he embarked on the *Church Dogmatics* he broke with this philosophical heritage, desiring only to be a theologian of the Word of God. In his later years, Barth had no compunction in describing his theological position as "evangelical," but by this he meant neither a rigid adherence to the letter of Scripture nor a belief in biblical inerrancy. Instead, he thought of himself as evangelical in the classical sense—committed to the gospel of reconciliation and redemption, the message that we are saved by the free grace of God alone as revealed and confirmed in Jesus Christ. For Barth, this entailed an acknowledgement of the authority of Holy Scripture as the primary witness to God's self-revelation in Christ. It also excluded any recourse to natural theology—the appeal to new revelations in nature and history that could supplement or fulfill the one revelation of God in the biblical history culminating in Jesus Christ. In Barth's view, natural theology is the antithesis of evangelical theology. It is the difference between dependence on natural wisdom and trust in the gospel of God.

In contradistinction to liberal theology, Barth was adamant that the gospel cannot be reduced to ethical principles or spiritual experiences. Instead, it is the story of God's incomparable act of reconciliation and redemption in the life and death of Jesus Christ. While some of his early critics accused Barth of ignoring the doctrine of creation, he tried to see creation in its rightful place—for the sake of redemption. Redemption,

moreover, is not the completion or perfection of creation but the dawning of a wholly new reality that opens up creation to a glorious new future. For him, redemption is even prior to creation, in that behind creation is God's predestining love.

Thanks to Barth, the atonement has once again become a credible doctrine. It is no longer the appeasement of a wrathful God who would not otherwise forgive, but the expression of a loving and holy God who forgives despite our unworthiness. Like Aulén he rediscovered the patristic motif—*Christus Victor*. The atoning sacrifice of Christ means the victory of Christ over the powers of darkness, powers that have held the world in servile subjection. Barth does not repudiate the satisfaction motif but now sees satisfaction as rendered *by* God rather than *to* God.

Barth has made it possible to speak again of hell, the wrath of God and predestination, and to preach these doctrines as good news. The wrath of God is but one form of his love, and predestination means foreordination to the kingdom of God. Hell has been done away with by the victory of Jesus Christ, though Barth allows for a subjective hell that exists when people deny and repudiate their election.

Barth has also helped the church rediscover the ethical seriousness of the Christian faith. Sanctification, he contends, must be reflected and attested in a life of costly discipleship. The gospel has social and political implications, though it itself is not a political message. While urging Christians to get involved in the work of social justice, Barth warns against utopianism, the illusion that the kingdom of God can be ushered in through social engineering. He sharply distinguishes between divine and human righteousness; the first is a divine gift, whereas the second is a human possibility, which can witness to but never reduplicate the first.

Another signal contribution is Barth's recovery of the objectivity of salvation. He sees the drama of salvation in terms of "God's search for man," not "man's quest for God." The object of theological reflection is not the relationship of "man to God in religious experience" (as in Schleiermacher) but that

Donald Bloesch is Professor of Theology at the University of Duquesne Theological Seminary.

of "God to man in Jesus Christ" (George Hunsinger). In Barth we move from an actuality (salvation through Christ's universal atonement) to a possibility that has to be seized (service in freedom). In liberalism we move from possibility (human freedom) to actuality (communion with God).

Barth's peculiar focus is reconciliation as opposed to justification (as in Lutheranism), predestination (as in orthodox Calvinism) and holiness (as in Wesleyanism). Reconciliation encompasses both justification and sanctification, but it also includes vocation—the calling to live out our faith in solidarity with the victims of oppression in the world.

What he propounds is best understood as a universalism of hope. We can regard even non-Christians with optimism because we know that they, too, are in the hands of God who is love. Even the most despicable are claimed by the love of God, and the Good Shepherd will not rest content until he searches and finds the lost sheep. At the same time, those who persist in rejection and defiance of the God of grace meet only judgment, wrath and condemnation. We cannot escape the grace of God, but we will experience this grace in the form of judgment if we bow down before Mammon rather than before the one and only true God revealed in Jesus Christ.

Barth thought of himself as evangelical in the classical sense—committed to the gospel of reconciliation and redemption . . . that we are saved by the free grace of God alone as revealed and confirmed in Jesus Christ.

In striking contrast to the pessimism we often encounter in Reinhold Niebuhr and Emil Brunner, who are also included in neo-orthodoxy, Barth exudes a holy optimism. For him, the "real man" is not "man the sinner" (as in Brunner) but "man created in the image of God." In our radical depravity as sinners, there is still hidden our true nature, which is grounded in an ontic relationship with the living God that can be marred but never sundered.

Particularism and Universalism

This sanguine attitude extends to Barth's view of our eternal destiny. As a result, he has often been accused of universalism, but actually his position is better described as a particularism within a universalism. He explicitly repudiates the idea of a universal homecoming (*apokatastasis*), contending that God is under no obligation to continue to favor those who spurn his grace and choose to live apart from his grace. Barth does affirm the universal atonement against a type of hyper-Calvinism that holds that Christ died only for the elect. He also teaches the universal triumph of grace; yet he recognizes that grace does not find its goal and fulfillment in each and every person. Those who refuse to believe in Christ are not only under the sign of predestination to salvation, but they also stand under the dire threat of God's judgment on sin.

According to Barth, all are children of God *de jure*, but not all are such *de facto*. All are ordained to fellowship with God, but not all are set in this fellowship. Calling goes out to all, but not all respond. For Barth, whether one can forever deny the grace that already claims and encompasses all people is an open question. He is basically an agnostic concerning the final fate of the spiritually lost, but that he acknowledges the reality of spiritual lostness cannot be denied. "We should not forget," he declares, "that we ourselves are lost if we will not have him as the Savior of sinners, if . . . we will not have God in him as the God who gives to all of us generously and without reproaching us" (*Ethics*, pp. 341, 342).

Christ and Culture

When we try to place Barth in one of the five categories of H. Richard Niebuhr's typology delineated in his *Christ and Culture*, we are in a quandary, since Barth seems to offer something new. In Barth's theology, Christ is not primarily the transcendent goal of culture (as in "Christ-above-culture"), nor is he essentially the converter of cultural values (as in "Christ-transforming-culture"). Neither is the Christian under two quite different kinds of obligations, the private and the public (as in "Christ-and-culture-in-paradox"). Still less is the Christian called to establish a counterculture in direct opposition to the prevailing culture (as in "Christ-against-culture"). And, of course, Barth is adamantly opposed to "Christ-of-culture" in which the highest values of the culture are equated with the kingdom of God. Barth specifically warns against the dangers of culture-Christianity, never wavering in his conviction that the true Christian will always stand against the stream of popular opinion.

In Barth's theology, Christ is *Victor* over culture in that the idolatries and pretensions of human culture are overthrown by the divine incursion into human history. Jesus Christ, by virtue of his cross and resurrection victory, is even now Lord of the principalities and powers. Yet these powers continue to rule by virtue of deception, and therefore the victory of Christ only becomes concrete and tangible when the Spirit of God brings people the knowledge of the reality of the transformed human situation.

Our goal, Barth says, is to humanize but not Christianize the structures of society. These structures already belong to Christ, but they must now be geared to fashioning a just society, one that will reflect but not duplicate or extend the righteousness of the kingdom. Culture must be allowed a certain degree of autonomy; pluralism in the modern world must be respected. This is why Barth shies away from any move toward a theocratic experiment (as we find in Calvin). Culture

TSF BULLETIN (ISSN 0272-3913) is published bimonthly during the academic year (September–June). Editorial address is Theological Students Fellowship, 233 Langdon, Madison, WI 53703. **Subscriptions:** \$15 per year (\$25/year for institutions) for five issues. Add \$2.00 per year for postage to addresses outside the U.S. U.S. currency only. Send subscriptions and address changes to TSF Subscriptions, 233 Langdon, Madison, WI 53703. Allow six weeks for address changes to become effective. **Manuscripts:** Although unsolicited material is welcomed, editors cannot assure response in less than three months. Please enclose a self-addressed envelope and return postage.

TSF BULLETIN is a member of the Associated Church Press and of the Evangelical Press Association, and is indexed in *Religion Index One: Periodicals*. Back issues are available from TSF, and are available on microfiche from Vision Press, 15781 Sherbeck, Huntington Beach, CA 92647. An annual index is published in the May/June issue. TSF BULLETIN does not necessarily speak for Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship in its articles and reviews. Although editors personally sign the IVCF basis of faith, our purpose is to provide resources for biblical *thinking* and *living* rather than to formulate "final" answers. © 1985 by Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, U.S.A. Second-class postage paid at Madison, Wisconsin. POSTMASTER: send address changes to P.O. Box 5000-GH, Ridgefield, NJ 06757.

is something worthwhile on its own level, but it must not be given ultimacy, nor must it be seen as a source of meaning and promise in human life, for this would be tantamount to idolatry. In Barth's theology, the break between Christ and culture is relativized. Ironically, by stressing the solidarity of the church with the world, Barth comes perilously close to the very Christ-of-culture position he abhors. He speaks of the need for nonconformity but only for the sake of solidarity (this is what distinguishes him from Protestant sectarianism). At the same time, Barth underlines the importance of a prophetic critique of cultural endeavor and achievement in the light of the gospel. Christ is not only the ground and mainstay of human culture but also its judge and adversary, and this means

citadels of righteousness. Instead, the prophetic church witnesses to the breaking into history of a higher righteousness; it points people to a higher law; it reminds people of the claims of a holy God that will always contravene the pretensions and priorities of the culture.

For Barth, our political attitude must follow the belief in justification by grace. The Christian can only affirm a state based on justice. There will always be a correspondence between genuine human justice and divine righteousness, however broken and tenuous. The Christian, moreover, is under no obligation to support a state that has become demonic, that arrogates to itself ultimate power, that demands unconditional allegiance from its subjects.

The holy optimism of this theological giant is especially needed in our time when the foundations of civilization are crumbling and the spirit of nihilism is being reborn.

that the proper approach of the Christian in culture toward the living God is one of gratefulness and penitence.

Perhaps Barth comes closest to being a transformationalist, but he is so only in a qualified sense. He believes that the task of Christians in the state is to seek justice, but this justice is always clearly distinguished from the higher righteousness of the kingdom that God alone creates. Human righteousness is not the same as divine righteousness, but it can be a parable and sign of this higher righteousness. For Barth, the kingdom of God is not transformed human culture so much as a new reality that negates as well as elevates and purifies human culture. Barth seeks a "free culture" determined by and standing in correspondence to the righteousness of the kingdom of God. The kingdom of God can never be identified with movements of social reform and revolution, but such movements can derive their inspiration and motivation from this kingdom.

Barth also retains the thrust of "Christ-against-culture," particularly evident in his very last writings. He contends that the Christian will always be against the ruling powers and in solidarity with the oppressed. The church's message will always go counter to civil religion and to the popular values of the culture.

All efforts to substitute a new religio-cultural synthesis for the prevailing one, however, must likewise be greeted with a touch of healthy skepticism. Barth sounds a timely warning against aligning the church with any cultural ideology. In his second phase, that of dialectical theology, he emphasized the dissonance between the kingdom of God and all cultural and political movements, both revolutionary and conservative. In his last phase, he reverted to an earlier stance, viewing democratic socialism as most closely approximating the concerns of the gospel for the poor and dispossessed. Yet Barth, in contrast to Tillich, was never an ideological socialist, and he continued to the very end to resist any efforts to confuse human movements for social reform with the kingdom of God. When still a pastor in Safenwil in his early years, he broke with the religious socialists on this very issue: the transcendence of the kingdom of God over all human ideologies.

The need, he saw, was for a prophetic church as opposed to a triumphant church, which seeks to wield worldly influence or which tries to impose its will on the culture. A prophetic church brings the Word of God to bear on cultural endeavor and achievement, and this Word is always one of judgment as well as grace. The prophetic church does not instigate a crusade to renovate the culture, nor does it call people to withdraw from the arena of culture into private

Reservations

Barth continued to insist that his mission was not to make "Barthians" but instead to call the church to obedience to the gospel. Thus he would have considered me derelict in my duty were I not to feel free to criticize him in the light of the gospel, though these criticisms are offered in the context of a fundamental appreciation for his monumental theological achievement.

First, Barth holds that reconciliation is manward, not Godward, that it concerns a change of attitude on the part of humanity toward God rather than a change in God toward humanity. But the question remains: Does not reconciliation in the biblical sense mean establishing concord between two opposing parties, and therefore is not reconciliation mutual? So long as people remain in sin, God is at enmity with them. Although God wills to forgive fallen humankind even in its sin, his forgiveness cannot reach us until peace is made between God and his people. God's holiness must be satisfied before his love can renew us. The good news is that God in his love acts to satisfy his holiness by taking upon himself the sin and guilt of the world in Jesus Christ. This motif is also to be found in Barth, but sometimes he gives the impression that the atonement is simply the demonstration of a love and forgiveness already available to us.

Second, Barth tends to break the correlation of salvation and faith in his pronounced objectivism. Because, in his view, each one of us is objectively, ontologically redeemed, all that remains for us is to become aware of this fact. Consequently, as ambassadors of Christ, we are to call people not to conversion but to a decision of obedience, one that belongs to the sphere of ethics rather than soteriology. While it is true that only God converts, as Barth reminds us, does not God make use of his ambassadors as instruments so that we, too, come to play a role, albeit a very secondary one, in this salvific event?

According to Barth, the whole world is included in the kingdom of grace. But is not C. S. Lewis closer to biblical truth when he likens the church to a beachhead of light in a world still under the sway of the powers of darkness? Barth acknowledges that there is a *real* difference between the Christian and non-Christian, even though this is a relative one, since both are elected to salvation by Jesus Christ. Yet only those who respond in faith are adopted into the family of God and become children of God in a special sense. This particularistic note becomes more pronounced in his posthumous

work, *The Christian Life* (Eerdmans, 1981).

Barth has often been criticized for underplaying the reality of the devil. It is indeed questionable whether he believes in a personal devil, but he does affirm the reality of the demonic, which he calls "the nothingness," a kingdom of darkness arrayed against the kingdom of God. To be sure, this anti-God kingdom has been shorn of its power by Jesus Christ, but it continues to have a semblance of power through its capacity to deceive. The nothingness or chaos might be likened to a nightmare that has no basis in reality but still is sufficient to wreak havoc in human lives. Barth's exposition of the demonic has a biblical ring, but the biblical testimony concerning the fall of angels is relegated to the area of mythology.

Where evangelicals have special difficulty with Barth is in his tendency to downplay personal sanctification. Faith in his theology is not the act by which we continually appropriate the righteousness of Christ, resulting in progressive sanctification and real holiness; instead, it is the act of acknowledging and trusting in the promises of Christ. For Barth, we are called not so much to moral excellence as to the service of the needy and downtrodden. The goal is not to lead a pious and holy life but a responsible and obedient life under God.

The danger in his theology is that the call to justice supplants the call to personal holiness. The call to freedom takes priority over the call to sainthood. Barth does not speak so much of Christian virtue as of Christian responsibility. But can there be justice without piety? Can we teach people to be disciples of Christ unless we are united to Christ in faith and love?

The problem, it seems to me, stems from the divorce between faith and religion in Barth's theology. By stressing the noetic and volitional over the experiential aspects of faith, he tends to empty faith of its mystical content. Faith involves knowledge, trust and obedience to be sure, but does not also entail a mystical union with the Giver of faith? Mysticism and religion are suspect in Barth's theology because they connote an attempt by humans to make contact with God, to approach God on his own level. Barth regards revelation as the *Aufhebung* or abolition of religion rather than its fulfillment. Yet this word must be seen in its Hegelian context, indicating elevation and purification rather than simply negation. Barth can speak of a "true religion," which points beyond itself to the free grace of God. At the same time, it seems that Barth makes religion and spirituality expendable rather than decisive for the Christian life.

Finally, we need to ponder again Barth's decision to abandon the time-honored concept of the means of grace. For the later Barth, Jesus Christ is the only sacrament, the one Word of God, to which other words and acts can only attest but never actualize or complete. When Barth launched his *Church Dogmatics*, he embraced a neo-Calvinist sacramentalism in which he could speak of Scripture and the sermon as well as baptism and the Lord's Supper as means of grace, visible signs that have both a divine and human side. In his last period, he returned to a much earlier position in which Jesus Christ alone is the Word, and Christ speaks directly to the human soul, sometimes in conjunction with outward means and sometimes not. Barth could say that God speaks "over and against" the human word rather than "in and through" it. It seems that for Barth the infinite is capable of laying hold of the finite, but the finite is not capable of bearing or carrying the infinite. Does not Barth break here not only with catholic tradition but also with the biblical witness, which holds that faith comes by hearing and hearing by preaching (cf. Rom. 10:14-17; I Cor. 1:21; II Cor. 5:20; Gal. 3:2-5; Mark 13:10,11; Lk. 10:16)?

Some of the ambiguities in Barth's thought stem in part from his openness to the Enlightenment of the 18th century as well as to the Protestant Reformation. Unlike Reinhold Niebuhr, Barth did not seek a synthesis of humanistic and Reformation insights, but he tried to incorporate what is valid and helpful in the Enlightenment into a basically evangelical perspective. He has declared that "in the whole history of ideas there is hardly a single verdict which verbally corresponds so closely to the Christian verdict as that of 18th century optimism" (*Church Dogmatics* III, 1, p. 404). Barth appreciated the celebration of the authentically human by 18th century thinkers, even though he faulted them for not acknowledging that the ground of our humanity is the humanity of God, as seen in Jesus Christ. Their efforts, he perceived, prepared the way for a new idolatry by failing to realize that the "real man" is the "man created in the image of God" and justified and sanctified in Jesus Christ rather than the "man of reason and refinement."

Where Barth proves to be an authentic son of the Reformation is in his strong advocacy of the priority of grace over virtue, the primacy of Scripture over both church tradition and religious experience, and the sovereignty of God over the strategies of nations. As he developed his position, Barth came ever closer to the left-wing Reformation with its emphasis on the church as a gathered fellowship of believers (*Gemeinde*) rather than a sacramental institution that dispenses grace. His advocacy of believers' baptism, his stress on discipleship under the cross, and his defense of the priesthood of all believers show his convergence with the concerns of the Anabaptists.

Perhaps we could say that Barth was a genuinely catholic theologian who was willing to appropriate the good and true not only in Reformation tradition but also in the traditions of medieval scholasticism, Protestant sectarianism and even Enlightenment modernism. He did not accept any insight or practice uncritically but always made an attempt to assess its truth in the light of the gospel of Jesus Christ, which remained for him the final criterion and authority for faith and practice until the end of his life. Barth wished his own theology always to be measured in the light of the Word of God in Holy Scripture. And indeed he practiced what he preached, demonstrating a willingness to alter his theological stance on the basis of this gospel, even in his later years. Perhaps this accounts for his continuing relevance in an age when finalized systems of truth are no longer credible or meaningful.

The holy optimism of this theological giant is especially needed in our time when the foundations of civilization are crumbling and the spirit of nihilism is being reborn. It is important to recognize that his optimism was based not on human potentiality nor on the wisdom of the church but on the invincibility of divine grace, demonstrated and fulfilled in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, Savior and Lord of all peoples.

WANT TO WRITE FOR TSF BULLETIN?

We solicit top quality articles for publication in the *Bulletin*. Regretfully, no remuneration can be provided. Send us those essays which ought not remain unpublished! Contact the Editor at *TSF Bulletin*, 233 Langdon, Madison, WI 53703.

My Encounter with Karl Barth

by Carl F. H. Henry

Dr. Henry and Word, Inc., have graciously granted the Bulletin permission to publish this excerpt from Henry's forthcoming autobiography, tentatively titled Confessions of a Theologian.

When Karl Barth came to America for a few lectures at University of Chicago Divinity School and Princeton Theological Seminary, George Washington University made a belated effort to bring him to the nation's capital. Barth was weary; but he volunteered to come for an hour's question-answer dialogue. The university invited 200 religious leaders to a luncheon honoring Barth, at which guests were invited to stand, identify themselves, and pose a question. A Jesuit scholar from either Catholic University or Georgetown voiced the first question. Aware that the initial queries often set the mood for all subsequent discussion, I asked the next question. Identifying myself as "Carl Henry, editor of *Christianity Today*," I continued: "The question, Dr. Barth, concerns the historical factuality of the resurrection of Jesus." I pointed to the press table and noted the presence of leading religion editors or reporters representing the United Press, Religious News Service *Washington Post*, *Washington Star* and other media. If these journalists had their present duties in the time of Jesus, I asked, was the resurrection of such a nature that covering some aspect of it would have fallen into their area of respon-

sibility? "Was it news," I asked, "in the sense that the man in the street understands news?"

Barth became angry. Pointing at me, and recalling my identification, he asked: "Did you say *Christianity Today* or *Christianity Yesterday*?" The audience—largely nonevangelical professors and clergy—roared with delight. When encountered unexpectedly in this way, one often reaches for a scripture verse. So I replied, assuredly out of biblical context, "*Yesterday, today, and forever*." When further laughter subsided, Barth took up the challenge: "And what of the virgin birth? Would the photographers come and take pictures of it?" he asked. Jesus, he continued, appeared only to believers and not to the world. Barth correlated the reality of the resurrection only with personal faith.

Later, UPI religion reporter Lou Cassels remarked, "We got Barth's 'Nein!'" For Barth, the resurrection of Jesus did not occur in the kind of history accessible to historians. Religious News Service and other media echoed my "encounter with Barth." But at the end of the hour Barth added a gracious apology. He was not fully happy, he said, with the way he had responded to some questions, and particularly about the way he had referred to *Christianity Today*. Some years later when Barth wrote his *Evangelical Theology: An Introduction*, he commented in the preface that he could go neither the way of *Christian Century* nor the way of *Christianity Today*.

A Letter of Thanks to Mozart

by Karl Barth

In his forward to the delightful collection of Barth's tributes to Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, the composer whom the great theologian passionately loved, John Updike writes:

Karl Barth's insistence upon the otherness of God seemed to free him to be exceptionally (for a theologian) appreciative and indulgent of this world, the world at hand. His humor and love of combat, his capacity for friendship even with his ideological opponents, his fondness for his tobacco and other physical comforts, his tastes in art and entertainment were heartily worldly, worldly not in the fashion of those who accept this life as a way-station and testing-ground but of those who embrace it as a piece of Creation. The night of his death he was composing a lecture in which he wrote, in a tremulous but even hand, that "God is not a God of the dead but of the living"; not long before this Barth made notes foreseeing his death and the manifestation before "the judgment seat of Christ" of his "whole 'being,'" his being "with all the real good and the real evil that I have thought, said and done, with all the bitterness that I have suffered and all the beauty that I have enjoyed." Foremost for him in the ranks of beauty stood the music of Mozart, music which he placed, famously and almost notoriously, above the music of Bach and all others as a sounding-out of God's glory. He began each day with the playing of a Mozart record, partook of Mozart celebrations and festivals, and conscientiously served as a member of the Swiss Mozart Committee, which included the government minister Carl Burkhardt and the conductor Paul Sacher.

Through the kindness of the Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co. we are privileged to share with our readers from that collection, simply titled Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, "A Letter of Thanks to Mozart," which appeared originally in the Luzerner Neuesten Nachrichten, January 21, 1956.

*In appreciation to Eerdmans for this kindness, it is fitting to mention that two other Barth books will soon be available from that publishing house: *Witness to the Word*, trans. G. W. Bromiley, and *A Karl Barth Reader*, eds. Rolf Joachim Erler and Donald Reiner Marguard, trans. G. W. Bromiley.*

Celebrate Barth's centennial year by reading about him; better still, by reading something from his own vast, stimulating corpus.

Basel, December 23, 1955

My dear Maestro and Court Composer:

Well now, someone hit upon the curious idea of inviting me and a few others to write for his newspaper a "Letter of Thanks to Mozart." At first I shook my head, my eye already on the waste basket. But since it is *you* who is to be the subject, I find it almost impossible to resist. For that matter, didn't you yourself write more than one rather odd letter during your lifetime? Well, then, why not me? To be sure, there where you are now—free of space and time—you [and your companions] know more about each other and also about us than is possible for us here. And so I don't doubt, really, that you have known for a long time how grateful I have been to you, grateful for as long as I can recall, and that this gratitude is constantly being renewed. But even so, why shouldn't you for