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Thesis stated: Both in his earlier "timeless eschatology" and in his later "christological eschatology" Barth has not given full place to the humanity of Jesus Christ.

"Timeless Eschatology"

Emphasis on the coming God in encounter, in merely tangentially touching man as the wholly Other (Genz Anderer) God, did not do full justice to the humanity of Jesus Christ as there was no incarnation in time. The logical result was a removal of the perousia beyond time.

"Christological Eschatology"

Barth attempted to rectify this earlier injustice to the humanity of Jesus Christ by presenting an incarnation in time which brought the perousia in time, from the resurrection to the second advent. The result was that the Christus Pretens came to replace the former Genz Anderer emphasis on God.

In spite of this necessary correction, the place of the humanity of Jesus Christ remained the christological weakness of Barth's Dogmatics. Evidence for this begins to be given in Chapter Four, where after noting various questions concerning his logos enearkos (J. C. Gibbs, D. L. Deegan, C. Brown, F. I. Herzog, H. Bartwell, and E. Brunner) we come to consider his understanding of the assumptio carnis. Accepting his genuine attempt to stress the nuxmum reality of the ΦΩΩΟΣ ΚΑΡΣ ΕΧΕΝΕΣΤΟ we find, nevertheless, that his anahypostatic overemphasis leaves no place for a genuine human υποστασις (as individuality). Rather, Jesus Christ was only the Son of Man as the Son of God, so that the divinity of God engulfed His humanity, so that the naticitas Jesus raised His humanity to the consortium divinatim, so that a unique determination from the divine to the human was actualized, so that this unique "inner history" was a dynamic communio gratiarum, and so that a unique relationship was maintained with the Holy Spirit. Thus, in the Dogmatics, Jesus is humanitas and not a homo consubstantial with us in every respect, and thus Barth's earlier Kierkegaardian emphasis on the infinite qualitative distinction between God and man which removed the incarnation above humanity is still to some extent present in this incarnation in humanity as He still was not a man like other men. For "Jesus Christ is a real man, not simply humanitas or the humanum" (W. McIntyre).

Grounded in this basic christological presupposition is Barth's artificial triplex munus (G. Bromiley). It has no real place for the role of the human Jesus as a man (vere homo). Its sole emphasis is upon God acting as God. In language of the Kingdom, Jesus Christ as the Eschaton is the αυτοβασιλευμα, in which it is the rule of God (ὑιος τον Θεον) over the realm of man (ὑιος του Εσχατον as humanitas) that is emphasized. Thus Jesus did not stand in man's place to redeem man as a man (as in Anselm) but stood in our place to redeem us solely as the acting God. Hence His priestly ministry (munus sacerdotale) was as the Son of God journeying into the far country instead of as the truly representative man (Hebrews, Calvin). Rather than the role of the human Jesus in salvation, there was a homecoming of the Son of Man as the royal man (munus regium). Instead of the suffering servant we have the servant as lord. It would seem that no place for a proper kenosis (laying aside the use of divinity whilst remaining divine) is found in Barth's Christology. The humiliation (exinanitio) of the Son of God was concurrent with the exaltation (exaltatio) of the Son of Man in Barth's actualized doctrine of the incarnation-atonement. This dynamic dialectical exchange (ομοιουδοκία) roots reconciliation solely in God's acts. Post-resurrection Christology presents the final ministry from resurrection to universal advent (munus propheticum) in which it is again the acting God that is emphasized, acting in self-revelation during the one on-going perousia in three moments (resurrection, Holy Spirit, final manifestation). The role of the human Jesus

Use other side if necessary.
during this time in the sessio ad dexteram is all but missing. This is a paradox when viewed in the light of Earth's stress on the bodily resurrection of Jesus, but is logical when considered in the context of his tripus munus. Thus, whereas his earlier eschatology concerns the fact that there is no "givenness" (G. Wanger) from God to man. There are therefore no eschatological firstfruits (\textit{Apokatastasis}), i.e. there is no ontological growth in man below as a vital preparation for the final parousia. Rather, Earth's actus munus context has the acting God ever coming in the Holy Spirit to man in repeated encounters, to awaken, enlighten and send him forth in vocation. The results are only noetic, and not ontological, for the encountered comes to know that his life is hid with God in Christ. This reality in Christ to the detriment of its reality below into man become Earth's sole concern. Many have criticized this "christomonism" in different ways (P. Tillich, C. Brown, G. S. Hendry, G. C. Berkouwer, H. Hartwell, Neo-Calvinists in the Netherlands, H. U. von Bolthazar, C. O'Grady and N. A. Niesiotie). Thus Earth's pneumatology is an one-sided as his Christology. Because his entire munus propheticum, or one on-going parousia, is a self-revelation of Jesus Christ (and thus of mankind's reality in Him) then the merely noetic differences between men below would seem inevitably to become finally non-existent in the universal manifestation which lays Earth's position open to the charge of 
\textit{apokatastasis}, inspite of his rejection of universalism. For Earth, ontological reality is in Jesus Christ alone (and seemingly affects his doctrine of "nothing-ness", his angelology as well as his understanding of the \textit{Imago Dei as analogia relationis}) and all that can take place below in man is a reflection of and a response to this reality. At best this could be considered as a "reality-revelation" (response) dialectic which is somewhat akin to his earlier "eternity-time" dichotomy. It follows that the importance of the final judgment as a novum event is called in question by this revelatio emphasis of the already actualized reality in the judgment of Christ, who Earth considered in the only one who is judged by God. Again it is the uniqueness of Jesus as humanitas engulfed within divinity which made Him only the content of these various aspects of eschatology (ontology, judgment) whereas if Earth had presented Him as\textit{ vera homon} consubstantial with us in every respect, then could He not have also been the real criterion for all other men in these questions? Would not this have preserved the witness to His growth in grace experienced through the "external history" with God? Is this not the same vital growth all men need to be ready for the parousia? Would this not give meaning to the final judgment? Would this not convincingly negate the doctrine of \textit{apokatastasis} which Earth cannot really do? Is not Earth's Trinity as the three modes of being of the one God instead of three persons in the Godhead the basic presupposition which makes impossible an "external history" between God and the man Jesus in both pre- and post-resurrection Christology?

Earth's contribution over the subjectivity of Schleiermacher and Ritschl was in emphasizing the objectivity of the Kingdom. It was more than just a kingdom An man (Schleiermacher) and a kingdom by man (Ritschl) for it was primarily a kingdom to man (Earth). It needs, however, to become a kingdom into man with all the ontological "givenness" that eschatological firstfruits demand. Thus Earth's later eschatology not only does not give full justice to the humanity of Jesus above time (as noted previously) but also \textit{into time}, i.e. \textit{into men's changing lives}. Just as his earlier eschatology stressed the ever-coming God in tangential relation to man, his later eschatology still speaks in this language of ever-repeated encounters inspite of a truer incarnation of the eternal One in time. However, Earth's munus propheticum holds together the past-present-future eschatological tension better than the one-sided emphasis apparent in other eschatologies, eg. on the past in C. H. Dodd's "realized eschatology", on the present in R. Bultmann's "timeless eschatology", and on the future in J. Nollmann's "proleptic eschatology". This could perhaps be considered as Earth's contribution to eschatology. But, his criticism of Calvin's lack of eschatology we shall see is groundless, and we will note that this very theology which he considered lacked eschatology actually gives the "new-old, here-there" eschatological tension which Earth's theology lacks. We shall see that this is because Calvin, unlike Earth, gave full justice to the role of the human Jesus.
"The crucial issue in eschatology concerns the **Humanity of the risen Christ**, and our participation in His Humanity through Word and **Sacrament** in the Church...

If in a previous generation we had to do battle for the Humanity of the historical Jesus, today we have to do battle for the Humanity of the risen Jesus ascended to the right hand of God the Father Almighty."

- Professor T. F. Torrance, *Royal Priesthood*, p. 43 (underlining added).
actualized, so that this unique "inner history" was a dynamic communio gratiarum, and so that a unique relationship was maintained with the Holy Spirit. Thus, in the Dogmatics, Jesus is humanitas and not a homo consubstantial with us in every respect, and thus Barth's earlier Kierkegaardian emphasis on the infinite qualitative distinction between God and man which removed the incarnation above humanity is still to some extent present in this incarnation in humanity as He still was not a man like other men. For "Jesus Christ is a real man, not simply humanitas or the humanum" (J. McIntyre).

Grounded in this basic christological presupposition is Barth's artificial triplex munus (G. Bromiley). It has no real place for the role of the human Jesus as a man (vere homo). Its sole emphasis is upon God acting as God. In language of the Kingdom, Jesus Christ as the Eschaton is the αὐτοκράτεια, in which it is the rule of God (τὸ Θεόν θεόν) over the realm of man (τὸ ἀνθρώπον as humanitas) that is emphasized. Thus Jesus did not stand in man's place to redeem man as a man (as in Anselm) but stood in our place to redeem us solely as the acting God. Hence His priestly ministry (munus sacerdotale) was as the Son of God journeying into the far country instead of as the truly representative man (Hebrews, Calvin). Rather than the role of the human Jesus in salvation, there was a homecoming of the Son of Man as the royal man (munus regium). Instead of the suffering servant we have the servant as lord. It would seem that no place for a proper kenosis (laying aside the use of divinity whilst remaining divine) is found in Barth's Christology. The humiliation (exinsanitio) of the Son of God was concurrent with the exaltation (exaltatio) of the Son of Man in Barth's actualized doctrine of the incarnation-atonement. This dynamic dialectical exchange (ἀποκαταλλάσσει) roots reconciliation solely in God's acts. Post-resurrection Christology presents the final ministry from
resurrection to universal advent (munus propheticum) in which it is again
the acting God that is emphasized, acting in self-revelation during the
one on-going parousia in three moments (resurrection, Holy Spirit, final
manifestation). The role of the human Jesus during this time in the
seicio ad dexteram is all but missing. This is a paradox when viewed in
the light of Barth's stress on the bodily resurrection of Jesus, but is
logical when considered in the context of his triplex munus. Thus, whereas
his earlier eschatology with its parousia beyond time did injustice to the
humanity of Jesus in time, his later eschatology with its parousia in time
did not do justice to the humanity of Jesus above time.

A serious critique of Barth's eschatology concerns the fact that there
is no "givenness" (G. Wingren) from God to man. There are therefore no
eschatological firstfruits (ἀφανίσθη), i.e. there is no ontological growth
in man below as a vital preparation for the final parousia. Rather, Barth's
actus purus context has the acting God ever coming in the Holy Spirit to man
in repeated encounters, to awaken, enlighten and send him forth in vocation.
The results are only noetic, and not ontological, for the encountered comes
to know that his life is hid with God in Christ. This reality in Christ to
the detriment of its reality below into man became Barth's sole concern.
Many have criticized this "christomonism" in different ways (P. Tillich,
C. Brown, G. S. Hendry, G. C. Berkouwer, H. Hartwell, Neo-Calvinists in the
Netherlands, H. U. von Balthasar, C. O'Grady and N. A. Nissiotis). Thus
Barth's pneumatology is as one-sided as his Christology. Because his entire
munus propheticum, or one on-going parousia, is a self-revelation of Jesus
Christ (and thus of mankind's reality in Him) then the merely noetic
differences between men below would seem inevitably to become finally non-
existant in the universal manifestation which lays Barth's position open
to the charge of apokatastasis, inspite of his rejection of universalism.
For Barth, ontological reality is in Jesus Christ alone (and seemingly affects his doctrine of "nothingness", his angelology, as well as his understanding of the imago Dei as analogia relationis) and all that can take place below in man is a reflection of and a response to this reality. At best this could be considered as a "reality-revelation" (response) dialectic which is somewhat akin to his earlier "eternity-time" dichotomy. It follows that the importance of the final judgment as a novum event is called in question by this revelatio emphasis of the already actualized reality in the judgment of Christ, who Barth considered is the only one who is judged by God. Again it is the uniqueness of Jesus as humanitas engulfed within divinity which made Him only the content of these various aspects of eschatology (ontology, judgment) whereas if Barth had presented Him as vere homo consubstantial with us in every respect, then could He not have also been the real criterion for all other men in these questions? Would not this have preserved the witness to His growth in grace experienced through the "external history" with God? Is this not the same vital growth all men need to be ready for the parousia? Would this not give meaning to the final judgment? Would this not convincingly negate the doctrine of apokatastasis which Barth cannot really do? Is not Barth's Trinity as three modes of being of the one God instead of three persons in the Godhead the basic presupposition which makes impossible an "external history" between God and the man Jesus in both pre- and post-resurrection Christology?

Barth's contribution over the subjectivity of Schleiermacher and Ritschl was in emphasizing the objectivity of the Kingdom. It was more than just a kingdom in man (Schleiermacher) and a kingdom by man (Ritschl) for it was primarily a kingdom to man (Barth). It needs, however, to become a kingdom into man with all the ontological "givenness" that eschatological firstfruits demand. Thus Barth's later eschatology not only does not give
full justice to the humanity of Jesus above time (as noted previously) but also into time, i.e. into men's changing lives. Just as his earlier eschatology stressed the ever-coming God in tangential relation to man, his later eschatology still speaks in this language of ever-repeated encounters inspite of a truer incarnation of the eternal One in time. However, Barth's munus propheticum holds together the past-present-future eschatological tension better than the one-sided emphasis apparent in other eschatologies, eg. on the past in C. H. Dodd's "realized eschatology", on the present in R. Bultmann's "timeless eschatology", and on the future in J. Moltmann's "proleptic eschatology". This could perhaps be considered as Barth's contribution to eschatology. But, his criticism of Calvin's lack of eschatology we shall see is groundless, and we will note that this very theology which he considered lacked eschatology actually gives the "new-old, here-there" eschatological tension which Barth's theology lacks. We shall see that this is because Calvin, unlike Barth, gave full justice to the role of the human Jesus.
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With this presentation we have not come to the end of studying Barth's theology. Rather, we are now only at the beginning. The following pages are but an attempt to bring together but one aspect of his thinking. The breadth and depth of his thought is amazing, not only in his early volumes of the Kirchliche Dogmatik but even in the last which was finished when he was eighty-one years of age. Constantly throughout the research the writer has felt like a small bumble bee trying to grasp and evaluate a moving Jumbo jet. The bird in flight, theology on the wing, theologia viatorum, or sheer dynamic, living, thought of Barth is presented in masterly circular reasoning. It is our hope that this essay will have captured sufficient of his eschatological thinking that a real insight into it will be possible. The thesis critique that has grown out of the study comes also from a context of genuine admiration for a truly great man.
REASONS FOR THE CHOICE OF THIS STUDY

As far as is known to this writer, there is no presentation of Barth's eschatology as there is of his other doctrines, such as on justification by H. Küng, and on ecclesiology by C. O'Grady. Not even G. C. Berkouwer's *Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth*, with its seemingly eschatological orientation, is a presentation of Barth's eschatology comparable to the other two cited. It is more of a general book, introducing one to Barth's theology through the motif of triumph. Furthermore, Barth has not written his proposed doctrine of redemption (eschatology) which would have been the fifth volume of his *Kirchliche Dogmatik*. Unlike E. Brunner's *Das Ewige als Zukunft und Gegenwart*, Barth has not written a separate volume on eschatology. It was therefore decided that the three years' research and study at New College should be an attempt to produce within one cover the eschatology of Karl Barth.

ON ITS PRESENTATION

It has been deemed best to attempt as complete a presentation of Barth's eschatology as is possible, although every source may not have been included. In order to do this, the study has taken us into his earlier writings, including two books, articles, sermons, lectures and the 1928 unpublished *Münster Ethik*. From this we went into the Church Dogmatics, systematically reading from one end to the other. The greatest surprise from this was the discovery that one page in every five, on an average, has something to do with eschatology (see Appendix No. 2). This indicates how important eschatology is to Barth's theology. In order to give his thinking within its proper context, Chapter One gives the de-eschatological background of the Schleiermacher-Ritschl tradition in which Barth was trained, and against which he spent most of his writing life. The second
chapter traces his theological roots, his change from Liberalism, and his own theological thinking to complete the background for the presentation of his early eschatology in Chapter Three. Chapter Four attempts to bring out the eschatological orientation of his theology, in its "christological teleology". In Chapter Five the thinking of Barth on the Kingdom is related to the debate on the Kingdom, the participants of which for the most part have entirely ignored Barth. The conclusion of this is given in Chapter Eight where his thinking on the "past-present-future" eschatological tension is compared with the best known eschatologies.

ON THE THESIS

This study is subject-oriented, and not thesis-oriented, that is to say, we did not start out with some thesis idea and read through Barth's theology in order to evaluate it against our contention. Rather, it was from the reading itself that a thesis idea gradually became clear. What was of particular interest was that the same weakness that was apparent in his earlier theology was finally found to be present almost throughout his later thinking. It concerns the humanity of Jesus Christ, which we submit, has not been given the full place it should have in Barth's eschatology. As our assignment is delimited to eschatology, our thesis does not concern the historical Jesus (Leben Jesu Forschung) critique of Barth's theology, i.e. it is not concerned with the place that the man Jesus of Nazareth has in revelation (hermeneutics or relation of faith and history). As the thesis critique grew out of the study, so it will be made from out of the presentation. This means that it will be necessary to give sufficient space to the subject before the thesis critique can be given. It also means that in order to fulfil the requirement of presenting Barth's eschatology, there will be much of this presentation which is not directly related to the thesis critique.
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CHAPTER ONE

DE-ESCHATOLOGIZATION OF NINETEENTH CENTURY THEOLOGY

In 1924, when Barth began working on his own *Dogmatics* (finally launched eight years later), he recorded in two letters to Thurneysen the breadth of the theological background over-against which he was working.

"Where actually is the divine Providence at work in the history of theology as we now have to see it? Three centuries of rubbish? That in itself is really a problem! And to what extent was the Reformation in some measure jointly responsible for this rubbish?" 1

"O this swamp of many hundreds of years in which we are stuck! It is so fearfully hard just to keep thinking the opposite always, to say nothing of speaking it, or of formulating it and setting it in its context." 2

These post-reformation centuries were the time during which, as J.P. Martin says, Protestant theology gradually became de-eschatologised (referring specifically to the latter half of the seventeenth and the first part of the eighteenth centuries), 3 and, as E. Brunner noted, the eschatological question remained almost completely outside of the theological debate (referring specifically to the eighteenth and nine-

---

1. J. D. Smart, *RT* 168.
2. Ibid. 183
3. LJPT 30
teenth centuries). We find these three hundred years not only often referred to by Barth, but also many times identified with what he considered a definite lack in Reformation theology. However, it is

4. E. Brunner, EH 213
5. Although Barth considered the Roman Catholic church as the typical form of de-eschatologized Christianity, CD 3/2 (1948), 511, and the Protestant tradition as never neglecting to consider the last things CD 4/1 (1953), 109, and wrote of the 16th century Reformation as a reawakening of the consciousness of the eschatological character of Christianity, Ethik (1928), 262, he nevertheless referred also to the Reformers’ lack of time for or understanding of eschatology, CD 3/2 (1948) 364, as it played a comparatively insignificant role in their theology, Credo (1935) 162f, being but an appendix of an appendix, CD 2/1 (1940), 632. Although he spoke of Luther’s conviction of the last day’s imminence, CD 4/3 (1959), 29, he also evaluated Calvin and the other Reformers as not being at their best when dealing with eschatology, CD 4/1 (1953), 332. Therefore the original eschatological impetus of the Reformation came remarkably soon to a standstill, Ethik (1928), 267, giving way to a de-eschatologizing of all Christianity, Ethik (1928), 261. (Previously Ritschl mentioned this lack in the Reformers’ eschatology, JR 286f.)

It was therefore in this time of the Reformation that Barth saw a re-emergence of modern man (previously present in the Middle Ages), CD 4/3 (1959), 748, and linked the Idealistic-Romanticist philosophy and theology of the 18th and 19th centuries as a continuation and renewal of the humanistic, enthusiastic, and mystical side movements of the 16th century, CD 1/2 (1938), 560. For it was the 16th century which appealed to this idea of a natural law and therefore to natural revelation with serious consequences in the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries, CD 4/3 (1959), 370. Cf. “frightful self preoccupation” CD 4/2 (1955), 287. Thus in the 16th to 18th centuries man discovered himself as a man, his nature, possibilities and capacities, and with the discovery of religion the Church championed the absolutism of the age, which began in the 17th century, CD 1/2 (1938), 292f, and was more or less attained by 1830, CD 3/3 (1950), 22. Cf. RR 11-57. (Note: the Copernican Cosmology overthrow of Ptolemaic Cosmology was in effect the anthropocentric replacing of the geocentric by absolute man of the 18th century, Ibid. 14-17. Cf. JR 615).

In short, Barth saw this Dogmatic emphasis upon man, not only as a sacrifice to the spirit of the age (eg. 19th century, CD 3/3 (1950), 66), but also as thoroughly de-eschatological, and its coming being at least unhindered by the lack of safeguards in the 16th century theology. Therefore he wrote in 1951 that an overdue Reformation was needed, one which would be far more comprehensive than the 16th century, CD 3/4 (1951), 490, for although Luther and Calvin did not need to aim at a “christocentric” theology, as Schleiermacher and Ritschl, because they were so from the outset, CD 1/2 (1938), 350, yet he pointed to their lack of attention to Christology, CD 4/1 (1953), 366, and we shall see in Chapters 4-7 that it was this christological emphasis with its resulting eschatology that became an important part of Barth’s great contribution to theology.
perhaps fair to say that the nineteenth century was the climax of this "Reformation post-Reformation" de-eschatologized thinking, and became the immediate focus of Barth's critique, not only in his Die Protestantische Theologie im 19 Jahrhundert but also throughout his theological writings, for he was himself schooled in its traditions and became one of its advocates before setting his sights in an entirely different direction.  

The nineteenth century has variously been called by theologians the "greatest century in theology since the fourth" (H. R. Mackintosh), the century of religious experience" (J. Richmond), a century of "secularization" (R. Niebuhr) and the "Century of Hope" (F. S. Marvin), and by two historians, the "Revolutionary Age" (K. S. Latourette and A. R. Vidler).  

Barth noted two lines of theological thought in it, stressing respectively, reason and feeling; whereas K. Heim saw three main lines of development, the moral autonomy of the individual, speculative theology and that of religious feeling. From whichever of these standpoints it is viewed, it appears as the century of anthropocentrism, and theologically speaking, Barth considered lines from everywhere, both positive

6. 611 pages covering Vorgeschichte (6 thinkers from Rousseau to Hegel) and Geschichte (19 thinkers from Schleiermacher to Ritschel). Only 11 of the 29 chapters appear in the English translation, RR.  
7. Noted in Chapter 2, Sec. 1.  
8. Types 183  
9. FF 54  
10. FH 15  
13. RR 190  
and negative, led to Schleiermacher for it was "his century".  

1. Schleiermacher's Der Christliche Glaube

Many thinkers, in different ways, have expressed the importance of Schleiermacher to nineteenth century theology, and pointed to his Der Christliche Glaube as second only to Calvin's Institutes on the one hand and as vital to understanding contemporary systematic theology as Darwin is to modern biology on the other. What H. R. Mackintosh called his "genius for thinking systematically", Barth considered Schleiermacher, in his Der Christliche Glaube, to have gone beyond Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Melanchthon, Zwingli and Calvin in that unlike their

---

15. PTh 381, 377, "Aber es ist auf dem Feide der Theologie doch sein Jahrhundert gewesen."

16. Not only is he considered as having had (in 1889) "almost unequalled veneration" (F. Lichtenberger, HGTN 47f), having theoretically "initiated" and "dominated" the 19th century (J. Richmond, PP 54f, Cf. J. A. Chapman, IS 13, 15) but is given credit for being studied, honoured and made more fruitful in 1910 than in 1830 (K. Barth, RR 306f) and studied with closer application in continental circles than anyone except Luther from 1887-1937 (H. R. Mackintosh, Types, 36). He was the pioneer of Christian humanism as far as a thorough going method is concerned (E. Brunner, MW 8) so that he has been called the "father of modern Protestantism" (J. Richmond, op. cit., 66) and "the father of modern theology" (C. Van Til, NM 1, 365). His is given credit as the first real effort of theology to come to terms with the modern spirit (J. A. Chapman, op. cit., 15 and John Bailie, IR 29) and as a new method of reconciling the doctrinal system with religious experience (G. Cross, TE 104). He has been called not only the greatest theologian of his century (E. Brunner, MW 6) but also the dividing line in theological studies (before and after Schleiermacher) as Kant is in philosophy (E. Brunner, Ibid. 8). Barth considered that he has launched a "new era" (RR 306f), a veritable "new golden age" (CD 1/1, 317) with his ideas as the "cardinal propositions in philosophy of religion in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries" (CD 1/1, 219) so that "the first place in the history of theology of the most recent times belongs and will always belong to Schleiermacher and he has no rival" (RR 306). It is therefore not surprising that Barth gives far more space to Schleiermacher than to any other theologian in his RR.


18. Types 64

19. Ibid. In striking contrast to Kant's Critique of Pure Reason, it is all of a piece.
articulated chapters, articles or *loci*, his was "a single astonishingly coherent view of the separate parts (*disjecta membra*) of the historical Christian faith."²⁰ We now come to consider briefly a few aspects of this book, as a background and context to the conception of eschatology that it contains.

a. Epistemology

To Schleiermacher, piety was a state²¹ made up of feeling, knowing and doing.²² These three psychic divisions can illustrate his epistemology over-against those followed by others, for whereas the Rationalists concentrated upon knowing or reason and thought, and the Moralists concentrated upon doing and will, the former represented by Orthodoxy and the latter by the followers of Kant, Schleiermacher chose the third of these three as a theologian of experience, partly because of his contact with the Moravians and the Romantics. Therefore, rather than the rational or moral proofs for God's existence, he maintained that God is given in and with the feeling of absolute dependence.²³

---

²⁰ TC 181
²¹ This word "state" occurs throughout CF in many different contexts which inspite of Schleiermacher's evolutionary presupposition, and his concept of the renewal of regeneration every moment (509) (like Barth), and his teleological emphasis (next section) (many similarities with Barth), yet his concept of these various states perhaps make his thinking less dynamic and more static and certainly introspective, Eg.: religious states (40), passive state (41, 319), quiescent state (111), sinful state (305, 334), ordinary state (310), inward state (314), and a derived state (344) with his being against a state without the need of a Redeemer (278) and against a Divine state determined by human activity (278). Then there is a state of hardening (312, 337, cf. 345), bondage (312), self assurance (312), hypocrisy (312), freedom (312), sin (352, 355), blessedness (358), union in Jesus Christ (398), lowliness (Christ) (474), futility and uncertainty (487), being sanctified (506, 510, 538), living susceptibility (520), open receptivity (640), and a state of grace (307, 487). Finally, the Church is pictured as advancing to a better state (657) followed by an intermediate state after this life (549), a state between death and resurrection (711) before the state in the next life (722).
²² CF 8f, 11.
²³ Ibid. 133f
For him then, the starting point in dogmatics is the self-consciousness of the individual, which is the God-consciousness of the redeemed person, or the religious self-consciousness, the homo religiousus incurvatus in se. It is only in the contemplation of this Christian self-consciousness that doctrines are discovered, for therein is their exclusive and ultimate ground, in which one can exhaust their whole compass. Dogmatics, therefore, is an examination and articulation of the sphere of the inner life of Christian piety, a fruitful self-analysis because doctrines are but religious affections set forth in speech. This piety is considered the essence of human nature, with the God-consciousness found within as a universal fact through hereditary, although bound up with Christ. It is this feeling of absolute dependence that dogmatics explains, as it argues from the redeemed to the Redeemer.

Not only starting with man, but staying with man, Schleiermacher worked out a thoroughgoing anthropocentric reduction of the Gospel, so that the Trinity (the starting point for Barth's Dogmatics) is considered last, for this doctrine is not contained in the Christian religious experience. Likewise, the doctrines of the Holy Spirit and Christ are each only studied in relation to the church or to man, and not for its

---

24. Cf 501
25. Ibid. 541f
27. Ibid. 841f
28. Ibid. 78
29. Ibid. 123 Thus for Schleiermacher, doctrine was "religious doctrine" Glaubenssatz (Ibid. 85), "real doctrine" (77), as "christian faith" contains elements of the definition of dogmatics (1f) and hence the name of his book, Der Christliche Glaube.
30. Ibid. 428, 485.
31. Ibid. 554
33. Ibid. 171
34. Ibid. 247
35. Ibid. 361
36. Ibid. 198
37. Ibid. 65
38. Ibid. 144
own sake, again in direct contrast with Barth.

b. Teleological Emphasis

In Chapter four we shall note the similarities and dissimilarities between Barth's teleological thinking and that of Schleiermacher which we now come to present. Opposed to Calvin's double decree, as against the idea of divine caprice, Schleiermacher's concept of one decree is unconditional in nature, related directly to creation, incarnation and justification. It is an eternal decree which ordains the whole development of the human race by means of redemption, the capacity for which is included in human nature from the beginning. Everything is already posited which comes into existence in time and space because omnipotence is eternal and omnipresent. There is therefore no difference between the actual and the potential in God, no duality in Him of thought and word, thought and creation, or resolve and activity. Schleiermacher considers that evil and death may have been preordained as certainly as God foreknew sin, thus evil was ordained by God or it cannot properly exist at all, for sin is the insuperable impotence of the God-consciousness which intensifies the longing without which the endowment from Christ could not have been received, and so is wrought in man with a view to redemption. This sin is not an essential part of the being as it is only a disturbance of human nature. Yet, Schleiermacher could speak of an "original sinfulness" and that redemption, in one sense, is not
essentially a restoration (and in the realm of religion is only an arrest of the vitality of the higher self-consciousness). Death is natural, for man was not created immortal, and yet he also maintains that human nature always possessed some immortality as Jesus did, although apparently in contradiction, he states that Jesus received immortality at the resurrection. Sin is not, however, immortal, as in the sphere of redemption it will disappear, and is now in the process of so doing, for the strength of the God-consciousness is growing greater because sin is growing less. Thus he could speak of the teleological character of christian piety, of a growing blessedness, of redemption being ever more completely realised in time, with progressive sanctification, a renewal of regeneration every minute, a christian fellowship that is gradually expanding, with the Roman Catholic and Protestant antithesis not only one day to disappear, but the church itself gradually expelling the world as it advances to a better state when all religions are destined to pass over into the Christian religion. Thus he speaks not only of a primitive stage of development when referring to the past, but even considered the apostolic age to have had only a degree of the spirit present in the church today, and hence the apocryphal sections of the canon are due to comparative unenlightenment in the apostolic and post-apostolic times. With continuing advance, he sees
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that in its critical side the normative use of scripture will one day cease.\textsuperscript{76} It is therefore a progressive development of man that is an important basic presupposition of Schleiermacher's entire thinking.\textsuperscript{77} Thus he considered an evolution of the God-consciousness\textsuperscript{78} which developed from Adam to the purity manifested in the Redeemer.\textsuperscript{79} Everything was set in relation to that appearing of Christ,\textsuperscript{80} in that his revelation was directly a result of the power residing in human nature, and so the logical conclusion of its progress,\textsuperscript{81} for Christ was simply the beginning of the supreme development of human nature.\textsuperscript{82} With this finitum capax infiniti presupposition, Schleiermacher sought not for the original perfection in Adam but in Christ,\textsuperscript{83} for in Him human nature was for the first time brought to perfection,\textsuperscript{84} giving man a new corporate life,\textsuperscript{85} for from the incarnation proceeds a whole new creation.\textsuperscript{86} In other words, Christ's entrance into humanity was a second creation,\textsuperscript{87} or the completion of the first creation,\textsuperscript{88} for eternally the appearance of the Redeemer was already involved in the imperfect state of the first Adam's creation.\textsuperscript{89} Thus instead of Chalcedonian Christology, Schleiermacher proposed the canon that in Christ man first reached completion.\textsuperscript{90}

Finally, redemption is therefore considered as the effect of the divine decree,\textsuperscript{91} and the coming of the Redeemer as the turning point for man;\textsuperscript{92} and although this redemption can be still needed,\textsuperscript{93} yet,
because already completed, there is only to be a further development but not a new revelation.  

**c. Kingdom of God**

Not only is the Kingdom of God so important and indeed all inclusive for Christianity, but it is related to the world as grace is to sin. For not only did Jesus come to establish the invincible kingdom, but as our new corporate life was in actuality the Kingdom of God. Thus in the narrower sense the Kingdom is confined to Christ alone, although in the broader connotation, even in Christ's day, it was yet to be formed. Whereas Christ was founding the Kingdom, which the new community became, the rule of the Kingdom is established in the Christian through the Holy Spirit, where it is present in the fellowship of believers, and every adult Christian ought to be conscious of himself as in it. Its increase and progress is now going on, and its completion is yet future. Schleiermacher speaks therefore of a will for the kingdom, which comes with faith, and with regeneration, which causes the new man to be active in behalf of it.

However, Schleiermacher is clear that the Kingdom of God established by redemption is foreign to his present purpose of investigating the religious self-consciousness. He therefore not only is against the classical division of the Kingdom into power, grace and glory, affirming

---
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that there is only a Kingdom of Grace, because it alone can really emerge in our moral devotion,\textsuperscript{113} but also, with Luther, sees a radical dichotomy between church and state so that the growing strength of the Kingdom is directly related to the degree of severance between them.\textsuperscript{114} In summary, then, we see that in the language of the Kingdom is again presented an evolutionary process towards a final natural completion.

d. Eschatology

Closely related to all that has preceded is Schleiermacher's deschathologised thinking. Because of his epistemology, and in agreement with his teleological thinking and concept of the Kingdom, eschatology became swallowed up in anthropology, as we shall now note. Although saying that eschatology is not established on the foundation of general principles,\textsuperscript{115} he maintained that affirmations of self-consciousness relative to the consummation of the Church are "most unreliable".\textsuperscript{116} This is because the Christian consciousness has nothing to say in regard to it, for in Schleiermacher's interpretation of the word - it is not a doctrine of "faith".\textsuperscript{117} Thus the last things are removed from the domain of inner life, which was his only concern,\textsuperscript{118} so that the Christian doctrine of eschatology (consummation of Church) must derive from some other source than the Christian self-consciousness.\textsuperscript{119} Naturally, bodily matters concerning the consummation are also outside of Christian doctrine.\textsuperscript{120} Thus all "last things" are placed under the caption "Prophetic doctrines" in his Der Christliche Glaube,\textsuperscript{121} and he refers to these last day matters as not only prophetic language but also poetical,\textsuperscript{122} and links prophecy
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with miracle as alien to faith. In fact, prophetic thought only gives stimulating expression to principles already known and is therefore not really knowledge at all. It is understandable then that he did not give the same value to eschatology as he did to the other doctrines.

As the new dispensation became established as a historical phenomenon, so the interest in the future decreased and prophecy ended. This is to be understood together with Schleiermacher's belief in an increasing presence of the Holy Spirit through the successive generations, and thus a more enlightened Christian consciousness today than was present in apostolic times. So he could say that since the Holy Spirit has been poured out, nothing essential can be thought of as lacking to the Kingdom of God. Therefore the redeeming efficacy of Christ depends upon the being of God in Him and not upon either the resurrection, ascension or the return. For, in fact, the return of Christ is but the counterpart of the ascension, and both are merely the accidental form behind which lies the content, i.e. the ascension is the form behind which is the content "right hand of God" and the return is the form behind which is the content "the real longing to be united with Christ". Moreover, less than in the case of the resurrection and ascension has the return of Christ any connection with the doctrine of His person.

Relative to death, Schleiermacher considered an intermediate state.

---
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between it and resurrection, considering the resurrection of body and change of it as different. He could not picture that life after death as either infinite progressive development or as unchanging completeness, for there is no conception of what it will be like as the question is merely cosmological and hence persistent union of believers with the Redeemer is the essential thing. This brings us to his universalism. He speaks of a universality of foreordination, with a redemption of all souls, with no state of absolute hardening in the human sphere, and even though he mentions the possibility of separation of the Church and world in the last judgement, he also states that all mankind is to be taken up into fellowship with Christ. Here he thinks together (in their relatedness) the personal survival (resurrection of the flesh) and church consummation (last judgment to eternal blessedness), after which mankind's God-consciousness will always remain a mediate rather than an immediate one.

However, it is the present that is of prime interest to Schleiermacher, for the picturing of the future life may spoil this one. Even though he considers consummation of the church to require cessation of propagation, and that if we were to conceive the absolute consummation extensively and intensively then the dissimilarity between God and man would be entirely abrogated and His Lordship cease, his main concern is the fact that this doctrine of eschatology has no reference to anything
in our present state as it transcends present conditions, and therefore
from his point of view, there can be no doctrine of the Church's con-
summation, for the Christian consciousness has nothing to say regarding
a "condition so entirely outside our ken." 146

2. Ritschl's Die Christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung

In the editors' preface to the English translation of Ritschl's
Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung, H.R. Mackintosh and A.B. Macaulay not only
pointed to this book as his monumental work, but as the greatest dogmatic
treatise since Schleiermacher's Der Christliche Glaube, having deeply
influenced the entire theological world. 147 There are three volumes
(Vol. 1, historical; Vol. 2, Biblical; and Vol. 3, systematic) and it is
the third that we will briefly consider.

a. Basic Comparisons with Schleiermacher

Being more pragmatic than Schleiermacher, Ritschl revolted against
all mysticism, pietism and romanticism, turning from the sole emphasis
upon "feeling" to include also "knowledge" and "will", considering that
all three psychological areas are concerned with religious functions, 148
for they mutually condition one another. 149 As preoccupation with "feeling"
was a post-Reformation phenomenon (replacing memory), 150 Ritschl's return
to stressing blessedness through faith in Christ instead of through
familiar intercourse with the Saviour, 151 and his calling attention to
the Object rather than the subject, 152 seemed an honest attempt to get
back to Reformation theology. For him devotion and dogmatics were separ-
ated as guided by different interests, 153 for theology, as a science, is
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Further, instead of the unifocal concentration upon the doctrine of redemption, an extension to ethics as the second focus in an ellipse was made. This meant a moving away from the essentially passive feeling of dependence to the decidedly active emphasis of freedom over the world. To see if these advances over Schleiermacher resulted in a better epistemology, teleological emphasis, doctrine of the kingdom, and therefore eschatology, is the purpose of the following sections.

b. Epistemology

We know God only by revelation, and Christ is the complete revelation of God, in that He was the Bearer of the perfect revelation and final revelation of God. Therefore the person of Christ must be regarded as the ground of knowledge to be used in the definition of every doctrine, for it is considered as the self-revelation of the Father through the Son. Thus theology has to do with God revealed in Christ, for He is the right way to the knowledge of God, and is considered as the Bearer of reconciliation, as the Bearer of God's moral lordship over man, as Bearer of God's operation against sin, as Bearer of the perfect spiritual religion, as Bearer of the Divine self-end, as

154. JR 213. It however involves value judgements which do not belong to the sphere of disinterested scientific knowledge, like the formula of Chalcedon (398). In other words, theology as a science concerns religious and not scientific knowledge. Cf. Faith in Christ is neither belief in the truth of His history nor assent to scientific knowledge as presented in the Chalcedon formula (591).
155. Ibid. 11 156. Ibid. 578f
157. Ibid. 398. Even this was qualified in the context to mean that we know God's essence by determining its value for our salvation.
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Bearer of God's peculiar purpose in the world, and therefore as revealer of the Divine purpose of the world.

Rather than following through with a true christology, and thus with an epistemology that begins with God and comes to man, Ritschl went on to state that all theological propositions have for their aim the explanation of the phenomenon of the Christian life, being unable to take the objective divine standpoint for more than an instant, for we know the nature of God and Christ only in their worth for us. Thus belief which cannot be tested by experience is a mere opinion. There is no other way of persuading ourselves of reconciliation than finding it experimentally, so that assurance of salvation comes from ascertaining subjective effects of it rather than inferring from general articles of faith. Likewise, Divine providence springs from our religious valuation of our spiritual personality. The Holy Spirit is the attribute

170. JR 461
171. Ibid. 593. Although Ritschl considered Christ unique in his order (465), His Divinity was not "nature" but "will" (465-468) - world conquering will (467f) - for interest in this nature was to him materialistic thought (468). Therefore he opposed the Chalcedon decree (591) as, with all christological formulas, it is worthless for faith which consists in trust (395), and it belongs to the sphere of disinterested scientific knowledge, whereas Christ acted for me, is my Lord, which is a value judgement (398). It was this Lutheran "pro me" emphasis which interested Ritschl more than the objective signification of the Creed (392) so that Christ as a Bearer of the perfect revelation of God (591f) had, on the one hand, no connection with His pre-existence (which Ritschl opposed, 400-404, Cf. 469, 471f) and, on the other hand, reduced Him to but the "instrument" for the complete self-revelation of God (436). In short, the theological doctrine of reconciliation (same as forgiveness and justification) was not to be sought so much in the words of Christ as in the correlative representations of the original consciousness of the community (3), and thus a theological system includes the standpoint of the redeemed community of Christ (5).
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of the community as the knowledge of God harmonizing with God's self-knowledge. Also Christ's divinity must be theologically analysed from what He has done in saving mankind, and the Christian view of the world obtained from our "consciousness of reconciliation". Thus, Ritschl's thought moves from the known to the unknown, from love on earth to God above, from the moral development of individuals in progressive fellowship to the idea of God, from the civil state to the transcending order, from forgiveness of sins to ascertain an attribute of God, and through actively fulfilling the will of God to thereby become convinced that Christ really revealed God: in short, from the same subjective, or anthropocentric pole, as Schleiermacher. As T. F. Torrance questioned, has not the human logos taken the place of the Divine logos?, for Ritschl bases his theology on a rather primitively conceived contradiction between spirit and nature, in which it seems to be forgotten that "the world of spirit, just as much as the world of nature, is world..." Ritschl, therefore, was concerned only with what Torrance called "the Sovereign religious experience".

c. Teleological Emphasis

Although Ritschl considered Schleiermacher the first to employ a true conception of the teleological nature of the Kingdom of God to determine the idea of Christianity, yet he was of the opinion that he did less justice to this aspect of Christianity than any other. Ritschl
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was against a natural development from Adam to Christ for the eternal decree had no connection with sin but with the completion of men in the person of Christ. 192 He considered Pietism to be the result of forgetting the teleological relation of the idea of justification to eternal life as consisting in freedom over the world. 193 This freedom, or the Kingdom of God, was contained in the eternal purpose of God as correlate of His loving will, while historical experience tells us that it is realized only at the close of the first era of the world's existence. 194 Thus Ritschl not only spoke of God's will being directed towards the realization of the Kingdom of God in the ethical and supramundane limits of a multitude of souls, 195 but also of His revelation being directed to redemption and the final end of the Kingdom. 196 From a different perspective, he also saw the teleological relation of justification to eternal life being somewhat lost when projecting eternal life entirely into the next life. 197

Not only does Christianity occupy the highest stage of all religions, 198 but humanity first becomes acceptable in Christ as its head. 199 Although Old Testament religion is the sole presupposition for Christianity, 200 the Roman State was the positive preparation for the ethical tendencies of Christianity, 201 and Rome, rather than Israel, was considered the first State. 202 From this beginning, he goes on to speak of the advancing forces of civilization, 203 the advancing power of Christ over the world, 204
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with the Kingdom prepared by moral fellowship of the family, growing into national fellowship in the state and on beyond into several nations in world-empires, so that the Christian religion is identified with civilized humanity (the non-Christian nations being remote from civilization) and the universalism of the Christian religion, in this advance, should not be doubted, for Christianity is destined to become the universal faith of humanity. He considered not only law and the state in general as preconditions of the Kingdom of God but also the whole universe as created for this end.

d. Kingdom of God

Already in the former section we were unable to refrain from speaking about Ritschl's doctrine of the Kingdom of God. This Kingdom is no realm within the Christian (vs. Mysticism), nor is it identical with the church (vs. Augustinianism). It is therefore not a devotional or a spiritual, but as with Kant, a moral kingdom, as a moral society of nations, a universal moral fellowship, a moral commonwealth or moral unification of the race, to develop one whole supernatural humanity through reception into the religious community of Christianity which will reach the highest morality.

Although God is the founder and ruler of the Kingdom, it was set up through the life and activity of Christ, and is still in the process of being realized in the world. It is being established by God as the
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final, supreme, supramundane, universal, moral end of the phenomenal world, which at the same time will be the supernatural, final end of the Kingdom, an end in the world, as a spiritual dominion over human society. This is repeatedly spoken of as God's end, His own most personal end, or final end in and of the world. Thus, in contrast to Thomas Aquinas, the end of the world and the end of God are the same, which is also our own end, the one end for all which is a moral end. In short, the Christian community, which is the moral Kingdom, is God's supreme end in the world. Everything moves towards that end, which is the Christian goal of dominion over the world. This climax in the Kingdom, of man's freedom over the world, expressed in different ways, occurs often, and as Barth commented, this "kingdom is indeed nothing else but man's own goal."

It is important to note here how this goal is to be obtained, according to Ritschl. Not only was the Kingdom founded through the moral task of Christ, but we all contribute to it through moral action, as it cannot be realized without these works. Reconciled man accepts this task of the Kingdom, which in itself is the motive for moral action, and God bestows the impulse to help in its realization. Thus the final
end that God desires to bring in the world must be realized through the human race. Here we have, as T.F. Torrance noted, an ethic of the bourgeoisie growing prosperous.

e. Eschatology

What then of eschatology? Beyond the few references to eternal life we find no doctrine of eschatology in this book. Mackintosh was right when he found in Ritschl only a few sentences on eschatology. If one is to consider Creation, Reconciliation and Redemption as Barth does in his *Kirchliche Dogmatik*, then we find only (for all practical purposes) the doctrine of Reconciliation in Ritschl's *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung* (as the title implies). That Redemption, or eschatology is not really important to Ritschl is seen from the following:

"Hitherto we have been accustomed to regard the early Christian expectation of the nearness of the world's end as belonging to the shell and not to the kernel. And there the matter will rest, for that anticipation has not acted prejudicially on any of the positive social duties which follow from Christianity."

Such disposable, time-related words or ideas as those within the category of the "shell" were the very materials Bultmann later demythologized in his radical gospel reductionism, which causes the writer to agree with Mackintosh, that in Ritschl "The Kingdom of God, stripped of the eschatological transcendence that belongs to it in the Gospels, is now hardly more than (as with Kant) a realm of moral ends, 'a purely present and mundane commonwealth'.

Thus both Schleiermacher and Ritschl were at one in de-eschatolo-
gising the Gospel. T. F. Torrance sees the astonishing uneschatological nature of nineteenth century theology due partly to its blindness to it, but partly "because it deeply resented certain aspects of the Biblical and early Christian witness bound up with it".

3. Conclusion

Neither the immanent Kingdom of Schleiermacher, nor the moral Kingdom of Ritschl were eschatological due to their preoccupation with man and the anthropocentric pole of revelation. Rather than a Kingdom in man or by man there was needed the emphasis of a Kingdom to man, but such would demand an opposite interest in the acts of God and thus in the objective pole of revelation. Although one may be able to indicate Barth's possible indebtedness to both these theologians, we shall note

247. KBI 72
248. The "Redemption" emphasis of Schleiermacher and the "Reconciliation" concentration of Ritschl were at best only within the subjective category of the beneficia Christi.
249. To Schleiermacher: Besides being dialectical (CF 87, 118) and separating Eternity, or the Divine, from time (152, 176, 401) - typical particularly of Barth's early writing (eg. R6). Schleiermacher, even though seen as apologetical by Barth (RR 312, 325-328, 331, 343) considered Dogmatics to be for those already admitting the facts, and therefore not apologetical (CF 122, Cf. 136f). This was Barth's position. Perhaps more important than details of similar or contrasting organization or comparison with Barth's similar gift for systematic and unified thinking, is the unsuccessful attempt to be christocentric. This could have been one factor in pointing Barth to a proper christological Dogmatics. Thus Schleiermacher stated that complete truth would be God making Himself known as He is in Himself (52) but this possibility along with the Trinity he dismissed (144). He spoke of the self-proclamation of Christ as being the only source of Christian doctrine (Barthself-revelation of Christ) (92) and His self-revelation (427) as identified with His whole being (75).
To Ritschl: Ritschl, not only said we know God only by revelation (JR 398) but also that we know God only if we know Christ (7) for Christ is the perfect revelation of God (483), as He gives us a conception of God (326) because the Father makes a self-revelation through Him (273). Thus Ritschl spoke of theology having to do with the God revealed in Christ (237) whose person must be regarded as the ground of knowledge to be used in the definition of every doctrine (331). See pp. 23f of this chapter.
in the next chapter his decided opposition to them.

249. cont.

Whereas, for Schleiermacher and Ritschl, preoccupation with man and his feelings and acts etc. made a true christology impossible, Barth took seriously such christological ideas, and was thus able to also present an eschatology that was missing in their writings. This we will see in the following chapters.

Their failure was in being only a movement towards christology from within anthropology. In contrast, Barth's position was christological, thinking out from that sole content and criterion. Barth considered Ritschl's attempt to be christo-centric to have been more evident than Schleiermacher's. But neither of them really got beyond their anthropocentric starting point. In CD 1/2, 123 Barth summed up their failure as he saw it: "And so Schleiermacher's romantic conception of history and Ritschl's Kantian metaphysics on the one hand, and their christocentric efforts on the other, could only render each other unworthy of credence."
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CHAPTER TWO

BARTH'S BACKGROUND AND THEOLOGICAL THINKING

Barth was trained in the thought-forms of Neo-Protestantism, represented above all by Schleiermacher, who, together with Kant, became his "guiding stars". Having studied at two other liberal universities (Tübingen and Berlin) he went to Marburg as a convinced "Marburger", and came under the influence of W. Herrmann whom he considered his greatest theological teacher. This was the period when he was still connected with "Liberalismus" even though W. Herrmann's theology was grafted upon the reformed principles which he had learned, less consciously than unconsciously, in his home.

After ordination in 1908, Barth assisted M. Rade in Marburg in the editing of Christliche Welt, where to some extent he shared in the

2. TK 240 (ET 238), "Als überzeugter Marburger bin ich nach Marburg schon gekommen."
3. Ibid. "Herrmann war der theologische lehrer meiner Studentzeit."
4. CD 4/2, x
5. WGEW 100. It is of interest that Barth in referring to this home training, mentioned Abel Burchkhardt's children's songs as his "first theological instruction" when a boy back in the 1890's", CD 4/2, 112. On his confirmation day, whilst 16 years of age, he decided to be a theologian (KB SJT 1961, 225), and thus to follow in the footsteps of his theologian father, Fritz Barth, who had taught at the University of Berne since he (KB) was three years old.
dominant theological trend led by A. Ritschl's young followers. During this period he was a liberal theologian.

1. The Change from Liberalism

During his twelve years in the pastorate Barth was faced with a "Hydra und Charybdis", seeking to find his way between the problem of human life on the one hand and the content of the Bible on the other. Life and the Bible forced themselves upon him. He mounted the pulpit steps conscious of his responsibility, longing to fulfil it but yet utterly incapable because not prepared for the preacher's task at the University.

He not only joined the social democratic party (1915) to help the workers in their social needs, eg. gave leadership to strike of factory workers in Safenwil in 1917, but also spent much of the week wrestling with the Scriptures, particularly Ephesians, Corinthians and Romans. This led to the discovery of "Die neue Welt in der Bibel" which first came to Barth with Paul. The final break with liberalism came in August 1914, when ninety-three German intellectuals came out with a manifesto

6. KB SJT 1961, 225. Cf. KBI 16
8. WGWM 100
9. Ro", Vorwort zur zweiten Auflage, xii, "Ich weiss, was es heisst, jahraus jahrein den Gno auf die Kanzel unternehmen zu müssen, verstehen und erklären sollend und wollend und doch nicht könnend, weil man uns auf der Universität ungefähr nichts als die berühmte 'Ehrfurcht vor der Geschichte' beigebrachte hatte...
10. J. D. Smart, DM 62
11. KBI 11
12. WGT 18-32 (ET 28-50)
13. WGWM 62. In 1918 Ro. Barth wrote, "the mighty voice of Paul was new to me" (p. 2).
14. Not Sept. 4, 1914, as in DM 67 which is referring to Barth's letter to Thurneysen (RT 26f) which records his sending of a carefully edited manifesto to the Christliche Welt against their manifesto.
supporting the war policy of Kaiser William II and his counsellors, and among them Barth was shocked to find the names of nearly all his theological teachers. Disillusioned by their conduct, he perceived that he could no longer accept their ethics, dogmatics, biblical exegesis, and interpretation of history, and that at least for him "nineteenth-century theology no longer held any future." Although J. D. Smart sees Barth moving out of the Schleiermacher-Hitschel tradition by 1917 Barth records, "Verschiedene von uns damals Jüngeren hatten sich freilich schon seit etwa 1916 tastenden Schritten auf den Weg gemacht, eine Theologie ins Feld zu führen..."

15. BG 14, J. S. McNab, SJT, OP 8, 58. It is important here to note that Barth was disillusioned by his former teachers' conduct and not by the war. Although the war did contribute to his revolt against optimistic Neo-Protestantism, yet it is not fair to Barth to consider, as Bishop Stephen Neill did, that the outbreak of war found him with "nothing to say to his people" and "in this time of mental and spiritual disarray" he "turned back to the Bible" (INT 205f), because such study had already been a basic part of his parish ministry for many years before the war. In fact, one month after war broke out (Letter Sept. 14, 1914, RT 26) we find Barth sending two of his latest sermons to his closest associate, Thurneysen, with no hint of being caught with nothing to preach when war came. In contrast to Rade of Die Christliche Welt who lost his head over the new situation, we find Barth unmoved to join the pro-German attitude, seeing through the situation with remarkable clarity, considering that "Die absoluten Gedanken des Evangeliums werden einfach bis auf weiteres suspendiert..." Such loyalty to the Gospel in opposition to the leading theologians by a young man only six years out of university, is not only remarkable but is mutually exclusive to the idea of being caught off guard by the war. Rather, it points to the fruitage of his years of study in the Bible.

J. McConnaughie, although recognizing the importance of the Bible to Barth (BT 94), nevertheless apparently overlooked the pre-war study in it when he wrote that "The movement towards a truer theology arose out of the discovery of Barth and others as preachers, in the dark morning of the post-war world, that there was no vital theology with which the Church could meet its crisis." (207) R. E. Hoyle cites the reformed tradition, influence of W. Herrmann, pastoral work, Kierkegaard with social unrest culminating in the World War, as influences behind Barth's mental make-up, having thus the place of the war in truer perspective (TKB 35). J. D. Smart (DM 57f, 64, 66, 212) also presents a balanced view between pre-war and war influences on Barth, as does G. W. Bromiley (CMCT 28).

2. Theology of the Word

a. Its Development

Long before 1914 and that "black day" in August, Barth was looking in the opposite direction from liberal theology - towards the objective pole of revelation instead of the subjective. In fact, even Herrmann, in spite of his consuming interest in autopistia, had made a contribution to Barth's future theology especially in showing him one essential truth which finally forced him to say everything differently from his teacher, namely, the possibility of a scientific theology.

That scientific theology was not born in the crisis of 1914 and the ensuing war, although they provided an added proof of the necessity of it. Long after the war, on May 18, 1924, he wrote Thurneysen of the difficulty he was having in trying to think in a way different from

18. On the 13th and 17th of May 1925, Barth gave an illuminating lecture on "The Principles of Dogmatics according to Wilhelm Herrmann" (TC 240-301) which reveals several concerns that Barth has taken more seriously than W. Herrmann could because of his subjective presuppositions. Eg. Belief in the self-revelation of God (243, 248), belief in the Trinity (253f), and opposition to apologetics (243, 258). Of interest is his attempt to correct Kant (240), Schleiermacher (245), and Ritschl (248), which were minor movements within the same subjective circle compared with Barth's complete correction from the totally different objective basis. Eg. In 1910 Barth and others had received the concept of "experience" from W. Herrmann (and others) which pointed them beyond mere "admiration" as summoned by Schleiermacher etc. (LTh 74) but Barth went on beyond to give full attention to the object for its own sake. In 1965 Barth noted W. Herrmann's attack on a sacrificium intellectus which assented to certain propositions and doctrines relating to the object of theology encountered second hand from dogma, confession or even the Bible. Barth has continued this (ETH 98). Herrmann influenced Barth in his attitude to historical criticism (Let. 1 Jan 1, 1916, RT 36). But, whereas Herrmann showed what is not the basis of religion, Barth went on to show what is the basis of theology.

19. TK 241, "Uber die Tatsache einer eigentlichen Bekehrung von Herrmann weg hätte ich innerlich nie zugeben können und könnte es noch heute nicht... Und dennoch hat er es mir gezeigt."

20. TK 265, "...einer wissenschaftlichen Theologie bedarf. Diese Möglichkeit war das eigentümlich Stährende für den theologischen Beruf, das man aus Herrmanns Lehre zu empfangen meinte."

21. KB God, Grace and Gospel, SJT, OP 8, 33f.
others, to say nothing of speaking of it, or of formulating it. And as late as his book *Fides Quaerens Intellectum*, published in 1931, he speaks of working with a vital key, if not the key, to an understanding of that whole process of thought that was to impress him more and more in his *Kirchliche Dogmatik* as the only one proper to theology.

Barth showed in a brilliant way that Anselm's ontological proof for the existence of God had been completely misunderstood by Descartes and Leibniz, and that it cannot even remotely be affected by Kant's critique (171) for it was not based upon philosophical presuppositions, was not the result of his own mastery, but was based on the self-revelation of his master (170f). The theory of the existence of God is lifted right out of the place of the general concept of existence (134) for the theory

---

22. RT 183. Having learned from Blumhardt to begin with God (DM 60), we find in the March 26, 1925 letter of Thurneysen to Barth that the Holy Spirit had been their interest from the beginning (RT 217f), although later (1950s) Barth considered that not until the year 2,000 could a pursuing of this doctrine be possible as immanentalism is still very much of a problem (TT 27f). Christology (2nd article of Creed) therefore became central to Barth, rather than the Holy Spirit (3rd article of Creed).

This struggle of Barth to re-think and re-formulate theology in revolt against its anthropocentric reductionism was already expressed with explosive force in his 1921 *R8*. Back of Barth's thinking was the wry grin of Feuerbach who considered that all theology is only anthropology. Thus he is referred to in the 1921 *Romans* (236, 316), is lectured on in 1926 (TC 217ff) and is given a chapter in the *RR* (355-361). The Index to the *CD* finds reference to him in several of the volumes. For further insight into Barth's thinking over-against Feuerbach, both in the earlier and later years, see J. Glasse in *HTR* Vol. 57, Jan. 1964, No. 1, 69-96, and M. H. Vogel in *HTR* Vol. 59, Jan. 1966, No. 1, 27-52. However, as G. Krüger pointed out, Barth and his associates in the "theology of Crisis" directed their attacks especially against Schleiermacher (HTR Vol. 19, July 1926, No. 3, 243).

23. FQl, Barth's intro. to 2nd ed., Aug. 1958, p. 11. H. Hartwell considered this book "a turning-point in Barth's methodological approach to theology" (TKB 14, 42ff). The key referred to was "faith-knowledge".

24. Also misunderstood by others, eg. Ritschl in 19th century (JR 216f) and Van Harvey in our time (*HTT* 145f). See CD 3/1, 361 on Descartes and Anselm, and C. Hartshorne in *AD* on his and 44 other philosophers' views on the ontological argument.
of existence has to follow the reality of existence (119f) for every category known to us cannot conceive God because He shatters every syllogism (29). In other words, Anselm was speaking within the area of the Church, to those who believed, was therefore not engaging in apologetics but in faith-knowledge. Barth set himself to the same task after writing Fides Quaerens Intellectum, significantly changing his Dogmatik from "Christian" (Christlich) to "Church" (Kirchliche) in name. 25

Thus we can say that Barth's main position was developed by 1930. 26

25. Barth called himself a pupil of Anselm (TT 44f), and we find him as early as Dec. 6, 1920, studying Cur Deus Homo (KB letter to Thurneysen, RT 55). In nine of the KD books Anselm is considered (not in 2/2, 3/2 or 3/4). Barth was strongly influenced by Anselm (KBI 27). He considered his "ontological proof for the existence of God" to be falsely so called and permanently misunderstood (CD 2/1, 305) and did not consider him as an apologist (2/1, 92). Although Anselm's chosen way of thinking was from possibility to reality, it was not from a priori to a posteriori, from interpretation to revelation, from general to unique truth, but rather a thinking of possibility on the basis of its reality - credo ut intelligam. From the same Credo, Barth however reversed the order, thinking from reality to possibility to counteract the immanentism and subjectivity of Neo-Protestantism of the 18th and 19th centuries (1/2, 8ff. Cf. TT 62). It is significant that in the 1927 Dogmatik, Barth attempted the path from possibility to reality but gave it up after that book (1/2, 9). In 1963 Barth affirmed "Faith seeking understanding, Fides Quaerens Intellectum, is what theology must embody and represent" (ETH 42f). Note Barth's indebtedness to Anselm for knowledge of God, CD 2/1, 4. Of interest in support of Barth is Cur Deus Homo, Bk. 2, chap. 1, "Sicut rectus ordo exigit, ut profunda christianae fidei credamus, pruisquam ea praesumamus ratione discuteret". Both Anselm and Boso represent believers, even though the latter asked infidel questions he keeps "autoritas sacra" in mind in his questions (Bk. 1, ch. 2). Anselm shows man's utter need which "necessitate Deus homo factus sit" (Bk. 1, ch. 1) and his humility before the subject is evident from beginning to end (Bk. 1, ch. 1, 2; Bk. 2, ch. 9, 16, 18, 19, 22). Concerning faith knowledge, as early as 1921 Barth wrote (in Jesus Christus) "hier verhüllt er sich endgültig, um nur dem Glauben offenbar zu sein" (Kb. 355, ET 369).

26. Although D. Horton claims that the foundation of Barth's thought has not changed since 1923 (WGM, new forward, 1957, 5) and although J. D. Smart concluded that there was little change from 1927-1932 (DM 198), T. F. Torrance (KBI 18), J. Gieske (HTV Vol. 57, July 1964, No. 3, 82), G. Foley (SJT Vol. 14, 1961, 137) and H. Bouillard (KBI 142-8) considered his study of Anselm in 1930 to have been decisive for change. Horton was correct relative to Barth's objectivity, but the others are right about the decisive significance of Anselm to Barth's developing thinking. Barth himself spoke of this deepening through Anselm (HCM 42f).
It is this that we now briefly present.

b. The Place of Dogmatics

"Das Subjekt der Dogmatik ist die christliche Kirche"\(^{27}\) which means for Barth that the \textit{conditio sine qua non} for pursuing dogmatic science is to be in the "sphere of activity"\(^{28}\) of the Church.\(^{29}\) It is the one particular place which corresponds to the particularity of the incarnation.\(^{30}\) Trying to be outside, one would withdraw from grace.\(^{31}\) To deliberately step outside and yet engage in dogmatics can unsurprisingly after the first steps lead to loss of bearings and damage.\(^{32}\)

The raw material of dogmatics is proclamation, but not the reverse. Theology guides the language of the Church about God in a self-test according to its own given criterion and object, thus serving the \textit{ministerium Verbi Divini}, not as a natural process but through the incomparably concrete fact of grace.\(^{33}\)

---

\(^{27}\) \(\text{DG 10, ET 9, Cf. AT 50 (ET 95), "Gemeinde' oder 'Kirche' gilt die Erbauung, sondern der Gemeinde, die Christus bezeugt". Cf. CD 1/2, 210f.}\)

\(^{28}\) \(\text{Tägigkeitsbereich, DG 9 (ET 9)}\)

\(^{29}\) \(\text{KD 2/1, 764 (ET 677), "Wie ausserhalb der Kirche wissen um die Wahrheit aber auch um die Verborgenheit dieses Sachverhalts und um die Gewissheit seiner künftigen Offenbarung?" As early as 1915, "Gemeinde" (community) was used by Barth (RT 28), being synonymous with "Kirche" (church) and points to the same place for dogmatic study (eg. ETH 37) the place of the secondary witnesses to revelation, the \textit{communio sanctorum}, \textit{congregatio fidelium} and the \textit{coniurates testium}. Even though Barth has been free to think "against the stream" (Cf. his book by this title, also ETH 118), he also notes that "theological existence does not swim alone in this world's seas, drifting with the waves or battling against them" because it is "existence in the community" (ETH 80).}\)

\(^{30}\) \(\text{CD 1/2, 247}\)

\(^{31}\) \(\text{Ibid. 766}\)

\(^{32}\) \(\text{DG 10 (ET 10), "Wer sich mit Dogmatik beschäftigen wollte und sich bewusst ausserhalb der Kirche stellte, der würde damit rechnen müssen, dass ihm der Gegenstand der Dogmatik fremd sein würde und dürfte sich nicht wundern, wenn er nach den ersten Schritten sich nicht zurechtfinden bzw. Verheerungen anrichten würde."}\)

\(^{33}\) \(\text{ETH 73, "Theology is ministerium verbi divini. It is nothing more or less", KB, Intro. to Eng. Romans, 1932, p. x.}\)
c. Criterion and Content of Dogmatics

For Barth there is only one criterion and only one content to guide dogmatics, i.e. the revelation actualized in Jesus Christ. He affirmed,

"A church dogmatics must, of course, be christologically determined as a whole and in all its parts, as surely as the revealed Word of God, attested by Holy Scripture and proclaimed by the Church, is its one and only criterion, and as surely as this revealed Word is identical with Jesus Christ. If dogmatics cannot regard itself and cause itself to be regarded as fundamentally Christology, it has assuredly succumbed to some alien sway and is already on the verge of losing its character as church dogmatics ... in the basic statements of a church dogmatics, Christology must either be dominant and perceptible, or else it is not Christology."  

Therefore, "dogmatics must actually be Christology and only Christology" for "the term dogmatics can and must be understood as Christology." The name of Jesus Christ is in fact "the very essence and source of all reality". He is the Lord who comes to man in self-revelation, so that "if we deviate only a nail's breadth from this confession, we are not theologically in earnest." Christian theology "is wholly and utterly the prisoner of its own theme, namely, the Word of God spoken in Jesus Christ." It does not stand within the mystery, but rather stands facing (gegenüber) the mystery which is and will remain its very "life centre".

Hence Barth maintained that there are no Christian doctrines independent of Christology for the second article of the Creed (on Jesus Christ) is basic to the others as the source (historische die Quelle) of the whole. It is the touchstone of all theology as the whole

34. CD 1/2, 123  
35. CD 1/2, 872  
36. CD 1/2, 883  
37. CD 1/2, 348  
38. CD 1/2, 295  
39. CD 2/1, 168  
40. CD 1/2, 125  
41. CD 2/1, 242  
42. CD 2/1, 320  
43. CD 3/4, 84  
44. Original Confession was "Jesus Christ (is) Lord" DO 65. This became 2nd article as the way (God-man) from the source (1st article God) to the goal (3rd article man) DO 71, 137.  
45. Ibid. 66
work of God lives and moves in this one person."

As a human work the character of theology remains fragmentary - a "knowing in part" (1 Cor. 13:12), bringing one to the boundary to beg, "Thy kingdom come". Thus doctrines point beyond themselves to Christ, through whom alone a knowledge of God is revealed to man.

This is not a static, but a dynamic revelation for it is the Being of Jesus Christ in the act of His revelation which is involved. Christology is thus not a system per se, i.e. a creation of man, as Christ cannot be enclosed even in the most correct Christology for as Barth put it,

"I maintain that for me thinking is christological only when it consists in the perception, comprehension, understanding and estimation of the reality of the living person of Christ as attested by Holy Scripture, in attentiveness to the range and significance of His existence, in openness to His self-disclosure, in consistency in following Him as is demanded."  

Hence

"The real act of God, the basis and presupposition of creation, reconciliation and redemption, is what has occurred and still occurs in accordance with God's will under the name of Jesus Christ."

Rather than following a thorough-going historical critical methodology on the one hand or an equally consistent verbal inspiration interpretation on the other, Barth attempted to transcend these two schools with his christological hermeneutics, stopping not with the mere words themselves but going on beyond to the reality to which they point.

46. D0 39
47. FEn 126
48. Ibid. 132
49. CD 4/3, 419
50. CD 2/1, 318
51. CD 1/2, 873. Cf. 1/1, 127 Where the Word of God is event (Ereignis), revelation and the Bible are one; 1/1, 339 The Bible is witness to revelation for revelation is the self-revelation of God; 1/1, 349 Revelation is Dei loquentis persona; 1/1, 368f Revelation is God's self-unveiling - an act of sovereign divine freedom.
52. CD 4/3, 376
53. CD 4/3, 174
54. CD 2/1, 513
55. Already in 1918 we see evidence of this basic interpretation (R 1) Cf. Apr. 1920 address recorded in WGM 60ff.
d. Epistemology

Barth's position is that to end with revelation one must begin with revelation, to end with Christology one must begin with Christology, and hence to end with God one must begin with God. It was this "Copernican" 180 degree turn from older epistemology which has been one of Barth's greatest contributions to theology. Neo-Protestantism had begun with man, e.g. Schleiermacher's theology of Feeling, Hegel's theology of Speculative Rationalism, Ritschl's theology of Moral Values and Troeltsch's Theology of Scientific Religious History. The Hume-Kantian "Objective-God" critiques concerning the long held supposed cosmological and teleological proofs for the existence of God were devastating in contributing to an immanentist response which was manifested in several ways, e.g. Solipsism, value judgements, value perception, spiritualistic moralism, pantheistic humanism, psychologism, religion and historicism which made their de-facto starting point their dogmatic place of beginning and hence tried to go from man to God instead of taking the way God did in the incarnation, from God to man.

Man's preoccupation with himself meant that his so-called "theology" was actually a monologue with himself, in which he tried to talk about God by speaking about man in a loud voice. Theology was also pre-occupied with making its presentation acceptable to man in his changing culture and overlooked the vital need of studying its own unique object

56. It is not our purpose to discuss the God to manward epistemology of Barth. However, it is our opinion that both a God to manward and a man to Godward movement was involved in revelation. Thus the Father revealed Christ to Peter (Matt. 16:16f) and Christ revealed the Father to the disciples etc. (John 17:6). It would seem, therefore, that the human Jesus had a definite role in this revelation.

57. Note that Barth's first six paragraphs (CD 1/1, 1-261) were specifically designed to bring about this change (1/1, 284).
for its own sake. Its desire to be accepted by man made it apologetical in emphasis, opening it up to external pressures such as the prevailing world view (Weltanschauung) and philosophical categories. Prolegomena to Dogmatics used these unrelated materials to form its supposed basis for acceptance. Natural theology with its general revelation in history, soul and nature, the study of comparative religions, the orders of creation and the Anknüpfungspunkt all had influence. Such alien studies were imported from outside the sphere of a proper dogmatics into many theological studies.

In direct contrast, for Barth, the word prolegomena is figurative in that it connotes first rather than previous, as it embraces the beginning of the path to knowledge rather than an area before it. In it he begins with reality and moves towards possibility, begins with the fact before interpretation, begins with the unique and moves to the general, begins with the triune God who came, comes and will come to man - the God who is the living Word, encounters man majestically from above and gives to him the capacity and capability to receive revelation not to be possessed by man but to possess him, and gives him

---

59. Barth opposed world views etc. CD 4/3, 254, 313, etc.
60. Barth opposed all "mixphilosophicotheologia", was against obsequious obedience to the spirit of the age but free in the eclectic use of current ideas, concepts, images and expressions (ETh 91). For too long theology had been regarded as a branch of philosophy whereas once the queen of the sciences. Now it looks to philosophy for the right to live (2d 312). KD 1/1, 4 (ET 5): "philosophia christiana ist faktisch noch nie wirklichkeit gewesen, war sie philosophia, so war sie christiana, war sie christiana, so war sie nicht philosophia."
61. Similarly Kierkergaard, "I always reason from existence (i.e. God's), not towards existence" (PhF 49f).
62. Rö (1921) 96, (ET 120): "So gewiss der Mensch für das Wunder kein Organ hat". Barth opposed any natural "Offenbarungsmächtigkeit", Cf. CD 1/1, 255.
63. Rö 299 (ET 315): "Nicht wir haben ihn, sondern er hat uns". Cf. 506 (ET 522: "Aber wer kann sich hier halten, es sei denn, das er gehalten werde")
faith which is opposite to religion, and hence comes to man who has no preconditions on his side for the acceptance of this "inconceivable novum." 66

"The movement of thought here is not from below upwards, but from above downwards." 67 Barth maintained that there is no way from man to God - such is a movement past God, and hence into the void. There is only the self-revelation of God who is in His revelation what He is eternally and antecedently in Himself. 68 God alone reveals Himself or He is not revealed at all. 69 Behind His noetic absoluteness stands decisively His ontic absoluteness, 70 for even when immanent in revelation, God is still transcendent. 71 He is omnipresent in the universe but distinct from it, 72 with space and time being divinely created qualities of reality separate from Him, 73 for God is not bound to limits of space and time. 74

64. Faith is the conditio sine qua non for theological study - but is not the theme - it remains theology not pisteology (ETh 99f). "...der Glaube niemals identisch mit der 'Frümmigkeit'" (Rö, 1921, 15; ET 40). "Faith is a history, new every morning. It is no state or attribute" (ETH 103). "Glauben meint ein endgültiges Verhältnis" (DG 25; ET 20). "Glaube ist das hervorbrechende Geheimnis Gottes" (Ibid. 31; ET 28). "Auch der Glaube, sofern er in irgendeinem Sinn mehr als hohlraum sein will, ist Unglaube" (Rö 32; ET 57). "Wir sind nicht nur, was wir sind, wir sind durch den Glauben, was wir nicht sind" (Rö 125; ET 149). "Der christliche Glaube ist der Tag mit dessen Anbruch auch die mystische Nacht vergangen ist" (KD 4/1, 703; ET 629). "Darum, weil er Glaube an Jesus Christus ist, kann er nur als die Demut des Gehorsams wirklicher, lebendiger Glaube, muss er leere Hand, leeres Gefass, 'Hohlraum' sein" ('Hohlraum' is same word used in Rö 32; ET 57), KD 4/1, 705; ET 631. "Was ist das sole fide Anderes als das schwache aber notwendige Echo alles solus Christus" (KD 4/1, 706; ET 632). "Glaube ist Bunder" (Rö, 1921, 90), "Glaube ist Angang" (102), "Glaube is Schöpfung" (108). Faith is not a capacity of man, innate or acquired (KD 1/1.272).

65. CD 1/1, 528
66. CD 1/1, 222. No religious a priori capacity in man (1/1, 220). Cf. "Es gibt keinen weg zu Gott von uns aus, auch Keine via negativa, auch keine via dialectica oder paradoxo" (WGT 153; ET 177).

67. CD 1/2, 21 68. CD 1/1, 148, 490.
68. CD 1/2, 21
69. 1927 Dogmatik, 135. Cf. Rö, 1921, 87 (ET 112): "Gott ist nur durch Gott zu verstehen...alheim durch den Glauben".

70. CD 2/1, 311
71. CD 2/1, 219, 313.
72. CD 2/1, 462
73. CD 2/1, 466
74. CD 2/1, 469f
Thus God cannot be compared to anyone or anything. He is only like Himself.75 There is no Deus absconditus behind the Deus Revelatus,76 even though His being and truth are not exhausted in His revelation,77 for we encounter the whole God (as Creator, Reconciler and Redeemer) in His revelation or not at all,78 and so in this encounter we have empty hands,79 for God does not merely become when we perceive Him,80 but opens us to knowledge of His revelation which we can only acknowledge.81

Man thus looks away from himself, the Church, the Bible, from philosophical concepts, psychologism, historicism, the prevailing world view, every Weltanschaung, metaphysical postulates and "ontologischen substruktion" to the God who comes in Lordly grace from the transcendent heights.82 To follow this movement of God in dogmatics is to be questioned down to the roots of one's being by the only revelation of God in Jesus Christ,83 for it is to follow the movement of this only One who is the Way, the Truth and the Life - the way from incarnation to resurrection and ascension, which constitutes the great eschatological fact of the $\Phi_{\chi\alpha\omega\sigma}$. This same Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit, comes in revelation, in proclamation, and will finally come in universal manifestation at the parousia. Hence Barth's epistemology - following God's manward movement in revelation - is basically eschatological. His entire

75. CD 2/1, 210, 542. Cf. R8 408 (ET 422): "Dass der Deus absconditus als solcher in Jesus Christus Deus revelatus ist".
76. CD 2/1, 75. Likened to glimpse through a keyhole, ETd.45.
77. CD 2/1, 51. Cf. R 108.
78. R 150.
79. CD 1/1, 234-38, 250.
80. CD 4/3, 79.
81. R 378 - cannot introduce Christ "either by bringing Him down, or by bringing Him up. For Christ is not the exalted and transformed ideal man. He is the new man." No approximation to the spirit of the age, to romanticism, liberalism, nationalism or socialism will bring Him into the picture.
82. CD 44 (ET 39).
Kirchliche Dogmatik could be summed up as witnessing to God as the coming God - in creation, incarnation, revelation, reconciliation and finally in redemption. In this sense his thinking is thoroughly eschatological but only because it is consistently Christological. It is God's encounter with man rather than man's discovery of God, it is the human logic of the Divine logos through pneumatic spiritual theology and so for us can only be the prayer Veni creator spiritus!

Then how does one evaluate Barth's thought? Barth requested,

"I do not want to hear of criticisms which proceed from some religious or philosophical or ethical 'point of view'...criticism or approval should move strictly within the realm of theology." 87 (i.e. Christology, and hence our thesis is a christological critique)

And that realm looks to no human support, but only to God who ever comes in revelation and is known only in faith, and in this encounter not only the Bible, Church and the Christian etc. become ever again Bible, Church and Christian, but also hope is continually renewed. 88 From the standpoint of a renewed hope and a renewing hope received from the inner rationality of the reality of revelation is the only position from which Barth would wish an evaluation of his eschatology to be made.

Also important to an understanding of Barth's thinking is his aversion to systematization for its own sake on the one hand and an achievement in systematic presentation on the basis of the revelation of the object for its own sake on the other. This means for Barth that he

84. Perhaps Barth would have therefore agreed with R. Otto that if the Bible had to be given a title, he would call it "The Book of the Coming Kingdom of God" (KGM 197).
85. ETh 55
86. Ibid. 58. Cf. 159-170
89. CD 2/1, 639. Cf. ETh 89; a certain degree is acceptable CD 2/1, 353.
faces the circle of truth in which every doctrine is integrally connected with the others.  

"The various departments of dogmatics do not lie alongside each other, but are implicated in each other, so that we cannot really work through any of them without expressly bearing in mind all the others to a greater or less extent, and certainly not without keeping them all in view. At what point, for example, does the doctrine of the trinity cease to have any decisive importance, or the doctrine of the church, or of justification, or of the return of Jesus Christ."  

For God as the object of theological study "is to be found in a sequence of events, even in all the events of his being glorious in his work. These events, although they are distinct from one another, must not be bracketed and considered in isolation...Instead, theology must describe the dynamic interrelationships which make this procession comparable to a bird in flight, in contrast to a caged bird." Or to change the analogy, theological study has the eternally rich God as its context, like a high mountain which upon being circled reveals differing vistas yet is always the same mountain.

"All these exist together: the one not without the many and the center not without its infinite circumference, although no one point of the circumference is identical or interchangeable with any other. None is insignificant, unimportant, or dispensable: none is without its special truth and work. There is none that does not represent and reflect the whole...None may be observed, understood and interpreted in isolation for its own sake..."  

Towards the close of his Prolegomena Barth put it this way,  

"Eschatology, then, cannot and must not be considered and treated merely as an appendix to the doctrine of the atonement. Jesus Christ in His New Testament totality can really be understood only as this Saviour who is to come. If He is not the One who comes, He is not the One  

91. CD 1/2, 792  
92. ETh 9f  
93. Ibid. 34  
94. Ibid. 87f
who has already come. If the atonement which has taken place in Him is not understood in the future sense, it cannot be understood in the perfect tense, which means that it cannot be understood at all. Our regeneration, justification and sanctification, the Church and the sacrament, the whole existence and the whole work of Jesus Christ in the present are eschatological, i.e. they are actual only in the coming Redeemer." 95

It is this important mutual implication of doctrines which not only makes the study of Barth's eschatology possible without his proposed volume five on Redemption, but makes it evident in his earliest works before any Kirchliche Dogmatik was even contemplated. Thus H. R. Mackintosh could write,

"From the outset, it is true, Barth had set eschatology at the very centre of his interest. He rightly insisted that theology is eschatological in temper and outlook not merely by accident; on the contrary, its whole thinking must be done in the light of the end" 96 so that "the theology of Barth is eschatological from end to end." 97

The closest associate to Barth in those early days, E. Thurneysen, asserted that "From the very beginning Karl Barth's preaching bore this eschatological aspect." 98 Even his severe critic, C. Van Til, saw that "all theology is eschatological for Barth", and that the "last things, eschatology, are very important" for him. 99 To the end of Barth's work it remained the same, so that in his swan song he noted that theology's "theme is the new man in the new cosmos." 100

95. CD 1/2, 875. The early date of this statement is significant, for when J. Moltmann in his TH 87 saw in the much later CD 4/3, 326, 334, a new direction in Barth's presentation, as Christ is said to be on the march towards His goal, with His work not yet concluded in His resurrection, he apparently overlooked this statement written 24 years before. However, we question Moltmann's interpretation, for the future emphasis in Barth's dogmatics is, in the end, seemingly referring to revelation rather than a new reality. See chaps. 5 and 6.

96. Types 273
97. Ibid. 298
98. RT 15
99. BC 16
100. ETh 119
However, epistemologically, unlike the three articles of the Creed which could be the starting point of theology, 101 eschatology should not be, 102 nor should it become the centre of a system. 103

e. Theologia Viatorum

Theologia viatorum as a post-fall human enterprise is not a theologia archetype, theologia ektypa, theologia paradisiaca or comprehensorum. 104 Neither, in the final sense, is it a theologia gloriae or theologia Patris. 105 Rather, Barth states,

"We are on the way (wir sind unterwegs). This certainly indicates the limit, but it also indicates the positive possibility of our cognition. At best, our theology is theologia viatorum... even in the eternal redemption, we shall not be at the goal, and the blessedness of our perfect knowing of God will consist in being on the way, so that it too will have to be described as theologia viatorum... through all eternity it will still be the knowledge of the Church of Jesus Christ and not the knowledge of the triune God Himself." 106

It was at the religiöse-soziale Konferenz held at Tambach in September, 1919, that Barth first referred to his position as really "ein Moment einer Bewegung" comparable to the momentary view of a bird in flight. 107 And it was before a ministers' meeting in Schulpferta in July, 1922, that he mentioned his joining those who have followed the ideal of a theologia viatorum. 108 This has ever remained characteristic of his thinking.

101. TT 27f
102. CD 1/2, 875-880
103. i.e. Doctrine of Redemption should not, see CD 1/2, 877.
104. ETh 113f
105. CD 4/2, 837
106. CD 2/1, 209. (Cf. 2/1, 214; 3/4, 34; 4/3, 122.) German parenthesis added.
107. WGWM 282f. Of interest is the way Barth described the effect of receiving W. Heffmann's Ethik in 1905: "ich empfing von diesem Buch den Stoss zu einer ewigen Bewegung" (TK 240; ET 238). Barth referred to his Sept. 1919 address as an attempt to speak of the "flying bird" not just a "painted picture puzzle" (WGWM 285). Cf. 283. In his letters Barth recorded on Dec. 3, 1920, that "the bird makes every conceivable effort to fly but finally it is still a painted bird..." (RT 55), and on May 18, 1921, "Paul means the bird in flight" (RT 58). Cf. 1924 (RD 116) on his flying bird difficulty.
108. WGWM 99
This dynamic movement of understanding resulted from Barth's openness to the object (Gegenstand) or only Subject of theology, to Jesus Christ in His self-revelation, the Word within the words. It was this constant attempt to be faithful to what he heard from the Word that left him unbound to his own words, and thus free to move on in obedience to change his views in the light of following the on-going revelation as he understood it, and not "in the light of the 'situation'" as P. Tillich claimed. 109

There are many examples of change within Barth's thought and

109. ST 5. The "situation" of the National German Christian Movement in the 1930's was a change of situation, which Barth met without any change of his ideas, (HCM 46). Theologia viatorum is not to be confused with what Overbeck called the "absurd delusion that Christianity's best defence to insure its existence is its unlimited capacity for change" (TC 69).

110. The 1918 Römerbrief was completely re-written in 1921, the 1927 Dogmatik was a "false start". The Römerbriefs and '27 Dogmatik contributed to existentialist philosophy (CD 3/4, xii). Barth moved out from this earlier existentialism when he began his KD in 1932, but later (1950's) recorded detection of remnants of it still in CD 1/1, 441-456, (eg. "der Herr unserer Daseins") and would write this section differently today (1950's) (TT 51). Change of name from "Christlichen" to "Kirchliche" for the Dogmatik signifies this decision to be rid of existentialism. Many changes are evident in the Kirchliche Dogmatik, of which some are as follows:

a. The Imago Dei is annihilated (vernichtet) with only "recta natura" preserved in 1932 (CD 1/1, 273; Cf. 1934, NTh 80, and 1937 KGSM 50 where Barth agrees with the 1560 Confessio Scotia, "The image of God (was) utterly defaced in man."). But in 1940 this "Ebenbilde Gottes" is seen as a determination to bear witness to God's existence in "unserer Existenz" (CD 2/1, 188) and by 1945 this image and likeness of God is not only not overthrown by the Fall, but is identified with the creation of man as male and female (CD 3/1, 190) or to "Menschen" in general (CD 3/2, 323; Cf. 3/1, 190-206; 3/4, 116ff; 4/1, 201).

b. The creatio continua of CD 1/2, 688ff and 3/1, 60 is given up later, eg. 3/3, 6 and 68ff.

c. The two covenants mentioned in CD 1/1, 205 become united in CD 4/1, 3-78, with Barth more skeptical of his first hypothesis (TT 36).

d. When he wrote KD 1 he did not know that God was the creator of the heavens and the earth, but did before writing KD 3 (TT 51). cont./
one of our tasks will be to see if there is any in his eschatological thinking. Whilst doing so it will be important to keep in mind what he has said concerning his own evaluation of the altered ideas. In 1955 he wrote:

"Perceptive readers will surely notice that there is no break with the basic view which I have adopted since my parting from liberalism, but only a more consistent turn in its development." III

He was referring here to Christology, to an ever truer Christological emphasis through the years. In looking back over the writing of his Kirchliche Dogmatik, he considered that,

110. cont.

In 1916 he referred to "Im Angang schuf Gott himmel und Erde" as a strange statement (Seltsamen Berecht) (WGT 20, ET 32). At least by CD 1/2, 881 he could write that God created all that was not Himself.

e. The projected plan recorded in CD 1/2, 881-884, has been changed, the second circle of the three in the doctrine of creation (i.e. destiny as the focal point of creation) has become the first, whereas the section on the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper is not found in KD 4/3 as originally planned.

f. The much used term "sakrament" in KD 1, is less used in KD 2 and 3 and thereafter dropped (CD 4/2, xi; TT 31)

g. By the time of KD 4/2 Barth had learned to regard a cautious and respectable practice of "Entmythologisierung" as expedient and practicable (KD 4/2, x; Cf. 4/3, 730).

h. By the time of KD 4/2 Barth understood the Pietists better than he had during the Römerbrief period and after (CD 4/2, x).

i. In the 1950's, Barth stated that if he wrote KD 1 again, it would be more irenic, not so polemical, and would consider the ecumenical movement that has developed since, but that the same heresies it opposed still exist (TT 40).

j. H. U. von Balthasar pointed out a change from the "Word of God" of KD 1 to "Jesus Christ, God and man" subsequently (DDS 124). Although Barth admits that KD 1 is not as christological as it perhaps could be (TT 30), and Lehmann noted a pointing away from the second to the third person of the Trinity as a shift of emphasis but not of position in the KD (THT, 1956, 349); and inspite of the centre of attention as "God's word" in KD 1, "God" in KD 2, and the "work of the Creator" in KD 3, there is really only one truth, one reality, but different views of it so that more and more in the KD Christ is seen to be the centre. TT 33.

111. CD 4/2, x
"In the twenty-three years since I started this work I have found myself so held and directed that, as far as I can see, there have so far been no important breaks or contradictions in the presentation; no retractions have been necessary (except in detail)." 112

112. CD 4/2, xi. E. Brunner thought he had discovered a "neuen Barth" (SJT 4, 2, 1951, 123ff). Barth in KD 4/2, xi replied to such thinking stating that he is naturally not infallible, but that there is perhaps more "innere und äussere Kontinuität" (inner and outer continuity) in the matter than some hasty observers and rash interjectors can at first sight give credit. Barth's articles in CT (three in 30 years), later found together in HCM, record no definite change.
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CHAPTER THREE

BARTH'S ESCHATOLOGY IN THE PRE-DOGOMATIC PERIOD

In Chapter One we noted the de-eschatological background in which Barth was trained as a young liberal. In Chapter Two we traced his break from this Schleiermacher-Ritschl tradition to its result in a christological starting point in his *Kirchliche Dogmatik*. We saw that this development was finalized in 1930 after his study of Anselm. In this chapter, the writings of Barth during this development period will be presented. There are many sources, including two books (*Der Römerbrief, Die Auferstehung der Töten*), various lectures (compiled in his book, *Das Wort Gottes*), various articles (in the periodical, *Zwischen den Zeiten*), various sermons (compiled in the book, *Komm Schöpfer Geist*) and his unpublished 1928 Münster *Ethik* which he personally suggested for inclusion. These early writings are polemical (*Streitschrift*) and set in a difficult dialectical framework. Especially is this true of the *Römerbrief* which is no ordinary commentary on Romans (as such it is disappointing¹), but rather, a platform on which and from which Barth launched his revolt against de-eschatologized anthropocentric culture-

---

¹ C. C. McCown said, "Barth's Romans is theology, not exegesis, it is Barth not Paul" (*HTR*, Vol. 38, July 1945, No. 3, 156).
wedded Protestantism. Studied over-against the Schleiermacher-Ritschl tradition given in Chapter One, these sources are seen to be a defiant negation of human optimism, an all-out attack on the popular nineteenth century Weltanschauung, a fight against the flourishing Bismarkian German Idealism, an "uncompromising war" as G. Krüger put it,\(^2\) a prophetic-like call to let God be God, and let man be man. For too long the distinction had been all but obliterated, and with it went the Subject of theology, the domestication of the Gospel, which included the neglect of eschatology. To restore all these to their central place was the chief concern of Barth in these years of debate. A thematic rather than a chronological presentation will be given.\(^3\) The purpose of the chapter is threefold: (1) to show the as yet unmentioned influences behind his writings, (2) to give his early eschatology, (3) to make observations, a critique and a conclusion.

1. Further Influences on Barth

On December 28, 1843, after two years of struggle, the elder Blumhardt, Johannes Christoph, healed Gottlieben Dittus. This began a ministry to the sick at Möttlingen, which in 1852 was extended to Bad Boll, where his son, Christoph, joined him in 1869. At the moment of deliverance, the demon possessing Gottlieben is reputed to have said through her, "Jesus ist Sieger" (Jesus is Victor). This became the motto for the continuing healing work that the Blumhardts did.\(^4\) Believing in

\(^3\) In the first writing of this chapter a chronological sequence was followed with the purpose of giving an exhaustive presentation of each article, lecture and book. The 129 pages and nearly 1,000 footnote references indicate how heavy this presentation became. The result of this approach was to bring to light different emphases and a development. The development will be noted in Section 3.
\(^4\) CD 3/4, 370f; 4/2, 835; PTh 590.
God's present action in life today, father and son broke with Pietism and came to have a remarkable influence upon theologians for men who did not themselves profess to be theologians. Barth records that theirs was an "unquenchable expectation and indestructible hope" in that reality of the Kingdom of God as it had come in Jesus Christ, in the fresh outpouring of the Holy Spirit and in the coming revelation of a new heaven and a new earth. This message of hope "embraced the body as well as the soul and the world as well as the community", giving the Gospel "a freedom, freshness, breadth and significance for which there are hardly any previous parallels."7

Helped by C. Blumhardt, E. Thurneysen introduced Barth to him while they were neighbouring pastors.8 Blumhardt's eschatological teaching had a powerful influence upon Barth, giving him a new understanding of the Kingdom of God as breaking into the world, as victorious grace which will one day be finally manifested.9

Eschatology had been for centuries the interest primarily of certain sects and certain isolated theologians (eg. J. A. Bengel). One focus in

5. KD 4/3, 194 (ET 170): "der nicht zu stillenden Erwartung und in her nicht zu zerbrechenden Hoffnung". In PTh 590, Barth writes of Blumhardt, "Er wird der Theologe der Hoffnung".
6. CD 4/3, 170
7. CD 4/3, 569
8. E. Thurneysen in letter to H. Kutter, Nov. 2, 1925, and Barth in Introduction to letters in honour of Thurneysen (RT 72, 212). Cf. DM 85, Blumhardt saved Thurneysen from leaving the Church.
9. Antwort, 833; PTh 588ff. Blumhardt's influence upon Barth is also indicated in the following: Long before 1920 he was puzzled why theologians had paid no attention to Christoph and father (TG 55), for they had slept through the phenomena (CD 1/1, 321) placing them with other venerable "outsiders" of the nineteenth century (HG 13). In a letter, June 14, 1915, Barth wrote: "I finished reading the book on Blumhardt (by Zündel) today, mainly with the feeling of shame" (RT 30). Cf. Thurneysen's letter to Barth, Oct. 5, 1921, in which he looks back to the time when they could no longer share the faith of Schleiermacher and could no longer be deaf to Blumhardt (RT 74f). Barth refers to the origin of his teaching in that of Kutter and Blumhardt (NTh 70).
the movement of its discovery came through the two Blumhardts, but already with the older Blumhardt more emphasis on the new outpouring of the Holy Spirit made the final return of Christ secondary. It was understandable then when the younger Blumhardt with H. Kutter, and especially L. Ragaz, gave the "fight for the Kingdom of God" a particularly surprising turn when they linked it with the eschatology and hope of the Socialist Labour movement. It was their preaching which did so much to stimulate this Religious Social organization which was finally to find, through J. Müller, an inglorious end in the German Christian movement (deutschen Christentums) of 1933 against which Barth's continuing influence was evident in the Barmen Confession.

Under the impression made by the first World War which shattered both the uneschatological inwardness of "personal life" as well as the Socialist expectation, Barth decided to make a fresh start from what he saw to be the original point of departure of the elder Blumhardt. He wrote,

"We felt compelled to press beyond all temporal expectations whether individual, cultural or political, even beyond what necessarily seemed to us to be the foreground view of the elder Blumhardt - to the view of a pure and absolute futurity of God and Jesus Christ as the limit and fulfillment of all time." 13

This must all be put within the context of Barth's own active participation in the socialist democratic work on the one hand and his discovery of the "new world within the Bible" on the other. For it was especially in this study of the Word that he gained a more balanced view of eschatology than the Blumhardts, which kept him from going as far as they did in the political sphere. Yet Barth recorded a debt to

10. CD 2/1, 633  
11. CD 4/3, 29; GCC 13-76.  
12. CD 2/1, 633f  
13. CD 2/1, 634
Blumhardt, Kutter and Dostoevsky:

"without whose discovery I would not have been able to write either the first or the second draft of the commentary on Romans, but instead - who knows? - I might actually have embarked on the attractive career of an Aargau trade-union man and councillor." 14

And Blumhardt's phrase, "Warten und eilen" (wait and hasten) became also Barth's watchword in his teaching about the coming of God's Kingdom, found not only in his early writings but also in the Kirchliche Dogmatik.

Barth speaks of several other people who influenced his developing thinking in those early days. In a letter to Thurneysen he spoke of discussing with Gogarten his first edition on Romans. They studied it by day and night and suddenly Barth received the enlightenment that it must be completely re-written. 15 In 1921 the second edition appeared. In the preface Barth desired that the first edition "disappear from the scene" as it had been completely rewritten. 16 It is in that preface that he speaks of the influences back of this re-writing. First, it was due to a continued study of Paul, whom already he knew in the first edition as the "Prophet and Apostle of God's Kingdom". 17 Next, Barth listed F. Overbeck. Overbeck made a definite contribution to Barth's eschatology, although in a different way to that of the Blumhardts. An insight into this influence is gained from a lecture Barth gave on Overbeck in 1920 at the time when he was in the midst of re-writing his Romans. 18

14. RT 72  
15. Letter Oct. 27, 1920, RT 53f  
16. R 2  
17. R 8, 1918, Intro. v.  
18. TC 55-73. Note the following quote from p. 56: "Blumhardt stood as a forward-looking and hopeful Overbeck; Overbeck as a backward-looking, critical Blumhardt."

A synopsis of the lecture: Overbeck pointed to man's limited knowledge stating that he knows nothing at all about the last things (den letzten Dingen) (58) as our world is on this side of these things (59) with death marking the limit of knowledge (die Grenze cont./
The others Barth listed as having influenced him are Plato, Kant, Kierkegaard, Dostoevsky, Thurneysen and the reviews of the first edition of his Romans. Kierkegaard's Philosophical Fragments provide an

18. cont.
der menschlichen Erkenntnis) and signifying its transcendental origin (transzendentalen Ursprung) (59). True Christianity comes from the realm of the unknown, from "Super-History" (Urgeschichte) and not from history (58). The choice is "Wenn Christentum, dann nicht Geschichte; wenn Geschichte, dann nicht Christentum" (61). It is an either/or. Rather than adapting Christianity to culture, or seeing it as the finest expression of it, rather than seeing only the temporary social significance of the Church (Troeltsh) (60) or reducing Christianity to a religion, which happened after the expectation of the parousia (Parusieerwartung) had lost its reality, "Man lives and must live from his certainty of the "last things". And that is something very different." (zweierlie) (64).

Overbeck's thought came from this immediate expectation of the parousia (65) for he maintained that there was a fundamental "contra¬diction between the original Christian eschatology and the contemporary hope for the future" ("Der Widerspruch der altchristlichen Eschatologie und der Zukunftsstimmung der Gegenwart ist ein fundamentaler") (TK 12, ET 65). Today it has "so little room left for the whole conception of the return of Christ (Widerkehr Christi) that it cannot even con¬ceive it historically as belonging to the original Christianity." (66)

Barth concluded that amongst other things, Overbeck raised the question concerning the practical significance of the "last things" (73). He, without traversing it, pointed to the new road, and "a theology which would dare that passage - dare to become eschatology - would not only be a new theology but also a new Christianity" (Ibid.). It should be noted that Overbeck's ideas were not a complete surprise to Barth (57), for, as the previous lectures show, he was already on this new road. Perhaps the concept of Urgeschichte was the most important influence Barth received from Overbeck - a term frequently used in the second Römerbrief. (Eg. 5, 117, 149, 219, 231f)

19. R 3f. Plato, Kant and Dostoevsky in their different ways exposed the shallowness of false idealism. Barth wrote on Kant in RR 150-96. Plato placed a radical separation between the two worlds, i.e. between the real unseen unobjectifiable world and this known world of man. In his 1918 Römerbrief Barth spoke in terms of the Heilgeschichte stream within history. This is the action of the world of Eternity within the world of time. However, in his second edition this accent on Heilgeschichte has been replaced by the emphasis upon the separation between the Eternal world and the temporal world. It is in this context that Overbeck's term Urgeschichte is used. With this in mind one can understand why Barth lists Overbeck and Plato first after Paul in his credits.

Dostoevsky in a novel pictures western civilization as pretentious¬ly trying to construct a tower of Babel, to master heaven with its cultural and religious achievements. Thurneysen's Dostojevski became ammunition in Barth's hands to expose the false optimism of
insight into his influence upon Barth's second Römerbrief, in the use of key words such as "paradox", "Moment", "occasion", and "leap" etc. Keeping in mind that later Barth attributed to Kierkegaard but a passing influence, it is of interest to at least note that in both books there is a recaptured sense of miracle so unpopular in the immanentism of the nineteenth century, and likewise a pointing away from man, from the Socratic doctrine of recollection of truth within, to the One who came as the Truth from without, the otherwise incognito God who is not immediately knowable. Man's desperate need because sin is taken as a pressing reality is stressed by both. Faith is defined as miracle in these two books and the "Moment" which is given by God alone, and over which man has no control, is vital to both writers.

19. cont.

Neo-Protestantism. It was an "extraordinary good" weapon (Letter, Jan. 22, 1922, RT 82) which alongside Barth's developing thought (likened to a "clumsy motor truck") it was a "thoroughly efficient motorcycle" which will certainly reach the people first (Letter, Aug. 3, 1921, RT 59). Besides placing Dostoevsky with Luther only as Overbeck is with Blumhardt (Letter, Dec. 18, 1922, RT 121), Barth specifically gave credit to his reading of Dostoevsky for his writing of the second section of Romans 10 (Letter, Aug. 3, 1921, RT 59). In the Römerbrief Barth refers to the novels of Dostoevsky (505, 350) and to the characters in general in them (67) but also specifically to the "Grossinquisitor" (332, 393, 479, 504f, 520), Iwan Karamasoff (300, 501f) the Idiot (354) etc.

"paradox" is used 80 times in Romans; "Moment", 58 times; "occasion" more than five, and "leap" more than 13 times.

20. See Footnote 27 below.

21. See Footnote 27 below.

22. PhF 65: "Paradox is the miracle". R 59f, 94, 120f, 289, 366.

23. PhF 52, 64, 78f, 100 etc. and R 27, 287ff etc.

24. PhF 21, man in bondage; 23, in the state of error. To understand fully the desperate situation of man since the fall one must take it into consideration all that Kierkegaard says about the Socratic state which throughout the book he compares with the experience of the "Moment" of new birth in which man receives the condition, faith, paradox and the higher knowledge.

25. Ibid. 81, R 124, 366.

26. In the "Moment" man becomes conscious of the new birth, PhF 25f. It is decisive for eternity (72), contributes to faith (72f), and man receives the condition in the "Moment" (77). In the Römerbrief, the word "Augenblick" is used over 50 times for the word "Moment", whereas the word "Moment" is used at least seven times - as either
Kierkegaard exposed the fallacious claims of both Greek Platonic idealism and his contemporary German Hegelian idealism that supposed man to be the centre of the universe and the container of all truth which could be brought to the consciousness through recollection stimulated through Socratic questioning. He compared the "occasion" of philosophy brought through supposed recollection with the far superior "Moment" of decisive significance in Christianity - that "Moment" being either the original incarnation of truth into our midst when God became man or any encounter of God with man, in which confrontation truth comes

26. cont.

"Moment der Bewegung" which is used interchangeably with "Augenblick" (111) or as "absoluten Moment" (4 times: 202, 381, 285, 366) which perhaps have reference to Troeltsch's use of the term quoted on p.194. Barth called the "Moment" the "theme of theology" (R 530). The following shows how he used the word in the Römerbrief. Thus, in the "Moment" of creation, God and men were one and not two (250), but we cannot now recapture this "Moment" of creation (256). God and man are now separated through sin, and the "Moment" is considered as the "great divine disturbance" (457). It is given many different adjectives such as the "critical" (165), "pure" (491), "strange" (499), "incomprehensible" (216), "absolute" (194, 202, 381) and "eternal" (188, 498, 501) Moment. Though called the Moment in the Moment (501), the fulfillment of all time (498), the meaning of every Moment in time (319), it is never understood as a moment in a series (Ibid.) as it is "kein Augenblick...in der Zeit." (R 109, 497). It is thus separate from all past and future (116), having no before or after (137), and setting all before and after in a new context (125) in which the past ceases its going and the future its coming (497).

This Moment beyond all time is the Moment of moments, or Jesus Christ as the crucified and risen. Everything before or after is only time (304), and merely points as a signpost to the resurrection (124). The cross is the bursting forth in time of the eternal "Moment" (404) and in the resurrection the heaven which bounds this world is rent assunder in the eternal Moment of apprehension (237). This is the absolute "Moment" of apprehension (285), a miracle (366) which is the eternal "Moment" of revelation (376), of the knowledge of God, the "Moment" or perception (188). It is hidden in the historical movement (343) for each moment in time can only at best be a parable of the eternal "Moment", bearing within it the unborn secret of revelation (497). The "Moment" is then "salvation", the "Kingdom of God" (498) or the "Day of Jesus Christ" (420) - the Eternal "Now" (497). It is not surprising that E. C. Hoskyns translated this "Augenblick" as the "eschatological moment", which is, however, no moment (109). Through this Kierkegaardian language of the "Moment", Barth indicated the timeless relation which Jesus Christ had to this world, with the eschatological "Moment" as no moment in time.
to man from outside of himself, rather than supposedly being brought to the surface in the mere occasion within man. It was against this same Immanent Idealism which Barth wrote in his Römerbrief using the idea of "Moment" as God's initiative, beyond man's control.

Barth specifically stated that

"if I have a system, it is limited to a recognition of what Kierkegaard called the 'infinite qualitative distinction' between time and eternity, and to my regarding this as possessing negative as well as positive significance: 'God is in heaven, and thou art on earth'." 27

27. R 10. Barth's first acquaintance with Kierkegaard was in 1909, one year after his university graduation and whilst still working with Nade on the Christliche Welt. He purchased his book, Augenblick (Moment), that year, but being occupied with A. von Harnack and W. Herrmann's theology it did not make a deep impression on him. Only about 1919 did Kierkegaard enter his thinking. All these facts Barth recorded in a lecture in 1963 (EvT, Juli 1963, "Denk und Reverenz", 337-342). Although he claimed in the same lecture that Kierkegaard had only a temporary influence upon him, it is important to note that his system in the Römerbrief was Kierkegaard's famous dictum. Also in Oct. 1922, he spoke of his theological ancestral line as running back to Luther, Calvin, Paul and Jeremiah through Kierkegaard (WGWM 195). It is therefore not without some foundation that in 1946 C. Van Til could write of Barth "operating under the relentless dictates of the Königberg philosopher" (NM 366), and in 1947 D. M. Baille could also speak of Kierkegaard's strong influence upon him (GIC 44). However, it is important to note that the distinction between God and man was not learned from Kierkegaard, as this had already become obvious to Barth from his Bible study with the discovery of the new world within it. Rather, Kierkegaard helped to clarify his already well-developed thinking. We therefore concur with J. D. Smart on this contribution of Kierkegaard (DM 105). We agree also with G. Krüger who wrote of Barth, "though undoubtedly influenced by Kierkegaard, he was originally of kindred spirit" (HTR Vol. 19, July 1926, No. 3, 235). We disagree, therefore, with J. McConnachie who claimed that Kierkegaard's doctrine of 'the infinite qualitative distinction between time and eternity' made Barth an eschatologist" (BT 42, Cf. SKB 32 which seems fairer). It was the discovery of the strange new eschatological world within the Bible that made him an eschatologist. The main point to note here is the very positive contribution that Kierkegaard made to the thinking of Barth in this early period, and although he referred to it as of passing significance, it is of interest to find reference to the infinite qualitative distinction between God and man made in different places throughout the KD (see p.455 below). In the early period, Barth wrote in a letter of June 7, 1920, "The composition frequently begins with a little private morning devotion from Kierkegaard" (RT 51). See also A. McKinnon (CJT Vol. 13, 1967, 31-41 on Barth's relation to Kierkegaard.
2. The Infinite Qualitative Distinction

The above statement by Barth is not only the key to his second Römerbrief, but can be considered as the key to his eschatology in this early period. This will become clear in what follows. We will find it appearing in a variety of different ways. The first concerns the qualitative distinction between two worlds.

a. The Great Gulf Between Two Worlds

In the midst of the second world war Barth pointed to the radical difference between this world of man and time and the world of God and eternity. Our world is one filled with morality, with ennobling state programs, and with religion and Christianity which are all towers of Babel which the devil laughs at. What is gained from religion?

"What is the use of all the preaching, baptizing, confirming, bell-ringing, and organ-playing, of all the religious moods and modes, the counsels of 'applied religion' 'for the guidance of parents' (Den Ehleuten zum Geleite), the community houses with or without motion picture equipment, the efforts to enliven church singing, the unspeakably tame and stupid monthly church papers, and whatever else may belong to the equipment of modern ecclesiasticism." 29

The tragedy is that,

"The longing for a new world has lost all its bitterness, sharpness, and restlessness, has become the joy of development, and now blossoms sweetly and surely in orations, donor's tablets, committee meetings, reviews, annual reports, twenty-five year anniversaries, and countless mutual bows." 30

Thus the righteousness of God, and His will which is the new world 31 is relegated to only the highest among various high ideals, as our own

28. References in this section come from four lectures, two given in 1916, one in 1919, and one in 1920. They show Barth's thinking whilst he was working on his Römerbrief. Already, in Sept. 1916, he was wrestling with chapter 3 (Letter, Sept. 1, 1916, RT 38).
29. WGWM 20
30. Ibid. 16
31. Ibid. 11-14
affair, Eritis sicut Deus. But the new world seeks entrance into our world to radically overturn, and is more startling than tuberculosis, the general strike or war. But man has not listened to God in his openness to the "veritable uproar" of morality, culture and religion, so that,

"We have mistaken our tent (Zelt) for our home (heimat); the moratorium for the normal course of things. We have prayed, Thy will be done! and meant by it, Thy will be done not just now! We have believed in an eternal life, but what we took for eternal life and satisfied ourselves upon was really only temporary." 34

This forgotten "other world" or the forsaken "Wholly Other" is also the strange new world that we find within the Bible. This lies between the statements, "In the beginning God" and "Even so, come Lord Jesus". 35 In fact, the meaning of the world lies between these two. 36 Here Barth is clearly placing this world in its Creator-Redeemer relationship. The people in the Bible are looking up to the "Wholly Other", 37 pointing to Christ as does John the Baptist in Grunewald's painting of the crucifixion. 38 Thus the truth of religion is its "other-worldliness" (Jenseitigkeit) its non-historicity (Nieht-Geschichtlichkeit). 39 The Bible is written from the standpoint of God, His history and His virtues, lifting us from man to the new world of God. 40 Barth could even say that the events of the Bible are the beginning of this new world. 41 He also said,

"God is the Lord of the heaven which awaits us, and in which, when our journey through the sorrows and imperfections of this life is done, we are to possess and enjoy our citizenship; and the new world is just this blessed other life, the 'still eternity' into which the faithful shall one day enter." 42

32. WGM 16
33. Ibid. 17
34. Ibid. 23 German parenthesis added.
35. Ibid. 32
36. Ibid. 51
37. Ibid. 64
38. Ibid. 65, 76.
39. Ibid. 69
40. Ibid. 45
41. Ibid. 49f
42. Ibid. 46
Throughout Barth stressed that the world of God and the world of man are qualitatively distinct. 43

b. The Great Gulf Between God and Man

It follows that there is an infinite qualitative distinction between God and man as an eschatological reality. Thus, there is no romantic and direct communion (romantische Unmittelbarkeit), 45 no improper notions of immanence, non-radical ideas of transcendence or a relative relation between God and man. 46 There is no dangerous "religious demeanour" (religiöse Gebärde) 47 with its supposed soul and sense experience bridging the gulf, 48 and no tyrannical egotism of man 49 which is contempt and presumption. 50 Therefore, there is no dissolution of the "final redemption" (Enderlösung). 51 If sentimental we shall confuse redemption with all manner of redemptions, and eternal life with the life which we suppose we can eventually experience (allerlei Erlöstheiten erleben können). 52 There is no "less exacting redemption" (bescheiden-heitere Erlöstheit), 53 no "blessed redemption (selige Erlöstheit) existing in some corner of our "unredeemedness" (unerlöstheit). 54 We must be rid of those "eschatological illusions" (enthusiastisch-apokalyptischen Illusionen) in which the union of "here" and "there" is anticipated in our imagination. 55

Rather, faith discovers God to be the originator of all things and thus awaits all from Him. 56 He is named the Creator-Redeemer (Schöpfer-Erlöser) 57 eighteen times in the Römerbrief and is thus understood as

43. WGWM 179
44. See R 251, 262, 265, 269, 309, 315, 433
45. Ibid. 50
46. Ibid. 108
47. Ibid. 136
48. Ibid. 163
49. Ibid. 81
50. Ibid. 117
51. Ibid. 151
52. Ibid. 224
53. Ibid. 255
54. Ibid. 292f
55. Ibid. 163
56. Ibid. 217
57. Ibid. 37, 41, 77, 110, 114, 120, 122, 141, 152, 156, 178, 288, 324, 331, 351, 404, 484. Cf. "Schöpfungs grade" and "Erlöungs grade" Ibid. 135
being both before and after man. The book is full of terms which point to this difference between the only Redeemer and sinful man, and so against an uneschatological immanentism. Thus God is the "unapproachably distant" (unuberwindlicher Fremdheit), "utterly strange" (unerreichbarer Ferne), 58 "utterly distinct" (der ganz anders). 59 He is the "eternal archetype" (ewige Ursprung), 60 the "unknown God" (unbekannten Gott) 61 whose Majesty is "unobservable" (unerforsliche) and "undiscoverable" (widergefun den). 62 He is "incommensurable" (inkommensurable), 63 the "incomprehensible and unexperienced but living God" (nicht gedachten, nicht erlebten, sondern lebendigen Gott). 64 He is the radical "Nevertheless" (Trotzdem) 65 whose ways appear always new, strangely distant, pre-eminent and beyond man's horizon and possession. 66 This distance between God and man has essential, sharp, acid, disintegrating and ultimate significance. 67 for it is an "all-embracing contrast (umfassenden Gegensatz). 68 Between lies a "vast chasm" (Kleffenden Ubgrundes), 69 a "awful gulf" (Distanzen), 70 a "precipice" (Schärfe), 71 a "massive wall" (himmelhohe Mauer), 72 a "barrier" (Barrikade), 73 a "final barrier" (letzte

58. R. 52., 27.
59. Ibid. 28. Cf. "utterly different (ganz anderer) (156), "wholly different" (ganz anders) (351), and "wholly Other" as either "Ganz Anderer" (49) or "totaliter aliter" (272). "Ganz Anderer" is a phrase used also by Bultmann, both he and Barth borrowing it from R. Otto (Smart, DM 95, also Hoyle, TKB 142).

Van Til's claim that Barth's "wholly other" God is "not wholly other at all, inasmuch as he is correlative to his complete identification with man" (NM 567f) resulted from unfairly equating his theology with immanentism of the very theology against which Barth wrote. This claim appears throughout the book, but even in the Rö. is refuted with Barth's christological presentation of the existential ego, as "Grabensuffrisses zwischen mir und - mir" (Rö. 244, ET 262).

60. R 52 61. Ibid. 60, 244.
62. Ibid. 46 63. Ibid. 533
64. Ibid. 316 65. Ibid. 99
66. Ibid. 120

67. Ibid. 49 68. Ibid. 80
69. Ibid. 98 70. Ibid. 244
71. Ibid. 245 72. Ibid. 414
73. Ibid. 418
Schranke), a "frontier" (Grenze), a "threshold" (Schwelle), a "boundary" (Schranken), with God as the "pure and absolute boundary" (die reine Grenze und der seine Anfang) so that man is described variously as on the "brink" (Rande) and "razor edge" (Messer Schneide) of the abyss (Abgründe) and at best only on the "very outermost edge" (Sussersten Rand) which is still in the world. Whereas God is the creator and sole ruler and "der herr über Leben und Sterben" on the other side, man stands under KRISIS (die Krisis) and sickness unto death on this side. God is absolute and eternal, man is temporal and relative with death marking both the limit of his life and the boundary between him and God, and judgment regulates the whole relationship manifesting that He is utterly different from us. Thus "God" and "man" are far from interchangeable terms for God is in heaven and man is on earth.

Truth encounters man from beyond like an arrow over an impassable river as God sets before him the "great hope" which is the antithesis of man's supposed possession which need not be waited for. Such hope points to man's proper relationship with God, that of "expectancy" (Wartender). Here Barth in revolt against the false immanental relationship between man and God points to the great gulf which separates them, but goes on to show that because of this the correct relationship is one of expectancy, and thus truly eschatological.

74. R 301 75. Ibid. 201. Cf. 238, 272, 305 - bengrenzende, 377. 76. Ibid. 41. Cf. 164, 166, 178, 182, 187. 77. Ibid. 46 78. Ibid. 330 79. Ibid. 361 80. Ibid. 252 81. Ibid. 377 82. Ibid. 529 83. Ibid. 168, 170, 249 84. Ibid. 367 85. Ibid. 156 86. Ibid. 84 87. Ibid. 310 88. Ibid. 238 89. Ibid. 457. Cf. 153 90. Ibid. 152
Thus in a lecture in 1922, Barth emphasized that the truly eschatological experience is one of "expectancy" (Erwartung - a word, with cognates, used twenty times in the lecture). Thus the members, whether realizing it or not, come to church with expectancy, the true preacher likewise comes, and the open Bible is full of expectancy. But all are only relative to God who in His expectancy arrives first on the scene. It is the expectant people who receive the Holy Spirit as a security for what has not yet appeared even to God's children, for the de-eschatological experience is belief in a present kingdom of heaven (Gegenwart des himmelreichs) without the experience of the "poor in spirit". Thus Barth said, "the situation on Sunday morning is related in the most literal sense to the end of history, it is eschatological..."

c. The Great Gulf Between Eternity and Time

The great gulf between the new world and the old world, and between God and man, is expressed, by Barth, as the infinite qualitative distinction between eternity and time. Through all history there runs the line of intersection (Schnittlinie) between time and eternity, between the present and the future world. Man's unrighteousness is his confounding (verwechseln) of time with eternity making God a thing of this world, forgetting the awful gulf between, and thereby trying to transform (ver-

91. WGWM 107, 110, 113, 123. 92. Ibid. 123 93. Ibid. 116 94. Ibid. 122 98. Barth considered in 1920-24 (sermons) that more people were ready to hear what the Bible says about eternity at that time than there were before the war (CHS 36). As Barth and Thurneysen jointly contributed to CHS without deeming it necessary to indicate who preached which sermons, the writer has likewise considered them all as representative of their united thinking, and thus all can throw light on Barth's understanding.

99. R 47 100. Ibid. 44
wechsel) time into eternity and eternity into time.\textsuperscript{101} But to project the temporal into infinity or to confine eternity within the sphere of time is wrong.\textsuperscript{102} To obscure the distance between God and man stems from the loss of the sense of eternity and comes from the suggestion, \\textit{Sicut Deus} (ye shall be as God),\textsuperscript{103} and ends in destructive and inconceivable scepticism.\textsuperscript{104}

Therefore, "this side of the line of death by which men are separated from God, time from eternity,"\textsuperscript{105} there is no direct observable relation, but only the indirect, underivable, unexecutable relation between them.\textsuperscript{106} This is the "world of time"\textsuperscript{107} and the beyond is the invisible and eternal world.\textsuperscript{108} The only world that we can know is the world of time, things and men.\textsuperscript{109} Thus God can only be apprehended through Himself, and only in faith.\textsuperscript{110} The possibility of this faith, of God, is capable of fulfillment neither within the realm of time, nor on the plane of history or experience.\textsuperscript{111} It is the Holy Spirit which provides this faith with content which is not a thing in time.\textsuperscript{112} Thus knowledge of God, or faith working through love is realized at no particular moment in time, but is open to us at every moment,\textsuperscript{113} for in the midst of this earthly heaven (Zion), God has set the fact of His eternity.\textsuperscript{114} In Christ it is in the midst of time.\textsuperscript{115}

Continuing this attack on immanentism, Barth said, this eternity is not time, so that men have utterly failed to put eternity into their hearts.\textsuperscript{116}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{101} R 244
\item \textsuperscript{102} Ibid. 108
\item \textsuperscript{103} Ibid. 44, 168, 236.
\item \textsuperscript{104} Ibid. 135
\item \textsuperscript{105} Ibid. 251, 265, 267, 269. Cf. 309, 315, 433.
\item \textsuperscript{106} Ibid. 112f
\item \textsuperscript{107} Ibid. 376
\item \textsuperscript{108} Ibid. 157
\item \textsuperscript{109} Ibid. 331f
\item \textsuperscript{110} Ibid. 120
\item \textsuperscript{111} Ibid. 355
\item \textsuperscript{112} Ibid. 56
\item \textsuperscript{113} Ibid. 59
\item \textsuperscript{114} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{115} Ibid. 269.
\item \textsuperscript{116} Ibid. 45
\end{itemize}
Rather, so great and so different is the new man and the new time for which we await, that everything that appears among us as new is really again only the old, and can at best be but parables of the truly new, which is no more our time but God's time. 117 Our time is waiting for eternity, 118 which is to wait for the end of times, 119 for time fulfilled. 120 Eternity is the homeland which is calling us, our origin from which we cannot sever ourselves, so that time is only a wayside station on our journey. 121 Eternity rushes into time as a mountain freshet rushes into its empty bed after a shower, and we are being led to this place where time and eternity meet. 122 As the earth shall become like heaven but never heaven like the earth, so time shall become as eternity but never eternity as time. But not until God becomes "all in all" will time become eternity. 123 In the meantime, as heaven is our homeland, we feel the strain of the hurried passing of time which is not yet eternity. 124 In this world of time, before as well as since Christ's first advent, the church is His partner in time (Zeitgenossenschaft) but certainly not a partner in eternity (Ewigkeitsgenossenschaft). 125

d. The Great Gulf between God's Kingdom and Human Kingdoms

The Kingdom belongs to God 126 and is called his "miracle", 127 and therefore the kingdom of man is without exception never the Kingdom of God. 128 Thus a "Kingdom of God religion" is a phantom 129 as religion is not the Kingdom of God. 130 Hence it is not in the subjective constitution

117. CHS 39f
118. Ibid. 42, 44f.
119. Ibid. 37
120. Ibid. 221
121. Ibid. 221
122. Ibid. 222f
123. Ibid. 224, 229.
124. Ibid. 274
125. ZdZ, heft 6, 1931, 459: "genossenschaft" is literally "guild" after the political-social divisions of Switzerland.
126. R 347
127. Ibid. 369
128. Ibid. 56
129. Ibid. 375
130. Ibid. 366
(subjektiven Verfassung) of man, nor found in his word. Barth saw in the Corinthian church a dawning of this "Kingdom-of-God-springtime" (Reich-Gottes-Frühlung) which thought that flesh and blood inherits the Kingdom as if it were a prolongation of this life in which man is eternal in every moment, a Christian monism which regards the Kingdom of God as already established with no kingdom in process of coming. There are two kingdoms, the Kingdom of Christ (Reich Christi) and the Kingdom of God (Reiches Gottes). We are now in the Kingdom of Christ, whose whole purpose is to abolish the last enemy death, and overcome all dualism that God may be all in all. It therefore has nothing to do with concluding peace and establishing a "spiritual-religious-moral kingdom" of God on earth. Rather to be in Christ's Kingdom is to have faith in the coming resurrection. To be without such hope is to be outside of this Kingdom.

However, in the Church, "the Kingdom of God (is) directly awaited with the result that men band themselves together to inaugurate it, as though it were a THING which men could have and await and work for. To a greater or lesser extent, the Church is a vigorous and extensive attempt to humanize the divine, to bring it within the sphere or the world of time and things..."

The Church does not wish to be a stranger in the world, does not wait

---

131. RD 18
132. Ibid. 30
133. Ibid. 103
134. Ibid. 130
135. Ibid. 122f
136. Ibid. 177
137. Ibid. 173
138. Ibid. 177ff. Barth considered, on the one hand, that the cross meant the end of Christ's Kingdom, the goal of His reign, and the dawning of the Kingdom of God (178f). Yet, on the other hand, he said that this coming to deliver the Kingdom to the Father has not yet reached its fulfillment, for the Kingdom of God is still in process of coming (177ff) so that now it is still "the Kingdom of God ripening unto the eternal harvest" (187).
139. Ibid. 178
140. Ibid. 180
141. Ibid. 216
142. R 332
for the city built upon a foundation, but is in great haste, hurrying for the concrete joys of the marriage feast. 143 But if we knew of some corporal, visible, concrete divine thing then God would not be God. The Kingdom is not "projected into" this world, and therefore men do not force their way into it. 144 Hence plans to take the Kingdom by force end in the territory of the "No-God of the world". 145 Thus "the Kingdom of God cannot be inaugurated by busy movements of reform". 146 It is because the relation between God and the world has been so thoroughly affected by the resurrection that the concept of the Kingdom as limited to social revolutions or reform movements in the usual narrower sense is impossible. The Kingdom of God does not begin with man's movements of protest. It is the revolution which is before all revolutions. It is the original synthesis out of which both the thesis and the antithesis arise. Thus genuine eschatology casts a light backwards as well as forwards, to the Creator as well as to the Redeemer. 147

It follows that even the regnum naturae is the Kingdom of God, though its glory is veiled. 148 Even parables of the Kingdom of heaven were analogies from this world, and for that very reason were "brimful of eschatology", 149 and in this sense manifested the "parabolic character of the present world". 150 Even the regnum naturae may always become the regnum Dei; and such it will be "when we are in the Kingdom of God and the Kingdom of God in us". 151 We are led from the regnum naturae over into the regnum gloriae. 152 In fact, "consummatio mundi", the dissolution of all things (Aufhebung alles Gegebenen), the passing of this age, is the
meaning of the Kingdom of God as preached by the Baptist, Christ, Paul and the Apocalyptist. In fact, when Jesus sent His disciples out it was to proclaim the Kingdom and not to establish it. Therefore Barth stressed that it is THY Kingdom and not man’s. Hence it does not take world history for its textbook. Both its coming to man and man’s entrance into it are completely dependent upon God, and upon Him alone. Put in different words, Barth said that redemption is not a work that man can do, nor a way that he can travel, nor a power that he can use, for redemption comes from an altogether different side, because from God Himself. This is the new, other and coming world. It is the "new eternal world" (Neue ewige Welt), a "foreign country" (sondelich Reich), the incomparable fulfillment of all time. It is "Grace" which lies beyond all human possibility, as the "freedom of God" (due Freiheit Gottes). It is the Eternity of God, His rule, His absolute transcendence as Creator, Reconciler and King of things and history, which sets a limit to the endlessness of the world of time, things and men, as well as breaking in as the "new world" in the forgiveness of sins.

Thus Barth speaks of God's Kingdom as coming in violently (stürmt herein) involving the passing away of heaven and earth, and the making of all things new which lies absolutely beyond all things human. It is the revolution, which bursts upon the world of man as an army bursts into
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hostile territory, and thus it assaults us.

Agreeing with Kant, Barth asserted that pure ethics require no mixing of heaven and earth, for,

"Whenever men claim to be able to see the Kingdom of God as a growing organism, or to describe it more suitably - as a growing building, what they see is not the Kingdom of God, but the Tower of Babel."

The reason for this is the great gulf between this world and the new world of the Kingdom, for,

"The Kingdom of God has not 'broken forth' upon the earth, not even the tiniest fragment of it; and yet, it has been proclaimed: it has not come, not even in its most sublime form; and yet, it is nigh at hand. The Kingdom of God remains a matter of faith, and most of all is the revelation of it in Christ Jesus a matter of faith. It is heralded and it is nigh at hand as a new world, not as the continuation of the old."

Five times in the Römerbrief the phrase "nigh at hand" (ist nahe), (nahe herbei), and once the words "at hand (ist aus)" are used in connection with the Kingdom of God. It is spoken of as "so near" (so nahe), three times, and "too near" (zu nahe) but never as in this world of time, and men and things. In fact, Barth clearly said in a Zwischen den Zeiten article that

"It is retroactively applied fanaticism if one claims that with the appearance of Christ the Kingdom of God has broken in and that indeed in the Church or in Christendom it manifests its visible presence."

The Kingdom of God has not come, but has only come near (nahe herbeigekommen) for it is not yet established in time. Thus just as the
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new world and the old world are qualitatively different, just as God and man are infinitely distinct, just as there is a complete difference between eternity and time, so there is the uneradicable distinction between the Kingdom of God and the kingdoms of men. The common aspect in each is the great gulf that separates, so that the new world is not in the old world, God is not in man, eternity is not in time nor the Kingdom come.

3. The "Coming" Emphasis in Barth's Early Eschatology

It follows that if the Kingdom has not come, if the eternal new world has not entered this temporal old world, that there is a "coming" emphasis in Barth's early eschatology. Throughout the Römerbrief, Barth repeatedly directs attention to a "Coming world" (kommenden Welt), a "Coming day" (nahenden Tag), (kommenden Tages), and a "Coming Age" (kommenden Ron), which are identified with the "Kommende Gottes Reich", coming "ewigen Seligkeit", coming salvation (nahenden Tag der Errettung), and coming redemption (kommende Erlösung), which all point beyond this world. Although in that Other Unknown world we are already invisibly, existentially redeemed, yet here in this known world there is not only no redemption - for it is not a concrete thing in the midst of other things, so cannot be possessed but only hoped for - but also this world is the "unredeemed world" (unerlöste Welt). Therefore as pilgrims
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upon this earth we find ourselves in the "not yet" tension of faith looking for the "final redemption" (Enderlösung) which cannot be a present reality. Though the world is incapable of redemption (erlösungsunfähige Welt), yet there is a redemption for it, and this work of God we await.

Barth's emphasis is upon God's act and not man's. The coming redeemed world will be a new earth and the coming redeemed man will be a new man for this corruptible will put on incorruption. It is to the Futurum resurrectionis and to the Futurum aeternum that he looks, when at the last trump the resurrection of the body together with cosmic renewal will take place (Erlösung alles Geschaffenen). Such a radical change has nothing to do with cause and effect, with continuation or evolution or even a variation of this world. It comes rather vertical from above unaided and unhindered by man, for God is God, and as Sovereign Creator and Redeemer, He will not only act but in Himself is the life of the coming day for "Christ is the 'new' Subject, the Ego of the coming world".

4. The "Beyond" Emphasis in Barth's Early Eschatology

With the "coming" emphasis before us, we now go a step further to consider the "beyond" emphasis that is found in Barth's early eschatology. It is within the coming context that this is found. Thus, we are
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"waiting for the existential occurrence of what has only apparently 'already' taken place, our expecting and looking for the eternal 'Moment' (ewigen Augenblick) of the Appearance, the Parousia, the Presence of Jesus Christ. This tension of the times has as much or as little to do with the well-known nineteen hundred years of the history of the Church - which quite obviously have 'not yet' ushered in the Parousia - as it had with those weeks or months during which the Epistle to the Romans lay in Phoebe's trunk (16:1), or with the moments which elapsed between Paul's dictation and Tertius' writing (16:22)."

The parousia has no chronological connotation, for it is no succeeding chronological hour and cannot be realized in time, as it is not time but Eternity which lies beyond. It is thus on the boundary of time (der Grenze aller Zeit) that we await the last hour, not knowing the hour of Christ's return. Therefore,

"Will there never be an end of all our ceaseless talk about the delay of the Parousia? How can the coming of that which doth not enter in ever be delayed? The End of which the New Testament speaks is no temporal event, no legendary 'destruction' of the world; it has nothing to do with any historical, or 'telluric', or cosmic catastrophe. The End of which the New Testament speaks is really the End; so utterly the End, that in the measuring of nearness or distance our nineteen hundred years are not merely of little but of no importance." 213

As the "eternal Moment" (Augenblick) does not, has not, and will not, enter, who "shall persuade us to depress into a temporal reality what can be spoken of only in a parable?"

"Who shall persuade us to transform our expectation of the End - the 'Moment' when the living shall be changed and the dead shall be raised, and both shall stand together before God (1 Cor. 15:51f) - into the expectation of a coarse and brutal spectacle? Who, when this
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spectacle is quite rightly delayed, shall be able to lull us comfortably to sleep by adding at the conclusion of Christian Dogmatics a short and perfectly harmless chapter entitled - "Eschatology?"...What delays its coming is not the Parousia, but our awakening." 216

Such awakening takes place in the "Moment" when men surrender to God, 217 it is the "line of death" which is nevertheless the line of life. It is the end, which is nevertheless, the beginning, the "No" which is also the "Yes". 218 In the light of this critical "Moment", "mankind and its world are passing as one whole, from the old to the new, from 'here' to 'there', from the present to the coming age." 219 Thus, even this world is eternal - in God, as the world of the new heaven and the new earth already subjected in Jesus Christ to the Father, and bearing within it its eternal existence, the birth of which can never take place in time. 220 For

"though the Futurum resurrectionis embraces the whole life of the man who is under grace - his heavenly and his earthly 'part', the new man, 'soul', and the glorified body of the old crucified man, - we must not understand this future life in the ordinary sense of the word 'future', as though men were to await it as an event in time. Rather, the whole broad front of human life - past, present, and future - is embraced and rolled out, so that, without providing a moment's respite to human waiting, it is defined as life in which sin shall not have dominion over you." 221

Barth therefore suggested that in order to counteract the "misunderstanding of the temporal eschatological possibility", the word "there" (dort) should be used instead of "then" (dann) for we speak of "keine Zeit", but of "alle Zeit". 222 For what then do we wait? We await our existential hearing of the Word of God and its existential utterance. 223
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This *parousia* of Jesus Christ is the creation which takes place at no time. "His coming is eternity", for the action of God cannot occur in time, but only in eternity. This End of the world of time and things and men is its Beginning, and which "though realised at no particular moment in time is, nevertheless, open to them at every moment, as the new and relizable possibility of their being what they are in God." Hence Barth's early eschatology was a "Timeless eschatology".

This removing of the *parousia* beyond time is the logical result of the radical separation of eternity and time, the new world from the old world, God from man, and His Kingdom from history. It is the logical result of Barth's consistent emphasis upon the infinite qualitative distinction between these various concerns as we have seen.

5. The "Above" Emphasis in Barth's Early Eschatology

Not only is there a "coming" and a "beyond" emphasis in Barth's early eschatology, but there is also an "above" emphasis which we now come to present. We have already noted how that in many different ways Barth referred to the great gulf there is between the new world and the old world, between God and man, between Eternity and time, between His Kingdom and human kingdoms, etc. It could be said that both his "coming" and "beyond" emphasis again present the gulf, this time between the present and the future. In this section we come to yet another gulf which Barth chose to call the "abyss between myself and myself" (Graben aufreisse zwischen mir und - mir).

He is referring to man's "existential" self which he considered as
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"an impossible possibility".\textsuperscript{229} The last two words (unmögliche Möglichkeit) Barth used in at least twelve other different contexts, eg. applied to the Lord,\textsuperscript{230} resurrection,\textsuperscript{231} faith,\textsuperscript{232} God,\textsuperscript{233} possession of grace,\textsuperscript{234} mercy of God,\textsuperscript{235} walking after the Spirit,\textsuperscript{236} loyalty,\textsuperscript{237} miracle,\textsuperscript{238} belief,\textsuperscript{239} revolution,\textsuperscript{240} fulfilling the law,\textsuperscript{241} and the new world.\textsuperscript{242} It is a convenient dialectical expression to indicate the two sides of reality, God's viewpoint (which Barth maintains is the point of view of Romans\textsuperscript{243}) is possibility because it is actuality, and man's viewpoint which considers the same reality as humanly impossible. Applied to "existentiality" (Existentialität) the term refers to the two Egos which every man is, i.e. his observable, visible, historical Ego and his unobservable, invisible, non-historical Ego, or the old man and the new man, or the man this side of the resurrection and the man on the other side of the resurrection. The one is known psychologically, the other only in faith. Jesus Christ is that new man, He is what I am not, my existential I, as He, has passed from death to life.\textsuperscript{244} "Wunder über Wunder, identisch (wir) sind mit dem neuen Menschen in Christus".\textsuperscript{245} I am the invisible new man who stands on the other side of the cross\textsuperscript{246} because I am invisibly one with this Other- the risen Christ.\textsuperscript{247} Thus my citizenship is in heaven (Phil. 3:20) and my life is hid with Christ in God (Col. 3:3).\textsuperscript{248}

\textsuperscript{229} R 376. The impossible possibility of the new man (196) and of redemption (105) are other ways of expressing the impossible possibility of existentiality.
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I am the wholly different man which I am not.\(^{249}\) That "New man is",\(^{250}\) he lives in God,\(^{251}\) and so is already invisibly redeemed.\(^{252}\) Of passing interest is the one reference to the existential Ego dwelling in man\(^{253}\) but this is to be understood objectively as the existential encounter with the Holy Spirit in which one encounters his own existential experience in God.\(^{254}\) Of prime interest is Barth's emphasis on present redemption of the existential man. This is not to be confused with idealism,\(^{255}\) neither do existential concepts point to an "ideal world" in contrast with the "concrete world",\(^{256}\) for Jesus Christ is the new and not the ideal man.\(^{257}\) There is also a wholly different self to human self-consciousness,\(^{258}\) as there is no enthusiasm, no mystical experience and no "feeling of dependence", for by the resurrection of Jesus we are invisibly disposed.\(^{259}\) In our "non-existence existence" (Sein als die, die wir nicht sind) as His children\(^{260}\) "human past, present, and future, is, as such, already the eternal Future."\(^{261}\) Love to God is an awaiting redemption, so great that it need wait for no time or event. It is therefore the unobservable place where "the consummation of all things has already been completed".\(^{262}\) So we stand already "in the primal and ultimate history" (Urgeschichte und Endgeschichte) "where all ambiguity, all polarity, every 'not only - but also' is done away, because God is all in all."\(^{263}\)

Over-against the "God in man" immanental relationship Barth has
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therefore pointed to the "man in God" existential relationship, which is an occurrence comprehended in no moment of time and thus is a "mystery" because an "invisible relationship". The radical difference between the two is of basic importance to Barth's Römerbrief, for the separation between the visible and invisible ego is just as vital as that between the visible world of man and the invisible world of God, or between the known man and the Unknown God. Thus the church of Essu is the observable, knowable and possible church, whereas the church of Jacob is the unobservable, unknowable and impossible church. The former has no miracle but the latter is only when the miracle occurs and is nowhere and at no time visible. Likewise in time we are vessels of wrath, but in eternity we are utterly different as vessels of mercy. Thus the church of Ahab-Jezebel was visible - the 7,000 invisible.

6. The Resurrection as the Eschatological Reality

The great abyss between myself and myself is the result of Christ's bodily resurrection. Just as previously the gulf between this old temporal world and the new eternal world was shown in that this world is bound on both sides by the Eternal God as Creator and Redeemer, so now in this section we see that it is bound by two resurrections, that of Christ and that of mankind. It follows that for Barth the resurrection means "the new world." Here we are in the "world of the Gospel" which is completely different from the "religious-moral-world".

The resurrection was exceedingly important to Barth in his attack against de-eschatologized Liberal theology, for in it he saw God's act
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and not man's. He considered it to be the theme of the Bible, the central point of importance in the New Testament, containing in itself the whole of what Christianity is. Thus it is the most positive subject that can be imagined as it is not a special truth but the truth. It means the Sovereignty of God (Gottesherrschaft). His complete sovereignty (Volle Gottesherrschaft). It was the turning point of our destiny, without which the absoluteness of Christianity has no meaning. Thus resurrection is the Biblical word which expresses in the strongest and most unambiguous way who Jesus is, for Jesus without the resurrection would not be Jesus. Also, Barth considered that Paul (in 1 Cor.) understood resurrection as a paraphrase for the word "God". It is this God who stands at the "boundary" of our existence (Grenze unseres Daseins), for

"Resurrection means eternity. Since it is the sovereignty of God which gives significance to time, it is for that very reason not in time. It is not one temporal thing among others." Thus the resurrection is as far removed from time as the infinite qualitative distinction between eternity and time, as far as God is from man, as far as Jesus Christ is from the old world, and as far as the eternal Kingdom is from human kingdoms. Hence the eschatological reality is separated from the temporal world of man by a great gulf.

Barth took death very seriously. To him it and resurrection belong to the strange new world. By contrast, the religious-moral world, against which he was writing, knew only of a visible heaven, the heaven in the
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breast (den himmel in meiner eigenen Brust), which is not only a false transcendence, 287 but is an "inner-worldly Christianity" - a dream without hope or a goal. 288 It followed that they proposed an "unending, horizonless (unendliche, horizenlose) life, lacking a last promise" (letzten Verheissung) 289 where men are as good as mere drops of water in an infinite sea of life with no last things, no crisis. 290 As this world and life is endless, then, to them, belief in the beyond was only an expression of idealism. 291 At best they concentrated upon the individual blessing instead of the universal, and so upon immortality instead of resurrection, 292 and entered into the "rebellion" (Auflehnung) of wanting to be with God without the body, 293 claiming that death means redemption (Sterben bedeute Erlösung) 294 and immortality (unsterblich). 295

In complete contrast, for Barth, resurrection did not mean progress, evolution or enlightenment, 296 nor a continuation of this life in a spiritual sense, which he considered to be only a romantic dream. 297 Rather, the man of the resurrection is more than the old man merely improved, for he is wholly and absolutely different. 298 It is the new emancipating beginning in the very midst of human transiency, the goal for which no natural ground or experience can be brought to prove or make it true. 299 It is thus in no way man's victory, but God's, 300 and tells us that God is not a thought, a word, a feeling, but the Great, True, Real and Living One. 301
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Thus in contrast to the evolutionary based natural immortality of the moral-religious world, to Earth man was under Krisis leading inexorably to death. Rather than being born to live forever and merely passing through the change of death, man lives as a temporal being between the two resurrections. This pilgrim life is likened to travelling through the night, journeying to the great beyond, a wandering between two worlds, moving from here to yonder, as aliens in a land of estrangement longing for home, coming to the end of the road where a new world has its beginning, living an Advent season lifetime, for redemption is resurrection. That final resurrection of man is man's only hope through Christ's resurrection. Man is pointed beyond his near and well-known goals to a strange and unknown land, because he does not prefer to wait but push right on to his own goal. But wait he must upon God and His resurrection, for although he may light his candles in the darkness, the New Day has not dawned with them for our goal has already been revealed through Christ, and He comes not towards it, but from this goal. So Earth pictures man standing on the border of his life where he can only wait and hope, - a hope which is both "great and joyous" and "unfathomable".

This hope springs from the fact that death is not the end, but the turning point (Wendepunkt), the other side of which is the life of God Himself, even as the seed must be cast into the ground and first
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die before the same seed in its new form comes forth as the plant. 318 This resurrection change will be sudden at the last trump when salvation history will cut right through other histories. Then death will be swallowed up in victory. 319 This is radically different from any theories of gradual developments.

7. Barth's Ethics, an Insight into his Eschatology

Throughout this chapter we have seen that Barth emphasized the great gulf that exists between the eternal strange new world and the temporal old known world. This radical dialectic springs directly from the infinite qualitative distinction between eternity and time, between God and man, between God's kingdom and man's, between man's two Egos, and between the miraculous resurrection and natural immortality. In this context eschatology is "coming", is "beyond" and is "above" and hence is removed from this world of time. It is therefore identified with the eternal world.

It is in this setting that Barth's ethics was given. 320 It follows that he rejected the ethics of Kant, Schleiermacher and Ritschl etc. as their thinking was wedded to culture. 321 He therefore rejected the idea of man's existence as steadily progressing, with morality and religion as the centre of interest in ethics. He turned from the interest others had shown in the supposed greatness and dignity of man. That unabated optimism in man had been shattered in the first world war, 322 so that Barth could say, "the era of the old ethics is gone forever." 323 For him the cardinal
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question of man's existence, or the ethical good was not to be found in this world,\textsuperscript{324} for over this world, its culture and man-centered confidence had been written the words \textit{"mene, mene, tekel".}\textsuperscript{325} Hence he considered that the problem of ethics lies wholly beyond this world.\textsuperscript{326} It is separated from this world by the "impassable frontier of death", or the "unbridgeable chasm", which separates the Holy One from sinners.\textsuperscript{327} This raises the question concerning the place of man's actions below. Barth is clear that the validity of human actions depend upon their relation to God.\textsuperscript{328} All man does is to move in the sphere of relativity,\textsuperscript{329} but rightly related to God he moves like a shell shot from a gun.\textsuperscript{330} God overcomes the existing order; not man,\textsuperscript{331} for His is the revolution which is the "new" whereas man can but revolt against the existing order to but change it for another one still on this side of the "new".\textsuperscript{332} Therefore Barth asked, "What man has the right to propound and represent the "new", whether it be a new age, or a new world, or even a new spirit? Is not every new thing, in so far as it can be schemed by men, born of what already exists?"\textsuperscript{333} "Our 'new' is not the \textit{new}".\textsuperscript{334} The Coming World from God's Revolution, the truly "new" is man's hope, and we can only bear witness to it by "not-doing".\textsuperscript{335} This is, to love (agape) which is a denial and demolition of the existing order which no revolt can accomplish.\textsuperscript{336} Whether in primary ethical action of worship and repentance\textsuperscript{337} or the secondary action of love towards our fellow men\textsuperscript{338} an existential action is involved, for we love the \textit{One} in the others, which \textit{Eros} knows
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nothing of. In this context, to be at peace with others bears witness to the peace of the Coming World, and announces its coming. In this relationship of love, it is not men who confront men, but God who confronts God. In short, "the form of this world passeth away, and the Kingdom of God cometh. Love and all that proceeds from love, demonstrates this passing away and this coming," but in no way does human effort bring in the final eschatological reality, for ethical behaviour is only a "demonstration" which points to the action of God.

It follows that Barth could say,

"There is nothing in the whole range of human possibilities, from popular indifference to mystical absorption in the All, which is capable of realizing the moral objective, the goal of history. Our range of possibilities is certainly capable of being increased and broadened, but its relation to the final goal must continue to be as it is,"

The question is raised, however, "Was not Barth himself a member of the Social Democratic Party with a definite interest in improving the social lot here on earth?" In answer, we note that his lecture on Ethics in 1922 referred to the millennium, stating,

"For many of our contemporaries - and I confess that I belong with them - this conception has taken the definite form of the socialistic ideal...It is concerned with the goal of earthly history - and this without prejudice to the hope of eternal life in another world."

He continued by saying that this millennial goal "is capable of being realized, not outside of time but within it", for it "envisages reality here on earth". It would seem that after stressing the great gulf between the new world above and the old world below that Barth in word
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and deed was anxious not to foster a "world escapism" ideal. Thus in a letter to Thurneysen on Feb. 5, 1915, he wrote,

"...I have now become a member of the Social Democratic Party. Just because I set such emphasis Sunday by Sunday upon the last things, it was no longer possible for me personally to remain suspended in the clouds above the present evil world but rather it had to be demonstrated here and now that faith in the Greatest does not exclude but rather includes within it work and suffering in the realm of the imperfect." 350

The interesting point to note here is that this letter was written seven years before the lecture on Ethics and even six years before the second edition of Romans in which the Wholly Other God emphasis is found. To this extent, therefore, even in these early days Barth had his feet on the ground even though he had to emphasize the Ganz Anderer aspect of God to counteract immanentism. Unlike immanentism he did not confuse the Kingdom of God with that of men. For example, the evidence that he was not confusing this social concern for man with establishing the Kingdom of God is clearly given one month after this lecture on Ethics, when in a letter he wrote of a Mr. Zänker from Soest who made "himself ridiculous at once by the assertion that I confuse socialism with the Kingdom of God." 351

Barth was therefore definitely interested in improving the social lot of man on earth, attempting to keep a balance between the eschatological future and the immediate present. Thus he wrote,

"We are expecting wholly other things: namely a new heaven and a new earth. We throw our energies into the most humdrum tasks, into the business nearest to hand, and also into the making of a new Switzerland and a new Germany, for the reason that we look forward to the new Jerusalem coming down from God out of heaven." 352

He therefore rejected "any pessemistic discrediting of the here-and-now" 353
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pointing rather to the Living God who is building a new world. He stated that without this perception "social Christianity" is sheer nonsense, a patching of the old garment with but pieces of the new, for God alone is the solution. 

Therefore the relation of a Christian to society is simple co-operation within the framework of existing society followed by radical and absolute opposition to that society for "we should like to be out of this society - and in another." As Thurneysen said of Barth's ethics, it "is not swallowed up by eschatology, much rather, it is given its foundation in it."

We now come to present Barth's unpublished 1928 Münster Ethik which not only gives us a further insight into his early eschatology, but shows the type of systematic presentation that was to be given in the kirkliche Dogmatik. This 555 page, two volumed, source presents the one command of God as Creator, Reconciler and Redeemer. The command of the Redeemer is where insight into his eschatology is given, but as it is integral to the other two it must be understood in the light of them. Thus, whereas the
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358. In 1968 there were only some 100 copies of this Ethik in various European libraries (the copy used came from Bethel), but it will be the first posthumous work published (information received Dec. 1968). Another unpublished Ethik of 1925, of which there is only Barth's own copy, was not made available for this study at Barth's request. It is evidently quite "lutheran" and Barth later became unhappy with it, which perhaps indicates its emphasis on "Timeless Eschatology". The 1928 Ethik, Vol. 1, devotes 56 pages to ethics and dogmatics, theological and philosophical ethics and the way of theological ethics; after which 44 pages consider the reality of God's command, concentrating on the revelation of the command, the command as God's command and the command as God's righteousness. The final 142 pages present the command of God the Creator, focusing on the command of life, on calling, order and faith. Vol. 2 presents the command of God the Reconciler (233 pages), focusing on the command of the decree, on authority, humility and love; and the command of God the Redeemer (67 pages), focusing on the command of promise, on conscience, gratitude, and hope.
creation-command entails faith, the reconciliation-command, love, the redemption-command involves hope;\textsuperscript{359} as the command of life, command of law and command of promise respectively,\textsuperscript{360} related to man as God's creatures, pardoned sinners and children respectively,\textsuperscript{361} causing them to acknowledge God's order, humble themselves and be thankful respectively,\textsuperscript{362} for they have God to thank for their existence, salvation and also their ultimate belonging to Himself respectively,\textsuperscript{363} as He is Lord of their life, Rescuer of their life and Father of their life respectively,\textsuperscript{364} for the relation between an obedient human will and the will of God is one of consent, binding and oneness respectively.\textsuperscript{365} In this way the three realms, "naturae", "gratiae" and "gloriarum", are considered as three concentric circles with the last as the innermost sphere which points beyond the other two.\textsuperscript{366} Thus the reality of man is not exhausted in his "creation" or "reconciliation" for there is the third "eschatological reality" (eschatologische Wirklichkeit) which involves the "end" or the goal (Ziel) of the Divine claim laid upon us which is actually the true and real beginning of man (um den Wahren und eigentlichen Angang des Menschen handelt)\textsuperscript{367} with theological ethics concerned with the "relentless approach of time to its end" (unsauflahtsam zu Ende gehenden Zeit).\textsuperscript{368} This eschatological aspect is the sphere we know least about.

"Whoever thought he could say much here would indeed not know what is here to be said. It is however not the case that the little that is to be said here could just as well be left unsaid. One notices all too clearly in the case of many elaborations of theological ethics, to their disadvantage, that their authors do not appear
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to have remembered at all the fact that in dogmatics there is also an eschatological viewpoint which is independent of all others and which inalienably affects all others." 369

Thus God not only wanted to do something with me when he created me, not only wants to do something with me in the present but also will want to do something with me as goal and meaning of His will as Creator and Reconciler. It is this "most real being", this "future man" (zukünftige Mensch) which is this "lacking goal" (erreichte Ziel) 370 - my being which has not yet appeared, though seen by God, which I am not of myself, but only from God. This future reality is vital as God's command concerns man in his "whole reality" - his "complete God-willed reality" (ganz gottgewollten Wirklichkeit) 371 for man as creature and as pardoned sinner does not exhaust the reality of man, 372 sub specie aeterni we are this future man. Just as "begetting" and "creating are two different things, so the fact that we are "God's children" cannot be postulated from the viewpoint of the Creator's command, for creation means creatio ex nihilo and thus not participation in the Divine Being. So obedience of the created man was obedience of the slave (Gehorsam des Sklaven), whereas man as God's child can only be said of the "goal of creation" (Ziel der Schöpfung) of the perfected creation, to which the existing creation merely points. Even in the regnum gratiae as a member of the people of God, one elect, called and justified, man submits in obedience to law, sacrifice,

369. Ethik 235: "Wer hier vieles zu sagen wüsste, der wüsste wohl nicht, von was hier zu reden ist. Es ist aber nicht so, dass des wenige, das hier zu sages ist, etwa gerade so gut auch ungesagt bleiben könnte. Man merkt es allzu vielen Bearbeitungen der theologischen Ethik zu ihrem Schaden allzu deutlich an, dass ihre Verfasser sich an die Tatsache überhaupt nicht erinnert zu haben scheinen, dass es in der Dogmatik selbständig gegenüber allen andern, und alle andern unveräusserlich mitbestimmend auch einen eschatologischen Gesichtspunkt 'gibt.'
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penance and humility for authority and discipline holds sway. Thus we
speak here of education, right, custom, church and state all of which
obviously have nothing to do with the obedience of children.\textsuperscript{373} But in
the sphere of the creation-command it is the child of God who obeys in
the bondsman for man is more than a creature as his future reality has
become present. Likewise in the sphere of the reconciliation-command it
is the child of God who obeys in the elected man for again his future
reality has become present - "redemption is present". The terms "Our
Father" and "children of God", are too often treated as small coin, but
one must pay attention to the quite special minting of this coin if one
does not wish here to cast pearls before swine, for the minting of this
coin is actually eschatological.\textsuperscript{374}

What does "eschatological" mean?

"Eschatological does not mean a truth of the kind that
must first become truth or which must first concern us
as truth. Eschatological means other-worldly and there¬
fore not this worldly, not yet valid and meaningful for
us, preserved in God far from the reality of our existence
and reserved for some future aeon. Eschatology is not
negation but affirmation. But all the same it is a most
definite and characteristic affirmation, or let us say:
within the word of God and His truth, it is a most definite
vital point of this truth which characterizes it peculiarly
as an act, as a way, as guidance, and therefore character¬
izes also our relation to it peculiarly as obedience.
Eschatological thus means above all: 'Final,' therefore
closing, definitive, unsurpassable...But now this 'final'
is only one side of the concept 'eschatological'. The
other consists of the fact that eschatological truth is
truth as future in the present, as truth that lies before
us in the same way as we have the truth of our creatureli¬
ness behind us, as truth that comes towards us, - not merely
facing us, as we must say of the Word of God as the word of
reconciliation, but actually coming towards us." \textsuperscript{375}

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
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\bibitem{375} Ibid. 238: "Eschatologisch heisst nicht eine solche Wahrheit, die
erst Wahrheit werden, oder die uns als Wahrheit erst angehen muss.
\end{thebibliography}
cont./
Thus to the child of God applies not only *not posse peccare*, not only *posse non peccare* (as for Adam before the fall), but also (and with this concept we stand at the very end of the way of God) *non posse peccare*. That is to say, the child of God is *per se* and beyond all dialectics, the obedient child of God. The peculiar feature of eschatological truth is then its "present not in the future, but as future, as a coming-to-us. Therefore something is coming is meant, our own coming being, when the final thing is said to us: we *are* God's children." It includes the statement "The Kingdom of God has *come nigh*, "Thy Kingdom come!", "Behold I stand at the door and knock," and "The Lord is nigh!". It means the waiting for the adoption (Rom. 8:23) as servants for the master, the ten virgins for the bridegroom. It involves both transcendence and immediate nearness, for this "most distant" thing is the "coming to us of this non-present". It is therefore not just the case of "Be what thou art" (applicable to created and reconciled man) but also "we *are* what we shall be 'for' we have it actually in the promise" (Wir haben es eben in der Verheissung).376

375. cont.

Eschatologisch heisst jenseitig, und also nich diesseitig, für uns noch nicht gültig und bedeutsam, fern von der Wirklichkeit unserer Existenz in Gott aufgehoben, und uns vorenhalten auf irgend einen späteren Aeon. Eschatologie ist nicht Negation, sondern Position. Aber nun allerdings eine höchst bestimmte und charakteristische Position, oder sagen wir: innerhalb des Wortes Gottes und Seiner Wahrheit, ein höchst bestimmtes, von den andern sehr deutlich sich abhebendes Wahrheits - moment, das diese Wahrheit in ganz besonderer Weise als Akt, als Weg, als Führung und eben darum auch unser Verhältnis zu ihr in ganz besonderer Weise als Gehorsam kennzeichnet, Eschatologisch heisst nämlich vor allem: 'Letztlich', also abschliessend, definitiv, unüberbietbar...Aber nun ist dieses 'Letztlich' nur die eine Seite des Begriffes 'eschatologisch'. Die andere besteht darin, dass eschatologische Wahrheit, Wahrheit is als Zukunft in der Gegenwart, als Wahrheit, die so vor uns liegt, wie wir die Wahrheit unserer Geschöpflichkeit hinter uns haben, als Wahrheit, die auf uns zukommt. Nicht bloß uns gegenübertritt, wie wir es von dem Worte Gottes als Wort von der Versöhnung sagen müssen, sondern eben aufuns zukommt."

376. *Ethik* 239
As heirs an indirect "having" and "being" is involved so that in the double sense of the final (Letztlichen) and of the coming (kommenden) we are children of God, and thus so in the eschatological sense.  

We are not therefore children of God Eternal in ourselves, but only in Jesus Christ for it is decidedly not God's essence and nature to be our Father nor man's being and nature to be God's child.  

We cannot claim or lay hold of this reality - such would make everything but Fata Morgana - but rather we aim for it as "our reality that is still outstanding, future, and only so far present as we have the Word and are hearers of the Word by its coming ever and again to us."  

It is our reality beyond the whole gulf between Creator and creature, beyond the abyss separating the Holy One from sinners as it is participation in His nature which creates us as a new creation.  

The reality of death is the double limitation in which we exist, as an ordinance of nature and as wages of sin, so that even in the Kingdom of Christ we exist under its shadow and judgment. By giving us His Word, God proclaims Himself ratione creationis as our Redeemer, giving us a share in the freedom from death, so that our limited temporal life is not bounded at the beginning by God and at the end by death, but at the beginning and at the end by God, and therefore "to that extent in man's whole temporality, eternity is his portion."  

Our future is not then a smaller or created thing but God Himself, and therefore our final, absolute and unconditional future (unsere endgültige, absolute unbedingte Zukunft), not any future but our truely genuine future which is present every moment because the Redeemer Himself - His parousia - is now no longer as the Word

---
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that is the beginning of all things, no longer as the Word by which we are kept above the abyss of our lost condition, but as the Word by which God draws us to Himself.

"We are the children of God, we have our 'citizenship in heaven' in the Jerusalem which is above, as truly as the fact that we must die. In place of this latter truth comes the former. Where we see death approaching, there comes the Lord, comes the Kingdom of God, comes the perfect. To this future of ours we are responsible."

Ethics cannot be confined to the command of life and the command of law on the one hand, nor to the command of promise on the other. The first mistake is made by rationalism whereas the second by mysticism and fanaticism. Rather, the three are joined together in "prayer" in which we enter into as more than creatures, more than pardoned sinners for "prayer is in fact the actualizing, made possible here and now, of our eschatological reality" (Das Gebet ist geradezu die jetzt und hier mögliche Realisierung unserer eschatologischen Wirklichkeit). Here we understand ourselves as the I that is coming towards us, as living in Christ, and Paul's sentences in Rom. 8:26f apply for the Holy Spirit intercedes for us who do not know how we should pray. More then than the claim of life, and the claim of our fellow men, is the Divine claim which finds in prayer its component, and in which man acts as entheos - i.e. "as one belonging to God, as one who has in God his home, his father's house."

Barth asked, Could not true obedience in the creation-command and recon-
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ciliation-command spheres be dependent upon prayer in this redemption-
command sphere, and thus of necessity be simultaneous? 

"When we are asked about the relation of our activity
to the potentiality of prayer, we are asked whether it
has that intrinsic quality of openness which must be
peculiar to it as obedience to God, as real walking
before Him. It is a matter of openness towards the goal,
towards the coming state of perfection. An activity
directed merely by the concepts of life and law, not
governed by the promise, must obviously be shut off in
front, an activity that has so to speak handed in its
resignation."  

Luther's "confident despair" must not be our last word, for this
character of openness means hope is the last word, which in concrete terms
means the waiting and hastening towards the future of the Lord.

Whereas naturalistic and idealistic moral philosophers begin with
the concept of conscience, in Earth's theological ethics it comes in for
consideration at the end.  

This is because he was interested in the
eschatological purpose of the one whole command of God in which one finds
the reality of the conscience given in the reality of our eternal future
that is thrust into our present. This he considered as the future of the
Lord, who, in bringing Himself to us, brings our own future. Thus the
conscience exists in the concrete fellowship with God and is identified
with the Holy Spirit. 

387. Ethik 249
388. Ibid. 249f: "Wir sind, wenn nach dem Verhältnis unseres Handelns zu
der Möglichkeit des Gebetes gefragt ist, danach gefragt, ob ihm die
jenige Offenheit eigen ist, die ihm als Gehorsam gegen Gott, als
wirkliches Handeln vor Ihm eigen sein muss. Um die Offenheit gegen
das Ziel, gegen das kommende Vollkommene Rin geht es. Ein Handeln,
das bloss an den Begriffen des Lebens und des Gesetzes orientiert,
das nicht ein unter die Verheissung gestelltes Handeln wäre, müsste
offenbar ein nach vorne verschlossenes, ein gleichsam resignierendes
Handeln sein."
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To have a conscience means then to reach out beyond our creatureliness, beyond our reconciliation also, as we do in prayer. As entheoi, we are our own judges, a witness and a prefiguring of the judgment, for we say to ourselves nothing other than what is said to us.

This is the last aspect of man's reality: illuminante et dictante spiritu - his own opposite number - to which he can reach out only in prayer. We thus have the voice of conscience that proclaims the Word of God to us, just as we have the coming Christ, that is, the Holy Spirit who is His representative, the pledge and earnest of the promise given to us here and now, in which the future can yet be the present only in the future. In prayer we expect of God - for "veni creator spiritus" is not for nothing the prayer that includes all prayers - that He may not only look upon us merely as His creatures and His pardoned sinners, but may grant us the reality of Spirit-men, may let us be our own opposite number that is approaching us in Christ.

Thus a man's conscience is considered in his relation to God as His child, and in relation also to the Holy Spirit, the parousia of Christ, and prayer, and so precisely in its eschatological connotation, and thus is different from naturalistic or idealistic moral subjectivity. What keeps us from considering the conscience as a subjective principle, or from playing the role of Hercules at the cross-roads, is the eschatological character of this concept, for it is only illuminante et dictante spiritu sancto, only in the prayer veni creator spiritus that we have a conscience at all.

In the conscience our own voice is God's voice, precisely in its eschatological sense. It is not my fellow man that confronts me, but my other self. I judge myself. I command myself.
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Not in the anthropological way of R. Zeeberg but as *con-scientia, suneidesis*, as co-knowledge with God.\(^{395}\) It is important to mark the extraordinary division of the self in that complete antithesis of my conditionally given and my objectively not-given I.

"Schleiermacher and his whole school would have been right in their assumption of a God-consciousness if they had not overlooked its non-presence, its pure futurity, and if they had not described it precisely as conscience, that is, as the Word of God both innate and entrusted to human self-consciousness."\(^{396}\)

It can be said that "I myself am God", as we are children of God, partakers of the divine nature, having co-knowledge with God, and yet only present, of course, as our own future. It must not be forgotten that the conscience is therefore not a *virtus operandi*, but a *virtus judicandi*, confronting me with a decision to obey or disobey. What I say to myself as a child of God, I hear as a pardoned sinner, in the total dialectic of my existence as such. It is indeed out of my future that I say it to myself into my present. The conscience condemns me – not as any sentence – but as a final sentence, as one sentenced to death. It is my other self coming to me as the voice of conscience that has this final authority, and is therefore my I on an entirely different plane, for it has freedom\(^{397}\) for it does not err whereas my present I is merely *peccator justus*\(^{398}\).

"Freedom in the fullest sense, as sovereign divine freedom, can surely be ascribed neither to man as God's creature nor to man as pardoned sinner, but solely to man as child of God partaking of the divine nature, at the very point where we understand man to be standing as

---
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God's creature in a definite calling and at the very point where man as pardoned sinner was placed under authority. Conscience is in short the freedom of man, in so far as he decides unconditionally concerning himself in the decree of his conscience." 399

When we call men free, we mean of course that pure future of his in his present. "His pure future, however, is his redemption. Redemption means precisely liberation, liberation from the limitations within which here and now we belong to God as His creatures, His pardoned sinners." 400 Redeemed man (or his future I) has authority and freedom which are not dialectical in God, so that his obedience to his own authority as God's authority is perfect freedom. He cannot be subject to any outside authority, for there can be no command of God for us as God's children that is not our own command, no authority that we do not ourselves exercise. It is the conscience that is the final authority, the last criterion, in the problem of obedience, 401 that speaking "I" which is altogether different from my hearing "I", for with the ears of the present we hear the voice of the future. 402 This, Barth noted, is in complete distinction to that "insane autonomism that has become so characteristic of the modern as well as the Catholic consciousness, both de-eschatologized but in differing senses."

The command of life (creation) and of the law (reconciliation) both come from the voice of conscience (redemption) as the conscience is not merely relegated to the ordinances of nature on the one hand or to the

399. Ethik 259: "Freiheit im Vollsinne als souveräne göttliche Freiheit kann man doch weder dem Menschen als Gottes Geschöpf noch dem Menschen als begnadigtem Sünden, sondern allein dem Menschen als dem der göttlichen Natur teilhaftigen Kinde Gottes zuschreiben, genau an der Stelle wo wir den Menschen als Gottes Geschöpf als in einem bestimmmt Beruf stehend, und genau an der Stelle wo wir den Menschen als begnadigten Sünden als unter die Autorität gestellt verstanden haben. Das Gewissen is geradezu die Freiheit des Menschen, sofern er im Spruch seines Gewissens eben unbedingt über sich selbst entscheidet."
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The special thing that the conscience holds before us is the command of God the Redeemer, the command of promise. In this conscience I hear my own voice as that of the redeemed child of God, and for that reason it is in its very essence the challenge to me to stretch out towards that which lies before me, to the approaching eternal home. Thus conscience is "the message, living in the present of the coming kingdom of God," and hence its absoluteness which brings disquiet into the present - into both our natural existence, and our Christian life. The conscience proclaims the relativity of all that is present by drawing us towards the kingdom, it detaches us from this world, and thus is finally a "revolutionary principle". This is understood by the "waiting and hastening" (Blumhardt's phrase).

"Wait! How so? Because the conscience announces to him his future in God, because it challenges him to seek it entirely in God, and to await it from God. This is the measure of his doing and his not-doing: whether he is really awaiting his future from God. Not from the natural course of things, not from the State and not from the Church, be they the best that ever were, also not from himself, though he were capable of the mightiest and most successful endeavours. Solely and entirely from God, who will make His Word come true to those who believe Him...

Hasten! How so? Because the conscience announces to him his future in God and thus challenges him to seek in God his future, to await actually everything from God, - therefore not to be satisfied with the res sic stantes. Therefore to build oneself booths neither in the kingdom of nature nor in that of grace, as if to abide here, but rather to set out, to become a wanderer and stranger, and to go bravely within the sphere of those kingdoms to meet the coming kingdom of glory."
Wait! and Hasten! are thus not contradictory commands, as one awaits his future from God and from God one's future. It is the revolutionary voice of conscience, the voice of hope, that directs both beyond the res sic stantes in regno naturae et gratiae. The conscience admonishes against all hasty impatience, all outbreaks of longing for the absolute, which can appear in the present, but cannot become the present because it is the eternally future. Now I am commanded to learn "to taste the power of the future world" (die Kraft der zukünftigen Welt schmecken) to accustom myself to the atmosphere of the redemption concealed in the future, "to be at home in advance in my home" (um in der Heimat zum voraus heimisch zu werden). We must practice the "experience of the coming Redeemer" (Erfahrung des kommenden Erlösers) in which He ever remains still the "coming Redeemer", which is built up (gemacht) in watching and prayer as does the Eastern Church in its questioning of the present world-structure before the "absolute wonder of the future-present resurrected Christ."

A "ready activity" (bereites Tun) is demanded of us, a yearning for redemption, the dissatisfaction with self, the questioning of our present from the viewpoint of our future. The loss of balance between semper justus and semper peccator must gain substance. Now we must breathe in the atmosphere of the redemption hidden in the future, now we must act in

405. cont.

selbst, und wenn er der gewaltigsten und erfolgreichsten Anstren- gungen fähig wäre. Allein und ganz und gar von Gott, der Sein Wort wahr machen wird an denen, die Ihm glauben...

Eilen! bedeuten. Wieso? Weil ihm das Gewissen in Gott seine Zukunft verkündigt, weil es ihn also auffordert in Gott seine Zukunft zu suchen, nicht nur alles von Gott, sondern von Gott nun wirklich auch alles zu erwarten. Also sich mit den res sic stantes nicht zufrieden zu geben. Also weder im Reich der Natur noch im Reich der Gnade sich Häuten zu bauen, also ob hier eines bleibens wäre, Vielmehr aufzubrechen, ein Wanderer und Fremdling zu werden, und im Bezirk jener Reiche dem kommenden Reich der Herrlichkeit tapfer entgegenzugehen."
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in the experience of the coming Redeemer.

"Now the same conscience that drove us inward drives us irresistibly outward. Now responsibility becomes accountability, for making things happen, not in order to set up the kingdom of God or to force it into appearing, but because, if the kingdom of God is coming, we cannot be idle, because it calls to us to go to meet it, because our waiting cannot take place otherwise than in our doing and hastening." 409

This "action-Christianity" has produced many short circuits, such as in the Papal kingdom of Christ, the old sectarian dream of the millennial kingdom (tausendjährigen Reich), the third kingdom of the Spirit, the Münster affair of the sixteenth century, and mutates mutandis, in original Zwinglianism, Calvinism, the activism of the Jesuit order, the nineteenth century Pietism and Christian or religious socialism. There have been many bad confusions of the kingdom of God with all sorts of more or less majestic world-kingdoms. But, on the other hand, ecstasy is necessary in contrast to Ritschl's stiffness. Are we not perhaps far too much at home in the present, and have listened far too little to the call of the future? 410

The subject of the conscience is primarily God and only secondarily the human "I". It is God striding out of the eternity of the divine will with man into his temporal present. This "eschatological content" or "prophetic possibility" is no cause of boasting for man. Before it the visible man is "hiddenness" (Verborgenheit) in which we possess it, for

"A real and visible triumph of this voice would at any rate mean the end of all things, i.e. the swallowing up

409. Ethik 269: "Nun treibt uns dasselbe Gewissen, das uns nach innen trieb, unaufhaltsam nach aussen. Nun beisst Verantwortlichkeit, Verantwortlichkeit dafür, dass etwas geschieht, nicht um das Reich Gottes zu bauen oder herbeizwinger, aber weil wir, wenn das Reich Gottes kommt, nicht müßig sein können, weil wir von ihm her gerufen sind, ihm entgegenzugehen, weil auch unser Warten nicht anders stattfinden kann als in unserem Tun, in unserm Eilen."
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of the present by the future of the eternal kingdom.
With the signs and wonders of this coming kingdom we
shall always have to reckon with due discretion,
recognizing them for what they are, and not as possi-
blilities that could become reality if only we willed
it so most earnestly and even defiantly." 411

This hiddenness of the conscience is seen in the fact that every man
has conscience only as his own conscience and not as God's truth valid
for all. "This very individuality of the conscience is a sign of its
defencelessness and impotence in the present, and therefore indirectly a
characteristic of its eschatological quality". 412 Another eschatological
characteristic of the conscience is its not being a kind of "organ", but
rather an "event", the event of the Holy Spirit's coming to us, with some-
thing new to tell us every moment so that instead of a treasure of
conscience-dictates, conscientiousness must mean fundamental openness and
willingness to allow oneself to be led by the conscience. Like the manna
in the wilderness it must be collected and not stored. The opposite is
to re-interpret the futurity of the word, to which we owe our origin, into
some more practical and tangible presentness which is always a surrender
of the birthright for a mess of pottage. 413 The eschatological deter-
mination (eschatologischen Bestimmtheit) of the conscience meets us as a
disturbance, a warning, a reproof, calling us to order "by calling us home,
by relating our doing and not-doing to the coming perfection of His
Kingdom" and it comes to us who are "wanderers in a strange and distant
land". 414 Thus the command of the Redeemer strikes home to us in the
conscience and sets our activity in relation to the future Kingdom of God. 415

411. Ethik 272: "Ein wirkliches und sichtbares Triumphieren dieser Stimme
würde jedenfalls das Ende aller Dinge, d.h. das Verschlungenwerden
der Gegenwart durch die Zukunft des ewigen Reiches, bedeuten. Mit
den Zeichen und Wundern dieses kommenden Reiches wird man besonne-
nerweise immer nur als mit solchen, nicht aber als mit solchen
Möglichkeiten rechnen, die sich verwirklichen liessen, wenn wir nur
recht innig oder auch trotzig wollten."
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In the confrontation of God and man there is involved not an initial oneness but a final oneness, for God met us first in "double grace" (doppelten Gnade) as Creator and Reconciler which involved distance, but now as Redeemer even though the distances are "included and dissolved" (but not negated) there is still the last distance between the children and the Father. "And we must remain fully aware that the special confrontation of God and man in this final oneness is not a natural or acquired property of man, but a supreme matter of a divine gift. This unity rests in God, not in us. It is to be sought in God, not to be asserted by us towards God. For this reason it is the final oneness... This lays an obligation upon us. The old Protestantism spoke of an "usus legis tertius, quatenus docendo vitam renatorum regit." The conc. formula refers this tertius usus legis to the "renatis...non quatenus justi sed infirmitati adhuc abnoxii sunt" for it is exclusively for the man living in time here and now, but only so far as he is renatus and partakes of the promise of eternal life, that the command in this last third form comes to him. "When the present is swallowed up in the future, in eternity itself, there will be no more commandments of any sort." Thus in this time before that eternity, God gives us in Christ a share in His own reality in the promise, and in the promise actually gives us a share. Nobody and nothing can tear us out of His hand so that even now in our creatureliness as the peccatores justi we find ourselves to be one with God as children with their father. By this we live. We are not going to live by it only in the future, but here and now we live by the fact that this is promised us in the complete hiddenness of future truth.
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For this we are thankful. It is this grateful response to God's command (Redeemer-command) that makes all orderliness (response to Creator-command) and humility (response to Reconciliation-command) complete and right by going beyond them.

The activity of the creature and pardoned sinner in relation to God's command is unliberated, except that by captivating him for God the Redeemer, the command sets him free. It is the law of liberty.

Most miserable, cried Paul in 1 Cor. 15:19, are we "If in this life only we have hoped in Christ" not wanting to know the eschatological reality of the Christian, the resurrection of the dead. The Redeemer's command brings unfettering (Lösung) but not redemption (Erlösung) for it is the promise of redemption, not redemption itself, but with the promise, liberation. We are and remain in the present infirmitati carnis obnoxii, always as captives, fettered bondsmen with yearning expectation of the sons of God (Rom. 8). Here we are in "extreme tension" (Verkrampfte), and yet in a state of freedom in the midst of the groaning. This freedom does not increase in life till final redemption, for to ignore the difference between them is to risk the gravest disappointments and most dangerous aberrations. "Liberation" in the present is in the context of total insecurity and precursoriness and openness to temptation, and thus not visible and tangible like a constantly burning flame of light but only as a flash of lightning in the dark sky. Such a liberation of the Christian from himself and the present situation as creature is a "politeuma" (Phil. 3:20) or "conversation (walk) in heaven" (Luther), it is the putting off of the old man and the putting on of the new which points to

---
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"my coming 'I', I in Christ, with Him dead, buried and resurrected."

"Therefore I cannot syschematizesthai τοι  ἐν ζωὴν τουτῳ, therefore I am in the process of metamorphosis (Rom. 12:2), and thus there is an obedience which consists in my letting myself be cut loose here and now in the midst of time, in my groaning towards the child of God that I am, and a disobedience that consists in my conferring and re-enforcing myself in my presentness, which is nevertheless condemned to annihilation."

This eschatological outlook which looks in expectation past the passing world of time to the eternal world of the child-Father relationship makes our life here only a game. This is not to detract from the seriousness of God's command which claims and judges us, for one can walk before God in utter seriousness only when one knows that God alone is completely serious. "The necessary distance between God and man does not disappear in the father-child relationship." We shall not pose as grown-up sons and daughters of God gradually moving onto the same level as colleagues. "We are and remain in fact His little babes" (Wir sind und bleiben wirklich Seine Kindlein).

Sub specie aeternitatis since we are partakers of the promise, our activity is thereby characterized as a "preliminary activity" (vorläufiges Tun) preparatory to our real activity as of men living eternally for God's Kingdom. This thing that God wills to do with us, our eternal existing and acting before Him, we cannot in any case anticipate by means of what we are doing here and now. Before God we can only play, and to the end of our days will remain as children, because "that which is perfect

424. Ethik 285: "Also kann ich nicht syschematizesthai τοι  ἐν ζωὴν τουτῳ, also stehe ich in der Metamorphose Röm. 12,2, also gibt es einen Gehorsam darin bestehend, dass ich mich jetzt und hier, mitten in der Zeit löse lasse, dass ich wache, dem kinde Gottes, das ich bin, entgegenwachse, und einen Ungehorsam, der darin besteht, dass ich mich selber in meiner Gegenwärtigkeit, die doch zum Abbruch verurteilt ist, bestätige und bestärke."
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beyond what we are doing is still on its way towards us" (das Vollkommene jenseits dessen was wir tun immer erst im Kommen ist). 426

"Art" and "humour" belong to the eschatological context, as in the strictest sense only the children of God are capable of both. The sudden flashing of real humour in a man is necessarily a manifestation of that one undisposable future in the present. Likewise, art lies neither on the level of man's action as creature, nor on that of man as pardoned sinner, but is related to redemption. Both art and humour are play, a not taking too seriously the situation in this world. Both are related to this world but point beyond to the other world, so that humour is "smiling amidst tears" (those who only in this life hope in Christ cannot laugh) and the artist in his work is "homeless" (Heimatlos) as he erects his signs of the promise (aufgerichtete Zeichen der Verheissung), appealing to man's openness to the last things (Allerletzten). 427 It is only the children of God who know that it doth not yet appear what they shall be, who with the groaning creation suffer the pain of the present, in which the future is present still only as future, and whose transience they cannot overlook. "Only he who knows about the future resurrection of the dead, knows really what it means that we must die." 428 The artist sets himself within the sphere of Isaiah's words (Isa. 65:17), "Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth", not taking the present reality seriously as "all artistic creation is in principle futuristic." There is, then, an "eschatological potentiality" (eschatologische Möglichkeit) in poetry, song, instrumental music, novels, drama, painting and in sculpture, 429 which become signs that point beyond the present. 430 The word
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and command of God demand art, as surely as we are confronted with the word of the new heavens and the new earth. Art thus is and remains play, with the great danger that the whole aesthetic potentiality of her character be the last and boldest peaks of human activity alleging to establish heaven on earth. Humour arises from our perception of the contradiction between our existence as children of God and as children of this aeon. It is the concrete realization of Romans 8:18, 'I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us.' It is "holding to the better" when realizing that "we can in fact not change the future into the present nor the present into the future." It does not take the present seriously, but endures it knowing that it already bears the future in itself. Genuine humour is eschatologically orientated, laughing at the passing riddles of existence because it knows what the ultimate situation is, despite the contrary aspect of the present reality.

"Hope is the reaching out of our thinking and willing beyond the present to the coming perfection. In hoping we are citizens of the future world amidst the present." It is a very prayerful seeking in God of our own futurity and of the goodness of our activity that is included in it and which will be considered before the judgement seat of Christ. Like faith and love, hope also bridges the distance between God and man without removing it: indeed "it affirms it all the more by giving God and not man the glory. Therefore what is done in hope is well done, because

---

431. Ethik 293; "Humor entsteht dadurch, dass der Widerspruch unserer Existenz als Kinder Gottes und als Kinder dieses Aeons eingesehen..."
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hope stretches out towards the good, the sole good of God." Thereby faith, love and hope "with and in one another are the obedience demanded of us". But while faith does this in awe, and love in fervent necessity, hope does it in the blissful realization already secretly there (in der heimlich schon gegenwärtigen Seligkeit, die da weiss). Thus the hoping man lives here only as in a tent (Zelte) that must and will be destroyed, whereas his house (Haus) is the one built by God in heaven, for which he cannot cease to long. We can hope only in God and by means of God Himself, and thus altogether hope for the sake of the thing hoped for." Hope, like faith and love, rests in the Word spoken to us which is the Word of the Holy Spirit, Himself, the pledge given us by God, the Paraclete in a present age in which our main concern is to be sure of the coming Lord." Paradoxically, we can have this certainty only to the extent that we let God be certain in our own uncertainty.

Having briefly presented in context the salient points of this eschatological section of the Ethik, we now come to focus on the category of the "coming" and the "future in the present". The Kingdom of God is coming at which time God will make all things new. This is the coming perfected state. Christ is called the "coming Christ", "coming Lord", and "coming Redeemer". Thus as children of God in Jesus Christ we have a final "coming being", our future which is coming to
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meet us. Although there still was for Barth a tension between the eternal future and the temporal present, with the future being unable to change into the present or the present into the future, he looked to a time when the present will be "swallowed up" in the future. In the interim, during the time "between the times" he not only presented a tension between present liberation and future redemption pointing to a metamorphosis process, but went on to stress that we already have that redemption now - in the promise - we are now heirs. Thus we are what we shall be, we are this future man so that the "Be what thou art" applies not only to the creaturely and reconciled spheres, but also to the eschatological reality of redemption. The God-child relationship is thus the undisposable future of man in the present (die unverfügbare Zukunft des Menschen in der Gegenwart) which is manifested in humour and art as God's future is projecting itself into the present. So the present already bears the future in itself and we live already on God's side triumphing over the contradictions and limitations of our existence, for in this temporal life we share in God's eternal reality. Because the eternal is the eternal future, it can really be present so therefore the conscience is in reality the voice of the eternal future in the temporal present, entering the dialectic of our present existence and asserting its divine, future character. Thus it is a call from the Father's house into this present strange and distant land.
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the voice of our future "I" speaking in the present, is the other coming now into the present from afar off. In this way the eternal future is thrusting into the present, and is the future of the Lord which we have now in the Holy Spirit in Christ. Man is therefore free, in the pure futurity of his in the present, liberated from the whole present situation to a conversation (walk) in heaven, so that amidst the seriousness of the present his actions are but eschatological play.

Not only, then, did Barth present the "coming" emphasis in this Ethik (as noted before in other writings) but stressed that the human "I" in its future reality is now striding out of the eternity of the divine will with man into his temporal present, and that the resurrected Christ is not only future but also present.

8. This Old World under Crisis

Barth's early theology became known as "Crisis" theology. This is because in his stress on the great gulf between the new strange eternal world and the old known temporal world he wrote about the crisis relationship between the two. This again was in opposition to liberal theology which thought it had God on easy terms, thought that Jesus Christ was only another man, and thought that it was bringing in the Kingdom through its own natural, religious or cultural development. Against this false optimism Barth raised a decided "No". Thus, in his early writings it is used in a past, present and future context. Thus, the world is bent under
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judgment which comes verticle from above, with the sword of judgment hanging over men's heads. It is in the transcendence of the judgment and righteousness of God where lies His most genuine immanence. There are several references to a final judgment (letsten Gerichtes) in which we shall all stand before the judgment-seat (wir Alle vor dem Richterstuhl Gottes) and because this Futurum aeternum is the critical truth of our being and existence it follows that we are now standing before it. Although present and future, more important, the judgment has already taken place for Christ set Himself wholly under it.

9. "Timeless Eschatology" and Barth's Early Christology

The one repeated motif which links the various parts of this chapter is Barth's emphasis on the great gulf between the new strange eternal world and the old known temporal world. It is this infinite qualitative distinction between eternity and time, God and man, which was behind his
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480. Ibid. 97. The background over-against which Barth wrote about the judgment was the Ritschlian concept of value-judgments as man's prerogative. Barth's stress on "let God be God" and "man be man", i.e. on the great gulf between God's world above and man's world below, led him to totally reject Ritschl's value-judgments. Hence Barth said, God judges and He alone (R 63, 69f). Who then can share His judgment? (484, Cf. 55) To try to, is to usurp His place (57), for who is the Lord?, who hath power to exalt and to cast down, man or God? (510) Only God can truly judge as His standard is righteousness from outside, justia forensis, justia aliena, according to His own righteousness, and hence His verdict is creative, as He pronounces us enemies to be His friends (93). Moreover, Christ as the new man that I am not, as my existential "I", is invisible to human judgments. Therefore man is not only incapable of value-judgments because not God, but likewise unable because the observable things and people of this world are only parables of the unobservable reality of the new man in Christ (464).
"timeless eschatology" of this pre-Dogmatic period. It is called "timeless" because of its removal above and beyond time, as we have noted. But what relation does this have to his Christology in this early period? It also was removed somewhat above this world, for in 1916 we read:

"In Christ he caused his word to be made flesh... He hath caused eternity to dawn in place of time, or rather upon time - for what sort of eternity were it which should begin 'afterwards'? He purposed naught but the establishment of a new world." 481

Here the incarnation is only tangentially related to this world, for the eternal God (who admittedly is said to have become flesh) is nevertheless spoken of as dawning upon time rather than in time. Thus the incarnation is thought of in a "timeless" relation to this world. Here the radical separation of the eternal God from temporal man is still, to some extent at least, present in the coming of God to be man.

In his Römerbrief, five years later, Barth wrote,

"If Christianity be not altogether thoroughgoing eschatology, there remains in it no relationship whatever with Christ." 482

Here Barth was concentrating upon an eschatological Christianity, rather than upon a christological eschatology. His burden remained the infinite qualitative distinction between eternity and time which removed Christ from time, and hence the incarnation was not in time, but above time, and the parousia will not be in time, but beyond time.

In revolt against uneschatological immanentism, Barth presented a Christianity that is wholly utterly and irreducibly eschatology, rejecting an eternity of God reduced to the mere temporal religious experience of the individual, replacing it by the pure and absolute futurity of God, based upon the radical separation of eternity and time. But in rightly
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trying to overcome this one-sided understanding, he unwittingly fell into an equally incorrect one-sided presentation. For, whereas immanen-
tism only stressed one aspect of God's eternity, not taking seriously His pre-temporality and post-temporality, Barth also emphasized only one aspect, not giving proper attention to God's pre-temporality and supratemporality. Moreover, this post-temporal emphasis concerned the coming day which was considered as a moment which confronts all moments in time, and is thus the eternal transcendental meaning of all moments in time. Thus, this "timeless eschatology" related as it was to the continual crisis of timeless events, concentrated only on the far-sidedness of the coming Kingdom of God which dismissed the parousia from history. Therefore Barth's emphasis upon the great gulf was too one-sided, as he seemingly overlooked the fact that this gulf had been bridged in Jesus Christ, thus bringing Eternity into time, giving hope of a future parousia in time. Our concern is that the humanity of Jesus Christ was not taken as seriously as it should have been in Barth's early theology, for if His becoming man had been determinative for his eschatology, then Eternity would have entered time, and the parousia would have been present as a future event in time to bring all time to an end.

It would be wrong, however, to give the impression that Barth did not write about the incarnation as in time. He stated,

"God stands in contrast to man as the impossible in contrast to the possible, as death in contrast to life, as eternity in contrast to time. The solution of the riddle (i.e. of man)...is the absolutely new event whereby the impossible becomes of itself possible, death becomes life, eternity time, and God man."

Again, in Jesus Christ "God has entered into our world" (Gottes in unsere Welt hineingetreten). He occupies a position in time (in der Zeit)
and in history (in die Geschichte) in that He has "completely
dissociated" as well as "united" time and eternity in Himself. Barth
clearly said that,

"God sends Him - into this temporal, fallen world with
which we are only too familiar; into this order which we
can finally interpret only in biological categories, and
which we call 'Nature'; into this order which we can
finally interpret only from the point of view of economic
materialism, and which we call 'History'; in fact, into
this humanity and into this flesh." 

God really did become man and took our misery upon Himself. It
follows that Barth could say that the theme of theology is not man becom-
ing God but God becoming man. Thus, "in Christ as the Son of man all
things, the heavenly and the earthly, are comprehended." Already by
1923 he could therefore say,

"We may, we must address ourselves to it, and not in a
haphazard, but in our specifically Reformed fashion;
and some day, if the old discernment becomes new in us,
we may reestablish for ourselves a theology of the second
article, which today is sadly lacking." 

What we wish to submit is that, inspite of this evidence of a genuine
Christology, of a genuine entrance of eternity into time, nevertheless
this very Christology did not become determinative for Barth's early
eschatology as it did in his later Dogmatic eschatology. The YES of
Christology was somewhat in the background behind the NO of the infinite
qualitative distinction between God and man. Barth launched his attack
with this Kierkegaardian dictum to topple Liberal optimism in man, but
the Gospel was never far behind even though it did not have the deter-
minative influence on the attack that it came (at least to some degree)
to have in later years. As this Gospel YES is directly related to
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Christology, we now come to note its presence.

Thus, although in the Römerbrief the No of God’s judgment is stressed more than the Yes of His mercy, although the Holy Spirit may seem more the Dis-Comforter than the Comforter, and although there is a lack of God’s love recorded, the Gospel, even though at times in the background, is still there, for it also holds for the Römerbrief (and other writings) that

"The Yes cannot be heard unless the No is also heard. But the No is said for the sake of the Yes and not for its own sake. In substance, therefore, the first and last word is Yes and not No." 497

So we find in the Römerbrief that the Holy Spirit is not only concerned
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496. E.g., in his sermons from 1920-24, the positive nature of Barth’s thinking during and just after the time of writing his second Römerbrief is seen. (Note following quotes from CHS.) Thus, not only do we find comfort (66), assurance (89), a call to fear not (137) with Christ bringing not an end but a new beginning, not judgment but overflowing grace, and thus Christ for us and not against us (144) in these sermons, but also one is devoted to the positive theme, "Come unto Me" (67-79), and another to "Be not anxious" (90-100). Repeatedly the "No" and the "Yes" of God are found together (23, 56, 70, 77, 119, 134, 260, 262, 272, 274, 277). These passages throw further light on the purpose of Barth’s negative emphasis in his Römerbrief, for the "No" was shown to be for the sake of the "Yes" linked to the light as a shadow (51f), just as the cross must be found together with the resurrection (70). Barth maintained that if we have never fled from God, we cannot flee unto Him (27), if the church cannot say "No" then it cannot say "Yes" (70) for the mercifulness of Jesus is in His apparent unmercifulness (108), for his forgiveness comes as an attack - a "redeeming attack" (71, 74). By way of the "Nay" we arrive at the "Yes" (263) just as Christ crucified meant to Paul a thrust through the most fearful "Nay" to a most glorious "Yes" (277). For us the "Yes" means resurrection, victory, life, reconciliation, God’s glory and power, and the Kingdom (134). It means the inward man beyond the world, whereas the "No" is related to the outward man of this world. Together with His emphasis on "God with us" in Christ, we find a very definite positive character in Barth’s thinking, which is identified with eschatology, in the new creation in Christ’s resurrection (186f, 189) and our new man above (111, 260), so that although there is the "frightful distance" which separates God from man, this very realization is when He is near, for only a "thin wall" is standing between God’s grace and man (285).

497. CD 2/2, 13
with judgment, but also with "consolation" (Trösteramt)\(^{498}\) in sending "comfort" (Trost).\(^{499}\) Re-reading the Römerbrief after going through the Church Dogmatics this writer is convinced that the "Yes" of the latter is quite evident in the former. Thus the eternal decree, the bodily resurrection, of Christ and mankind, the cosmic renewal, and many aspects of his later Christology are to be found. Concerning Christology we find Christ is not only the new man, but also the Kingdom, is the Krisis,\(^{500}\) the Judge, the end of all history (Ende der Zeit)\(^{501}\) for in Him is finished both the world and the Church.\(^{502}\) He is the history of salvation (heilsgeschichte)\(^{503}\) having brought the dawn of a New Day in his resurrection.\(^{504}\) In 1920, Barth identified this resurrection with Christ's second coming,\(^{505}\) an insight which he was to develop in his \textit{munus propheticum}, particularly in KD 4/3 some thirty-nine years later.\(^{506}\) In the same article he called the Holy Spirit the Redeemer,\(^{507}\) and it was his plan to present his eschatology in KD 5 under the Holy Spirit as the Redeemer. Together these evidences show a presence of Barth's later Christology in his earlier writing, even though the overwhelming emphasis on the "No" of God's judgment on men, His distance from this world (Ganz Anderer) removed the "Yes" of His love, of His incarnation into time, into the background. It was this one-sided emphasis which produced his "Timeless eschatology" as before noted, and thus the humanity of Christ (as eternity in time) was not given the determinative place that it should have had in his early thought.
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10. Berth's "Timeless Eschatology" compared with Schweitzer's "Thorough-going Eschatology"

In opposition to the Tübingen school and the modern school of Ritschl as especially presented by A. von Harnack, F. Overbeck, who influenced Berth in his second Römerbrief, was the first to adopt the position that the whole of primitive Christianity was chiefly concerned with the end of all things. This view was taken up by the emerging religious historical movement, and especially by Johannes Weiss,\(^508\) and finally and perhaps most thoroughly by Albert Schweitzer in his Von Reimar zu Wrede, 1906.\(^509\) Whereas liberal thought had concentrated only on God's presence or super-temporality, this pure eschatological thinking emphasized God's future or post-temporality, having this much in common with Berth's Römerbrief. In this section we will briefly note Schweitzer's mistake because of his Christology. This is further evidence of the importance of the hidden "Yes" behind the "No" of Berth's earlier thinking, as we shall see. First we come to consider Schweitzer's thesis.

With F. Ghillany\(^510\) and J. Weiss, Schweitzer considered the relationship between the Kingdom of God teaching of Jesus and prophetic, apocalyptic Judaism to be essential.\(^511\) Rather than beginning with the teachings of Jesus, as for example, Weiss did, Schweitzer examined the whole course of Jesus' life.\(^512\) He did this through his understanding of Matt. 10:23, in which Jesus promised that the Kingdom would come before the disciples had returned from their mission to Israel's cities. Although Colani, in 1864, had rejected this prediction as impossible, and hence

\(^{508}\) In Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes, 1892 (quoted in CD 2/1, 636).
\(^{509}\) Barth comments on this development in CD 2/1, 636f.
\(^{510}\) ZHJ 166f
\(^{511}\) Ibid. 365f
\(^{512}\) Ibid. 256
placed it among the sayings put into the mouth of Jesus,\textsuperscript{513} and, although in 1892, Bousset considered it as an obscure and unintelligible tradition,\textsuperscript{514} Schweitzer considered it to be the first failure of the parousia because the disciples returned without the Kingdom's advent.\textsuperscript{515}

According to Schweitzer, Jesus then reasoned that the faithful would not need to go through the pre-parousia great tribulation, if as in Isaiah \textsuperscript{53} He would voluntarily suffer and die for them to usher in the Kingdom.\textsuperscript{516}

This first failure closed the former period of Jesus' activity,\textsuperscript{517} giving it new direction otherwise inexplicable.\textsuperscript{518} Reminiscent of Ghillany's Jesus compelling divine intervention by his death (1864)\textsuperscript{519} and K. Hase's Jesus dying in order to return on the clouds of heaven,\textsuperscript{520} Schweitzer pictures Jesus taking the same initiative in a statement which E. N. Mozley considered as "one of the greatest passages in world literature."\textsuperscript{521}

"The Baptist appears, and cries: 'Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.' Soon after that comes Jesus, and in the knowledge that He is the coming Son of Man lays hold of the wheel of the world to get it moving on that last revolution which is to bring all ordinary history to a close. It refuses to turn, and He throws Himself upon it. Then it does turn; and crushes Him. Instead of bringing in the eschatological conditions, He has destroyed them. The wheel rolls onward, and the mangled body of the one immeasurably great Man, who was strong enough to think Himself as the spiritual ruler of mankind and to bend history to His purpose, is hanging upon it still. That is His victory and His reign."\textsuperscript{522}

For the second time Jesus supposedly miscalculated the time of the

\textsuperscript{513.} QHJ 224  \hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{516.} Ibid. ix
\textsuperscript{514.} Ibid. 264  \hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{517.} Ibid. 357
\textsuperscript{515.} Ibid. 358
\textsuperscript{518.} Ibid. 358. In 1829 Hase was the first to divide the life of Jesus into two different periods, followed by Holtsmann, Keim, and this prevailed down to J. Weiss (92).
\textsuperscript{519.} Ibid. 168
\textsuperscript{520.} Ibid. 215. Strauss also pictures Jesus looking for Divine intervention - 1835 (92).
\textsuperscript{521.} ThS 18 It is one of the most tragic devaluations of the cross.
\textsuperscript{522.} QHJ 368f
Kingdom's entrance and therefore died a deluded man. The result to
eschatology, in Schweitzer's opinion, was as follows,

"The tragedy does not consist in the modification of
primitive Christianity by eschatology, but in the fate
of eschatology itself, which has preserved for us all
that is most precious in Jesus, but must itself wither,
because He died upon the cross with a loud cry, despairing
in the new heaven and the new earth - that is the
real tragedy." 523

It is overs against this background that we can compare the con-
tribution of Barth's "timeless eschatology", noting its positive gains over
the eschatological interest roused by Schweitzer in 1906, some fifteen
years before Barth's Römerbrief. Both books were referred to as bombs
falling into the theological world. 524 Schweitzer forced the world of
New Testament scholarship to consider the problem of the Kingdom of God
in the teaching of Jesus Christ (N. Perrin), 525 and deserves the merit of
drawing attention to the fact that Jesus and early Christianity expected
the appearance of the Messiah in glory and the consequent end of this
world in the very near future (E. Brunner). 526 This discovery of the cen-
tral significance of eschatology was one of the most important events in
recent Protestant theology (J. Moltmann), 527 marking a turning point in
Biblical criticism (G. E. Ladd), 528 and bringing an era to an end (C. F.
Henry); 529 and Barth's commentary marks the great turning-point in the
modern understanding of eschatology after Schweitzer (T. F. Torrance), 530
with its rediscovery of the eschatological nature of the Kingdom of God
(J. P. Martin). 531

523. QHJ 254
524. Dr. Micklem, principal of Mansfield College, Oxford, spoke of Von
Reimarus as an "explosion of a vast bomb in the theological world"
(statement given to Col. E. N. Mozley and recorded in his book,
TS 9). Karl Adam spoke of the Römerbrief as falling on the play-
ground of the theologians (DTK 276f).
525. KTJ 28 526. BH 127 527. TH 37 528. JK 4 529. Jesus, 26
530. KBT 78 531. LJPT 208
Eleven. Evaluation

Over-against the counter emphases of Liberal theology, Schweitzer contended that the New Testament is eschatological from end to end, but his unfortunate understanding of its basis in Jewish apocalyptic caused him to reject eschatology on the grounds that the Messianic Kingdom did and has not come. He failed to realize that the Gospels present more than a totally future accent, more than the Messiahship and Kingdom as purely eschatological, with the resurrection of the Son of Man only projected to the parousia. By contrast, Barth considered Jesus Christ as the Kingdom, and took very seriously His bodily resurrection as an accomplished fact. To Schweitzer the cross stands for the last desperate effort of a deluded man, but for Barth, "only through the resurrection of Christ is meaning assigned to the cross." Whereas Schweitzer considered predestination only for the elect (eschatologisch-prädestinationische Vorstellung), with the chosen in process of winning their salvation from God as a part of the "Interimsethik", Barth understood election of all in Jesus Christ and ethics as man's relation to the One in the other, as salvation was already fully realized in Him. Whereas Schweitzer rejected the two natures of Jesus Christ, Barth saw the Divine Son of God as also the "New Man". However, whereas the Jesus of Schweitzer was too human (deluded man), the Christ of Barth was too divine (eternity not entered time). Finally, whereas for Schweitzer there were two failures on the part of Jesus to bring in the Kingdom of God in history, for Barth there was to be no goal in time so that his "timeless eschatology" can be

532. QHJ 247, 283f. Cf. 342 - "Zukunftstheologie"
533. Ibid. 344f, 364.
535. Ibid. 513
536. QHJ 388, 352f.
537. Ibid. 352, 364
538. R 301
539. QHJ 2ff, 17f, 342, 380.
considered as the logical "full circle" of Schweitzer's *Konsequente Eschatologie*.\(^{540}\)

The chief difference between Schweitzer's rejection of eschatology and Barth's emphasis upon its removal from time lay in Barth's Christology. In other words, although it was one-sided in not giving full credit to the fact that Eternity became time, that God became man, it at least understood the Divine origin and nature of Christ which saved his thinking from rejecting eschatology. If Schweitzer reminded the theological world of eschatology, then it was but of passing effect, for in the end it is perhaps fair to say that the *Römerbrief* was only able to burst with the same bomb-like force in the theological world as Schweitzer's *Von Reimarus zu Wrede* as the call of eschatology was again just as necessary. As E. Käsemann has said, "Barth's Epistle to the Romans brought 'thoroughgoing eschatology' back out of its existence among the shades and made it into the keynote of New Testament interpretation in Germany..."\(^{541}\) Schweitzer's eschatology was completely set loose from a true Christology so that he ended up rejecting eschatology. By contrast, Barth's eschatology was anchored into one side of Christology (i.e. in the strange new eternal world beyond time) and hence had a firmer christological basis. It desperately needed to become anchored into the other pole of Christology, i.e. into the humanity of Christ, but this was to be finally attempted in the launching of his *Kirchliche Dogmatik*. However, the road from the *Römerbrief* (1921) to the *Kirchliche Dogmatik* (1932) was not a sudden jump, but a gradual one, a development of his Christology in which

---

\(^{540}\) KBI79. It was in his KD that Barth, in ten different places, fully answered the errors and questions of the "Leben-Jesus Forschung" in general and of "Konsequente Eschatologie" in particular, which we will note in a later chapter. (CD 1/2, 64, 99, 493f; 3/2, 473, 497-500, 509f; 4/2, 102f; 4/3, 295, 324, 683f) See Chapter 7.

\(^{541}\) NTQ 109f
from these pre-Dogmatic sources there is evidence of theologia viatorum. To this we now come.

12. Evidence of Theologia Viatorum (as change in emphasis) in the
"Timeless Eschatology"

As has been discussed, the 1921 Römerbrief emphasized the radical dichotomy between eternity and time, removing the parousia beyond time. This would seem to be the same position in the 1924 Auferstehung der Toten where the eschatological "then" is "the beyond of all time", the resurrection is thus "beyond" and the end of history (Endgeschichte) and pre-history (Urgeschichte) are synonymous and limit all time and every time, and salvation history (Heilsgeschichte) is said to be not enacted in time, but between eternity and time, making creation, Christ's resurrection and the end but one day. Thus, "Of the real end of history it may be said at any time: the end is near!" Nevertheless, in his final paragraph Barth said,

"The tension in which the thoughts of Paul moved is unprecedented. I do not think I have exagerated it: I fear rather the contrary. It is not tension of a successive order, but tension of an intertwining character."

This is perhaps why T. F. Torrance could say that there is in this book the beginnings of a change from the eternity-time dialectic to a new-old tension. In coming to the 1928 Ethik this change of emphasis is very

542. RD 76
543. Ibid. 122
544. Ibid. 110
547. Ibid. 222. The presupposition behind this would seem to be the resurrection of Christ and its relation to the final resurrection (113) which is spoken of as "the eternity of time" (114). Barth's point is that denial of the future resurrection by the Corinthians was already negated by the reality of Christ's resurrection (119). We freely admit, however, that it is difficult to see much difference between R and RD as both are so dialectical.
marked for now the stress is upon the Eternal future already in the temporal present in the promise.\textsuperscript{549} Here the radical dichotomy between Eternity and time with its \textit{totaliter aliter} emphasis has seemingly become a truer eschatological tension between them with Eternity already present in time. Thus Barth's definition of eschatology in the \textit{Ethik} had now become that which embraces the "other-worldly" and "the future in the present"\textsuperscript{550} which shows the distance he had come in the seven years since his \textit{Römerbrief} which defined it solely in terms of the first transcendent aspect.

We submit that behind this development of Barth's "timeless eschatology" towards a "Christological eschatology" lay his developing Christology. It has been said that the "Yes" of his Christology was even evident in the \textit{Römerbrief}.\textsuperscript{551} Perhaps the fairest assessment is to say that the "Yes" of Christology that was to the rear of his presentation in that early source became ever more to the fore until it was right in front and remained central in the \textit{Kirchliche Dogmatik}. It is within this development that this changing emphasis is perhaps best understood. In 1931 Barth spoke of the fulfilled and unfulfilled promise relating to each other as sunrise (Morgendämmerung) and sunset (Sonnenaufgang), so that, if anywhere, then precisely in the light of the appearance of Christ has faith become "Advent faith" (Adventsglaube) awaiting for future revelation.\textsuperscript{552} In this context the future is said to be "implanted into the present without thereby ceasing to be strictly future."\textsuperscript{553}

\textsuperscript{549} Ethik 254, 258, 289. \hspace{1cm} 550. Ibid. 238
\textsuperscript{551} Even before the second \textit{Römerbrief}, in 1920, Barth could speak of the resurrection of Christ as His second coming (\textit{Niederkunft}) (WGWM 90).
\textsuperscript{552} ZdZ, heft 6, 1931, 462.
\textsuperscript{553} Ibid. 461f
13. Various Critiques

Within the several sources studied in this chapter we have collected a number of facts that we will present here together for questioning. They cover a variety of matters.

In speaking of the new world, Barth spoke of the events of the Bible as its beginning, including those of Abraham, Moses and Samuel etc. \(^{554}\) Could this not make the incarnation appear as one in a series of events bringing in the new world?

In the Römerbrief Barth wrote that originally there was no separation between God and man, so that in the Fall such distinctions as absolute and relative, "Higher" and "Lower", "There" and "Here" came into being. \(^{555}\) He went on to suggest that Eve was the first to worship God, and in that act was separated from Him. \(^{556}\) No scriptural evidence is given for this, nor, we submit, can it be found. Only reference to Michelangelo's depiction of Eve's creation is mentioned, in which she worships, and to which Barth comments, "She is manifestly behaving as she ought not". \(^{557}\) Therefore, he goes on to call her the first "religious personality". This is supposed to have taken place before the appearance of the serpent and his temptation. Barth suggested that the primal union was one in which adoration of the Creator by the creature did not exist. It was God's secret that man was merely a creature, and in His mercy He

\(^{554}\) WGWM 49f, 28f.

\(^{555}\) R 244, 247, 249ff, 254, 256, 277, 296.

\(^{556}\) Ibid. 247: "Und nun beachte man auf Michelangelos 'Erschaffung der Eva' die fatale Geste der Anbetung, mit der Eve im vollen Reiz ihrer Sinnlichkeit den Schauplatz betritt; man beachte die warnend erhobene Rand Gottes und den höchst befördertem Ausdruck seines Gesichts, mit dem er gerade auf diese Geste antwortet. Hier bereitet sich offenbar des ver, was nicht sein sollte. Eva (wahrhaftig zu ihrer Ehre: die erste religiöse Persönlichkeit!) tritt als Erste Gott gegenüber, ihn anbetend, aber eben indem sie — Ihn anbetet, sich in unerhörter, vermeersener Weise von ihm abgrenzend."

\(^{557}\) Ibid.
concealed it from them so that whilst ignorance prevailed, He could walk freely in the garden in the cool of the day as though in the equality of friendship.\textsuperscript{558} This is significant for Barth's eschatology in the \textit{Römerbrief}, as the eschatological reality will be the complete restoration of the lost union, an ultimate union with no duality.\textsuperscript{559} Rightly he concluded that beyond this we know nothing and therefore "must break off" (\textit{wirbrechen ab im Bewusstsein}).\textsuperscript{560} (Such is wiser than his pre-temporal speculation.) Our concern is that such a complete restoration to the lost union would include a return to that non-worshipping relationship. However, this is contrary to Isaiah's witness to regular worship in the new heavens and the new earth (Isa. 66:22f). Furthermore, taking just Eve's adoration as the cause for her separation from God, we would submit that the elders before the throne of God as well as the angels at the birth of Christ have entered into worship and yet were not separated from God (Rev. 4:10, 5:14, Heb. 1:6, Luke 2:13f). In fairness to Barth, this account is the only one to appear in his \textit{Römerbrief} and does not reappear in the \textit{Kirchliche Dogmatik}. Our conclusion here is that Barth's understanding of the primal union between God and man is much closer than we would expect between creatures and their Creator (from cases of other creatures' worship already cited). In the 1928 \textit{Ethik} there is a change, for there this close union has become the relationship of the Master and the bondsman.\textsuperscript{561} It is therefore natural that redemption as a restoration as given in the \textit{Römerbrief} is understandably omitted in the \textit{Ethik}. If the relationship of God and man before the Fall was too close in the \textit{Römerbrief} then it is too removed in the \textit{Ethik}. Post-Fall man is

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{558} R 247
\item \textsuperscript{559} Ibid. 277, 309, 321, 326f, 417.
\item \textsuperscript{560} Ibid. 327. "Brechen ab" (417).
\item \textsuperscript{561} Ethik 236f
\end{itemize}
also placed at too great a distance from God in the Römerbrief, for there he is radically separated, so that God is the Stranger who is finally and everywhere outside (Umkreis) our world,\textsuperscript{562} segregated from us\textsuperscript{563} so that union with Him is not possible in this world.\textsuperscript{564} If the first example in this Römerbrief was an overemphasis which verged on a type of monism, then the latter overstressed in the direction of Deism.

In Das Wort Gottes Barth speaks of the millennium (uses the three words, tausendjahrigen, Millennium and Chiliasmus) as concerned with the goal of earthly life, which is capable of being realized in time.\textsuperscript{565} He noted that even Christian hope envisages reality here on earth.\textsuperscript{566} Can this earthly interpretation of the millennium really be proved from Revelation 20? If Barth removed the \textit{parousia} beyond time in this period, was he not in this article bringing the millennium into time? However, if Barth wished his readers to think of the resurrection as beyond time, because an event in the \textit{parousia}, then Rev. 20:6 identifies the beginning of the millennium with that resurrection event, and hence would logically have to be placed beyond time.

In the same article Barth said "all men must die, one after another, without having seen the goal of history."\textsuperscript{567} This goal is the final, ultimate goal beyond history. However the weakness of Barth's \textit{parousia} beyond history which necessitates the death of all men before it takes place is seen in the Biblical document which witnesses to a translation without death as well as a resurrection from death for mankind at the \textit{parousia} (1 Thess. 4:16-18). Four years later in his \textit{Auferstehung der Toten} Barth rectified this "all must die" idea, by noting that some will

\textsuperscript{562} R 318 \textsuperscript{565} WGWM 157
\textsuperscript{563} Ibid. 255 \textsuperscript{566} Ibid. 160
\textsuperscript{564} Ibid. 113 \textsuperscript{567} Ibid. 166
be alive and changed. Whether dead or alive the change was termed a resurrection by Barth. We submit that the word "translation" would be better for the living, leaving the word "resurrection" for its normal reference to those having already died.

There are other critiques concerning universalism, the naturalness of death and the openness of the final end which we will meet again in the Kirchliche Dogmatik and so will take them up later in order to save repetition.

14. Conclusion

This early literature of Barth is mostly presented in a difficult dialectical way that causes the reader to have to read and re-read the books or articles as a whole in order to get the final meaning. It has been only after doing this that we have attempted to present the main thrust of his thinking which we submit revolves around the Kierkegaardian infinite qualitative distinction between God and man, eternity and time. Thus we have traced this consistent motif throughout the various sources which emphasize this great gulf between the new strange world of eternity above, and the old known world of time below. Let God be God and man be man was the cry of the early Barth in revolt against liberal theology which thought it could have God on easy terms. Thy Kingdom come, was his emphasis against Ritschlian kingdom building below. The stress was on the movement from above to below rather than an earthly-centred or anthropocentric concentration. Thus eschatology had to do more with God than with man, was dynamic rather than static, came as a Krisis to this world rather than realizing its inbuilt potential. It was a decided "No" to culture theology, turning rather to the world above time, to the parousia
beyond time, and thus to the coming Kingdom. It's message was finito, non capax infiniti. Our thesis critique for both the earlier and later writings of Barth concerns the weakness of his Christology which does not do justice to the humanity of Jesus Christ. We submit that this entire emphasis on the radical separation between eternity and time removed the incarnation from its rightful place as a "temporal event" to a place above time, or at best to a place merely touching time tangentially. Urgeschichte and Endgeschichte replaced Historie. Thus the eternal God did not really become temporal man, nor will His parousia be a temporal event. The sheer Godness of God, the Ganz Anderer emphasis to overcome man-centered liberalism, resulted in a one-sided Christology, and a parousia removed beyond time. The two go together. To bring the parousia back into time would necessitate taking the incarnation seriously as an event in time. Although we noted a change in emphasis during this period, which could be considered as resulting from a developing Christology, the one-sided emphasis upon God which did not give proper place to the humanity of Jesus remained the key weakness of this early literature.

Later, Barth was to give his own criticism of this earlier period. Concerning the coming of the Kingdom in time he said,

"I had no such confidence in relation to its coming as such. So when I came to expound a passage like Rom. 13:11f ('Now it is high time to awake out of sleep: for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. The night is far spent, the day is at hand'), in spite of every precaution I interpreted it as if it referred only to the moment which confronts all moments in time as the eternal 'transcendental meaning' of all moments in time... I missed the distinctive feature of the passage, the teleology which it ascribes to time as it moves towards a real end." 569

Back of this "timeless eschatology" there was a Platonic-Kierkegaardian-
Overbeckian influence that divorced the eternal from the temporal world. It followed that the Eternal God was removed from this temporal world. Thus in revolt against a near pantheistic immanence Barth finished up with a near deistic conclusion. Of this he said,

"We viewed this 'wholly other' in isolation, abstracted and absolutised, and set it over against man, this miserable wretch - not to say boxed his ears with it - in such fashion that it continually showed greater similarity to the deity of the God of the philosophers than to the deity of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." 570

After warning his readers against his earlier "timeless eschatology" (or transcendent revelation) in the Römerbrief, Barth wrote,

"Then, in face of the prevailing historicism and psychologism which had ceased to be aware at all of any revelation other than an inner mundane one within common time, the book had a definite, antiseptic task and significance. Readers of it today will not fail to appreciate that in it John 1:14 does not have justice done to it." 571

We conclude, therefore, that the "timeless eschatology" of Barth is unacceptable because it did not take the incarnation, and hence the humanity of Jesus, seriously. Hence, at best, his early theology could be considered as an eschatological Christology, but not as a christological eschatology.
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CHAPTER FOUR

CHRISTOLOGICAL TELEOLOGY

The theme of Barth's "timeless eschatology" (previous chapter) was the infinite qualitative distinction between God and man, between the eternal strange new world above and the temporal known old world below. The rest of this presentation concerns his later "christological eschatology" found in the Kirchliche Dogmatik (1932-67). Here the theme is, what God is in His revelation that He is antecedently and eternally within His own inner-Trinitarian Being. Here it would seem is a departure from the earlier radical dichotomy between eternity and time to a real entrance of eternity into time, bringing the incarnation into history as well as the parousia. Here God is not separated from man, but comes to Him in revelation. Here the Ganz Anderer becomes the Christus Praesens. We shall see that there certainly is evidence for such an advance over the earlier period, but we will be left asking if the humanity of Jesus has still not been given its proper place. This will involve an examination of Barth's understanding (1) of the incarnation of the Eternal God into time, (2) of his Triplex munus, and (3) of his post-resurrection Christology related to on-going history. These matters will occupy us for the rest of this essay, but only within the context in which Barth has given us his eschatology. Therefore we will need to give space to the various aspects of his eschatology,
attempting to keep in mind the basic theme that runs throughout, and
the relationship to the humanity of Jesus. We shall be led to ask if
the earlier eternity-time dichotomy has simply become a reality-revelation
emphasis which still does not do full justice to the humanity of Jesus.

In this introductory chapter, we will follow Barth in the eschatological
orientation of his Kirchliche Dogmatik which spells out a God to
manward movement from eternity to the life-acts of Jesus Christ in time.
It will then be towards the end of the chapter that we will come to examine
the place he gives to the humanity of Jesus.

Unlike the separate articles, sermons, commentaries, and lecture
notes considered in the earlier theology, we now come (primarily) to one
source, which is one astonishingly unified whole.¹ The four volumes,
Doctrine of the Word of God (Prolegomena Vol. 1), Doctrine of God (Vol. 2),
Doctrine of Creation (Vol. 3), and Doctrine of Reconciliation (Vol. 4) are
both trinitarian and christological:² trinitarian in that God is in His
revelation what He eternally and therefore antecedently is in His three
modes of Divine Being (unus et individuus);³ as Father Creator, Son Reconciler and Holy Spirit Redeemer;⁴ (the latter is the unwritten Vol. 5);

1. To borrow an evaluation Barth made of Schleiermacher's Der Christliche
   Glaube (TC 181) which equally applies to Barth.

2. The placing of the doctrine of the Trinity at the head of the whole of
dogmatics is a position Barth realized was adopted only in isolated
instances in the past, eg. in the Middle Ages by Peter Lombard in his
Sentences and Bonaventura in his Brevilegium(CD 1/1, 345). Barth has
understood that the proper subject of theology is the revelation made
through Christ, which was the manifestation of the One God in His three
modes of Being. The Trinity is therefore the proper context for a
christological dogmatics. This was apparently not understood by Oscar
Cullman (CAT fn. 26).

3. CD 1/1, 453

4. Although all three are Creator, Reconciler and Redeemer as God is One
   (CD 1/1, 453), so that the Father is no less the subject of reconcilia-
   tion and redemption than the Son and the Spirit, there is a distinction in
   the opus ad extra, so that creation is ascribed as a proprium to
   the Father, the Son is regarded peculiariter the Reconciler, and the

cont./
christological in that Christ is the revelation of the One God.\textsuperscript{5}

That which was revealed in time through Christ and will be manifest in the final parousia, is rooted and grounded in the eternal decree. It is this teleological relationship between eschatology and God's eternal election that this chapter presents, and which we have chosen to call "Christological Teleology". We begin with the Eternal God from whom all things move towards His eternal goal.

\section*{1. The Eternal God}

As one of His perfections, God is Eternal,\textsuperscript{6} not in the sense of timelessness, but pure duration in which beginning, succession and end are not three but one, not separate as a first, a second and a third occasion, but one simultaneous occasion as beginning, middle and end, and therefore not an infinite extension of time.\textsuperscript{7} As time is God's creation it is not eternity, it is the formal principle of His free activity outwards whereas

\begin{itemize}
  \item Creator Spiritus is identified as the Redeemer. God is varied in His unity and unified in His variety. The doctrine of perichoresis admitting a one-sided invocation or interpenetration (Ineinander) or an equally one-sided invocation as a convolution (Miteinander) is wrong (CD 1/1, 455f). Rather, God in His complete being and action is present in all His modes of being and is only per appropriationem designated especially as Creator Father, Reconciler Son and Redeemer Spirit (CD 1/1, 430).
  \item "The doctrine of the Trinity is nothing else than the unfolding of the knowledge that Jesus is the Christ or the Lord" (CD 1/1, 384). It was Barth's concern to bring theology back to a true doctrine of Christology, Trinity and Predestination which for centuries had been only of marginal interest (CD 4/3, 498).
  \item The Creator is the Eternal Father (CD 1/1, 448-456); the Reconciler, the Eternal Son (1/1, 474-512); and the Redeemer, the Eternal Spirit (1/1, 533-560) as three modes of being of the One God who has Eternity as one of His perfections (2/1, 608-677).
  \item In God, present, past and future are simultaneous; 3/2, 465 - Rev. 1:8 "I am", past, present and future simultaneously; 3/2, 545 - For God there is no "not yet" which might possibly be a threatening "never". He "was", "is" and "will be" simultaneously and without limit or separation; 3/2, 558 - eternity is not timelessness. It is beginning, middle and end in fulness, for it is all three simultaneously. Cf. 3/2, 565.
\end{itemize}
eternity is the principle of His freedom inwards. God's eternity is therefore not the negation of time, for eternally He has had time — time for us, the time of revelation, the time of Jesus Christ, for He has had time because and as He has had eternity.

This is the eternity of the triune God, the One who is eternally the Father, who without origin or begetting is Himself the origin and begetter, and therefore undividedly the beginning, succession and end, all at once in His own essence. It is God who is also eternally the Son, who is begotten of the Father and yet of the same essence with Him, who as begotten of the Father is also undividedly beginning, succession and end, all at once in His own essence. It is God, who is also eternally the Spirit, who proceeds from the Father and the Son but is of the same essence as both, who as the Spirit of the Father and the Son is also undividedly beginning, succession and end, all at once in His own essence. The fact that God has and is Himself time, and the extent to which this is so, is therefore necessarily made clear to us in His essence as the triune God.

Eternity has a positive relationship to time in its concrete form as readiness for time, with God who is the One who rules before time, in time and again after time, who is before, over and after time. This temporality of eternity is described in detail as the pre-temporality (Vorzeitlichkeit), supra-temporality or co-temporality (Überzeitlichkeit), and post-temporality (Nachzeitlichkeit) of eternity. God is thus "He who was, and is, and is to come", so that the whole content of the Christian message embraces,

---

8. CD 2/1, 608-619. Cf. 1/1, 400-440 - Oneness in threeness, threeness in oneness and three-in-oneness — where God as Creator can be the Reconciler which He can also be because He can be the Redeemer. He possesses Himself as Father (pure giver), as Son (receiver and giver) as Spirit (pure receiver). These are inadequate concepts which point beyond themselves to the mysterium trinitatis — the One God who is only knowable in the three, the three only as the One.
"creation as the basis of man's existence, established by God, reconciliation as the renewal of his existence accomplished by God, redemption as the revelation of his existence to be consummated by God (and therefore as revelation of the meaning of His creation)"^9

Our past and future are surrounded by God's eternity, for our time is not an abstract or self-enclosed middle separated from beginning and end in God's eternity, for His eternity accompanies our time to its goal, and is in time, as time is in eternity. Time is thus kept and preserved by eternity. God is thus not only to become all in all (post-temporal) but already was pre-temporally and is supra-temporally all in all. Therefore as God is already eternally what He is in His revelation, so He has always been what will only finally be revealed to be in the eschatological goal of redemption.\(^{10}\)

Barth considered that one problem of theology has been the one-sided emphasis of, or interest in, God's eternity, with the Reformation concentrating on His pre-temporality\(^{11}\) (divine election and providence), Neo-Protestantism concern with His supra-temporality (Immanentism and man in time), and his own earlier revolt against Neo-Protestantism with his presentation of the pure futurity of God or His post-temporality (no parousia in time). Each concentration presented a distorted understanding of God's eternity and eschatology suffered. Thus Barth considered that for the Reformers, eschatology was but an appendix, for Schleiermacher it became but a concept of being eternal in every moment, and for the early Barth was only an event removed beyond time, and thus missed the distinctive teleology that moves towards a real end in time (eg. in Römerbrief).\(^{12}\)

---

9. CD 2/1, 620
10. CD 2/1, 621-631; 3/2, 522: "Menschlichkeit ist Zeitlichkeit" (humanity is temporality).
11. CD 2/1, 632. We shall return to this in Section 8 to show that Barth was unfair to Reformation eschatology.
12. CD 2/1, 631-638
Thus, in contrast with Reformation and subsequent theology including his own earlier non-eschatological, one-sided emphasis, Barth viewed his trinitarian understanding of the eternal God, and His revelation in time through Jesus Christ, as holding together in proper balance the pre-, supra- and post-temporal aspects of God's eternity. Thus he could now say,

"The establishing and preserving of sound teaching in the Church is wholly dependent on two important factors: the post-temporality of God must not become the content of a mere appendix, or the pre-temporality the content of a mere introduction; and a dislike of the truth of God's supra-temporality (which is historically understandable through the misuse of this truth in the past) must not be allowed to dictate what is said." 13

God lives eternally so that "before" in Him does not imply "not yet"; "after" in Him does not imply "no more" and above all His present does not imply any fleetingness. 14 Or, put in other words, there never was a time when God was not our Creator, Father and Redeemer 15 which brings us to the doctrine of eternal election.

2. Eternal Election

In Barth's Dogmatics, the place (Stellung) of the doctrine of election is in the doctrine of God. 16 This is because it forms part of the definition of the subject of all Christian doctrine, for it is the interna actio of the being of God, whose being and act are considered inseparably together (as opposed to the Reformed tradition which separated them). 17

The function (Funktion) of the doctrine of election is to give testimony that God elects man, that He determines man for Himself, having

13. CD 2/1, 637
14. CD 2/1, 640
15. CD 3/2, 545
16. CD 2/2, 76-93
17. CD 2/2, 79
first determined Himself for man. It shows that all God's works and ways have their origin in His grace.\(^{18}\) It gives glory to God and bears witness to Him as the gracious God.\(^ {19}\)

The **foundation** (Begründung) of the doctrine of election is found alone in Jesus Christ.\(^ {20}\) It is not to be found in ecclesiastical tradition, or didactic value and pedagogic usefulness, or in a datum of experience or axiom of reason, or omnipotent will, not from a *voluntas maiestatis* behind the Deus incarnatus, not in a Deus nudus absconditus\(^ {21}\), not in the general, the abstract or the *decretum absolutum*, which he considered idolatrous (Gützenbilt).\(^ {22}\) Thus Barth considered that in opposition or contradistinction to Aquinas, Bonaventura, Zwingli, Luther, Calvin, Bullinger (to name a few)\(^ {23}\) and the Neo-logians that followed in the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries, he presented the doctrine of election by witnessing

---

18. CD 2/2, 91  
19. CD 2/2, 93  
20. CD 2/2, 134-76  
23. Discussed by Barth in CD 2/2, 45-76. Concerning Calvin J. K. S. Reid wrote two illuminating articles on "The office of Christ in Predestination" (SJT Vol. 1, 5-19, 166-183). The following are a few of his points. Calvin did not neglect the thought that predestination is in Christ, but Calvinist theology failed to draw fully upon the implications of this presupposition. To Calvin, Christ was even auctor electionis (Institutes 3.23.7) but the decree nevertheless belonged to God, to His *arcanum consilium*, within the *divinae sapientiae adyta*, without Christ being admitted. Christ therefore merely carried out something already fixed and definitive in which he had no part. Further, as reprobation found its ground within the sinner, Christ was also separated from the execution of the decree. In Institutes 3.22.1 Calvin speaks of *"gratiam istam Dei praecedent electio"* (election precedes grace). But, as Reid states, there is no will of God which is superior or anterior to grace for God's *consilium* is not only carried out by grace, but is itself gracious. In contrast with Calvin's incorrect *ante-gratiam* concept of predestination, Reid penetrated to the real root and ground of its reality by pointing to it as *sola gratia* in the sense of God's eternal determination towards man. This is in complete agreement with Barth's understanding of the election of Jesus Christ as Gospel, and the eternal God to manward movement we are concerned with in this chapter. Barth considered his doctrine of predestination to be radically different from Calvin's (CD 2/2, x). See also SJT Vol. 2, 352-363, J. G. Riddell, "God's Eternal Decrees".

21. CD 2/2, 111  
22. CD 2/2, 143
to Jesus Christ as both the electing God (Erwählende) and the elected man (Erwählte).  

Therefore, in contrast to Luther's *De servo arbitrio*, Zwingli's *De providentia*, and Calvin's double decree, Barth saw the doctrine of election as unequivocally Gospel. With it theology begins and ends with Jesus Christ, who is in movement (zuwendung) towards man. This movement towards man is God's primal decision (entscheidung) or the covenant in Jesus Christ which is the overflowing (überströmen) of the love which is the being of God. This is primal history (Urgeschichte) - between God and the man Jesus and His people, which will bring all history (Geschichte) to its goal when it attains to its goal. Thus for Barth, the crucial point of salvation history (Heilsgeschichte) is not from the incarnation, but from eternity.

3. The Election of Jesus Christ

24. That Jesus Christ is Himself the divine election of grace in Barth's understanding gained from the Bible (CD 2/2, 95, x). In formulating this thesis he had to expose himself to "the risk of a certain isolation" (Einsamkeit). It was a surprise to him to have to defend the obvious in the apparent form of an innovation. However, he did find historical support for the direction of his thinking in certain statements of Athanasius, Augustine, and Cocceius, in the inevitability in the light of the Supralapsarian controversy, in the general Reformation assertion that Christ is the *speculum electionis* (which He deepened), in articles 7-8 of the 1560 Conf. Scotica developed by John Knox and in the fine lecture of Pierre Maury (Election et Foi) given at the Congrès international de théologie Calviniste in Geneva in 1936 (CD 2/2, 154f). For Barth, Jesus Christ existed in the counsel of God from all eternity, and therefore before creation, as the elected and resurrected Son or Word of God (CD 3/1, 51).

25. CD 2/2, 13, 17.
26. CD 2/2, 4
27. CD 2/2, 7
28. CD 2/2, 9
29. CD 2/2, 7f
30. As early as CD 1/1, 158 Barth spoke of the eternal generation of the Son or *logos*. Consistently through the KD he has opposed any reference to the eternal Son or eternal Word of God in *abstracto* and therefore to a so-called *λόγος ἀρχής* (eg. a few of the many are CD 3/1, 54f; 4/2, 33f, 101; 4/3, 13), as if there was time when the pre-temporal being of the Word of God was not His incarnate being, the being of the *Deus pro nobis* (CD 4/1, 52). In opposition to Brunner, Barth saw in the history of Jesus Christ the reality which precedes all other
It is by Him, Jesus Christ, and for Him and to Him, that the universe was created as a theatre for God's dealings with man and man's dealings with God. He is the decree of God behind and above which there can be no earlier or higher decree. As such, the pre-existent Jesus Christ was both original Subject of this electing as well as its original object. He is not merely the Reconciler between God and man, He is the reconciliation. He is to be understood as the beginning of all God's ways and works, for in Him it comes to pass for the first time that God wills and posits another being different from Himself, His creature. Here is a self-giving, an overflowing of the glory of God. He is the merciful and just God who elects from all eternity, and also the homo faburis who is elected from all eternity. God's eternal will, unlike previous interpretations of the doctrine of predestination, is the election of Jesus Christ. He is "Gottes ewige Gnadenwahl". From all eternity He has been man's covenant partner (Verbündeter) and Friend. He is the true goal of all the divine purposes. The eternal election of Jesus Christ is thus the basic presupposition of all God's works and ways ad extra.

He is the Word which exhausts the self-revelation and whole knowledge

30. cont.

reality and thus all men even thousands of years before Him find in Him their being (See ZThK 1951, 98 - article by Brunner commented on in CD 4/1, 53). In eternity Jesus Christ is the very God and very man He will become in time, the eternal basis of the covenant as the eternal testamentum, eternal sponsio, and eternal pactum between God and man (CD 4/1, 66. Cf. 1/2, 193). So that Jesus Christ who is incarnatus in the New Testament was incarnandus in the Old Testament (CD 4/2, 683). See Section 8a, pp. 196-203.

32. CD 2/2, 94. Cf. 2/1, 631, Rom. 11:36: ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἐπικρίνεται ἢ ἐπικρίνεται ἀνθρώποι ἀνθρώπου καὶ ἐπικρίνεται ἐπὶ ἀνθρώπου.
33. CD 2/2, 94-104
34. CD 2/2, 105
35. CD 2/2, 120f
36. CD 2/2, 143
37. CD 2/2, 146
38. CD 2/2, 104
39. CD 3/2, 549
40. CD 2/2, 149
of God. The One who came in that revelation is the same as the One in pre-temporal eternity. As God is One (in His pre-, supra- and post-temporality) so His eternal will before time (vorzeitlich ewige) is the same as that which is above time (überzeitlich ewige) and reveals itself and operates in time (in der zeit), for the will of God is Jesus Christ. In the light of this, the terror of the decretum absolutum is effectively removed, for an amazing exchange was made by God taking man's place, the judge judged for us that we may be exalted into God's covenant fellowship, and thus for Barth the double predestination is now not dual but an election of man for God because of the election of God for man. (We will need to return, in Chapter 6, to this aspect of election when considering whether Barth teaches apokatastasis). Barth thus went beyond Calvin in his election of Jesus Christ (particular) instead of election of man (general), in his double election of the God-man (electing God and elected man) rather than the double decrees (to salvation or damnation), in his emphasis upon God's sovereign grace in place of an abstract sovereign will. So, for Barth, predestination was not a res acta but a res agenda, not static but dynamic, not a fiat but an overflowing of God, not Deistic but gospel, not immanent gratia infusa but eternally personal, not prior or above grace but utterly gracious. And as such, it was God's eternal manward movement in His eternal election of the eternal logos Jesus Christ.

4. The Two Creation Sagas

41. CD 2/2, 152f
42. CD 2/2, 156
43. CD 2/2, 157
44. CD 2/2, 155-194
45. In this section we find ourselves in the first article of the Creed, not in the sense of forecourt, vestibule (DO 50, 52) or prolegomenon (CD 3/1, 29) but within the circle of faith in Jesus Christ. The Doctrine of Creation is not an abstract reality in which the world per se gives us information about God as Creator. God is still known only through God in this first article. Barth has clearly shown the cont./
Barth considered Genesis 1 and 2 as two distinct creation sagas, the first witnessing to creation as the external basis of the covenant, and the second to the covenant as the internal basis of creation.

45. cont.

relationship between the three articles of the Creed as follows: The One God in three modes of Being is the One Object of the Creed, as Father (1st), Son (2nd) and Holy Spirit (3rd) (DO 42). From another standpoint the first speaks of God, the second of the God-man, and third of man (DO 137). Put another way, creation is an articulus fidei, an essential part of the Credo ut intelligam. Thus Jesus Christ is not the second of the three articles of the Creed in the sense of subsequent creation, but in the sense of centre, with creation only coming before and redemption coming after because both are rooted and grounded in Him as their only purpose and reality (noetic and ontic). The original Christian confession consisted of the three words "Jesus Christ (is) Lord" thus even historically making the second article the source of the whole Creed (DO 65).

Barth therefore found the basis and presupposition for creation not in some concept of a world cause (Weltgrundes) (CD 3/1, 11), supreme or first cause (höchste und erste Ursache) (3/1, 13) but within the eternal inner-trinitarian being of God (3/1, 14). Thus the Creed is read, "I believe in Jesus Christ, God's Son our Lord, in order to perceive and to understand that God the Almighty, the Father, is the Creator of heaven and earth" (3/1, 29). Creation is then the "temporal analogue", taking place outside God, "of that event in God Himself by which God is the Father of the Son" (DO 52). And it is in Jesus Christ that we have the place where creation stands before us in reality and becomes recognisable (DO 53).

Thus in agreement with Augustine, creation is understood as the grace of God (CD 3/1, 39ff; DO 54) and concurring with the indications of the Heidelberg Catechism and Calvin's Commentary on Genesis, a definite relationship is therefore seen between the second and first articles of the Creed (CD 3/1, 11, 30f) in that (reminiscent of Irenaeus) the creation of the world found its purpose and goal in Jesus Christ as the actualisation of the eternal logos, of the eternal council and the eternal covenant (CD 3/1, 54f).

46. The two sagas are very different in orientation (CD 3/1, 213), they are opposite (3/1, 228), a new and different history of creation (3/1, 229).

47. Barth considered the biblical history of creation to be pure saga, i.e. a witness to God’s self-revelation and thus distinguished from history (cannot be historically expressed) on the one hand and myth (product of man’s mind) on the other (CD 3/1, viii and 42 fn. (ed. note) and 81-94). They are, however, not incompatible with "aetiological myths" in that they are poetic visions of the becoming which underlies being. Nevertheless, Barth preferred the word saga to myth, even in this "aetiological" aspect (3/1, 39f). They are not a preface or prolegomenon, but the pre-history or primal pre-history of the people of Israel (3/1, 65). Unlike Neo-Platonic metaphysics, the Babylonian Enumah Elish myth and Augustinian timeless relationship of God to His creature, they are genuine events that happened once for all (3/1, 64f).

48. CD 3/1, 94-228

49. CD 3/1, 228-329
Creation therefore had no independent validity or meaning, but was rather rooted and grounded in the eternal decree with a view to a definite goal in covenant history. It was not, as with Ritschl, for the purpose of the Kingdom (i.e. development of ideal, spiritualized or deified man) but was rather the ground, sphere, object, instrument or theatre for the overflowing of God's love, grace and power, and for the revealing thereby of His glory. It was therefore for the purpose of bringing to external consummation what had been an eternal reality within the inner-trinitarian Being of God, i.e. the eternal God to manward movement in the covenant or eternal logos, Jesus Christ. It was in creation that God's opus ad intra became, to His glory, His opus ad extra.

a. Creation as the External Basis of the Covenant

In this section we will briefly follow Barth's presentation of the first creation saga. Within the story of the six days Barth finds an integral teleological relation to the last day, or Sabbath. Everything created by God during the six days finds its purpose and meaning in the seventh day. It is this day of rest which is the "supreme point" or "coronation of creation" (Krone de Schöpfung), and not man (only with reservation can man be so described, whereas the Sabbath is unreservedly so). This heptaemeron understanding of creation as opposed to the fathers' hexaemeron is vital to Barth, because, true to his christological hermeneutical principle, he considers the saga as prefiguring the covenant

50. CD 3/1, 47. Cf. "overflowing of His fulness" (Überfluss seiner Fülle) DO 44.


52. CD 3/1, 98

53. CD 3/1, 225

54. CD 3/1, 181. Cf. 3/1, 223. Man is not the crown of creation. Barth called man, as male and female, the "crowning mystery of the divine work of creation" (3/1, 326), but also that he is not the "crown of creation" (3/1, 223). His emphasis is that in contrast with the Sabbath that is unreservedly the "crown of creation" (3/1, 223) man can only be so described with reservation (3/1, 181).
history to culminate in the incarnation of the God-man. The creation history therefore points beyond itself to the covenant history of the children of Israel (equated with the witness of the six days) after which, or rather as its culmination, Jesus Christ would bring in that great Sabbath day of rest, the dawn of the new day, or era, the true goal of creation.\(^55\) Thus, for Barth, creation is not itself the covenant, but the way to it, and as such is only the external basis of the covenant which is the goal of creation.\(^56\) He likens creation (as related to the covenant) to the building of a temple, the arrangement and construction of which is determined as a whole and in detail by the liturgy it is to serve.\(^57\)

God's act of creation involved a negation or rejection of the "tohu wa-bohu" (Gen. 1:2).\(^58\) For Barth this chaos was no informitas materiae or rudis indigesta moles (as with Luther) it did not represent a

\(^{55}\) CD 3/1, 95f, 115.  
\(^{56}\) CD 3/1, 97  
\(^{57}\) CD 3/1, 98  
\(^{58}\) CD 3/3, 74. God in His decree eternally rejected chaos. The problem of "nothingness" (das Nichtige - that which is not, i.e. brought to naught) is placed by Barth in the Doctrine of Providence and thus as a section in the third part of the Doctrine of Creation (CD 3/3, 289-368) as its threatening of God's good creation is not abstract but under the control of providentia Dei. Barth considered that the power of nothingness should be rated as low as possible in relation to God, and as high as possible in relation to man (3/3, 295). Both "Yes" and "No" are involved in creation, and both will be revealed as very good and supremely glorious in the final parousia (3/3, 296). In its totality creation praises its Master, which Mozart's total music conveys (3/3, 297ff). Barth emphasized the "total Saviour", who has routed nothingness (3/3, 311). It is thus not a positive force, as with Leibniz, (3/3, 319) but (following Schleiermacher) it is that which has been negated by God's grace, and exists only in this relationship to His grace (3/3, 326). The problem of nothingness appears in the Doctrine of Providence and not in the creation of the cosmos, as that creation alone is good, whereas nothingness is not good, and so Barth maintained was not created but rather rejected by God in His act of creation. In treating the categories of good and evil in this way, Barth had been credited with an original and concrete answer to the perennial problem of theodicy (eg. H. Hartwell, ThKB 116f). He defended his presentation of "Nothingness" in answer to G.C. Berkouwer in CD 4/3, 178f. However, we will criticize his presentation in Chapter 6, pp. 443f (also 435-443).
"veritable mythological treasure chest" (as with Gunkel) nor was it explained in many different ways (as with Augustine) but, was the "monstrous realm" that has radically passed away in God's creative will and act, as the negative that He passed by in His positive Word.\(^59\) This judgment on chaos Earth understood as pointing beyond to the judgment Jesus Christ would receive on the cross,\(^60\) and to the final judgment of Jer. 4:23.\(^61\) The important thing for us to note is the victory over chaos even before man's creation and fall, and Christ's death and resurrection. Eschatology precedes creation in the sense that man not only moves towards triumph through Jesus Christ, but comes from this first rejection of that which threatened him, but can now only exist behind God's back.\(^62\) It was in this beginning that God created heaven and earth, which Barth sees as already a promise for reconciliation and redemption for the man yet to be created.\(^63\)

Light in its separation from darkness was the first work of God's creation. Here the rejection of chaos in and with the creation of heaven and earth is followed by rejection of darkness in and with the creation of light. Darkness is not God's creation, existing only in its creaturely connection with light. In it God did no work for only in light did He create.\(^64\) Creation begins with light which is a prototype of that light in and with whom creation will culminate. This light created by God is no Persian (especially Zoroastrian) deity, no emanation, but is implicitly what the apostolic office is explicitly. Also, created before the luminaries it negates every kind of sun worship. There was not only a time before the sun, moon and stars, but there will be a time when again they

\(^{59}\) Discussed by Barth in CD 3/1, 102-110.
\(^{60}\) CD 3/1, 109
\(^{61}\) CD 3/1, 104f
\(^{62}\) CD 3/1, 108
\(^{63}\) CD 3/1, 116
\(^{64}\) CD 3/1, 117
will not be needed (after parousia) for then there will be no more night, and the light will be the glory of God. Until that eschatological day the luminaries are but signs, witnessing to the light with even darkness being ruled by them and thus significant of the final eschatological victory yet to be manifested. But, as important, the sun marks out the days (time as a unit) as the week marks out time as a sequence. Man (when created) will then be in real time (not in an infinite period) and therefore he will be in history. Thus Barth with Gunkel, and against Delitzsch and A. Jeremias, accepted the literal twenty-four hour day for each creation day of Genesis 1 (the meaning of the Hebrew word for "day" [yom] supports this decision). He thus rejected Augustine's one day creation (six days in one). Rather he saw a necessary connection between created time and the last time to which we move, for it has not been created without reference to its own eschaton. It is a "time of hope" because the morning or terminus a quo of the following day emerges as a second and absolutely indispensable constitutive element of the first day. Thus there is no eternal night, only a fleeting triumph of darkness, which is actually so surrounded by light that it is like a "beleaguered fortress". Light will never cease to shine, as there is a clear distinction between the present and future cosmos from the past cosmos, for there has taken place in that commencement of time what Barth called the "turn of the ages." Although he did not draw the comparison, these are almost identical to the words he later used of Jesus Christ as the "turning point in history".

Continuing His separating work, God divided the water into separate

67. KD 3/1, 130 (ET 118) "Wende der Aeonen". Cf. DG 158 (ET 135) "Geschichtwende".
oceans for land to appear, dividing further the waters into those above and those below, establishing a raquia boundary between them. With this disarmament of chaos was the establishment of the cosmos. This raquia witnesses to God's preservation against the rejected chaos. It has, however, been opened, but only from the inside in the incarnation of Jesus Christ and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. One day, though, it will be no more, which will mean the end, or the revelation of the new heaven and earth. 68

Barth went on to make clear his eschatological orientation in interpreting these creation-separations, for,

"There is no question of a complete liberation of the earth from the sea, just as created light was not completely liberated from darkness, or day from night or the lower cosmos from the danger threatening it from above. This is a matter for the new creation which does not form the commencement but the culmination of earth's history." 69

Nevertheless, Barth considered the threat as already removed in creation itself, and thus an essential prelude or preparation for man's creation.

This division of the seas points beyond, for Barth, to covenant history in Israel's crossing of the Red Sea and Jordan, and on to the time when in the new heaven and earth there will be no more sea. 70 But in the meantime, just as the moon and stars shine in the darkness, so fish and water creatures live in the oceans, and birds fly in the air (all nearer or in the "inhospitable regions") inspiring confidence and bearing witness as signs of hope to the overthrow of chaos. It is this eschatological reference that is important to Barth when he comes to the "tanninim" ocean monsters and not naturalistic allegorisations or natural

68. CD 3/1, 133-141
69. CD 3/1, 145
70. CD 3/1, 146-156
science as with the church fathers.\textsuperscript{71} In fact, so trustworthy has the strange and distant region of the sea become that the sacrament of calling and reconciliation is now baptism in which man is taken out of the water.\textsuperscript{72}

It is only on the basis of the final work of these separations, that Barth moves on to the next circle of creation, that of the animals,\textsuperscript{73} which further contributes to the house in which man will be placed. The innermost circle of creation, and to which all the rest has aimed, is the creation of man as male and female and thus in the image of God as a heterogeneous imitation or tertium comparationis, and not as an analogia entis (as with the Catholics) but as an analogia relationis, the confrontation of an I with a Thou as within the inner-trinitarian Being of God. For unlike the multitudes of creatures, only one man as male and female was created just as there was and is only One God.\textsuperscript{74} This imago Dei was not lost through the fall (as with the Reformers in their understanding of the imago as rectitude animae, or status integritatis). Rather, Barth found nothing about an original ideal man in an ideal state in the saga,\textsuperscript{75} and therefore rejected the original golden age ideas of the Persians, Greeks and Romans (also as in Gunkel) for creation is not itself the covenant but only the external basis of it. Barth was far more interested in the final eschatological redemption in which there will be perfection and peace. He found in the Old Testament (eg. Isa. 11:6f, Hos. 2:18, Isa. 65:25) witness to this future, but not with the intention of unfolding the history of the creatures' original state of innocence and peace, "thus moving the reader to homesickness instead of hope."\textsuperscript{76} This is

\textsuperscript{71}Discussed by Barth in CD 3/1, 169-175.
\textsuperscript{72}CD 3/1, 176. Cf. 280
\textsuperscript{73}CD 3/1, 143
\textsuperscript{74}CD 3/1, 181-206
\textsuperscript{75}CD 3/1, 200
\textsuperscript{76}Discussed by Barth in CD 3/1, 210-212.
typical of his so-called non-independent or non-abstract study of the saga for its own sake, but always in its teleological or eschatological orientation, and therefore with a view to its christological content and witness. We will need to question this interpretation of the *Imago Dei* in Chapter Six, Section 8f, pp. 444-449.

For Barth the completion of creation took place on the seventh day, not in some finishing touches (as with LXX translation) or in the creating of rest (as with Rabbi Raschi) but in a confirmation and confrontation of the Creator with His creation. He constituted Himself "its co-existing God in the historical event" of the Sabbath. The content of this event was the revelation of true deity, the establishing of the history of the covenant. Thus the constitution of the world "included from the very outset its completion. Without violating His own temporality, God has again taken time from our time for His action, and therefore really completed everything on a genuine last day of the first week. That even the history of God's lordship over the world moves towards a completion which concludes time but to that extent is itself temporal, towards the dawn of a genuinely last day of redemption, has its definite correspondence in the history of creation." As with Kohlbrügge, everything done in the saga is with a view to Jesus Christ, and for Barth, there is no avoiding of the "eschatological explanation of this rest" for He sees God on the seventh day looking forward to the completely different fulfillment and completion of man's relationship with Him. In this Sabbath rest God did not separate Himself from (as in Deism) but bound Himself to the world. Thus the Sabbath is a sign of a future which is to be free from work and given to man freely, a fact that clearly distinguishes Barth's Christian under-

77. Discussed by Barth in *CD* 3/1, 213f and 220.
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80. *CD* 3/1, 221
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standing of God from the demiurge creator of Marcion. Here the Gospel precedes law, and creation is grace. 83

The covenant history of salvation is spoken of as commencing with the creation of light, 84 or beginning with the Sabbath day of rest 85 - as then secretly begun, 86 and yet again as not starting until after the completion of the history of creation, 87 and finally as beginning immediately after the fall. 88 These may look like contradictions, but it is the eternal history between God and man that has always been a reality in Jesus Christ that Barth is speaking about, and even with the creation of light, its external basis had begun to be laid, but of course in the full sense of realization was not actualized until after man's creation. It would seem that Barth is following the unfolding of that which is enfolded in the eternal covenant, calling different moments the beginning, but in reality viewing the one creation week as the one commencement, even as it was the one external basis for the one covenant. 89

"Creatureliness, and therefore creation, is the external basis of the covenant of grace in which the love of God for man moves towards its fulfilment. It is in this teleology that it is presented in the first creation narrative of the Bible." 90

b. The Covenant as the Internal Basis of Creation

We now follow Barth into the second creation saga. He considered Genesis 2 to be concerned with the same theme as Genesis 1, with no contradictions, but from a different dimension, viewing the reality from a new and in fact, opposite angle. He considered this chapter as neither a supplement to Genesis 1, nor a commentary on it, but (as opposed to
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84. CD 3/1, 163
85. CD 3/1, 177
86. CD 3/1, 217
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89. Cf. CD 3/1, 240f
90. CD 3/1, 219 Underlining added.
B. Jacob) a new and different history of creation, viewed this time in mediis rebus or from the "inside".

"The main interest now is not how creation promises, proclaims and prophesies the covenant, but how it prefigures and to that extent anticipates it without being identical with it; not how creation prepares the covenant, but how in so doing it is itself a unique sign of the covenant and a true sacrament; not Jesus Christ as the goal, but Jesus Christ as the beginning (the beginning just because He is the goal) of creation."

In other words, whereas Barth saw in the first saga the covenant as the goal of creation (the unfolding of God's eternal plan) he saw in the second saga the covenant as the ground of creation (the enfolded eternal plan of God). Whereas the first account is given with a view to a future, the second has that future already present in the beginning. Barth called the first a prophetical view of creation, the second a sacramental.

Actually, both, in their opposite emphasis and direction, are but two ways of saying that what God is in His revelation, that He is antecedently and eternally within His inner-trinitarian being, for it is the eternal covenant, the eternal Logos Jesus Christ which is the identical content that both sagas witness to, and therefore Barth would say that instead of abstract accounts of past events they are eschatologically oriented.

The interest of Genesis 2 is not in the cosmic creation per se (as in Gen. 1) but in the earth, and then primarily in only one part of it - the small amount from which God made man, and the one garden in which He placed him. Here we are standing in the internal basis of creation, which prefigures the one man Abraham to be taken out of Chaldea, the one nation to be brought from Egypt to that garden-like land of promise

91. CD 3/1, 228f, 239f
92. CD 3/1, 233, 238.
93. CD 3/1, 232
94. CD 3/1, 232
95. CD 3/1, 233, 252
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(subjective content of Gen. 2), culminating finally in that one man Jesus Christ, the second and yet first Adam, the one man for all (objective content of Gen. 2).  

Here the covenant is not only the goal of creation but already characterizes creation itself.  

Thus Barth saw the key to the peculiar orientation of this second creation saga in the twofold divine name, which does not occur in Genesis 1, i.e. Yahweh Elohim, the covenant God of Israel.  

He concluded that La Peyrere (1655) was basically right when he saw in Genesis 1 the story of natural pagan man, and in Genesis 2 that of the Jew, the man of the history of salvation.  

Thus, as with all anthropogonies, the view of man is that held by the writers, which in this saga is the Hebrew or Old Testament picture, the man of Israel in his creatureliness (in strong contrast to deified man of the Babylonian Enuma Elish), most deeply humiliated but highly exalted, highly exalted and yet most deeply humiliated. Here (as with Delitzsch) is a supralapsarian picture of creation, which to Barth is also suprafederal in that the creation of man is described in the light of the faithfulness of God confirmed on the far side of creation and the fall.  

Man was formed a body from the dust and God breathed into him the breath of life, prefiguring Abraham to be taken from the nations to form a body called Israel into which the prophetic spirit would be breathed. But Adam’s creation would not be completed until God’s act in the garden.  

The garden in Genesis 2 is spoken of as the genuine and original place on earth, just as the week in Genesis 1 was the genuine and original
time on earth;\textsuperscript{105} with the establishment of paradise as the distinctive spatial parallel to the institution of the Sabbath as the temporal.\textsuperscript{106} The two trees in that garden representing God's revelation and prohibition, prefigured the same double ministry in Israel, and (with a change of signs) the chaos "water" enemy of Genesis 1, is now the river that goes out from the garden to divide to the four corners as with the proclamation from Israel to the world.\textsuperscript{107} Man before the trees, was not like Hercules with a choice at the cross-roads, but with opportunity to confirm and actualize his obedience as would be given to the covenant partner Israel,\textsuperscript{108} and the loss of paradise prefigured the Jews return to exile.\textsuperscript{109} However, the history of paradise acquires only its provisional form in the history of Israel, pointing beyond to the paradise to come, the goal of man and the world, where there will be only one tree instead of two. It is thus more than an Elysean fields, a paradise lost (as with the Persians, Greeks and Romans) or a fool's paradise (as with the Moslems) for it prefigures the Christian eschatological goal.\textsuperscript{110} Thus in Eden man's eternal destiny, his immortality was present as a promise, not inherent, but to be given by God.\textsuperscript{111}

The climax of the history of creation in the second saga is the completion of man's creation in the forming of woman out of man. Here is prefigured the whole covenant with man which will later be established, realized and fulfilled historically\textsuperscript{112} although that will finally be the incarnation of the God-man from woman. God used man to create woman, as He had used dust to create man. In both He significantly fashioned the new out of the old.\textsuperscript{113} This "absolute unity" (schlechthinige Einheit),\textsuperscript{114}
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unequal duality" (ungleichen Zweihheit), or "twice man" (zweisam Mensch) is really for the first time complete man as male and female, the image of God. Here in the climax is anticipated eschatology, the "incomparable covenant" and not the later father-mother-child relationship (typical throughout the Old Testament). Barth finds the Song of Songs as the only other place in the Old Testament where this same relationship is given. Ritschl had dismissed the Christ-Christian interpretation of the Song of Songs but Barth saw in it the eternal covenant of love at its eschatological goal, and therefore the ultimate culmination of creation. He called the Yahweh Elohim the "Husband Yahweh" whose mortal sleep and resurrection brought forth his helpmeet, the Church, and the two became one, for He had left the glory of His Father for the sake of His own, and the Church became the new creation, the body of which He is the head. Therefore, for Barth, the second saga prefigures through Jesus Christ the final eschatological goal of creation, when God and man will be one and will dwell together in peace, the covenant not only restored (objectively) but actualized (subjectively).

Thought through together, Barth considered that these two creation sagas present the eternal decree as the internal basis of creation and creation as the external basis of the eternal decree. Therefore creation and covenant are not abstractly separated. Marcion excluded man from the covenant, Schopenhauer excluded God from creation. In Marcion's scheme creation is lost sight of in the covenant, and in Schopenhauer's scheme the covenant is lost sight of in creation. In contrast, for Barth, they

115. CD 3/1, 288
116. CD 3/1, 306
117. Ritschl considered the Song of Songs as expressing love between equals, a false piety as seen in St. Bernard and the Latin Catholic Church (JR 593f). Barth, in contrast saw it as eschatological in that Gen. 2 sets at the beginning that which is the goal in the Song of Songs.
118. CD 3/1, 312ff
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are unequivocally and eternally related. In this sense he goes on to show that the Christian doctrine of creation, unlike others, is a "benefit" (Wohltat). Further, in that God as Creator has not said "No", or "Yes" and "No", but unequivocally "Yes" to what He created, means that He has both actualized it, and justified it. Concretely in Jesus Christ creation is actualization, and justification as God has taken the creature to Himself even before it was, namely, in His own Son. The covenant between God and man is the meaning and end of creation, so that unlike the false eighteenth century Leibnizian optimism, this is in fact the best of all possible worlds. Hence the goal and centre of the created universe is man whom God pronounced as very good, which Barth interprets as "pre-eminently suited for His future purpose."

Therefore, in contrast with theological orthodoxy of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which hardly knew what to make of Christ in the doctrines of predestination, creation and providence; which was far more at home with Aristotle and Descartes, and which even took over a dual system of bookkeeping (in Roman Catholic fashion) by tearing asunder creation and covenant; Barth found them united in the One Lord Jesus Christ. And it is important to follow him in his way of looking at them in Him, i.e. according to the basic presupposition that what Christ is in His revelation that He is antecedently and eternally in Himself, for God's

---
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revelation has its reality and truth wholly and in every respect (ontically and noetically) within itself. Thus what the incarnate Christ was as the actualized covenant and new creation in time He already was in eternity. It follows then that what Christ will be seen to be in the revelation at the parousia, He already was in eternity. Rooted in the eternity of God, in his pre-temporality, is not only His supra-temporality and post-temporality, but also, and because of this, his eternal relationship with man in creation, reconciliation and redemption. This world through creation has but become the theatre for the manifestation of the overflow of God's love in the covenantal or manward movement which has always been an eternal reality from God's standpoint. With its eternal roots, eschatology is then the final actualization of that eternal movement of God towards man which embraces creation, incarnation, reconciliation, resurrection, proclamation and ultimate redemption. For Barth, creation, reconciliation and redemption are grounded in God, as the three sides of His operation or "single act" just as His pre-temporality, supra-temporality and post-temporality are not three but one. From man's standpoint they appear separate, but from God's they are inseparable. Thus in opposition to older Reformed Federal theology, and nineteenth century history of redemption theology he viewed the entire Bible as a testimony to only a single event.

5. Providence as the External Execution of the Eternal Decree

Like the doctrine of creation, and together with it, providence describes an outer work of God, grounded in His eternal election.
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It is not continuata creatio, but as continuatio creatio it follows creation as the history of the covenant between God and the creature, for the act of creation takes place in a "specific first time" whereas the "time of providence" is the whole of the rest of time right up to its end. Its revelation is not read off from world-occurrence, but from Jesus Christ. Having basically a "prophetic relationship to history", not an immanent perception, it concerns God's teleological acts as a definite movement. Barth was astonished that older Protestant theology (Reformed and Lutheran) was guilty of almost a total failure to present a Christo-centric doctrine of providence, i.e. it taught the divine lordship over all occurrence without attempting to say what is the meaning and purpose of this lordship (he considered Catholic and Armenian theology to be no better). In contrast, Barth clearly linked providence to its goal in Jesus Christ, to the actualization of the eternal covenant:

"As the creation of all the reality distinct from God took place on the basis of this purposed covenant and with a view to its execution, so the meaning of the continued existence of the creature, and therefore the purpose of its history, is that this covenant will and work of God begun in creation should have its course and reach its goal. There is no other meaning or purpose in history." 

Thus for Barth, it is in the cosmos, as the theatrum gloriae Dei (or servant, instrument, mirror), where the "teleology of the divine work", the "history of the covenant", or this "special history" is enacted and unfolded under His divine providence. As in creation, there is no abstract understanding of providence, and thus not apart from Jesus Christ,
and therefore not apart from eschatology, for his "concern is with the permanence or continuity of human, or better of Christian, existence" until the return of Jesus Christ.\(^{146}\) In its broadest sense, conservatio is "eternal preservation" which preceded creation, occurs within time and continues after the creature's allotted time terminates.\(^{147}\) In time it is the divine accompanying of the creature as præsentia actuosa,\(^{148}\) a divine ruling which has an aim, a telos, set by God, and one to which He guides the creature.\(^{149}\)

"His rule or government is always a completed fact from which we derive and which can be known to us, and yet also an imminent event towards which we are only moving and which is still concealed from us."\(^{150}\)

This goal is God Himself, and "the movement towards God is the meaning of its history".\(^{151}\) Here Barth expresses, without contradiction, God's eternal manward movement in terms of man's temporal Godward movement. In other words, christological teleology includes the providence of the creature to its goal in God. It is a movement through providentia specialis (or extraordinaria) to providentia generalis (or ordinaria); i.e. from salvation history to world-occurrence in general,\(^{152}\) in which "we are caught up and forced to tread a definite path."\(^{153}\) God is thus present not as one influence among many, but as King.\(^{154}\)

Barth goes on to speak of the still valid election of the Jews, which is not only a pattern of the election of all peoples, but points to a preservation which is unique.\(^{155}\) (We will return to this in Chapter Six). God is in control, He remains faithful inspite of man's unfaithfulness.
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Just as His "target" was His Son becoming flesh when He created the world, so His "target" when His Son became flesh was the world. Providence is an essential aspect of the eternal christological teleology which moves towards a cosmic conclusion. It includes God's victorious rejection over nothingness and faithful servants of God and man (angels as the Kingdom of Heaven, or Ambassadors of God), who as a part of their raison d'être victoriously ward off the opposing forms and forces of chaos. Agreeing with Schleiermacher, Barth therefore opposed any dualism. He also disagreed with Heidegger's almost consuming purpose to demonstrate the potency of nothingness against existence and Sartre's nearly sole desire to demonstrate human existence as conditioned by the potency of nothingness. Heidegger turned towards, and Sartre away from, nothingness in order to press along their different paths to absolutizations and thus to their substitutes for God. Although both Heidegger and Sartre are more realistic than eighteenth and nineteenth century optimism, having been influenced by two world wars, yet they still resemble Leibniz and Schleiermacher in viewing the situation from their arbitrary human standpoint, rather than from the christological, and thus Barth called them "a false alarm." In direct contrast, Barth sees in Jesus Christ the last word already spoken to nothingness (at creation and in the resurrection), and therefore although nothingness is not nothing, it is but a "fleeting shadow and a receding frontier", with its final defeat as "the purpose and end of the history of God's dealings with His creature." It can no longer be feared in the light of a backward look to the resurrection of
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Jesus Christ and a forward look to His coming again in glory, even though its destruction has not yet taken place.

Christological teleology is seen in the ministry of the angels with the two-fold movement of God turning towards the creature and the creature towards Him. Angels appear only in this movement from heaven to earth, the movement of God, the movement of revelation (though they are not revelation but witnesses to it).

With Barth's doctrines of election, creation and providence before us, we are now ready to consider his christological teleology from the standpoint of "time" from which his eschatology again comes into focus.

6. The Time of Revelation
   a. God's Time and Our Time

   Keeping to Barth's order we present first a comparison of God's time and our time as revealed in and through Jesus Christ, followed by the Old Testament time of expectation and the New Testament time of recollection.

   The infinite qualitative distinction between God and man, and therefore between eternity and time, remains throughout the Kirchliche Dogmatik, but unlike the earlier period, the entrance of eternity into time is taken much more seriously. This is in the fullest sense, the forty days post-resurrection period which is, for Barth, a bodily resurrected Jesus Christ who appears as both eternal God and temporal man united in the one glorified risen Lord of time.

   To Barth this bodily resurrection revelation of Jesus Christ is of prime importance, rather than a mere rise of faith in the risen Lord as it is for R. Bultmann. Barth criticized W. G. Kümmel for not even
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mentioning it and O. Cullmann who only presents it at the end of his book, and with no real significance to his understanding of time in the New Testament. For Barth, it is not from the years 1-30, but from the standpoint of the resurrection appearances that the entire New Testament was written. This then was the primary time of revelation, from which alone God's time and man's time can be understood. (We will return to these forty days in Chapter Five.)

Barth therefore turned away from classical and modern concepts of time, eg. from Augustine and Heidegger and their interpretation of it as a mere product of man's existence, as a distentio, in which man not only possesses but creates time. Rather,

"There must be no appeal to God's creation of the world, and therefore of time also, to justify taking over a time concept gained elsewhere as the precondition of investigating the concept of revelation time. Of course God is the Creator of time also. But the time we think we know and possess, 'our' time is by no means the time God created. Between our time and God-created time as between our existence and the existence created by God there lies the Fall."

Barth considered that this "resurrection revelation" negates several theories, which we will briefly enumerate:

(1) The delusion that we possessed time is destroyed by this revelation which meant the end of our time, for as the eternal God He was before time, above time and will be after time, surrounding man on every side. He did not remain transcendent over time, but entered it, assumed and created it, thus breaking through our time to unveil His own time - the new time. In this way our time is really in His hands,
and so Barth asked, should we not say that time possesses us rather than we possess time?  

(2) This same revelation of Jesus Christ shatters the myth that man's time is endless, and so e.g., dismisses the famous first antinomy of the antithetic of pure reason in Kant. (Is time without beginning and end or has it a beginning and an end?) Closely linked is Barth's rejection of the optimistic anthropocentric concept of finitâ capax infiniti, for the coming of Jesus Christ (reconciliation) was not a continuation of creation but a new work, not a completion of creation but a miracle. It was real time (miraculous) entering our time (non-miraculous).

(3) Further, Barth considered that this same revelation of Jesus Christ is contrary to Cullmann's concept of "linear time" which supposes the New Testament authors to have started with a particular conception of time as an ascending line with a series of aeons, and then inserted into this geometrical figure the event of Christ as the centre of this line. Instead, for Barth, Jesus Christ is not only the "midpoint of time" but the "fulness of time" or the One in whom time was "actualized". In other words, He was eternity and time together in the One Being as God and man (vere Deus, vere Homo). And finally,

(4) this revelation of Jesus is self-revelation, and not a predicate of history (i.e. time) for history (i.e. time) is rather a predicate of revelation. This Barth held in opposition to the Erlangen school (redemption history) to M. Kähler (superhistory) and to his
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Turning from all abstract or general views of time (in contrast with the four theories cited above), Barth concentrated upon the self-revelation of the eternal God who entered into time, who particularly in the resurrection revealed both eternity and time. From this standpoint all Barth's eternity-time thinking derives.

Jesus Christ revealed God's own time, specified by Barth as "fulfilled time", "revelation time", "eternal time", "mastered time", "real time", "genuine time", "special time", "new time", "time of salvation", "normal time", "time of His covenant", "the great Sabbath", 191 "time of Grace", 192 and "time of light". 193 There is a qualitative distinction between this time of God and "our time" which is by contrast only "lost time", "fallen time", "condemned time", "problematic time", "improper time", "general time", "world time", "old time" 194 and "empty time" 195 because it is "essentially past time", "the non-recurring past of commencing time" 196 excluded in creation and revealed in God's "new time" that has broken into "our time" through the incarnation - resurrection. This is the time of the Deus praesens, the "time God has for us". Prior to the fall there was "God-created time" or "co-created" 197 or "time of creation" 198 which Barth also called "primal time" (Urzeit), 199 and "commencing time", 200 which man lost. The reconciling God who from eternity

191. CD 1/2, 45-70; 3/2, 437-640.
192. CD 4/1, 739
193. CD 3/1, 156f
194. CD 1/2, 45-70
195. CD 3/1, 75
196. CD 3/1, 102 Cf. 110.
197. CD 3/2, 438
198. CD 3/1, 75
199. CD 3/2, 477
200. CD 3/1, 75
has had time for us, has entered into time overcoming our lost time by giving us new time in a wondrous exchange. Rooted and grounded in the eternal decree, God's manward movement has been from eternity - it is His time for us which became manifest as "fulfilled time in the midst of the times" in the new creation or resurrection of the God-man. Although our being is one long loss of time, in Him is our true being in time. Our time is thus revealed as embedded in His eternity.

Whereas eternity was not created, because God is Eternal, time was willed and created by God as a reality distinct from Himself. As the eternal God He is the giver and guarantor of man's time. Thus Barth considers time as "Given time" with a definite "Beginning time" and an "Ending time", for even "God-created time" was "allotted time" (befristete Zeit) by contrast with God's time which is "unallotted eternity" (unbefristete Ewigkeit). In other words, even before sin and its death, eternity embraced time on all sides as man was only given limited duration, to conclude with natural death. Barth finds this revealed in

201. Man's "empty time" commenced after the "time of divine creation", and God's "time of grace" commenced simultaneously with it as the true and proper sequence and continuation of the "time of Creation". The lost or "empty time" opened up at that point was also the "fulfilled time" of Jesus Christ which has its centre in His "life-time", i.e. the "pre-time" which was His "life-time". Thus man lost the time loaned to him but received it back again in Jesus Christ. From the beginning his "lost time" has been surrounded by the "time of the divine covenant of grace" directly continuing the "time of creation" (CD 3/1, 75). Although the "time of creation" was "commencing time" it was not the beginning of the "time of grace" (which is eternal) but it was the "time of grace". In this sense reconciliation precedes creation, for the "first and genuine time", which is the prototype of time is not the "time of creation" but the "time of reconciliation". "Real time", in this case, is primarily the "life-time of Jesus Christ". (CD 3/1, 75f)
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the allotted time given to the man Jesus Christ who was not only born but died. He considered that his death was not only natural but also the στόχος θανάτος of Rev. 20:14. God has thereby removed the fear of death. Thus man not only comes from God but moves towards God, having both a definite beginning and as specific an ending as a part of his God-created time. In contrast, Barth suggested that a being in unending time would be centrifugal rather than oriented and determined by God. Here (as in the section on Providence) we see not only an eternal movement of God towards man, but a movement in God-created time in which man comes and goes to God. But when God became man, and man was taken up into God this movement found its fulfillment in a double God to manward and man to Godward movement within the very being of Jesus Christ (to be studied later in this chapter). This was the actualization in time of the eternal covenant, or eternal election of the God-man, Jesus Christ, which brought the dawning of the "last time" or "end-time". Christological teleology is this eternal movement of God towards the consummation of the "last time" or "end-time" which dawned with His appearance in time. It is thus a movement which seen from man's side is yet to be consummated, whereas from God's side it has never been "not yet", for it must be stressed that what God was in His revelation that He already was antecedently and eternally in Himself. In this sense eschatology preceeded creation. Yet, from man's side, revelation is not yet redemption, for "new time" is not yet the "only time". For now in this "time of grace" there is a parallelism between "fulfilled time" and the "time of grace" which Barth, in direct contrast to his Römerbrief (and hence indicating

his developed eschatology) called a "delay".  

He also considered this fulfillment of our time by revelation not to be the completion but the announcement, the immediate imminence of the taking away of our time.

b. The Time of Expectation

Fulfilled time has a quite definite pre-time co-ordinated with it, a time within the ante Christum natum, the time of a definite history, the historical uniqueness of Israel, which in itself was revelation-time, but only in the sense of expecting revelation in Jesus Christ as the goal of its history.

Following Irenaeus, Augustine and Calvin and rejecting Marcion, the Socinians, Schleiermacher and Harnack, Barth recognized an important identity between the Old and the New Testaments, in that they both point to the revelation actualized in Jesus Christ. Three lines of unity are given. (1) Both witness to the free, utterly once-for-all concrete action of God in His self-revelation. So in the Old Testament the covenant did not discover Israel as already existing as such but created Israel, arresting man for God and not God for man, attesting thereby God's revelation in its expectation of the revelation of Jesus Christ. Further, all Old Testament Covenants (eg. Sinaitic, Abrahamic, and that made with Noah) are but the one eternal covenant between God and man that pointed beyond themselves (as promise) to the future covenant time of salvation. Likewise, prophets, priests and kings find in that future Prophet, Priest and King their reality. Thus the content and theme of the Old Testament is Jesus Christ. (2) Both witness to the revelation in which God remains a hidden God, declaring Himself as such by revealing Himself. In this attestation

---
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is pronounced both a judgment on the world and hope for it. Both are seen above all in Israel.

"It especially, the beloved, chosen, sanctified nation, the house of God, must be the place where the old aeon begins to pass in face of the coming of God and His new work." 225

As the suffering servant, Israel typified the Son of man, who would be rejected and crucified. (3) Both witness to revelation in which God is present to man as the coming God, and "Present and coming are both to be stressed." 226 Thus there is "an eschatological thread in the Old Testament in which "God's future" is "intensive presence". Genuine Israel is therefore merely typified by both the Northern and Southern Kingdoms, and their promised land directs attention

"to the paradise lost and restored which is to be the dwelling-place of this people, to the miraculous renewed earth upon which this people will some day live amid the other happily and peaceably united peoples." 228

Likewise, their temple is governed by the temple of the future which will

"stand and shine upon some quite other mount of God, to which some day not only Israel but the nations will make pilgrimage. It is from the standpoint of its future that the temple at Jerusalem is what it is." 229

Everything present in the Old Testament is to be regarded from the standpoint of its own future, as the complete lordship of God gives rise to the hope of a Kingdom without end, in the "future accomplishment" of which God's people live even in the imperfection of its present situation and government. 230 Thus judgments in the Old Testament point beyond to universal judgment, having as it were already the future in the present.

"The prophets look beyond the flames which, kindled by hostile men, destroy Samaria and Jerusalem, but
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also in the end Nineveh and Babylon, to see this quite different, unquenchable flame."

The earthly kings (already cited above) are again here in this list, for in them Barth sees a parable of the Messianic King who according to Daniel 7 will appear in the clouds of heaven. He sees in this Old Testament a pointing beyond to the consummation which will bring victory not preceded by a struggle. (The Messiah will not take part in the Messianic woes, which although he does not mention it, is apparently said in opposition to Schweitzer's theory. See page 121 above.)

It is only ex eventu, from the recollection of New Testament time, that we can say that in respect of this expectation, the Old Testament witnesses to divine revelation. Before coming to consider that time of recollection, it is important to note that, reminiscent of Kierkegaard, Barth also presented the contingent contemporaneity of Christ with the Old Testament, as John 8:56 links the time of Jesus Christ with that of Abraham, and thus he considered this effectively overcame the false leap over the centuries proposed by Lessing, Herder, Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Harnack, Lagarde and Troeltsch.

c. The Time of Recollection

Fulfilled time, or the time of Jesus Christ, is followed by a very definite time which as little coincides with the time post Christum natum as the preceding time did with the time ante Christum natum. This subsequent time is a time within this time, a time of a definite history, the time of the New Testament or time of recollection. Having nothing to do with historical cause and effect, apostolic proclamation found its
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rise in revelation as no less a miracle than the Old Testament found its
goal in the same revelation. New Testament religion is not based upon
the ground of our judgments of value and taste (apparently against
Ritschl). 237 Rather, in it revelation "breaks in from above", as its
own ground for the witness. Then Barth went on to indicate that the
three lines of Old Testament expectation are continued beyond the time
fulfilled in Jesus Christ in the New Testament recollection. (1) Like
the Old Testament it witnesses to the togetherness of God and man. What
was expected has been fulfilled, so that every statement in the New Testa-
ment originates in the fact that the Word was made flesh. 238 The form of
the Old Testament has now a content in the New Testament, although eternity
has not yet become time. Nevertheless in the crucifixion event, the new
time is established and the old fulfilled. (2) Like the Old Testament it
witnesses to the revelation of the hidden God, proved by His own people's
rejection and crucifixion. But that death brought an end to this aeon.
The Old Testament question concerning suffering is answered by One dying
for all. Christ has therefore already fought the fight against the old
world and man in faith lives with Him in the new. 239 (3) Like the Old
Testament it witnesses to the revelation in which God is present to man
as the coming God. 240 Whereas there was an eschatological line in the Old
Testament all is either explicitly or implicitly eschatological in the
New Testament. 241 The exception, which proves the rule, is found in the
Easter narratives and Paul's Damascus road encounter in which the "pure
presence of God" rather than the eschatological is involved. This was
revelation, the eternal time which is recollected subsequently. This
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time overarches our time causing recollection of it to be more strongly expectation of the coming Christ than was possible in the Old Testament. Thus, far more than the Old Testament, the New Testament message is "completely eschatological in direction and intention".242 The forty days is different from the apostolic age, and fulfilled time different from the time of recollection. In other words, revelation is not history, nor is it a revealed state (apparently against Schleiermacher)243 for "what Christ is in us, that He is for us and therefore in His difference from us. This is what is assured by the eschatological trend of New Testament faith." 244 Faith thus has Christ as it hopes in Him, as it reaches forth to those things which are before. How then is this different from the hope of the Old Testament?

"As distinguished from Old Testament expectation, New Testament expectation knows concretely and explicitly who it is that is expected. It is simply recollection turned at an angle of 180°, the recollection of the Word come in the flesh, whose glory the New Testament witnesses have seen. Similarly, the Christ it expects is none other than He whom it already knows as very God and very man, from whom also it is already derived. His coming is in fact only His second coming." 245

Summarizing the last two sections, we note that revelation time (i.e. the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ) is different from historical time, (whether B.C. or A.D.) for it is "eternal time" which has entered into our "lost time" bringing an utterly "new time". All time before it moved towards it, and all subsequent times falls away from it, whilst it accompanies our time on its way to final manifestation. This eternal time or eternal covenant, or eternally elected Jesus Christ takes up one nation which is elected, and moves on and finally narrows down to become the one Jew elected,246 the man Jesus Christ, and then on from Him
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the movement continues and reaches outwards to embrace the world. Thus all movement before Jesus Christ's coming in the flesh moves towards this one election actualized, and all movement after Him moves out to all mankind as elected through Him. At the same time, the movement in the Old Testament was to the fulfillment realized in Jesus Christ's resurrection, whereas that victory is forever a fact in the New Testament and we only await the final revelation of it. In other words, Jesus Christ "is the eschatological (endzeitliche) realization of the will of God for Israel and therefore for the whole race." As the eternal covenant, He is the only covenant between God and man, and so Barth refers to "the bow of the one covenant which stretches over the whole" (Old Testament and New Testament) of the one history of the community in the Old Testament and the New Testament which hastens to its culmination from its centre in Jesus Christ. Barth thus speaks of man being created with a teleology, of the relationship between Jesus Christ and the world in terms of a dynamic teleology, and of a teleologically oriented history. This is a movement towards a definite goal. Thus the incarnation is the goal and recapitulation of all God's acts, the crucifixion is the goal and end of time, and the resurrection is the goal of all history from which we come. Although Jesus Christ is the goal of all natural history, and in Him we are already at the goal; He, as the victor, marches irreversibly and ineluctably forward to the goal of final triumph (the parousia) which as the culminating act of salvation history will be the
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goal of the history of creation. The incarnation, cross and resurrection are neither several goals nor goals separate from the eschatological goal of the final parousia, for it is in relation to this future goal that those of the past find their reality. They are not isolated but integrated, being but the unfolding of the one eternal goal. Here is the eternal manward movement of God which places the world, history and therefore every man under the determination (Bestimmung) of the Lord of time, directing them to the final revelation of God's one goal which will be fully manifest to man in the parousia, but which has antecedently and eternally been a reality to God.

7. The Munus Sacerdotale and the Munus Regium

---

258. Note CD 3/1, 115
259. Here Barth expounds the first two parts of the triplex munus (threefold offices of Jesus Christ). Here the priestly and kingly aspects are considered in the whole life-act (being and works) of Jesus Christ from incarnation to crucifixion. The prophetic ministry (to be considered in the next chapter) concerns the post-resurrection ministry of Jesus Christ in the forty days and through the subsequent work of the Holy Spirit to be consummated in the final parousia revelation. What is significant for us to note is Barth's apparent change of thinking on the triplex munus, i.e. in CD 2/2, 431 he referred to the prophetic office as Christ's Galilean ministry, the priestly office as His passion and the kingly office as His exaltation. This is the same order, not interpretation, as Schleiermacher (CF 438-475). Calvin's order was prophet, king and priest (Institutes 2.15.1-6) so that the first office for Calvin became the last for Barth's presentation in KD 4. The prophetic office of Christ for Schleiermacher consisted in teaching, prophesying and working miracles (CF 441-450) culminating in the 40 days of the resurrection. It is with these 40 days that the prophetic office begins for Barth. The priestly office of Christ for Schleiermacher consisted in his active obedience (law keeping), passive obedience (death) and his intercession (CF 451-466). What is significant is his rejection of the active-passive obedience as two different times, relating both to the whole course of Christ's life (CF 452f) but with no humiliation through union of two natures (CF 473ff). Barth also related the offices to the whole life of Jesus Christ (in CD 4, although apparently not in 2/2, 431) and thus in agreement with Schleiermacher, but he considered the priestly and kingly within the being and acts of the God-man rather than just associated with the God-consciousness in the only quantitatively different man Jesus. As with Calvin, Barth cont./
Jesus Christ is both the source, revelation, guarantor and goal of all God's works and ways ad extra. It is to this God-man that the eternal movement is teleologically oriented, but only because it is within this God-man that the teleological movement is effectively actualized. There is involved not just a general relationship of God with man, and movement between them but with this specific God-man, so that Barth refers to the "dynamic and teleology of the antithesis" in this solidarity between the eternal God and temporal man in the very being of Jesus Christ. This is the very heart of christological teleology which we now come to examine, for it contains all the rest in nuce. Its position in the Kirchliche Dogmatik is the Doctrine of Reconciliation which Barth

259. cont.

considered the three offices as indissolubly connected (see Institutes, 2.15.1 - three parts of the one office) and did so by considering them as one in the being and acts of Jesus Christ. However, perhaps the greatest difference between Calvin and Barth lies in Calvin's triplex munus of Jesus Christ being for the church only (Institutes, 2.15.1,5), whereas for Barth they are associated with the cosmos (world, community and individual). In this Barth is the same as Schleiermacher who related them to the entire human race (CF 457-465, 468-472). These differences spring from differences in the doctrine of election. Thus Calvin's is rooted in a soteriological predetermination of the elect (i.e. church); Schleiermacher's is grounded in an inherent created determination (finitas capax infiniti) to evolve by natural means (even though connected with Christ's influence) to universal fulfillment; and Barth's is rooted in the eternal election of Jesus Christ, the one man for all men who through His life, death and resurrection has actualized redemption for the cosmos, for in Him there is realized the new creation. This obviously has an important connection with eschatology, and especially for the doctrine of apokatastasis as we shall see in Chapter 6. Of the risen Jesus Christ Barth said, "The three offices of Christ differentiated by the older dogmatics run into each other at this place so as to be almost indistinguishable" (Credo 110). The problem with Barth's presentation of the risen Lord, is that the prophetic office was given exclusive, even though associated, consideration with the others as we shall note in Chapter 5. In a sentence Barth related them as follows, "As long as time lasts, we stand in the realm of grace and therefore do not know the munus regium Christi otherwise than in the munus propheticum that proclaims to us His munus sacerdotale" (Credo 112).
rightly calls the "centre of all Christian knowledge." 261

In classical theology, the triplex munus of Jesus Christ is given sequential treatment so that He was first the prophet in His proclamation and teaching, followed by the priestly ministry on the cross and climaxing in the ascension to be King in the sessio ad dexteram. This progression through these three specific offices was sharply divided into two different states (status) - the state of humiliation from incarnation to burial after which came the state of exaltation beginning with his resurrection. 262 Barth changed both the order and the emphasis, the prophetic office being placed last instead of first, and the movement (humiliation-exaltation) seen as integral to the very Being of the God-man so that humiliation and exaltation are considered concurrent instead of sequential. 263 This meant that the priestly and kingly offices rather than consecutive are both related primarily to the entire period from incarnation to crucifixion. What is involved here is no mere static unio but a dynamic unitio. It is this period that we now turn to, and at the close of the following chapter we will come to the post-resurrection prophetic office. These two final sections to these two chapters have an important relationship to our thesis.

We have now left the doctrines of creation and providence at the circumference (the external basis and execution of the covenant) to come to the heart of the covenant fulfillment in the atonement. It is from

261. CD 4/1, ix. Cf. 1/2, 882 where Barth refers to it as the "real", "actual" and not the "systematic" centre of dogmatics and church proclamation.
262. Referred to in CD 4/2, 106.
263. Barth does not however negate the fact that in Jesus Christ "an ascendit follows the whole descendit" (CD 3/3, 430), the resurrection comes after the cross (3/1, 384). It should, however, be kept in mind that from God's standpoint He humbled Himself in the divine decree from eternity and therefore before the creation of all things (3/1, 50). Cf. "condescension from eternity" (3/1, 130). H. Hartwell rightly called this "novel" (ThKE 136).
264. The eternal covenant is the presupposition of all God's works ad extra, and therefore of creation, reconciliation and redemption (See CD 4/1, 22-66).
this point that Barth understands the full meaning of creation, on the one hand, and eschatology on the other, which is also a part of the circumference with creation. Here we face the Immanuel, "God with us", and because of this the resulting "we with God". With the "outer work" of God in the doctrines of creation and providence behind us we now face the "inner work" revealed in the doctrine of reconciliation. This "God with us" is "not a state, but an event", which apparently Barth said in opposition to the Schleiermacher-Ritschl emphasis, and it is further "God Himself in this act of His." Unlike the early church's emphasis upon the being of God (eg. councils of Nicea and Constantinople) and the Reformation interest in the acts of God (eg. Lutheran justification by faith and Calvinistic decrees) Barth considered the being of God in His acts and the acts of God in His being together in a non-abstract unity. For Him De persona Christi Θεοῦ Θεοῦ (stressed in Eastern church) and De officio Christi mediatorio (stressed in Western church) were of necessity integrally related, so that His having two natures meant that the two states were not separate in time or independent from the two natures.

Thus "in His own person He is the eschatological (erlebtliche) sovereign act of God," It was this thinking together of the act and being of God which was the basic presupposition behind the original contribution Barth made to the triplex munus. Like everything considered in
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272. Barth considered that the vere Deus, vere homo of Athanasian-Nicean Christology was basic to his Christology which moves in the same direction, but being formally independent from it, goes far beyond that of the fourth century in the dynamic understanding of the munus triplex. See CD 4/1, 200.
this chapter, it is important to keep clearly before us that the *triplex munus* is also rooted and grounded in the eternal decree, in the eternal election of Jesus Christ, and therefore embraces a fulfillment (vollzieht) and a revelation (*Offenbarung*) of that original and basic will of God, i.e. the eternal covenant.\(^{273}\) God's eternal manward movement has been the outworking of that eternal covenant which was actualized in the reconciliation atonement, in the very being and acts of Jesus Christ. It is thus for Barth more than creation, more than the preservation, accompaniment and overruling of His creatures,\(^{274}\) as it has priority and precedence over creation and providence,\(^{275}\) because in Jesus Christ we do not have to do with a second and subsequent, but with the first and original.\(^{276}\) Therefore, for Barth, creation realized its goal in the atonement as of itself it was *finitum non capax infiniti*, which was in complete contrast with Schleiermacher (also Duns Scotus, John Scotus Eriugena and second century gnostics) who also considered creation as realising its goal in Jesus Christ, but only as a natural development from its beginning which was *finitum capax infiniti*.\(^{277}\) Although both Schleiermacher and Barth have a christological teleology, they are as opposite in emphasis as their anthropocentric and christocentric concern. Barth's christological teleology is also completely different from the philosophical teleology of the Hegelian dialectic of thesis and antithesis resolved in the synthesis, for his Christian dialectic of covenant, sin and reconciliation views sin as already excluded and negated by the will of God active in creation on the one hand, and sin as not leading to reconciliation on the other, for it is not a higher unity, but in it God contends one-sidedly for His work
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in creation and the covenant and therefore one-sidedly against sin. 278

In the \textit{triplex munus} we come to the very centre, the goal, of this christological teleology, for it is the fulfilling and revealing in time of the covenant of grace concluded in Jesus Christ from all eternity. 279

Again, we will follow Barth's own order of presentation of the first two aspects of the \textit{triplex munus}, which primarily relate to the period from incarnation to crucifixion.

a. Jesus Christ, the Lord as Servant

(1) The Way of the Son of God into the Far Country

The atonement is history that takes precedence over all other history, being noetically the history about Jesus Christ and ontically, Jesus Christ's own history. 280 It involves an act of extravagance, an entrance into complete solidarity with man by becoming flesh (σώματος, \textit{natura corupta}; as with Athanasius, Anselm, Irving, Kohlbrügge) and thus under the sign of the fall 281 into a state of perishing before God (and therefore different from the incarnation of Isis, Osiru, Buddha and Zoroaster). 282 In Him the non-immutable (in Pagan sense) God broke into the \textit{circulus vitiosus} of human plight, making His own man's guilt, rejection and condemnation, not of necessity but in a sovereign act, 283 and doing so not as an inclusio of the logos in the creature (Lutheran) but, also at the same time, being the logos extra carnem, (extra \textit{Calvinisticum} of Calvin and also evident in Athanasius) 284 and therefore not in a Docetic kenosis. Without ceasing to be very God of very God, God became
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also very man of very man (as in Niceo-Chalcedonian Christology and therefore in apposition to all forms of subordinationism or modalism) the *forma Dei* became the *forma servi*. This is the meaning of the eternal "God for us."

"In the condescension in which He gives Himself to us in Jesus Christ He exists and speaks and acts as the One He was from all eternity and will be to all eternity. The truth and actuality of our atonement depends on this being the case."  

Thus, for Barth, it was the One who already existed *a priori* who came to exist against *a posteriori*, becoming also what He had not previously been, taking into unity with His divine being the quite different creaturely and sinful being, and thus choosing, sanctifying, and assuming human nature and existence into oneness with Himself, remaining throughout the free, sovereign Word of God. In this *assumptio carnis* Barth's interpretation of the anhypostatic and enhypostatic aspects involved in the *unico hypostatica* is such that the ἔναντιόσχεσις means nothing else than "independent existence" for "Jesus Christ exists as a man because and as this One exists". (We will return to the significance of this later in Section 8 b (1).)

He did not take neutral human nature, nor adopt the body of one already in existence, nor become a third being different from God or man, nor a co-mingling or identification, or mutual participation of

---
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288. CD 1/2, 122, 136. The *natus ex virgine* is but the sign or form pointing to the signified content (i.e. the mystery) of God's own free and sovereign act in the incarnation just as the empty grave. Likewise it pointed to His other act in the bodily resurrection. In both God remained indissolubly subject. The incarnation is therefore *conceptus de Spiritu Sancto*, a mystery, a miracle conceived in faith or grace (Augustine) or through the ear (John of Damascus) so that the miracle rests upon the mystery rather than the mystery upon the miracle (1/2, 172-202).
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natures into a humanized divinity (Entgöttung) or divinized humanity (Vergöttung)\textsuperscript{290} (Quendstedt's communis participatio, and earlier, Luther's communicatio idiomatum) but became a duality in unity (communio naturarum) as ἄσυμμτως - inconfuse, ἄτρεπτως immutabiliter (against any metamorphosis of the divine, and Monophysitism, against excesses of Alexandrian theology) and ἄσικητως - indivise, ἄχιρπτως - inseparabiliter (against Nestorianism, against excesses of Antiochene theology). In positive terms this means that both the divine and human essence (Wesen, not Natur)\textsuperscript{291} neither were nor are changed and self-alienated in their union in Jesus Christ; and that even in their distinctiveness they were and are united in Him, not merely in appearance but in fact, not merely partially but totally, not merely temporarily but definitively. In line with Chalcedonian Christology, and following the acting God emphasis of Reformed tradition and the communio concern of Lutheranism (however gratierum instead of idiomatum), the incarnation to Barth meant, in the fullest sense, the presence of God and man in one being, and thus the covenant actualized. And it was within the very being of this God-man that a history took place, making Jesus Christ the object and "theatre" for the acts of God.\textsuperscript{292} With this background before us we are now ready to consider Barth's presentation of that history, i.e. that part which involves the munus regium and munus sacerdotiale of the triplex munus.\textsuperscript{293}

\textsuperscript{290} CD 4/2, 68

\textsuperscript{291} Barth deliberately chose Wesen (essence) over the traditional Natur (nature) to get free from conveying any idea of general nature and resulting tendencies to natural theology. However, "essence" in English is perhaps even more misleading, and must be understood as the translators noted, "strictly in the sense of intrinsic being or nature" (CD 4/2, 26ff, trans. note bottom of p. 44).

\textsuperscript{292} CD 1/2, 147, 149, 163ff; 4/2, 49-60, 63-116, 503-505; or "humanum" (Menschlichen) 4/2, 48. Cf. D. Bonhoeffer, C 91 and T. F. Torrance, TR 131.

\textsuperscript{293} Although Barth does call Jesus Christ the "Bearer (Träger) of the power of the Creator", and "Bearer of our human nature" (CD 3/1, 35, cont./
b. The Judge Judged in our Place

The way of the Son of God into the far country (in die Fremde) into lowliness, was a revelation of His deity, His divine sonship, and was for His own sake and then as such in fact propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem; in other words, primarily pro se, and then pro nobis and therefore pro me. As humanitas Jesus Christ's incarnation had cosmic significance.  

(Earth turns from the Lutheran pro me subjective delimiting interest, placing it last instead of first.) It was an unreconciled world that He willed to convert to Himself, and which (reminiscent of Athanasius) not by overcoming or removing it from without but from within. He entered the misery and curse of man, to turn and change it from the inside - i.e. in His very being. He was acting in His very being in the place of sinners, in no false masquerade, dressing up or mere appearance of exchange, but in actuality (in the fullest sense) became "the only One who is judged and condemned and rejected", as He was "the one great sinner among all other men." Jesus Christ therefore took our place as our judge, and took our place as sinners. This was the journey into the far country with its humiliation which climaxed in His suffering, crucifixion and death in our place. "On that one day of suffering of that One there took place the comprehensive turning

---

293. cont.
55, 97) and so uses the same word "bearer" (Träger) as Ritschl (eg. JH 388, 446, 591f, etc.) he nevertheless fills it with his own content (i.e. true divinity) rather than following Ritschl's anthropomorphic-humanized connotation.
294. CD 4/1, 211-215
295. In doing what He does God does it first for His own sake (for His glory) and only then for man (CD 4/1, 212) so that He does not first elect and determine man but Himself (4/2, 84).
296. CD 4/1, 237. Cf. Athenasius, DI 43.6, 44.6, 9.4, 20.5, 44.2.4, 49.2 etc.
297. CD 4/1, 216
298. CD 4/1, 237ff
299. CD 4/1, 231-235
300. CD 4/1, 235-244
301. CD 4/1, 244-256
(umfassende Wendung) in the history of all creation - with all that this involves", for He the Judge gave Himself up to be judged in our place so that in Him the world is converted to God, the covenant renewed and restored, and thus as the second Adam He reversed and overthrew the activity of the first, founding a new world and inaugurating a new aeon. Jesus Christ has done this for us before God and has therefore done right. We therefore wait for Him when, placed in Him and with Him at this turning-point of the times (Wende der Zeiten). He is the end of the old aeon and the beginning of the new, having come, occupied, as it were the archimedian point from which He could move, and did move the world. He was, on the one hand, the one lost sheep, the one lost coin, and the lost son making His day not only the day of the divine judgment, but, on the other hand "the great day of atonement, the day of the dawn of a new heaven and a new earth, the birthday of a new man." To the question "Cur Deus homo" (asked by Anselm) Barth thus gave these four related answers. "He took our place as Judge. He took our place as the judged. He was judged in our place. And He acted justly in our place." This is theologia crucis, the strait gate and narrow way, the great substitution in which the Son of God went into the far country, the Lord became a servant, the High Priest became the sacrifice. He the eternally living One died for us the death of the old man, to actualize the new and the eternal. The situation between God and man has therefore been completely altered with a "radical conversion of man to Himself which posits an end and therefore a new beginning." This is the munus

302. CD 4/1, 247. Cf. DO 122
303. CD 4/1, 251
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305. CD 4/1, 256-283
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307. CD 4/1, 257ff
308. CD 4/1, 273
309. CD 4/1, 277-283
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sacerdotale (being and act of Jesus Christ) which in older dogmatics was considered separately in the person of Christ, especially His deity, and His high-priestly work.\(^{311}\) We will need to further examine and criticize this munus sacerdotale later in the chapter. What concerns us here in following Barth's presentation is that the eternal manward movement of God reached its deepest depths when He came to the far country to become what we are in order that we might become in Him what He is. This other side of Barth's christological teleology, this elevation of humanity in His humanitas, is the other side of what took place in His being and acts in His journey into the far country, and to which we now turn.

c. Jesus Christ, the Servant as Lord

(1) The Exaltation of the Son of Man

The first problem of the doctrine of reconciliation now lies behind, and we are in the second. Just as God is One so is the work of atonement, which is His action, one. But just as we cannot even know and confess the one God Himself except as the One who is Father, Son and Holy Spirit, so His being and acts in Jesus Christ in the doctrine of reconciliation must be unfolded separately in dogmatics.

The free turning of God in condescension, His inconceivable self-offering to the cause of His unfaithful covenant partner and His journey into the far country as the Lord becoming the servant was a "mighty movement from above to below."\(^{312}\) The other side of this one atonement or reconciliation, mediation or covenant actualized is what concerns us in this section, and the important thing to note is the concurrent and yet opposite movement involved.

\(^{311}\) CD 4/1, 283

\(^{312}\) CD 4/2, 4
"Now what was done to man, and the meaning for him of the divine work of atonement and therefore of the grace of God, is that, as God condescends and humbles Himself to man and becomes man, man himself is exalted, not as God or like God, but to God, being placed at His side, not in identity, but in true fellowship with Him, and becoming a new man in this exaltation and fellowship. It is true enough that the event of atonement is wholly and utterly a movement from above to below, of God to man. But it is also true that this truth encloses a further truth that the atonement is wholly and utterly a movement from below to above, the movement of reconciled man to God." 313

Here is the inner heart of christological teleology, God's manward movement in Jesus Christ from eternity. Here it is seen to be a two-fold movement in which He has chosen for Himself man's eternal perdition and in and with this His abasement has elected and achieved man's exaltation, so that "the telos of this judgment, in which God took it upon Himself, can be only the redemption of man - and more than that, the creation and existence of the new man who is well-pleasing to God." 314

The placing of "reconciled man" as the second problem of the doctrine of reconciliation completely reverses former primary interest in it in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and even in the Middle Ages and Early Church. Rather than the immanent emphasis of God in man (even secretly widespread in the seventeenth century and in the Reformation) Barth comes in this section to concentrate upon the man in God. 315 It forms a christological answer to all anthropocentric theologies of reconciliation, including the Marian dogma of Romanism. 316

But in turning from this anthropomonism, Barth was careful not to go to the opposite theomonism, for in Jesus Christ there is man as well as

313. CD 4/2, 6. Underlining added.  315. CD 4/2, 8f
314. CD 4/2, 6  316. CD 4/2, ix
God. 317 (Critics would perhaps call this Christomonism. 318)

(2) The Homecoming of the Son of Man

In the sentence, "the Word became flesh" (John 1:14), accent on "flesh" makes it a statement about God, but accent upon "word" makes it a statement about man. This means that without ceasing to be the true God, God in the second mode of his being as the Son went into the far country of human corruption and perdition, and man without ceasing to be man, was assumed and accepted in his creatureliness and corruption by the Son of God, thus returning home to where he belonged, to the covenant fellowship, to the "fulness of His time for which He was made, to the presence and enjoyment of the salvation for which He was destined." 319

This going out of the Son of God and coming in of the Son of man as it took place in Jesus Christ is the "one inclusive event" or atonement - the ζητοκαταλλασσειν or "exchange". 320

This man is not comprehended from man in general (naturalistic, idealistic or existential categories) for besides being exactly the same as we are, He is so quite differently in that an exaltation of His humanity took place, which in turn means the placing of the humanity common to Him and us on a higher level. 321 Different from the false immanental theologia gloriae, He is the genuine theologia gloriae, which calls us on from just an abstract theologia crucis (the first problem of atonement). 322

Both the theologia crucis and theologia gloriae are grounded in the eternal election of Jesus Christ, in which God in His Son elected and determined Himself for man (first problem of atonement) and man for Himself

317. CD 4/2, 10
318. For Barth's reply to such critics, see CD 3/3, xi; 4/1, 683. We will return to this in the next chapter, section 10d.
319. CD 4/2, 20f
320. CD 4/2, 21
321. CD 4/2, 25-28
322. CD 4/2, 9, 29.
(second problem of atonement). This eternal election of grace, is manifested as the beginning of all God's works and ways. Therefore Jesus Christ is

"God's eternal, twofold predestination, from which everything else, all God's other purposes and therefore all occurrence, proceed, and in which all things have their norm and end. For what God willed and did, and still wills and does, and is to will and do, is - directly in the history of His incarnate Word (and the further history to which it gives rise, and which is the meaning of this last time), and indirectly in God's fatherly rule as Creator, Sustainer and Ruler of the cosmos - the execution and revelation of this twofold predestination, and therefore of the election of Jesus Christ, the unfolding of that which is enfolded in this eternal divine decree. He, Jesus Christ, is the One who was and is and will be, of whom and by whom and to whom are all things, very God and very man." 323

This christological teleology which reaches back into eternity and forwards into eternity became manifest in time. The "real man" concerns us here, the man who although a creature did not come late on the scene to disappear later, did not exist secondarily, but was the primary object and content of the primal and basic will of God, which was the election of the totus Christus. 324 The incarnation is the being of Jesus Christ in time as grounded in this eternal election of grace and actualized accordingly. This is the "absolutely new event" and "new act of God" in that He becomes man, the Creator a creature - He is the "new man", unique in cosmic being and history. 325 Therefore reconciled man is originally the man Jesus. 326 He is the One adopted from all eternity and then in time. 327 His incarnation "signifies the promise of the basic alteration (Veränderung) and determination of what we all are as men", 328 for His history is our history of salvation which "changes the whole human situation." 329

323. CD 4/2, 32
324. CD 4/2, 32ff
325. CD 4/2, 36ff
326. CD 4/2, 40
327. CD 4/2, 47
328. CD 4/2, 49
329. CD 4/2, 51
Barth, then comes to examine this exaltation of human essence, this man to Godward movement, this history in the very being of Jesus Christ. This "new man" or "true man" resulted from the "mutual participation" of the divine and human essence in Jesus Christ. It is important to note that this "mutual" is in no sense to be understood as "interchangeable" (as in Lutheran communicatio idiomatum) but rather as in opposition to each essence retaining its separate identity, remaining alien in a neutral proximity (as in the two lashed or glued planks image often used in older polemics). It is essential to understand that in the Son of God, the divine Subject, who takes the initiative in this event (and not either His divine or His human essence) each of the two natures, without being either destroyed or altered, acquires and has its own determination. Thus "mutual participation" of the divine and human essence as it takes place in and by Him does so in a twofold differentiation. (1) As His divine essence is that which is originally proper to Him in contrast to the human which is only adopted and assumed by Him,

330. With this "mutual participation" Barth is in the particular sphere which older Christology considered as the doctrine of the effects (effecta) (i.e. of the hypostatic unio and the communio of the two natures.) He followed the classical threefold presentation - (1) the communicatio idiomatum corresponding to what he called an impartation of the human essence to the divine, and the divine to the human, as it takes place in the one Jesus Christ as Son of God and Son of Man; (CD 4/2, 73-83) (2) the communicatio gratiarum corresponding to what he called the address to human essence in Jesus Christ in this impartation (4/2, 84-104); and (3) the communicatio operationum corresponding to what he called the common actualization of divine and human essence as it takes place in Jesus Christ on the basis of this impartation (4/2, 104-116).

331. Modern Protestant theology has become essentially anthropology, due not so much to external pressure as to its own internal entanglement in this Lutheran concept of commingling the divine and the human in Jesus Christ. Barth considered it not an accident that opposition to this tendency which arose about 1920 came from the Reformed side (CD 4/2, 83). This of course was launched by his Rümerbrief with its stress on the infinite qualitative distinction between God and man.
"The determination of His divine essence is to His human, and the determination of His human essence is from His divine. He gives the human essence a part in His divine, and the human essence receives this part in the divine from Him." 332

This clearly defines "mutual" as non-reversible, non-cyclic and therefore non-interchangeable. We have here, then, a definite movement that takes place from above to below first, and only then from below to above. God is always the subject of this history, 333 for in this movement it is the self-humiliated Son of God who is also the exalted man. (2) The two elements in this history of the humiliation of Jesus Christ as Son of God and the exaltation as the Son of Man are not in simple correspondence.

"The first, His humiliation as the Son of God, means that He became man. But the second, His exaltation as the Son of Man, does not mean that He became God. How could He just become that which He already was from all eternity as the Son of God, and which He did not cease to be even as the Son of Man?" 334

Here is a maintaining of the distinctiveness of each essence in the irreversible giving and receiving so that the exaltation as the Son of Man is not divinisation, but unchanged as such, it is placed in perfect fellowship with the divine essence, it is the "telos" of God's love and grace, 335 or the exclusive determination of the human nature of Jesus Christ by the grace of God (communicatio gratiarum), 336 not as an infused gratia habitualis but in the history of the divine giving and human receiving, 337

332. CD 4/2, 70. Last two underlinings added.
333. This is stressed in the very way Barth follows the movement of revelation (i.e. from God to man), e.g. in the four sections presenting this history and movement in Jesus Christ for (1) this One, God the Son, became and is also man (CD 4/2, 45-50), (2) His existence became and is also the existence of a man (4/2, 50-60), (3) that divine and human essence were and are united by Him and in Him (4/2, 60-69) and (4) that He raised up human essence to essence in Himself and therefore as true God became and was also true man (4/2, 69-73). See also 4/2, 73-116.
334. CD 4/2, 71f
336. CD 4/2, 88
337. CD 4/2, 89f
(and therefore dynamic and not static, a real movement and not just a state\textsuperscript{338}), a common actualization (Gemeinsame Verwirklichung) instead of an abstract duality.\textsuperscript{339}

This Son of Man does not become a fourth in the Holy Trinity, but He takes as a man a full share in its being, in that the "Godhead surrounds this man like a garment", and He participates without measure in the unconditional affirmation of the Father and Holy Spirit, "and this distinguishes Him qualitatively as well as quantitatively from all other men."\textsuperscript{340} In other words, He is not deified but exulted into the consortium divinitatis. This did not take place only in the resurrection and ascension to the right hand of God, for in the humiliation (exinanitio) of the Son of God there was a concurrent exaltation (exaltatio) of the Son of Man, the One not without the other, and both from the incarnation, for with the journey into the far country as the Son of God He returned home as the Son of Man.\textsuperscript{341} Thus Barth, transcending earlier Christology, "actualized" the doctrine of the incarnation, in which the traditional concepts, unio, communio and communicatio are related concentrically to describe one and the same ongoing process.\textsuperscript{342} This is "the central history of all histories" the goal of the eternal decree of God, the fulfillment of the covenant, the reconciliation of the world with God.\textsuperscript{343}

(3) The Royal Man

Jesus Christ, the new and true man, was among His fellow-men as the Lord, the royal man,\textsuperscript{344} in his munus regium or kingly office. Not therefore as the supreme self-manifestation or self-actualization of the old Adam, but as absolutely opposed to our world He is nevertheless both

\textsuperscript{338} CD 4/2, 99, 136
\textsuperscript{339} CD 4/2, 115
\textsuperscript{340} CD 4/2, 94f
\textsuperscript{341} CD 4/2, 100
\textsuperscript{342} CD 4/2, 105, 117
\textsuperscript{343} CD 4/2, 131f
\textsuperscript{344} CD 4/2, 154-264
first and last not against but for men. His coming is the end of misery and the beginning of redemption. Because of this He called them "\(\mu \alpha \kappa \alpha \rho \iota \sigma\)" (synthetic, not analytic) which Barth considered was not merely a promise and proclamation, but the present (if hidden) impartation of full salvation, total life and perfect joy. It is the rule of God taking place in "fulfilled time" signified by acts of healing, as unusual miracles of the Kingdom.

"His own coming meant that the seventh and last day, the great day of Yahweh, had dawning, and healing was the specific Word of God that He had come to accomplish on this day." It was that rest time which the creation Sabbath pointed to, the time of the new man, the royal man, the dawn of the new age. Thus, Barth saw the grace of God

"at the very heart of time, in restoration of the glory and peace of creation, and anticipation of the glory and peace of the final revelation of the will and kingdom of God, it is free to accomplish real deliverances here and now." 

It is essential to note that Barth holds together the humiliation and therefore passion of the Son of God to its climax on the cross with the exaltation of the royal Son of Man to the same climax of coronation on the cross, which is considered as a real "lifting up". In other words, both the depths of humiliation and heights of exaltation meet together in the cross. This means that the passion is no chance or fate (as with Schweitzer) but is the goal toward which He controls circumstances in order to freely reach this conclusion of His life as a direct result of His Sovereign Lordship. The cross is therefore His victory and not an
abstract passion as in Bach's St. Matthew's passion. It is the sign of hope, an act of His rule and therefore not an act of a disillusioned man (as with Schweitzer). It was the telos of the double movement within the very being of Jesus Christ.

(4) The Direction of the Son

The power of the existence of the royal man has effected all men, for his history is not only "private history" but "world history". We are taken up into fellowship in Him, for primarily and finally we ourselves are what we are in Him, where the covenant has been restored on both sides. This is "truest reality" a being and not just an experience, disposition, attitude, will or emotions (as with Schleiermacher and Ritschl, etc.) To be a Christian is per definitionem to be ἐν Χριστῷ, and so already with Him in heaven, already in the περιπτώμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς (Phil. 3:20). They sit with Him in heavenly places (Ephes. 2:6) and are therefore already glorified (Rom. 8:29f) and nothing can separate them from God for their life is already above, hid with Christ in God (Col. 3:3). This being in Christ, Earth concluded, is impregnable, unassailable by any human attack or cosmic situation. Here we see repeated the earlier objective or ontologically realized eschatology. It considers our being in Him as irrefutably, incontestably and unassailably grounded in itself, with the salvation taken place belonging inalienably and even centrally to Him and in Him to all men. Thus in His death man too has attained his goal, and in His resurrection he also has been set in a new beginning, the old man giving way to the new. This is the alteration of the human situation which having taken place in Him which is also the reality of

353. CD 4/2, 250-264, 294, 301.
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all men.  

Through the resurrection man is caught in an upward movement which cannot be arrested, he yet lives in the night but moves towards the morning.  

History has not continued the same since the death of the royal man, for in it it attained its own goal.  

Everything has already taken place in the man Jesus that will take place in its course and consequence.  

In Him the goal was already included in the origin.

"For what is denoted, represented and reflected in the riddle of the existence of Jesus Christ is the dynamic and teleology of the divine life...He is obedient to His election and therefore righteous, to be the Representative and Revealer of our election, the royal man who is alive in His death and exalted in His abasement, and in whom we are destined and called to life, to exaltation, to a royal humanity."  

Barth's ontologically realized eschatology is thus one which is christological in that the dynamic and teleology are first in the living act of God Himself, so that in Him we are no longer in the far country but home again, no longer servants of God but sons.

8. Critique

We will not comment on the allegorical, if christological, interpretation of the two creation sagas as the external basis of the eternal covenant. Rather, we will go to the basic presupposition that seems to be behind this interpretation. This concerns Barth's theme throughout this chapter - i.e. what God is in His revelation that He is antecedently and eternally within His inner-trinitarian being. We want to be completely fair to Barth by at once taking note that this shows his proper concern to protect the divine pre-existence of the Son of God. With this we are in agreement. What concerns us, however, is the extent to which this is

---

358. CD 4/2, 304f  
359. CD 4/2, 316-319, 376.  
360. CD 4/2, 327

361. CD 4/2, 336f  
362. CD 4/2, 357  
363. CD 4/2, 359-363
taken in apparent relationship to the humanity of Jesus. We speak of his understanding of the logos ensarkos.

a. The Logos Ensarkos Questioned

We must make it perfectly clear at the outset that this is perhaps one of the hardest sections of Barth's theology. However, considered in the context of this chapter it at least forces us to raise certain basic questions. As is evident in the "universalism" question, Barth seemingly supports both aspects of a mutually exclusive situation, and in this case both the new reality that the incarnation was in space and time and its eternal reality. Does this not mean that his earlier dialectical thinking is not altogether removed in his Kirchliche Dogmatik? We will consider both aspects and attempt to see what Barth's conclusion seems to be. The question before us is simply, did or did not the humanity of Jesus pre-exist ontologically in the eternal being of God before the incarnation? We submit that evidence for both a negative and a positive answer seems to be present in Barth's Dogmatics.

The negative answer has already been referred to in this chapter (see Section 7 a) where Barth emphasized the Jewish and sarx nature of the flesh which God's son became. From this it would appear that the reality of the incarnation as an event in space and time, as a novum on the plane of history, is given. Thus Barth stressed that in the incarnation Christ "became what He had not previously been. He takes into unity with His

364. In this critique, and that of "universalism" in Chapter 6, the "either-or" situation seems to be called for as far as our interpretation is concerned. Others, perhaps, would consider a "both-and" situation to be possible but it seems to us that the human Jesus could not exist both before and after the incarnation, nor can all mankind be saved and yet some be lost (Ch. 6). This is not to detract from the profundity of the divine mystery involved, but to be true (as we see it) to the ageneto of John 1:14 on the one hand and biblical prophecy on the other hand. Even Barth spoke of contradictions in his KD (see TT 12).
divine being a quite different, a creaturely and indeed sinful being."365
Thus, He was "the great divine and the great human novum."366

Apparent evidence for the opposite position includes what Barth has written on the logos ensarkos. It would be more correct to say, it is found in what he has written against the logos asarkos, in his support of the logos ensarkos. What do these terms mean? Naturally the logos referred to is the Word, or the Christ. Sarkos has to do with His humanity (sarx) in which asarkos means "without flesh", and ensarkos means "in the flesh". The question raised is, when did Christ become flesh? when did the Λόγος σαρκός ἐγένετο? The question is, does Barth's christological reference, his revelational theology, read back from revelation to reality, and thus from revelation in time to reality in eternity? Could this be why he rejected the logos asarkos as a reality because there could be no revelation of a logos asarkos? At least in one place he wrote,

"Under the title of a Λόγος ἀσαρκός we pay homage to a Deus absconditus...Is it real faith and obedience which concerns itself with this regress to a pre-temporal being of the Word of God which is not His incarnate being, the being of the Deus pro nobis?" 367

His burden was that Jesus Christ is not an "empty logos", for as the pre-existent Deus pro nobis He "alone is at once and altogether very God and very man".368 He considered, therefore that the Deus Revelatus, who was vere Deus, vere Homo, was qualitatively different from any "naked deities" (logoi asarkoi)369 as "He was in the beginning with God" (οὗτος ἐν ἀρχῆ ἔν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν John 1:2).370 In other words, "He was already in the eternal decree of God the Mediator: the Bearer of our human nature; the Humbled and Exalted as the Bearer of our flesh."371 Involved is the
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fact that "the man Jesus pre-existed in creation, and eternally before creation in God." 372 He did so as the totus Christus, as Christ and Christians. 373

The question immediately arises – was this pre-existence of the man Jesus merely noetic, or was it more than just noetic? In the following answer, was Barth saying that more than a noetic reality was involved?

He wrote,

"Jesus Christ was in the beginning with God. He was so not merely in the sense that in view of God's eternal knowing and willing all things may be said to have been in the beginning with God, in His plan and decree...He was also in the beginning with God as 'the first born of every creature'." 374

Therefore he wrote,

"Even in the eternal divine decree of election He was not alone, but the One in whom as their Firstborn and Representative God also elected the many as his brethren because He also loved them in Him before the world was created and established." 375

It would seem that the reason why this eternal decree is more than noetic is because Jesus Christ was "Himself the plan and decree of God". 376

Here it would seem is not a noetic reference to a future reality but an ontological reference to an eternal reality in Jesus Christ, and therefore in the Trinity. If this is so, would it not then follow that the incarnation brought no change to the Trinity? Can such a position be found in Barth's thinking? This is precisely what he has said, for,

"No, the incarnation makes no change in the Trinity. In the eternal decree of God, Christ is God and man. Do not ever think of the second person of the Trinity

---
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as only Logos. That is the mistake of Emil Brunner. There is no Logos asarkos, but only ensarkos. Brunner thinks of a Logos asarkos, and I think this is the reason for his natural theology. The Logos becomes an abstract principle. Since there is only and always a Logos ensarkos, there is no change in the Trinity, as if a fourth member comes in after the incarnation.  

Before us now are what appear to be the two sides of Barth's presentation on this question of the incarnation. Which are we to accept as normative? Which is determinative in his theology? Put in other words, how can he say that there was no change in the Trinity in the incarnation and yet also say that this event was a new reality? It could be argued that he was using this terminology to emphasize the eternal pre-existence of Christ's divinity, but we are forced to ask if this is not at the price of preserving His humanity? It is understandable that against the quantitatively different human Jesus of the Schleiermacher tradition that Barth would wish to emphasize the *vera Deus* of Christ, but what has become of the *vera Homo* in the process? Can one really speak in terms of an eternal *logos ensarkos* and yet still give full value to the *Λόγος σάρξ ἐγενέτο* in space and time?  

Perhaps it could be said that the context of this chapter helps us to understand the problem. In other words, Barth's entire theology is revelational. This is its consistent orientation. He begins with God and follows the manward movement of self-revelation. We have seen that what God is in His revelation, that He is antecedently and eternally within His own inner-trinitarian being. Admittedly this is to protect the divine pre-existence. Thus, it follows, that the reality that is enfolded in eternity is simply revealed or unfolded in time. Here is the eternal

---
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378. Barth tried to do justice to this *ἐγενέτο*, eg. CD 1/2, 159-171. See also 1/2, 132-159, 172-202; 4/1, 157-210.
379. CD 1/1, 474-512.
manward movement of God's self-revelation. But, we are forced to ask if this is why there is no change in the Trinity at the moment of the incarnation, simply because it is merely an unfolding in space and time of a reality that has always been enfolded in eternity? Unless we have been totally unfair to Barth, it would seem to us that he has not fully protected himself from such questions, other references to the novum aspect notwithstanding. In other words, can the incarnation be both a new event ontologically speaking, as well as a mere revelation of an unchanged reality? Or, does the ageneto require a clearer distinction?

Another question presses. If there is a reality-revelation dialectic involved here, has not the Urgeschichte of the "timeless eschatology" appeared again in this logos ensarkos of the "christological eschatology"? In other words, if the human Jesus was removed to a place above time in Barth's earlier thought, has he not been somewhat removed to the inner-trinitarian being of God in his later theology?

Wrestling with these questions would seem relevant as several other writers have expressed criticism of Barth's logos ensarkos. Thus C. Brown said, "the New Testament does not project the incarnation back into the being of God before the event took place", and F. L. Herzog questioned, "Was there not a time when Jesus of Nazareth was not?" As H. Hartwell put it,

"Barth makes no distinction between the Son of God as the designate Godman Jesus Christ and Jesus Christ as very God and very man. He treats the latter as if He too existed from eternity, though He can properly thus be styled only after His birth. In speaking throughout of 'Jesus Christ', Barth obviously wants to stress the continuity between the Son of God and Jesus Christ and, in a sense, their identity; but the language used by him to that end is, theologically, open to question since according to his own teaching Jesus Christ, in
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contrast to the Son of God existed before the Incarnation only in the form of God's thought and will." 382

The point is, however, that he seemingly teaches both the noetic and the ontological pre-existence of the human Jesus, and it is this which makes his distinction between the Son of God as designate Godman and Jesus Christ as very God and very man unclear. Looking at this problem from an eschatological standpoint, we are reminded that, to Barth, eschatology preceded creation. The Eschatos is also the Protos. The whole of his theology is therefore teleologically oriented towards the final, universal manifestation of the eternal Jesus Christ. Could it not be said that Barth is concerned with a movement towards a final revelation rather than towards a final reality? Is not the reality eternal, and its revelation temporal? Is it not this reality-revelation framework that logically results in the logos ensarkos? As J. G. Gibbs has noted, Barth allows teleology to override ontology, 383 and, as D. L. Deegan put it, "while Barth wishes to avoid thinking of Jesus Christ as only an 'after-thought' in the mind of God nevertheless he fails to preserve a real distinction between the intention of God to become incarnate and the event of the incarnation itself." 384 E. Brunner, in agreement with the concern of those already cited, wrote,

"If the eternal pre-existence of the God-man were a fact, then the Incarnation would no longer be an Event at all; no longer would it be the great miracle of Christmas. In the New Testament the new element is the fact that the eternal Son of God became Man... yet in this view of Barth's all this is now anticipated, as it were, torn out of the sphere of history, and set within the pre-temporal sphere in the pre-existence of the Logos." 385

Rather than the seeming reality-revelation dialectic of Barth's logos

382. ThKE 185
384. SJT, 1961, 128.
385. CDG Vol. 1, 347
ensarkos, even Brunner (who denies the virgin birth\textsuperscript{386}) can rightly say, "The incarnation and the Incarnate Son of God was, it is true, determined by God from all eternity, but it only became a reality in the fullness of time."\textsuperscript{387} D. M. Baillie was right when he affirmed that we are not "to think of the human personality of Jesus of Nazareth as having had any heavenly and eternal pre-existence. The Church has never taught that the human element in Jesus, His manhood, is consubstantial or co-eternal with God, but that it is consubstantial with ourselves and belongs to the order of created things."\textsuperscript{388}

What should our conclusion be? Did Barth really teach a pre-existence of the human Jesus, or was his burden rather that the Son of God always was from eternity?\textsuperscript{389} Did he oppose a \textit{logos ensarkos} because the only revelation of God is \textit{ensarkos}? Did he oppose the \textit{logos ensarkos} because a \textit{Deus absconditus} or a reality of God \textit{extra carmem} in post-incarnation time, so that this was his concern over Brunner's natural theology?\textsuperscript{390} At least W. Pannenberg and O. Weber supported Barth's \textit{logos ensarkos}.\textsuperscript{391} So there are those for and those against his thinking on this. We do not pretend to be able to say which interpretation is without question the right one. However, having noted the questions his presentation has raised, we must now emphasize that he certainly said far more about the new event of the incarnation than he ever did about the \textit{logos ensarkos} (see fn. 378 above). Therefore, it is perhaps right to conclude that this is what Barth really wanted to say.\textsuperscript{392} In other words, it is the divinity of Jesus Christ alone which is antecedently and eternally in itself what it was in revelation,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{386} CCR 353-356
\item \textsuperscript{387} CCR 239
\item \textsuperscript{388} GIC 150
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\item \textsuperscript{390} CD 1/2, 169; 4/1, 181.
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\item \textsuperscript{392} To Israel Jesus Christ was not \textit{logos ensarkos} but \textit{logos incarnandus} (CD 1/2, 165; 4/2, 683). These are significant in pointing to the coming new event, or to the \textit{assumptio}.
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although that revelation included the eternal logos becoming for the first time ssa, 393 If this is so, then what is far more crucial to us is what he meant by this incarnation. To this we now turn.

b. The Humanity of Jesus Christ in Barth's Christology

It is our thesis contention that Barth has not given full place to the humanity of Jesus in both his earlier and in his later eschatology. In this section we come to the basic presupposition behind this critique to be made in the following chapters, i.e. his emphasis upon God's acts in Christology.

(1) The Assumptio Carnis

Already in the logos ensarkos context the egeneto of the incarnation was considered. Now we return to this same egeneto to note that Barth clearly identified it as an assumption. 394 Thus instead of the "Word became flesh," he preferred the phrase, the "Word assumed flesh". This he felt emphasized the fact that the Word remained the Word in this becoming. Moreover, this assumpto carnis was considered as an event in space and time whose Subject was the acting God, in sovereign freedom, without any necessity, in the free overflowing of His grace. 395 As such Mary was but the passive participant without capacity for this miracle that was wholly actualized by God. 396 Here Barth chose to emphasize that the humanity of Jesus only had existence within this act of God. 397 This was the same position as taken in classical anhypostatic Christology. 398 Barth's position is clearly seen in that the ex Maria virgine and the empty tomb are together considered as a single sign which pointed beyond to the act of
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398. Barth seemingly interpreted this as enhypostatic, see CD 1/2, 163-169; 4/2, 49-60 and J. McIntyre, SCC 95-99.
This meant that he categorically opposed any finitum capax infiniti in either event. Both were entirely predicated on the action of God's freedom. As we shall note, everything in the life-acts of Jesus Christ between these two events are apparently also dependent upon this same sole activity of God to the detriment of the role of the human Jesus.

What then was assumed according to Barth? He said,

"In Jesus Christ it is not merely one man, but the humanum of all men, which is posited and exalted as such to unity with God." 400

"What God the Son assumed into unity with Himself and His divine being was and is - in a specific individual form elected and prepared for this purpose - not merely 'a man' but the humanum, the being and essence, the nature and kind, which is that of all men, which characterises them all as men, and distinguishes them from other creatures...It is the concrete possibility of the existence of one man in a specific form - a man elected and prepared for this purpose, not by himself, but by God..." 401

Further, Barth stressed that the humanity of Jesus is "both completely like and yet also completely unlike that of all other men". 402 He is obviously trying to do justice to the representative humanity of Jesus, even stating his opposition to any Docetic Christology, i.e. to any mere appearance of His humanity. 403 We will want to keep in mind in this section that Barth is grappling with the greatest of all mysteries, trying to explain to some extent, the unexplainable, anxious to protect both the divine and human aspects of the reality in Jesus Christ. Anything that follows is not to detract from this his obvious aim. The difficulty he faced was the understanding of Jesus as representative man, as the humanitas, the one man for all men. What we are forced to ask is whether Jesus was humanitas as a homo, i.e. was He the man for all men as the One man? Put another way, did He redeem mankind as God in man, or as the God who chose
to redeem mankind as a man? It would seem to us that Barth’s emphasis is on the former and not on the latter. The rest of the section will attempt to indicate this. Thus Barth said that Jesus Christ,

"as the Son of God became and is man, as He caused His existence to become that of a man, as He united divine and human essence in Himself, He exalted human essence into Himself, and as very God became very man... And the force of this history is the raising, the exaltation of human essence by the fact that God Himself lent it His own existence in His Son thus uniting it with His own divine essence... As a man like all men, He was and is the Head of all men... In the essence common to us all, as a man like ourselves, He is completely different. This is His exaltation. This is why He is raised up above us and therefore for us. For He is the Son of God, and in Him our human essence is conjoined with the divine essence." 404

"the Son of Man is also and primarily the Son of God" 405

This humanity within the divinity of God lifts Jesus above the level of other men, for,

"because and as He was man only as the Son of God, it (i.e. sin) was excluded from the choice of His acts. In virtue of this origin of His being, He was unable to choose it. Therefore He did not choose it. And He did not do it. This, then, is the exaltation of our human nature in Jesus Christ as seen from this standpoint. It is an exaltation to sinlessness, to freedom from sin. Note that from this standpoint too it is real exaltation not change or replacement... when in His acceptance of human essence even in its perversion He does not repeat the perversion or do wrong, when in virtue of His origin He cannot will or do it. He is just what we are and how we are. The only difference is that He is it in genuine human freedom... The Son of Man is not deified by the fact that He is also and primarily the Son of God. He does not become a fourth in the Holy Trinity. But necessarily He acquires and takes as man the same full share in its being and work in creation as He has in its inward life as God. Godhead surrounds this man like a garment, and fills Him as the train of Yahweh filled the temple in Isa. 6. This is the determination of His human essence... As Son of God He participates without measure in the unconditional affirmation of the Father and the Holy Ghost (John 3:34), and this distinguishes Him qualitatively as well as quantitatively from all other men." 406

404. CD 4/2, 69
"What protects Him and His human nature from temptation is not a particularity of His creatureliness, but the particularity of the way in which He is creature. He is so as the Son of God, and therefore as the Creator and Lord... He could not succumb, and therefore could not sin, because as the Bearer of humanity He was Himself its Lord, the Creator God active within it." 407

"God became man, and as such acts upon man. By this action of God sin is excluded and nullified." 408

"Of course, the meaning of the New Testament is that Jesus cannot sin, that the eternal Word of God is immune from temptation even in the flesh, that Jesus is bound to win in this struggle... The sinlessness of Jesus thus does not admit of a systematic connexion with the fact that here a true man had a serious struggle, but only of establishment and acknowledgment in its historical connexion with that fact. He who struggled here and won is He who was bound to win. He who when He entered that contest had already won." 409

These quotations reveal the heart of Barth's Christology which is an emphasis upon an acting God who embraces the humanity of Jesus within such a determination that it is impossible for Him to sin as He is the Son of Man as the Son of God. Here is the outworking of his Οὐσίασις with its meaning as no more than 'independent existence', or put in other words, this is the logical result of his enhypostatic Christology which calls in question the human hypostasis (as individuality). 410 Does not such a unique relationship of the Son of Man with God remove him beyond our ken? As such can he really be vere homo? Barth's assumptio carnis is not a coming to stand in man's place to redeem man as a homo, but rather is an exaltation of the humanum into the consortium divinitatis. Admit-
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410. CD 4/2, 49 is not very convincing for the true humanity of the man Jesus, as (1) "He is also a real man only as the Son of God", and as (2) He is not said to be consubstantial with us in every respect. J. McIntyre has shown that there cannot be a human hypostasis in the Chalcedon definition (SCC 93f). This is Barth's position too. McIntyre discussed a "no physis anhypostatos" (SOC 86-94) for "Jesus Christ is a real man, not simply humanitas or the humanum" (SCC 100).
207.

tedly, He did not come for Himself, but only for us, and that His humiliation was for our exaltation, but the question presses - how did He bring the exaltation about? Barth's answer concerns the "inner-history" between the divine and humanum, whereas we submit it should concern the "outer-history" between God the Father and the homo Jesus.

We come now to consider these two.

(2) "Inner" or "Outer" History for a True Humanity?

The journey into the far country as the Son of God and the concurrent homecoming as the Son of Man is an "inner-history" based upon the Luke 15 prodigal Son parable that really speaks of an "outer-history". Barth's Christology concerns this "inner-history" to the nigh total exclusion of the "outer-history". It is not until we come to KD 4/4 that a significant change of emphasis is apparent, but by contrast with the inbuilt stress in the rest of the Kirchliche Dogmatik it is marginal, except as an example of theologia viatorum. 411 Over-against the God in man emphasis

411. In KD 4/1 to 4/3, Barth presents the triplex munus of the life-act of Jesus Christ as the munus sacerdotale and munus regium, from incarnation to crucifixion, as His "inner history". Then the revelation of this "inner history" is presented in the munus propheticum, from resurrection to parousia, as the enlightening, awakening and sending encounter or "history between Jesus Christ and man". In the KD 4/4 fragment a change is evident. Instead of the "inner history" of mediation from the incarnation, He is said to have "entered upon His office as Messiah, Saviour and Mediator" at His baptism (4/4, 54), as this was "the beginning of the history of Jesus Christ" (4/4, 53, 66f, 87), "the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ" (4/4, 67), the "entry into service which Jesus effected de facto" (4/4, 66), the commencement of His self-proclamation" (4/4, 67), the moment when He "actualised His submission to God and solidarity with men, and thus entered on His ministry as Messiah, Kyrios and Soter" (4/4, 87). Thus in His baptism, "the ministry of reconciling the world to God began to take place (4/4, 61) as this was His "entry upon His service as Mediator" (4/4, 70f. Cf. 65). Thus "began the fulfilment of His mission" (4/4 54) as the "fulfilment of the whole righteousness of God which now commenced" (4/4, 84).

If Barth in KD 4/2 overstressed the immediate exaltation of the humanity in Jesus at the incarnation so that the man Jesus was Lord as royal man, here we find him placing the beginning of His ministry cont.
of immanence, we have a man in God presentation. Hence, at best it is a history of man taken up into the history of God. In this context it is significant to note the following unique relationship the man Jesus had with the Holy Spirit. Thus,

"The Holy Spirit does not dwell lastingly in men; He comes to them. Thus life is given to them from time to time... (but)... Jesus does not have the Holy Spirit in the way in which it can be said of any man that he has the Spirit... Jesus has the Holy Spirit lastingly and totally... This is His absolutely unique relationship to the Holy Spirit... the man who lives in sovereignty."

How then can Jesus be vere Homo? If Schleiermacher's Jesus was too human, is not Barth's Christ too divine? He was too divine in the early period, but this problem (in a different form) is still apparent throughout the Dogmatics as these various quotes from 1/2 and 4/2 indicate. Whilst agreeing with Barth that Jesus Christ is qualitatively distinct from all other men (eg. He alone did not sin, He alone had no rupture between His

411. cont.

at the baptism, thirty years later. Thus in KD 4/4, the beginning of the history of Jesus Christ as Mediator is from his baptism, not from his incarnation. It is spoken of as a "circle" leading from baptism in the Jordan to His baptism on Calvary (4/4, 52). In this water baptism He "took up the ministry which reached its goal in His death" (4/4, 153), as it was His "entry on the way to Golgotha" (4/4, 98). Thus the hitherto royal man, the servant as Lord (4/1 to 4/3) entered the "way into the depths, the way of the servant of the Lord of Isa. 53" (4/4, 66). Thus "in baptism He took up the office of this obedient servant of God who suffers on behalf of many" (4/4, 98).

It would seem, then, that KD 4/4, shows development towards giving fuller credit to the humanity of Jesus Christ. At least it would seem that the Servant as Lord of KD 4/2 has become the Suffering Servant of KD 4/4. If this is valid, then instead of considering the Suffering Servant from baptism on, would it not be better to do so from incarnation? This writer finds it hard to follow Barth in speaking of the Jordan baptism as "the commencement of Jesus' own Christian life". If one wishes to call Jesus a Christian in this sense, then was He not such from incarnation rather than just from His baptism? However, would it not be wiser to concur with T. F. Torrance that "Jesus Christ was not a Christian" (TR 135), because not a sinner saved by grace as Christians are?
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"is" and "ought"), we believe the emphasis should also be upon the fact the He became man - a real homo - in order to redeem man as a man. Is this not what the kenosis of Phil. 2:5-11 means, 413 i.e. that He chose to lay aside - not His divinity, but the use of it - so that as man He could meet temptations as a man, experiencing the "external history" between Himself and the Father as any other man can? Is this not what the writer of Hebrews meant when he wrote,

"We have not a high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are (ὅπως ἐπηρώθη) yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need."? (Heb. 4:15f) 414

The synoptic pericopes speak of the wilderness temptations as a real experience for the human Jesus, and attributed the cause to the devil - whom Barth has dismissed. 415 Also, Christ's victory is said to be through the Word of God and not through a determination of His humanity from His own divinity (Matt. 4:4, 7, 10). In fact, after the devil left Jesus, it records that "angels came and ministered unto Him" (Matt. 4:11).

Does this not shift the emphasis away from the "internal-history" of inability to sin to the vital importance of the "external-history"? Put

413. Phil. 2:7 is referred to several times by Barth, eg. in CD 1/2, 147, 152; 2/1, 398; 2/2, 106, 474; 3/2, 45; 3/4, 662. In 3/4, 477 he said that God acts in the One who became a servant. Again the emphasis would seem to be upon God acting as God rather than upon God acting as a man. Cf. 4/1, 165f, 180-183, 187-192. NB. "the forma Dei consists in the grace in which God Himself assumes and makes His own the forma servi" (4/1, 188) which is an anhypostatic rather than an enhypostatic emphasis.

414. Barth could even quote this, eg. CD 4/1, 165.

415. CD 3/3, 477-531. However, in CD 4/1, 164 he at least wrote that the temptation is "expressly described as the temptation of the devil" but again he emphasized God's act in this experience, for he said, "He shows that He is the Son of God (Mt. 4:1f) by resisting the temptation." Cf. temptations no mock battle (1/2, 158), and Jesus Christ obedient because eternally so (4/1, 192, 195). Christ serves as He rules (4/2, 690).
in other words, if Jesus Christ really could not sin, if He really did have a unique relationship with the Holy Spirit, if He as man did therefore live in sovereignty, then was not His kenosis without meaning? Would it not be true to say that evidence for this kenosis is found throughout the Gospels? Thus, in His humanity Jesus was like the clinging vine (ἡ ἔριστος) (John 15) because so dependent upon the Father. He said, "I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things" (John 8:28). Although He stated that He had power to lay down His life and take it up again, He concluded, "This commandment have I received of my Father" (John 10:18). He did not know the hour of the second advent but the Father did (Matt. 24:36). Given this context of God choosing to become man in order to live as man to redeem man as man, we are not surprised to find witness to the prayer life of this man with His Father. Here we find an important aspect of this "external-history" between them. Thus after the return of the seventy He is found in prayer (Luke 10:21). Later, at the resurrection of Lazarus He prayed (for the sake of those looking on that they might know the Father) (John 11:41f). In His crisis hour we find him earnestly praying for the cup to pass from Him in Gethsemane (Matt. 26:39-44, Mark 14:34-39). His final words, "Father forgive them" and "Into Thy hands I commend my Spirit" (Luke 23:34, 46) were a prayer. Imbedded amidst this prayer context of the real man Jesus is the High Priestly prayer of John 17 which reveals His deep concern and intercessory love for His followers before the Father. This is His continuing prayer as the risen man in the sessio ad dexteram. In this same context of prayer is the man Jesus who groaned in spirit and wept over Lazarus his friend (John 11:33-38), and who was greatly saddened over Jerusalem His rebellious people (Matt. 23:24). The writer to Hebrews who gave witness to the reality of the human Jesus as a supplicant, gathered
up these strands in the Gospels, relating them to the redemption achieved through the whole life-acts of the human Jesus Christ, saying,

"Who in the days of his flesh when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared; Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; And being made perfect (Τελείωθεν), he became (ἐγένετο) the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." (Heb. 5:7f)

The picture given from these several documents is of a genuine "external-history" with the Father with internal results - a growth, a bending back of sinful humanity into which he had entered into solidarity in order as a man from within to redeem man, bringing him back to God through His own faithfulness.

The biblical witness to Jesus Christ comprises two distinct and yet complementary strands. Thus it was God in Christ reconciling the world (2 Cor. 5:19) as in Him dwelt the fullness of the Godhead bodily (Col. 2:9). As such it was the eternally pre-existent Word that became flesh (John 1:14). He was indeed the Son of God because vere Deus (Matt. 16:16ff). This would appear to be Barth's emphasis. However, the other and equally important strand of witness tells us that "God sent the Son into the world, not to condemn the world, but that the world might be saved through him" (Σώτος) (John 3:17, Cf. 6:29). There was a definite work that the Father had given Him (Σῶτός) (John 5:36). This task was not performed through an "inner history" of exaltation of humanity through "mutual impartation" of the two natures, but was actualized because God the Father was able to give to the man Jesus the Holy Spirit (John 3:34f).

Matthew considered the Servant passage in Isa. 42:1, where God gives His

416. Barth has referred to this, eg. CD 1/2, 158f; 4/2, 250f.
elect His Spirit, has one fulfillment in the Spirit-filled servant-man Jesus Christ (Matt. 12:17-21). In Isaiah 11:1-3 there is also reference to a son of Jesse (of David's line) upon whom the Spirit of the Lord will rest to give understanding, knowledge and counsel. Thus Jesus "grew, and waxed strong in spirit" (Luke 1:80). The servant song of Isaiah 53 met its deepest fulfillment in the man Jesus as the "man of sorrows... acquainted with grief" (v. 3). As such "He was wounded for our transgressions...and with his stripes we are healed" (v. 5). "He was cut off out of the land of the living...he made his grave with the wicked" (v. 8f). "He shall see the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied" (v. 11). It was the man Jesus, our Brother, who exalted humanitas through His human (as vere homo) struggle. Of His own self He could do nothing (John 5:30) but clinging to the Father in our place as one with us, and therefore the man for us, He was baptized of the Holy Spirit (Matt. 3:16f, Cf. Mark 1: 10f, Luke 3:21f), and following the ensuing wilderness temptations He returned to Galilee "in the power of the Spirit" (Luke 4:14). There in Nazareth he read the lesson for the day in the synagogue. It was Isaiah 61:1f, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken hearted, to preach deliverances to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, To preach the acceptable year of the Lord". In His exposition Christ applied the reading to His own mission, "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears" (v. 21). It is this "external history" between the man Jesus and God the Father and God the Holy Spirit which needs to be given equal emphasis in order to correct Barth's one-sided emphasis.

T. F. Torrance has said, "for too long in Protestant, as well as in Roman theology the full place of the humanity of Christ has been neg-
With this in mind it is of real interest to note the following Catholic reaction to Barth's humanity of Christ. C. O'Grady wrote,

"I am convinced that Barth does not develop sufficiently the scriptural assertions that Christ redeemed the world as man. In his human work as priest, king and prophet, Christ redeemed the world. For Barth, the work of reconciliation would seem to be solely a divine act."

Although disagreeing with the Catholic place of Mariology, and that part of humanity in our redemption, this writer finds his conclusion the same as C. O'Grady's. In apparent agreement, from the Protestant side, T. W. Ogletree concluded that in spite of the fact that Jesus is a man, born of Jewish flesh, nevertheless rather than continuity, the "controlling element" in Barth's theology is "discontinuity."

The Cappadocian Father, Gregory of Nazianzen, said "the unassumed is the unredeemed" (τὸ ἄναρχον ἀπόκτητον ἀθέραπυτον). In other words, God really became men to assume humanity as a man in order to heal. Anselm in his Cur Deus Homo considered that the fall temporarily robbed God of His purpose for man. Therefore as man freely yielded, man must now conquer, for man must pay back his debt to God caused by the fall.

"Anselm: 'But none but a man ought to do this otherwise man does not make the satisfaction!'
Boso: 'Nothing seems more just'
Anselm: 'If it be necessary, therefore, as it appears, the heavenly kingdom be made up of man, and this cannot be effected unless the aforesaid satisfaction be made, which none but God can make and none but man ought to make, it is necessary for the God-man to make it.'"

Thus it was as man that Jesus Christ came to pay man's debt, and we would add that in doing it as a man He relied completely upon His Father to
accomplish His mission. Barth gained the epistemological key from Anselm's *Fides Quaerens Intellectum* for his *Kirchliche Dogmatik*, but did he not need to gain this christological key from Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*? It would appear that the weakest part of Barth's Christology is the human role of Jesus in redemption. This is in both his pre-resurrection and post-resurrection Christology. The consistent stress is upon God's acts which leave no room for the acts of the *vere homo*. G. W. Bromiley has said that Barth's "christological framework verges on the artificial". His reference is to the *triplex munus*, but no explanation for its artificiality is given. We submit that it is artificial because it revolves solely around God's acts to the exclusion of the saving role of Jesus as man. Thus it was as the Son of God going into the far country that Jesus Christ was the priest - and not as the Son of Man. It was as God that He acted as priest. As Son of Man He came home in His kingly ministry. But where is the priestly role of the human Jesus as representative man in this arrangement? It is non-existent. Rather, Barth's human Christ is the "Servant as Lord", the "Royal Man" rather than the "Suffering Servant", the "Representative Man". This is not to suggest that he makes no reference to the sufferings of Christ or of His being man for us, but to note that his *triplex munus* arrangement says the opposite. Barth was once asked about his priest, king, prophet order of the *triplex munus*. He replied,

"There are two reasons why I chose the order I chose: first, I thought it wiser to begin with God's act for man and then continue with the humanity of Christ and what became of humanity in the sanctified Christ; second, by beginning with the priestly work you can make clear the meaning and reason for the second element, because God did this for man."
This clearly emphasizes the priestly ministry as an act of God for man, whereas it should rather be an act of God as man for man. The result is that any quotes relative to the suffering servant are enclosed within the royal man context. It is the how question, the role of the human Jesus that is short-changed. The logical conclusion of this emphasis on God's act is seen in post-resurrection Christology where the munus propheticum is the act of God in self-revelation to man which all but ignores the act of Jesus as human-representative to the Father. We shall come to this in the next chapter. We conclude, therefore, that proper place has not been given to the humanity of Jesus in this climax of christological teleology.

c. "Nothingness", God's Good Creation and the Fall

It would be logical to take up these related problems in Barth's theology in this context, but it would seem more advantageous to make a critique of them in Chapter Six where they will again become important for understanding whether or not Barth's theology leads inevitably to universalism. In that chapter the context will have been broadened so that we will be able to do better justice to interpreting these aspects of Barth's presentation. We will see then that just as His overriding emphasis on God's act of assumption has not given full justice to the ontological reality of the human Jesus, so his christological teleology has not given full justice to the ontological reality of evil, and to the ontological effects of the fall, and of sin.

d. Barth Unfair to Reformation Eschatology

We submit that Barth has not been fair to the Reformers' eschatology for when he considered that the doctrine was only an "appendix of an appendix" in their thinking we shall show, through a consideration of
Calvin's Institutes that his charge is not only unsubstantiated by the facts, but that the facts prove the very opposite. Any one Reformer could have been used to disprove his point, but as it was perhaps primarily against Calvin that Barth spoke when considering that the Reformation concentrated on the pre-temporality of God, i.e. upon the divine decrees, relegating eschatology to a mere appendix position, it seems best to consider his theology. Of Calvin, Barth specifically said, "Like the other Reformers, he was not always at his best when dealing with eschatology". 428

(1) Calvin's Eschatology no mere Appendix

By appendix Barth does not only mean the last chapter, as an addition added on to what goes before. He can also mean this, but hardly when considering Calvin whose last chapter in the Institutes was on Civil Government. Rather, we submit, Barth was primarily speaking of eschatology as not integral to the theological presentation as a whole, being rather somewhat adjacent to its central concern. It is precisely this that cannot be substantiated when considering Calvin's theology, for eschatology and not just the eternal decrees were of integral importance to his thinking.

In order to present the evidence for this critique, the writer purposely read through the Institutes to discover how integral eschatology was to Calvin's theology. In direct contrast to Barth's charge, it was therefore with amazement that reference to eschatology was found on no less than 204 pages throughout the four volumes of the Institutes, with

427. We are limiting our attention to Calvin's theological system, but one could also find eschatology in his commentaries. Even his first major work as a young man, the Psychopannychis, also concerns one aspect of eschatology.

428. CD 4/1, 322
even ten references to it in the first volume.

What we must keep in mind is that Barth did not only say that Reformation theology relegated eschatology to "a mere appendix", but even went as far as to say, "It was only the appendix of an appendix", for they "never had their heart in this" i.e. in the post-temporality of God.\footnote{429}

In Book 1 on Creation, Calvin referred to God's created works and said,

"By the knowledge thus acquired, we ought not only to be stimulated to worship God, but also aroused and elevated to the hope of future life." \footnote{430}

He saw that Adam, Noah, Abraham and the other patriarchs were "elevated to the hope of eternal blessedness" by the "peculiar doctrines of faith" which they had knowledge of.\footnote{431} He considered that scripture "conducts the sons of God to the final goal",\footnote{432} that the Holy Spirit is "the author of future immortality",\footnote{433} that an understanding of the mystery of angels "is deferred to the last day",\footnote{434} and that "an angel will blow the trumpet which is to summon the world to judgment".\footnote{435}

In Book 2 on the Knowledge of God the Redeemer in Christ, Calvin said, "It thus appears that none can enter the kingdom of God save those whose minds have been renewed by the enlightening of the Holy Spirit,"\footnote{436} for "there is no man who would not be pleased with eternal blessedness; and yet, without the impulse of the Spirit, no man aspires to it."\footnote{437} He spoke of "the reward of eternal life",\footnote{438} of a destiny "to the inheritance of his kingdom",\footnote{439} of "the end of the world",\footnote{440} of "a future life and..."
death, both without end", 441 of "the judgment that will ultimately overtake all sinners", 442 and of "the world to come". 443 Calvin expressly rejected Servetus who abolished eschatology with his idea that man now possesses the fullness of what Christ has wrought for him. He put it this way,

"He pretends, that by the faith of the Gospel all the promises have been fulfilled; as if there was no distinction between us and Christ...but from this it is erroneously inferred, that we are now put in possession of all the blessings purchased by him, and thereby implying, that Paul was incorrect in saying, 'We are saved by hope' (Rom. 3:24). I admit, indeed that by believing in Christ we pass from death unto life; but we must at the same time remember the words of John, that though we know we are 'the sons of God', 'it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is.' (1 John 3:2) Therefore, although Christ offers us in the Gospel a present fullness of spiritual blessings, fruition remains in the keeping of hope, until we are divested of corruptible flesh, and transformed into the glory of him who has gone before us." 444

Just as Barth did, Calvin before him saw that both the Old and the New Testament had something to say about eschatology. Thus he said that Paul most clearly demonstrates "that the Old Testament had special reference to the future life, when he says that the promises of the Gospel were comprehended under it." 445 As for the New Testament, "the Gospel does not confine the hearts of men to the enjoyment of the present life, but raises them to the hope of immortality..." 446 Thus the Jews were bound to God "unto the hope of eternal life", 447 God's children were "strangers and pilgrims on earth". 448 Despising hardships and calamities of the present life they lifted their eyes "to the eternal world". 449

---

441. Institutes, 2.8.4
442. Ibid. 2.8.21
443. Ibid. 2.8.38
444. Ibid. 2.9.3. Barth even referred to this in CD 1/2, 117f.
445. Ibid. 2.10.3
446. Ibid.
447. Ibid. 2.10.7
448. Ibid. 2.10.13
449. Ibid. 2.10.17
Job confidently, therefore, looked beyond the present to the "last resurrection".

Calvin, like Barth, had an unfolding of the eschatological reality in time,

"Accordingly, at the beginning, when the first promise of salvation was given to Adam (Gen. 3:15), only a few slender sparks beamed forth: additions being afterwards made, a greater degree of light began to be displayed, and continued gradually to increase and shine with greater brightness, until at length, all the clouds being dispersed, Christ the Sun of righteousness arose, and with full refulgence illumined all the earth (Mal. 4)." 451

This is because the covenant of God made with Israel "was not confined to earthly objects, but contained a promise of spiritual and eternal life, the expectation of which behoved to be impressed on the minds of all who truly consented to the covenant." 452

Calvin referred to an earnest of the future eternal life given in the resurrection of certain people with Christ on Easter Sunday, and in the Holy Spirit's work in us now. 453 So it was with the Jews whose earthly possession was as it were a "mirror" in which they beheld their future inheritance in heaven. 454 In this respect Calvin saw a harmony in the Old and New Testaments, as both speak of present possessions or blessings from God in which He "was pleased to indicate and typify both the gift of future and eternal felicity by terrestrial blessings." 455

His eschatology concerns "a sure inheritance in the heavenly kingdom", 456 a being "received into the heavens, and made like the angels", 457

---

450. Institutes, 2.10.19
451. Ibid. 2.10.20. Together with this unfolding or progressive revelation (with some similarity to Barth) it is of interest to note that in 1953 Barth wrote, "We must admit that Calvin did see very clearly the problem of the teleological determination and direction of the whole being and status of man as changed in Christ..." (CD 4/1, 109).
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454. Ibid. 2.11.1. Cf. 4.16.11.
455. Ibid. 2.11.3
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and considers that the "kingdom of Christ is spiritual,"\(^458\) and that the "final judgment" will be "the last act of his reign", before handing it over to the Father so that God may be all in all.\(^459\) It also includes a literal second advent, for

"faith is most properly invited to mediate on the visible presence which he will exhibit on the last day. For he will descend from heaven in visible form, in like manner as he was seen to ascend, and appear to all with the ineffable majesty of his kingdom, the splendour of immortality, the boundless power of divinity, and an attending company of angels. Hence we are told to wait for the Redeemer against that day on which he will separate the sheep from the goats, and when not one individual either of the living or the dead shall escape his judgment."\(^460\)

Those living in that last day will not die after the natural manner but be changed. They will be transformed in a moment.\(^461\) On the judgment, Calvin considered that "it is most consolatory to think, that judgment is vested in him who has already destined us to share with him in the honour of judgment (Matt. 19:28)."\(^462\)

In Book 3 of the *Institutes* on the mode of obtaining the Grace of Christ, (Benefits and effects) Calvin noted that

"the Spirit does not merely originate faith, but gradually increases it, until by its means he conducts us into the heavenly kingdom,"\(^463\) for God "holds out the hope of a blessed resurrection to those only who feel His Spirit dwelling in them (Rom. 8:11);..."\(^464\) Thus "faith believes that eternal life has been given to us; hope expects that it will one day be revealed."\(^465\)

With complete confidence in the final advent, Calvin stated that as Peter told us (2 Pet. 3:4) scoffers rise up asking where is the promise of His

\(^{458}\) Institutes, 2.15.3
\(^{459}\) Ibid. 2.15.5
\(^{460}\) Ibid. 2.16.17
\(^{461}\) Ibid.
\(^{465}\) Ibid. 3.2.42. In 1959 Barth even called this section "one of the most striking passages in the *Institutio*" (CD 4/3, 913). He admitted that Calvin "has clearly shown the unity and yet also the distinction" between faith and hope.
coming, for all things continue as they were from the beginning of creation. "Nay, the world and the flesh insinuate the same thing. Here faith must be supported by the patience of hope, and fixed on the contemplation of eternity, consider that 'one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day'" (2 Pet. 3:8, Psa. 90:4)."

Calvin's ethics have an eschatological goal, for "Ever since our soul and body were destined to heavenly incorruptability and an unfa
ding crown, we should earnestly strive to keep them pure and uncorrupted against the day of the Lord. These, I say, are the surest foundations of a well-regulated life, and you will search in vain for anything resembling them among philosophers, who in their commendation of virtue, never rise higher than the natural dignity of man." 467

Thus, with Paul, he saw that a well ordered life embraces that looking for the blessed hope (Titus 2:11-14) when on "his final advent he will give full effect to the salvation obtained by him." 468 We must then "aspire with our whole heart to the future life", 469 for "if heaven is our country, what can the earth be but a place of exile?" 470 Thus Calvin significantly said,

"let us hold as fixed, that no man has made much progress in the school of Christ who does not look forward with joy to the day of death and final resurrection... 'Look up,' says our Lord, 'and lift up your heads: for your redemption draweth nigh.' (Luke 21:28) It is reasonable, I ask, that when he intended to have a powerful effect in stirring us up to alacrity and exultation should produce nothing but sadness and consternation? If it is so, why do we still glory in him as our Master? Therefore, let us come to a sounder mind, and how repugnant so ever the blind and stupid longing of the flesh may be, let us doubt not to desire the advent of the Lord not in wish only, but with earnest sighs, as the most propitious of all events. He will come as a Redeemer to deliver us from an immense abyss of evil and misery, and lead us to the blessed inheritance of his life and glory." 471

---
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Thus saints will pray for the coming of the Kingdom. This is called the "final advent." Believers "long for the advent of the kingdom," which will "be plainly manifested" on the last day. Calvin said that "nothing is more contrary to its nature than to be in doubt as to our final destiny" for "it shall one day be said, 'Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom,' etc. (Matt. 25:34)"

Calvin concludes the third Institutes with an entire sixteen-page chapter on the "last resurrection" where the stress is on the "final advent." Again he states (this time from the positive viewpoint) that "he alone has made solid progress in the gospel who has acquired the habit of meditating continually on a blessed resurrection," for on no other subject does scripture furnish a clearer explanation or a stronger proof. If Barth was thinking of eschatology as only an appendix in Calvin’s theology because the last chapter, the nearest evidence for this, would be this last chapter of the third Institutes, but, as we have seen eschatology is not left to this chapter for it is throughout all the books, and furthermore the third book is followed by the fourth in which we find many more statements on eschatology.

Thus in the fourth Institutes on the Holy Catholic Church, Calvin again has an eschatological emphasis from this new viewpoint, stating, "unless we are united with all the other members under Christ our head, no hope of the future inheritance awaits us.”

---
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478. Barth’s critique against the supposed “appendix of an appendix” position of eschatology in Reformation theology was made in 1940 (KD 2/1). Nineteen years later, in 1959 (CD 4/3, 553) he could even refer to Chapters 9 and 25 of Book 3 of the Institutes as “two eschatological chapters”.
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That there are tares amongst the wheat is no deterrent from membership, for "the Lord declares that the Church will labour under the defect of being burdened with a multitude of wicked until the day of judgment..." Calvin clearly held to that eschatological telos stating that "some hold the resurrection of the dead in derision, though with it the whole gospel must fall". Here we see that this eschatological event is equally important to Calvin as it was to Barth. In fact, Barth's opposition to the Catholic rejection of eschatology was already made by Calvin who was against the fact that to them the "doctrine of a future life and final resurrection is a mere fable." As with Barth, Calvin considered the time of the Church to be "the last hour, the last times, the last days".

"It behoves us to hunger after Christ only, to seek him, look to him, learn of him, and learn again, until the arrival of the great day on which the Lord will fully manifest the glory of his kingdom, and exhibit himself as he is to our admiring eye (1 John 3:2). And for this reason, this age of ours is designated in Scripture by the last hour, the last days, the last times..."

In conclusion, we can see from the above presentation that eschatology was no mere appendix to Calvin's theology, for we have found it throughout his Institutes, because he considered it to be so vital to the Gospel. Barth therefore was not fair to Calvin when he considered that eschatology to him was a mere appendix, because interested mostly
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486. CD 3/2, 510: "In 1944 the Congregation of the Sacred Office passed a remarkable resolution to the effect that belief in a visible second coming could 'not be taught as a certainty' - the very thing which for the New Testament is the greatest certainty of all on the basis of the resurrection."
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in the pre-temporality of God (i.e. predestination). In the presentation above, only one side of eschatology as it is found in Calvin's theology has been given, i.e. the future aspect. This is because that side, as we have seen, is Barth's emphasis in his "christological teleology". However, the Institutes also include the other side of eschatology, i.e. the present aspect. We have purposely omitted this half of Calvin's eschatological presentation because it will concern us a little in the next chapter, and more fully in the final chapter. What we shall see then - from the advantage point of the context we shall then be in - is that contrary to Barth's understanding that Calvin relegates eschatology to a mere appendix position in his theology (which is not substantiated by the facts) it is actually Barth who does this in his treatment of this present aspect of eschatology.

Against Barth's relegating of eschatology to an "appendix of an appendix" position in Reformation theology, which is really to hardly give it any meaningful position at all, we find that T. F. Torrance read Reformation theology differently. Thus he could say,

"Theologically the reformation was carried out through Christological correction of the doctrines of the Church, notably the doctrines of the Church, ministry, and sacraments, but also of the doctrines of God, salvation, and of the last things." 491

Particularly in reference to Calvin, and obviously in direct contrast to Barth, he wrote,

"The Calvinist Reformation stands for the christological criticism of the doctrines of Salvation, Church, Ministry, and Sacraments, and for their re-shaping in terms of the Church as the Body of Christ. That was the primary and predominant emphasis in this

490. Exception is one paragraph, last on p. 62, which also concerns Calvin's eschatological understanding of both the O.T. and N.T.
491. T. F. Torrance, CAC Vol. 1, 79.
Reformation - and not predestination, as is so often declared...Calvin...is more biblical, more dynamic and eschatological, than mystical...Rather, then, does Calvin give predestination a place on the circumference of his theology."

Therefore, "the doctrine of the Christian hope was unquestionably one of Calvin's chief concerns, although it is so often misunderstood."^93

Perhaps we have given sufficient evidence from at least one Reformer to show that Barth did not give them sufficient credit for having eschatology as an integral and vital part of their systems. T. F. Torrance has clearly shown that the same could be said for Luther and Butzer, and could even call their eschatology the eschatology of faith (Luther), and eschatology of love (Butzer), and the eschatology of hope (Calvin).^94 He has also said of John Knox that "in none of the Reformers was the stress upon incarnational union so strong as in Knox; and in none of them was the place given to the parousia so powerful."^95 It is all this evidence that Barth has seemingly not been able to find in the Reformer's theology, but which is really there to be found.

9. Conclusion

Just as there is one God, and, as such in His pre-temporality, supratemporality and post temporality, there is one goal, and as such in creation, reconciliation and redemption,^96 and there is the one Jesus

---

492. CAC Vol. 1, 89-92
493. Ibid. 98
494. T. F. Torrance read a paper on "The Eschatology of the Reformation" at Cambridge, July 1952, published in SJT OP No. 2, 1953, and later expanded into the book, KC. Having read both, this writer is convinced that Barth has no case at all for his charge against Reformation eschatology. Even L. Berkhof noted eschatology in the Reformation although he considered it made no great contribution to it. (STh 663) P. Althaus, however, considered that the Reformation was of decisive importance to eschatology (TTM 266-269).
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496. God's creation, reconciliation and redemption are grounded in the eternal election of Jesus Christ and ordained in reference to it (CD 2/2, 104) so that from eternity He was Priest, King and Prophet, cont./
Christ, and as such in His eternal life-act as munus sacerdotale, munus regium and munus propheticum. God, the goal, and Jesus Christ are identical and eternal being in temporal revelation but the unfolding of what they were antecedently enfolded in the inner-trinitarian being of God, and therefore in the eternal covenant and decree of His grace. Put another way, christological teleology, which is central to Earth's theology and therefore to his eschatology, is the eternal manward movement of the logos ensarkos. The role of the human Jesus as a man (homo) rather than just the exaltation of our humanity in him (humanitas) is desperately needed to balance the otherwise one-sided Christology of Barth in the Kirchliche Dogmatik. Thus, to a degree, we still remain with the critique raised in the previous chapter. The Urgeschichte - Historie or eternity-time dialectic of that "timeless eschatology" has simply appeared at least to some degree as a reality-revelation, or as an enfolded-unfolded dialectic

496. cont.

and did not merely become as such subsequently in time any more than He was in eternity (CD 4/3, 13).

497. The one God, one goal and one Jesus Christ are only truly the Christian God, goal and Jesus Christ in the combined three respective realities mentioned above. To speak of either God, the goal or Jesus Christ with an abstract emphasis on either one or two of the same mentioned realities is to end up not speaking about the Christian God, goal or Jesus Christ. This is basic to Barth's non-abstract thinking. However, two points are immediately obvious.

(1) We have only presented two of the three aspects of the life-work of Jesus Christ. (2) The two that we have presented have concerned only that period between incarnation and crucifixion. Without the third these would violate Barth's non-abstract presentation, but (as with the necessity to flatten out his superb circular reasoning) for purposes of orderly presentation with the minimum of repetition, it has seemed best to reserve the third ministry to the next chapter, and also the information from the previous two which refer to post-resurrection period also logically comes in the next chapter. Likewise, it has seemed best that all material in these same two ministries already studied which refers to the kingdom should be presented together with much more that is said on the subject throughout every book, and this also logically comes in the next chapter.
in his "christological eschatology". This is because there is no
givenness, no human hypostasis. Perhaps with this should be placed
the content-form dialectic mentioned not only in CD 1/2, but as late
as CD 4/1.

498. This will become more evident in Chapter 5.
499. i.e. The ontology of the human Jesus is engulfed within God's
(anhypostasis).
500. Eg. CD 1/2, 179, 189 and 4/1, 53. CD 4/1 was written in 1953.
Somewhere between that year and 1956 Barth said, "In theology the
terms 'form' and 'content' have no place, for they are philosophical
distinctions. I am sorry I ever used them!" (TT 41).
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CHAPTER FIVE

THE KINGDOM, AND THE TIME BETWEEN THE TIMES

In the previous chapter on christological teleology we noted Barth's emphasis on God's movement towards His goal which holds together creation and redemption. The acts of God ad extra were seen to be the unfolding of that which has from eternity been enfolded within the inner-trinitarian being of God. This unfolding movement in time was with a view to the God-man, to whom it was teleologically oriented, but only because it was within this God-man that the teleological movement was effectively actualized. In Him the movement was seen to be dual, with a concurrent God-to-manward and a man-to-Godward direction as both God's word to man and man's answering word to God.

In this chapter, we are still concerned with God's movement, but this time from the realized goal to its future manifestation. The orientation is eschatological in that the Eschaton has already been inserted into history in the life-act of Jesus Christ. The orientation is also teleological in that the full manifestation of the Eschaton is yet to come in the ultimate parousia.¹

¹. Although we will have to question whether Barth has fully overcome his "flight from history" (earlier eschatology) in his later eschatology, cont./
This chapter sets out to achieve three goals: (1) An attempt to relate Barth's thinking on the Kingdom with major aspects of the modern debate. This is deemed necessary because he has been ignored by the overwhelming majority of contributors. We will give certain key eschatological theses special consideration in Chapter Seven in order to consider Barth's contribution over-against them after having spelled out his position in this chapter. When coming to Chapter Seven it will be seen that this Chapter Five is an important preparation for the final evaluations to be made then. (2) This chapter is also an attempt to show the advancement Barth's position has made over-against those of Schleiermacher and Ritschl. This will be given in the final section. (3) Finally, this chapter is an attempt to indicate that the "unfolding revelation and anhypostatic emphases of the previous chapter are seen again in Barth's Kingdom presentation (especially in Section 4 of this chapter) and that the logical conclusion of both is found in the non-ontological subjective realization of the Kingdom (in Section 10 of this chapter). Thus we shall be forced to question whether Barth has taken history as seriously as he should have, and therefore whether he has fully overcome his earlier "Wholly Other" God. However, prior to this critique we shall follow Barth's attempt to take history seriously\(^2\) in his consideration of the

---

1. cont. we can at least concur with D. L. Deegan that Barth's doctrine of providence makes meaningful for us not only the ultimate but the penultimate (SJT Vol. 15, 1962, 83), and indeed this is so because the teleological movement of time towards the end of time gives meaning to history in the interim. However, this is primarily so because the end of time as the Eschatos has already been inserted into history in the life-act of Jesus Christ. Thus the ultimate gives meaning to the penultimate (and therefore to history between the times) not because the ultimate is only future (as in J. Holtmann, TH 108, 263, 279, 283) but because the ultimate is fully realized. Cf. F. Althaus, TTH 284.

2. It has been considered best to first present Barth's apparent attempt to take history seriously, which was successful to a point. Section 10 will then examine this attempt and find it lacking in full success.
parousia as in time instead of beyond time, and in his emphasis upon the Christ in man instead of above man. From the discussion as a whole, will develop two opposite but related lacunae in Barth's eschatological thinking, i.e. the spelling out of the man to Godward movement for us above, and the completing of the God-to-manward movement into us below. Here we will note that his double christological movement in pre-resurrection Christology became only one movement in post-resurrection Christology. God will still be seen as a Word to man, but instead of the risen man Jesus Christ continuing to be man's answering word before the Father, we will be left with man's own answering word of response below. Our thesis argument which criticized Barth's earlier eschatology because it did not do full justice to the humanity of Jesus Christ in time will, in this chapter, have to criticize Barth's later eschatology because it does not do full justice to the humanity of Jesus Christ above time, as well as man's participation in His humanity in time.

1. Aspects of the Kingdom Study

The Kingdom has received intensive study during the last few decades, producing a vast literature. As C. H. Pinnock noted, "Few other doctrines have so impressed themselves upon the minds of twentieth century theologians as those of revelation and eschatology" and yet no firm concensus has been reached. Therefore, it would be beyond our present purpose to compare Barth's thinking on the Kingdom with all that has been discussed, but we will attempt to relate his position to the main ideas in the debate. This will be done throughout the text, whereas the various aspects of the debate are given together with sources in the Appendix (No.1).

2. Barth's Basic Position

Barth has consistently adopted the theological approach rather than the so-called "historical quest" approach to the Kingdom. He was therefore not interested to follow New Testament exegetes who attempt to get behind the pericopes in either the Synoptics or the Johannine account to the "rudimentary" λόγος, for his christological hermeneutic points beyond the witness found therein to the "revelatus" λόγος. That revealed Word, Jesus Christ, was God's eternal goal, His eternal election of all mankind. From our previous chapter we see that Barth understood this revelatus λόγος to be vere Deus, vere Homo (humanitas) and as such He was (according to one emphasis - although called in question by the λόγος ζυγαρκός) both discontinuous with man (as God) and continuous with man (as man). In this chapter we will see what this discontinuity-continuity means for Barth's understanding of the Kingdom. As in everything else in his theology, the incarnation will be the controlling root and ground of his understanding of the Kingdom.

Before coming to the positive side (i.e. what the Kingdom is) let us first note what Barth considers it not to be.

---

5. He was not interested in the Old Quest referred to in Schweitzer's Rzw 1-401, and therefore not in the New Quest of J. M. Robinson (ThT XV, July 1958, 183-197) nor would he have been in the suggested "indirect Jesus research" of H. Anderson (JCO 308-311). In writing about the years 1948-1958, Barth referred to "New Testament men, who to my amazement have armed themselves with swords and staves and once again undertaken the search for the 'historical Jesus' - a search in which I now as before prefer not to participate" (HCM 69). In CD 4/2, 149f he spoke of it as only leading away into a "Babylonian captivity". (In fairness this perhaps cannot be applied to H. Anderson as it can to others. See JCO 307. Cf. Barth's comments in CD 1/2, 64f.)

6. Eg. CD 1/2, 104 - Every statement in the New Testament originates in the fact that the Word was made flesh. Cf. the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ, in Barth's thinking, also involves continuity (body) and discontinuity (raised by God and glorified).
3. What the Kingdom is Not

For Barth, the Kingdom is not a normative concept like the "idea of the good" or the "categorical imperative" which has to be filled out in content by interpretation according to our judgment or discretion. It is not a mere schema, the practical realization of which God watches only as a spectator, encouraging and consoling and in the end distributing rewards and punishments. This to Barth would be an abstract kingdom. For him the Kingdom cannot have an independent reality, i.e. cannot be separated from its King. Neither is it any kind of island of inwardness (as with Schleiermacher) which he considered non-Christian, for a Kingdom possessed by man is not the Kingdom of God in the biblical sense, even though he could say that it is set up in the Christian's heart through prayer; for the true Kingdom is the transcendent Kingdom which comes to man. As such its establishment is not (as with Ritschl) surrendered to the power and control of men, even though Barth could speak of the Christian as being saved to the glory of God and "co-operation" in execution of the Kingdom of God. This is to be understood in the non-synergistic sense of not completing, accomplishing or revealing the Kingdom per se, and thus only concerns reflecting those transcendent realities. This is because the purposes of the Kingdom are fulfilled through the Holy Spirit and not through man, coming, therefore, without his work. Thus Barth was satisfied neither with the immanental Kingdom of Schleiermacher nor with the moral Kingdom of Ritschl.

7. CD 2/2, 668 13. CD 2/2, 693f
8. CD 2/2, 424 14. CD 1/2, 686
9. CD 2/1, 277 15. CD 3/3, 255
11. CD 1/2, 789 17. CD 4/3, 608
19. CD 1/2, 791, Not even doctrine - CD 1/2, 762.
Augustine’s identification of the Kingdom with the Church (civitas Dei) was also opposed by Barth as it looked to the rule of the Church instead of the rule of God. In contrast to Roman Catholicism’s (pre Vatican II) too rigid identification, Barth only equated the Kingdom with the Church, secondarily applied in a relative and historical sense (in contrast with its primary absolute, christological and eschatological meaning). Thus, although the hidden Kingdom is not to be found in the being of the Church (in the absolute sense), the Kingdom of reconciliation is concealed in the visible appearance of the Church (in the relative sense). As the Church is not an end in itself (not absolute) it is not as such the Kingdom of God, but only its likeness, its witness, and as such it is the Kingdom (in the relative sense). The community is not the Kingdom of God but the Kingdom of God is the community. It has its earthly historical form, which as the visible Kingdom on earth, is only as such the provisional form of the Kingdom. Several scholars are

20. See A. Augustine, TCCG Bk. 15-18. Rudolf Schnackenburg, a contemporary Catholic theologian, has compared the old church-Kingdom interpretation of Catholicism with his "progressive heilsgeschichtlich" interpretation in GHR 78. He speaks of the Gottesherrschaft, not as exhausted in the Church, but as having a future character or future perfection (78, 96). This is in direct contrast to Augustinian identification of the Church and Kingdom, which Barth opposed.

21. CD 1/2, 678f. Vos equated the Kingdom and Church, TJKC 150.

22. CD 4/3, 23. Barth considered that the Roman Catholic Church ceased to understand itself as the community of the last time inaugurated with the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, thus forgetting that it comes from the goal of all history, choosing rather to understand Jesus Christ as the foundation or beginning of a new epoch in history, and thus tried to establish itself a kingdom with others (CD 3/2, 585). Eusebius thought he saw in Constantine’s kingdom a kind of definitive revelation of the Kingdom of God, and wanted the Apocalypse to be taken out of the Canon (3/3, 25).

23. CD 4/2, 657f

24. CD 1/2, 678f

25. CD 2/2, 390

26. CD 4/3, 766

27. CD 4/3, 795, 850, 853f, 864.

28. CD 4/3, 887

29. CD 1/2, 696, 589; 4/2, 658. Specified as the Evangelical Church, 1/2, 579.

30. CD 4/2, 656

31. CD 2/1, 199

32. CD 4/2, 677
in basic agreement with Barth on this. 33

He also dismissed the doctrine of the three kingdoms, which spoke of the Petrine past, Kingdom of fear of the Father; Pauline present, Kingdom of truth of the Son; and Johannine future, Kingdom of love of the Spirit. 34 He saw in the spiritual Kingdom of Francis Assisi, which was to outdate the so-called Church Kingdom of Augustine, a supposed outdating of Jesus Christ. 35 Such an abstract consideration of the Holy Spirit outstripping the Son (as well as the Father) he rejected. 36

Barth also wrote against the doctrine of the two kingdoms with its

33. The Kingdom and Church are not identical (H. B. Swete, STL 161, 167, 184-186; K. E. Skydsgaard, SJT Vol. 4, 1951, 397; J. S. Candlish, KG 205; John Bright, KOG 236; T. F. Torrance, EQ Vol. 25, 1953, 168 and F. F. Bruce, EQ Vol. 15, 1943, 266 - the Kingdom of God is not absolute but a relative identity (p. 265). The Kingdom is wider than the Church (J. Orr, HDB II, 854), the Church as the sphere of the Kingdom of Christ, as its proleptic form (T. F. Torrance, SJT Vol. 19, 1966, 138), the Church is not the Kingdom but the Messianic Community (F. F. Bruce, EQ Vol. 38, 1966, 57), not even the world (let alone the Church) can contain the Kingdom (H. P. Owen, SJT Vol. 15, 1962, 381). In agreement with Barth's eschatological consideration of the Church, it is called an "eschatological phenomenon" (C. Cullmann, BNTE, 413) and an "eschatological community" (E. G. Selwyn, BNTE 395; W. D. Davies quoted by F. W. Dillistone, SJT Vol. 6, 1953, 158 and N. A. Dahl, BNTE 422f). In contrast to the above mentioned, and to Barth, E. C. Hoskyns did apparently identify the Church with the Kingdom of God on earth as the fulfillment of Christ's language relative to the coming of the end (CS 32). This, however, negates the necessary eschatological tension and makes the final parousia unnecessary. Barth's "christological eschatology" with the eschatological tension between the Eschaton already inserted into history and its final manifestation in history at the end of history makes everything within history relative. With this T. F. Torrance is in agreement when he noted that the Church is not identified with the Kingdom in the New Testament because of the doctrine of final justification (EQ Vol. 25, 1953, 168).

34. CD 1/1, 387
35. CD 1/2, 250
36. CD 4/4, 99. Although Barth could speak of the Word of God in the act of creation, act of reconciliation and act of redemption as revealing the Kingdom as the Kingdom of nature, Kingdom of grace and Kingdom of glory (CD 2/2, 549) and could refer to David's reign as gratiae, and Solomon's, as gloriae (2/2, 56), and identified the present time as the Kingdom of grace (2/2, 688f); yet none of these references were meant to present the idea of subsequent stages of the Kingdom, for eschatology to Barth is not just an appendix with the regnum glorise merely following the regnum gratiae (1/2, 875). They are, rather, concurrent as we shall see later.
radical separation of Church and world, which he considered unfortunate. 37

Even his understanding of the Church as the Kingdom in the relative sense did not mean that the non-Church part of humanity was outside of the Kingdom of God. He did speak of the present condition of the world as not yet identical with the Kingdom, 38 and that prior to that final identification, all kingdoms are but fleeting shadows alongside the Kingdom of God. 39 Even so, the state is not only within the Kingdom, 40 but is even the form assumed by the Kingdom of God outside the Church. 41 As heaven and earth, gospel and law are one, so is church and state. 42 In this way the Church is not the Kingdom of God over against the kingdoms of the world 43 (or "anti-Christian" as the Anabaptists claimed), for the political order itself is an expression of the Kingdom of Grace. 44 Barth called this an "all-embracing kingdom", 45 or "cosmic kingdom", 46 which is not just a kingdom amongst others, but as the Kingdom of all kingdoms is above them all. 47 By this he meant that even the "kingdom of the non-real", 48 or "sidereal kingdom", 49 - that which (in one sense) is outside of both Church and world - as the "kingdoms of disobedience" are within the embrace of the regnum Jesu Christi, 50 for Christ overcame these "beast kingdoms" in His birth, 51 routed "nothingness" in His miracle ministry, 52 conquered them within Himself, 53 and will defeat them in the end of history, 54 which will be but the final revelation of their destruction already taken place. 55
4. What the Kingdom Is

Emerging from the previous negative section is the positive fact that the Kingdom, to Barth, includes the Church, world and chaos powers in an all-embracing realm under the rule of the Sovereign Lordship of Jesus Christ. The significant point to note is this holding together of realm and rule. Apparently the Kingdom to Barth is therefore more than just the rule of God (unlike E. F. Scott, H. B. Swete, T. W. Manson, G. E. Ladd, J. Bright, C. K. Barrett, G. Dalman, W. Manson) and more than just the realm of God (unlike R. Otto, M. Goguel, and S. Aalen). Apparently it is a combination of both the rule and the realm (as with W. G. KümmeL, J. Orr, A. M. Hunter, and S. D. F. Salmond). We have said "apparently", and will come now to consider if this is the case.

a. The Kingdom as Rule and Realm

We first must see that Jesus Christ is Himself the Kingdom in Barth's presentation. As such He is both the rule and the realm for He is both the θεοσ του (rule) and the θαυμάσια του (realm as humanitas) because in Him are united both God and man. As such Jesus Christ is the αυτο βασιλεία as He was to Origen and Tertullian. But what is the relationship of this rule and realm in the Kingdom? To this we now come.
b. The Kingdom as Rule in the Realm

In his angelology, Barth said that Basileia does not denote the sphere but the act of kingly rule. In his ecclesiology he spoke of the Church as the sphere in which the glory of the Kingdom, or rule is made manifest in transitory flashes, also noting that the Kingdom is the Lordship or rule of God. In his ethical fragment, he referred to "when the kingdom of heaven is set up as God's rule on earth." Is there a similar emphasis upon the rule over the realm in his Christology?

In the previous chapter we noted that the humanity of Jesus is so engulfed by His divinity that the emphasis upon His life-acts was upon the acting God. Thus there was a determination from His divinity to His humanity, there was a mutual impartation between the two natures, there was a unique relationship to the Holy Spirit, there was an impossibility to sin, all because of the "inner-history" between God and man in Jesus Christ. We were forced to question this emphasis as the role of the human Jesus, His redeeming men as a man, is not given it's proper place. Now in this question of the Kingdom we have returned to the same problem, only we are looking at it through different language. Here Jesus Christ is the autobasileia, the rule over the realm, God acting over humanitas. In this context Barth often spoke of the divine (rule) which gives, and the human (realm) which receives. In one place he said that the "divine rules and reveals and gives," whereas the "human serves and attests and mediates". It follows that his frequent emphasis is that "the Son of Man is also and primarily the Son of God", for the Son of Man "is adopted and controlled and sanctified and ruled" by the Son of God. Here then is a rule over

59. CD 3/3, 433
60. CD 2/2, 390
61. CD 4/2, 655
62. CD 4/4, 56
63. CD 4/2, 72, 74, 89f.
64. CD 4/2, 116
65. CD 4/2, 88, 90, 98, 100.
66. CD 4/2, 88
the realm, just as previously we noted the divine content in the human form, Urgeschichte over Historie. In each the emphasis is upon God's act rather than upon the role of the human Jesus in man's redemption. It follows that the external signs of this Kingdom reality, such as healings, exorcisms, resurrections etc. are considered as military actions revealing it's nature and character. It is identified as God's coup d'état, or "seizure of power". As such "God the Son is the acting Subject in this event". We are left asking where is the human Jesus as one man (homo), and thus as vere Homo, in this autobasileia God-humanitas rule over the realm?

c. Motivation for Barth's Kingdom Rule Emphasis

Anthropocentric presentations of the Kingdom include those considering the realm as the Church (Augustinian Roman theology), those considering the realm as the self-consciousness (Schleiermachian theology), and those considering the realm as moral ethics (Ritschlian theology). Each, in a different way, is synergistic and Pelagian. As has usually been true in the history of theology, one over-emphasis evokes its opposite over-reaction. So this over-emphasis on man led to an over-emphasis on God, the pendulum swinging from primary consideration of the Kingdom realm to the Kingdom rule. Whereas God was missing in the above examples, He is brought back to the centre in Barth's understandable reaction. Now, however, to some degree at least (as shown above), the proper place for the humanity of Jesus is missing.

d. At least both Rule and Realm are Present in Barth's Kingdom

Having noted the emphasis of Barth upon the Kingdom rule, we must now go on to underline the fact that the realm is nevertheless included in his

70. CD 4/2, 46, 51, 65f, 71, 75, 96, 101.
presentation of the Kingdom. At least his stress on the coming God was better than Schleiermacher's domesticated or immanent God. For Schleiermacher there was only a consciousness of God instead of a rule, and only one human person instead of a realm. Not so with Barth, for in Jesus Christ there was both *vere Deus* and *vere Homo* (humanitas), and thus the ruling God and the entire realm of man under His rule. Even though we have had to question the relationship between the two, we must now understand that they are both present.

This brings us to a very important aspect of Barth's thinking, which ties this chapter in with the previous one on christological teleology. For Barth there is an eternal relationship between (1) the Kingdom, (2) the covenant, (3) the decree of God, and (4) Jesus Christ. All are identical in the absolute sense in that the eternal decree concerned the coming in time of the Kingdom. This is put in different ways by Barth, so that the Kingdom is understood as the fulfillment of the eternal decree,\(^71\) into which all are predestined.\(^72\) This establishing of the Kingdom among men is identified with the fulfilling of the covenant,\(^73\) with the coming of Jesus Christ\(^74\) as the accomplishment of reconciliation;\(^75\) for, the uniting of God and man in Jesus was the restoration of the covenant, the actualization of reconciliation and the inauguration of the Kingdom.\(^76\) Thus Barth could speak of the Kingdom as the last thing corresponding to the

71. CD 2/2, 491
73. CD 3/2, 439
74. CD 3/4, 199, 200, 205, 212, 233, 282f.
75. CD 3/4, 516
76. Jesus Christ is the Kingdom as the coming of the *regnare* and the inauguration of the *regnum*. As such the covenant "I shall be your God" (as king) and "ye shall be my people" (as realm) was fulfilled in Jesus Christ from both sides in that He was both God's word to man and man's answering word to God. Barth's covenant concept of the Kingdom is thus gospel and not the religious contract interpretation of Federal theology.
First thing in the counsel of God before all time, 77 as the centre and goal of God's actions, 78 in which His sovereignty over all the world has its centre and aim. 79 In this way the covenant was the promise of the Kingdom and the Kingdom the fulfillment of the covenant. 80 For the goal of the covenant was the Kingdom of God on earth in Jesus Christ, 81 and not just in heaven as with Rudolf Otto. 82

Although Barth referred to the Kingdom in various ways, such as the kingdom of God's loving kindness, 83 kingdom of the Creator, 84 kingdom of the Holy Spirit, 85 God's coup d'état, 86 kingdom of heaven 87 and the kingdom of grace, 88 on the one hand; and spoke of Jesus returning to the kingdom of God in heaven, 89 on the other: his central interest was in the fact that primarily it is Jesus Christ himself in His being and acts 90 who was, is and will be the kingdom 91 in all its fullness. 92 This christological understanding of the Kingdom is shared by many other scholars but was wrongly opposed by Bultmann as "escape reasoning". 93

77. CD 3/2, 487 80. CD 4/2, 760
78. CD 3/4, 521 81. CD 4/3, 51
79. CD 3/4, 534 82. R. Otto, KGM 131-137 - Jesus did not recognize the Kingdom as present. It was only future and purely transcendent, Cf. pp. 150-155.
83. CD 2/2, 492 85. CD 4/4, 163
84. CD 3/2, 149 86. CD 4/3, 620, 625, 627 or alteration 4/3, 713.
87. CD 3/3, 437. Jesus Christ called the Kingdom of heaven (3/3, 437), a term Barth uses almost entirely for the angels.
88. CD 2/2, 578; 3/3, 53.
89. CD 3/4, 320 90. CD 4/3, 610
91. CD 3/2, 490; 4/2, 97, 155, 181, 253, 656.
92. CD 3/2, 491
93. TNT Vol. 1, 22. Bultmann considered Jesus' expectation of a near end of the world to be an illusion, and that to say He saw the presence of God's reign in His own person is only "escape reasoning". However, the failure was not in the non-beginning of the reign, but in Bultmann's Docetic Christology which refused to see in Jesus Christ the God-man as the covenant restored and therefore as the Kingdom actualized, and therefore both the realm and reign of God. R. Otto does not seem to identify Jesus Christ and the Kingdom in saying that "it is not Jesus who brings the kingdom...the kingdom brings him with it" (KGM 103). G. E. Ladd put it better - "Jesus brought the kingdom.
The importance of Jesus Christ as both rule and realm, and therefore the Kingdom realized, atonement actualized and reconciliation effected, must now be noted. Here Barth has held together creation and redemption, and found their centre, purpose and telos in the being and acts of Jesus Christ. It follows that the realization of the Kingdom and soteriology are held together, for in Jesus Christ God and man have been brought back into at-one-ment. It follows that soteriology and eschatology are held together because the Kingdom reality in Jesus Christ is identified with the Eschatos. Thus, unlike Schleiermacher, who placed sanctification under the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as if the Kingdom is only established through Christ (περὶ Χριστοῦ), Barth rightly placed it within Christology (ἐν Χριστῷ). This is in agreement with Paul, who witnessed that "of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption" (1 Cor. 1:30). This understanding of the realized Kingdom is clearly given in Barth's theology, both in the earlier period (e.g. Römerbrief) as well as in the later Kirchliche Dogmatik. It could be considered as the consistent positive leitmotif of his eschatology. This is why he has always stressed the

93. cont.
Apart from Jesus, there would have been no kingdom" (JK 152). The Kingdom existed on earth in Jesus since the incarnation (J. Orr, HDB II 850-852. Cf. 849), Jesus was "the incarnation of the kingdom of God" (T. W. Manson, SJ 345), Cf. Christ was the manifestation of the Kingdom (NMJ 383), the Kingdom came in the advent and presence of Jesus (T. F. Torrance, SJT Vol. 16, 1963, 121; Cf. EQ Vol. 25, 1953, 167, 169), Jesus Christ in His person and work was the Kingdom (C. J. Cadoux, HBJ 128-133, 296 *), Jesus Christ was the "living embodiment of the Kingdom" (E. F. Scott, KM 153), the Kingdom came in Christ's person (J. K. Howard, EQ Vol. 38, 1966, 55f), the Kingdom was present in Christ's person (E. von Dobschütz, EG 23), the future Kingdom entered into history in the person of Jesus (G. E. Ladd, EQ Vol. 29, 1957, 97; Cf. JK 135, 142), "Christ who is Himself the kingdom" (G. W. H. Lampe, SJT OP No. 2, 22), Cf. the Kingdom of God was God Himself (H. B. Swete, PK 21) and the Kingdom had drawn nigh in the person of the King (F. F. Bruce, EQ Vol. 15, 1943, 264).
bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ, for the Kingdom realized is now at
the right hand of the Father, where (again in agreement with Paul) our
"life is hid with Christ in God" (Col. 3:3). We gladly acknowledge this
aspect of his Kingdom teaching which does better justice to the reality
involved than does that of C. H. Dodd, R. Bultmann and J. Moltmann as
we shall see in Chapter Seven, but we see its weakness in over-stressing
the rule to the detriment of the realm so that his post-resurrection
Christology became a continued stress upon the rule instead of the realm,
in that the emphasis was still upon the coming God instead of upon the
man Jesus before the Father. But such a stress upon a coming God to the
neglect of the man Jesus above time is really no better than his earlier
stress upon the coming God to the neglect of the man Jesus in time. Even
his later Christology, we have seen, does not do full justice to the
humanity of Jesus in time, and thus throughout his theology there is a
tendency to not give full justice to the humanity of Jesus which can be
considered as the consistent negative leitmotiv of his eschatology.

5. When the Kingdom Came

In his earlier thinking Barth's "timeless eschatology" stressed
that the Kingdom had not broken forth upon the earth even in the tiniest
fragment, for it had not been projected into the world. He dismissed
the idea of the Kingdom come as "Christian" or "unchristian dreamery". He
considered that any claim to seeing the Kingdom growing, as an organism,
was not the Kingdom but the Tower of Babel. The key to his opposition
to the Kingdom as having come in Jesus Christ rested upon his claim that
such a consideration was fanaticism. Therefore he stressed that the

94. R 102
95. R 317f
96. ZdZ heft 6, 1931, 463.
Kingdom had only drawn near and was at hand, but never that it had come. In his Kirchliche Dogmatik, or later "christological eschatology", his revised understanding of the incarnation of the eternal God in time rather than just above time, and its consequent final parousia in time instead of beyond time, brought Barth to see Jesus Christ as the Kingdom (as noted above), and therefore its coming was now understood to have taken place in Him. Thus it had not only dawned (Anbruch) in the sense of drawing near (nahe herber) but had irrupted into history (Hereinbrechen). It is this progress in his thinking that we now come to consider.

Repeatedly he refers to the Kingdom as having already come, noting that it came with Jesus Christ, by Jesus Christ, and in Jesus Christ. The point we wish to note from what follows is that the question WHEN the Kingdom came with, in and by Jesus Christ seems to have many different answers. Thus (1) it took place in the incarnation, which Barth called its inauguration, or actual dawning in the fullness of time. (2) It is considered as gloriously open from the days of John the Baptist, with its advent identified with the entrance of Jesus into Galilee. (3) Although the words and acts of Jesus Christ were not only said to be the βασιλεία announced but as present and effective

99. See Chapter 3, p. 75f.
100. The coming of the Kingdom is equated with God's receiving of man to Himself (CD 4/1, 417), when God called man by becoming man (4/2, 107) so that it is in His human person that Jesus Christ is the Kingdom, and in which He is simply but totally its first and proper subject (4/1, 208), for Barth saw in the New Testament an identity between the actualized Kingdom of God with the Son of Man (5/4, 400). This is the kingdom set up in the life of Jesus Christ (4/3, 635) which caused Barth to speak of His life as the presence of the Kingdom (3/2, 581).
102. CD 3/2, 493.
103. CD 4/3, 260.
106. CD 3/2, 583.
107. CD 3/2, 461.
108. CD 4/4, 55.
in human history,\(^{110}\) (as both signs of its hidden presence on earth\(^{111}\) proclaimed as come in parables\(^{112}\) and as triumphantly visible,\(^{113}\) especially in exorcisms and resurrections\(^{114}\) they are also considered to be the dawning (or coming) of the Kingdom actualized in Him.\(^ {115}\) (4) It came in the transfiguration\(^{116}\) as its first and provisional fulfillment\(^ {117}\) seen by three disciples.\(^{118}\) (5) Yet, it was not until on the road to the cross that Jesus Christ entered on His rule,\(^ {119}\) (6) not until His betrayal, his παραδοσεως, or handing over, by Judas that the gates of the Kingdom opened, or the way to its establishment actually opened up.\(^ {120}\) (7) It came with the shedding of Christ's blood.\(^ {121}\) (It came in his passion\(^ {122}\) and He exercised, confirmed and maintained it in His death.\(^ {123}\) (8) However, it was not until after the cross that it came,\(^ {124}\) for it was the goal of his suffering.\(^ {125}\) Thus it came to sight in the resurrection,\(^ {126}\) even though it could be said that miracles had been a revelation of it previously.\(^ {127}\)

At first sight these eight seem contradictory, for how can the same kingdom be credited with coming at the incarnation, at the beginning of Jesus Christ's ministry during His ministry of miracles, signs and parables, in the transfiguration, betrayal, crucifixion and resurrection? Surely it could not have come at least eight different times? We submit that the correct way to interpret Barth here is to do so in the light of our

\(^{110}\) CD 3/2, 498
\(^{111}\) Ibid.
\(^{112}\) CD 3/2, 474
\(^{113}\) CD 3/2, 498
\(^{114}\) CD 4/2, 232
\(^{115}\) CD 3/2, 331
\(^{116}\) CD 3/2, 478
\(^{117}\) Ibid.
\(^{118}\) CD 3/2, 499
\(^{119}\) CD 2/2, 435
\(^{120}\) CD 2/2, 493f
\(^{121}\) CD 4/3, 422
\(^{122}\) CD 4/2, 252, 389.
\(^{123}\) CD 4/2, 295
\(^{124}\) CD 4/2, 142
\(^{125}\) CD 2/2, 264
\(^{126}\) CD 3/2, 489; 4/4, 74, 89.
\(^{127}\) CD 4/2, 243. Although the coming of the Kingdom was identical with the coming of Jesus Christ (4/3, 872) the signs of its hidden presence were unveiled during the 40 days of Easter (3/2, 479).
previous chapter on christological teleology, in which we noted that
the eternally enfolded decree of God has been and is being unfolded in
time. In that chapter we came across the different events which he
considered to be the "goal" in time of that eternal decree, so that
incarnation, cross and resurrection were each understood to be that goal.
In this same way he is speaking about the Kingdom, for the Kingdom was and
is that goal; and as such his emphasis here is not upon one event as the
coming of the Kingdom but upon the dynamic process of its coming as un-
folded from incarnation onwards. He is therefore referring to the dif-
ferent moments of the Kingdom's coming as it was unfolded in time, with
particular emphasis on its present and yet hidden and provisional nature,
although already a reality in the person of Jesus Christ from the very
beginning. 128 In Jesus Christ the Kingdom did come in the incarnation,
was increasingly testified to in miracles, signs and parables, reaching a
full manifestation to three disciples in the transfiguration and to many
more followers in the resurrection. In this sense of a gradual unfolding,
the Kingdom came to be known to the contemporaries of Jesus Christ, but,
not only for the overwhelming majority, but also in the fullest sense, it
came to revelation only in and through His resurrection.

Having pointed to its unfolding reality from the standpoint of revel-
ation, and thus from man's viewpoint; it is also Barth's purpose to see
in Jesus Christ, and therefore from God's viewpoint, the complete reality
of the Kingdom. Thus in Him it had come in the absolute sense (in contrast
with J. Knox129), and was therefore actualized rather than merely imminent
(in contrast with M. Dibelius, R. H. Fuller, E. F. Scott, and W. G. Kümmel130).

128. CD 3/2, 498  129. John Knox, CL 30
130. M. Dibelius, J 78f, 89f; R. H. Fuller, MAJ 20-49; E. F. Scott, KM
    125, 245-257; W. G. Kümmel, PF 23.
It was (as with J. Bright) already set up, and therefore not (as with G. S. Duncan) yet to be fully established. There was, however, a continuance of this Kingdom come in that its manifestation is still yet in the process of unfolding (in contrast to the early C. H. Dodd) and will continue to do so until the future final ultimate revelation in the parousia, so that an "eschatological reserve" (as with T. F. Torrance) is understood by Barth to point beyond the Kingdom come to its future coming manifestation. It is with this in mind, although having corrected his earlier exclusive emphasis on the Kingdom drawn near, that Barth in his later thought continues to stress this aspect together with the realized aspect of the Kingdom. To this we now turn.

6. The Kingdom Drawn Near

We come now right into the debate concerning the Greek word ἐκκένωσις. Barth's earlier "timeless eschatology" can be identified with the thinking of V. Taylor and J. M. Robinson, etc., in that the Kingdom had only drawn near but never came. His later "christological eschatology" with its Kingdom come emphasis is the same as we find in A. M. Hunter and R. H. Lightfoot etc., but does not go to the extreme in transmuting the final parousia in supposedly finding it already exhaustively present as in the "realized eschatology" of C. H. Dodd. By contrast, Barth has more than a realized Kingdom interest, for he looks beyond to a future fulfillment.

131. KOG 233
132. G. S. Duncan, JSM 258f. Duncan thinks of the future as "essentially spiritual" and can speak of a coming in glory as the ultimate triumph of God (pp. 174, 180, 188f). In contrast, Barth looks to the cross and resurrection as the ultimate triumph, and thus to the future as the manifestation which already began in the resurrection. This will become clearer later in the chapter, and in the next. Barth, it seems to this writer, takes more seriously the bodily resurrection of Christ and his bodily return and thus speaks clearly of the Kingdom already fully established in Him. By contrast, see Duncan, JSM 174-189.
133. T. F. Torrance, RP 48
Therefore his "christological eschatology" interprets \( \tilde{\gamma}_{\pi}^\chi E \) as both drawn near in so far as the final or ultimate revelation is concerned and as come in reality as far as actualization in Jesus Christ is concerned. In this eschatological tension, Barth held together both past and future aspects of the coming of the Kingdom, and so read behind the \( \tilde{\gamma}_{\pi}^\chi E \) a concealed \( \tilde{\theta}_{\nu}^\lambda \nu \).\(^{134}\) With this as a background we will note what he said about the Kingdom as drawn nigh.

Just as he pointed to different times for the coming of the Kingdom so he referred to different times when it drew nigh. Thus it did so (1) in the epiphany of Jesus Christ,\(^{135}\) (2) at His baptism,\(^{136}\) (3) in His signs and deeds,\(^{137}\) (4) when the Galilean miracle of fishes took place at Peter's calling,\(^{138}\) (5) when the storm came on the lake,\(^{139}\) and (6) in the life and death of Jesus Christ.\(^{140}\) In all, the Kingdom could be said to have drawn nigh in bodily form.\(^{141}\) But in contrast with the Kingdom's imminence at the Baptist's announcement,\(^{142}\) (7) the Kingdom is said to have drawn disproportionately nearer since Pentecost.\(^{143}\) Here again, as with the coming of the Kingdom, we have an unfolding or a drawing nearer (not in reality) but in manifestation. Throughout the Kirchliche Dogmatik Barth consistently holds together these two aspects of the Kingdom as having come and yet as only having drawn nigh. Both are related to this process of unfolding in history. Thus the Kingdom has drawn nearer and is continuing to do so as far as ultimate revelation is concerned (i.e. from man's viewpoint) but has been and already is a present reality in Jesus Christ (i.e. from God's viewpoint). It is because of the latter

---

134. CD 3/2, 460
135. CD 2/1, 384
136. CD 4/4, 62
137. CD 4/2, 210f; 4/2, 220f, 244f, 438f; 4/3, 862.
138. CD 4/3, 590
139. CD 4/3, 733
140. CD 4/2, 766
141. CD 4/1, 302
142. CD 4/4, 55f
143. CD 4/4, 87
that Barth spoke of the Kingdom as not just drawn near or a future possibility, but as theirs, for they have it already. Thus, although in one sense it was and still is only at hand, he could also say that it has irrupted or broken into the old world in an invasion or incursion.

This double way of looking at the Kingdom - as both come and near - is repeated in many different ways. Thus the Kingdom is set up and yet the consummation is still future, it has already come but still comes, it has come but not come, is real but not operative, is at hand and yet constantly expected, has come in Jesus Christ but has yet to be revealed in its perfection; and yet has in fact already come in its perfection and only hastens to its revelation. So Barth can say that the Kingdom is among us now (i.e. between the come and the to come). Although hidden, this Kingdom has drawn near and is not concealed from Christians as it was revealed to them in the resurrection and is revealed through the Holy Spirit. This secret presence of the Kingdom is Jesus Christ coming to all now as the Kingdom which is coming, has come and is present, so that even in his present prophetic ministry, Jesus Christ (in whom the presence of the Kingdom is a complete reality) is still spoken of by Barth as the prophet of the Kingdom drawn near in Him. (To this prophetic ministry we will return later in the chapter.) This holding together of the past, present and future aspects of the Kingdom is
characteristic of Barth's developed understanding of the Kingdom, and thus places him with those who have considered the Kingdom as both present and future, which is the concensus of recent scholarship. 160

7. The Growth of the Kingdom

Apparently Barth no longer has his earlier radical Docetic understanding of history, for not only did the incarnation take place in history, but as such the Kingdom through the incarnation has been placed in history to run through it till the future ultimate manifestation of it in history at the parousia. This section and what will follow concerning the munus propheticum illustrate Barth's attempt to take history seriously. 161 We come first to consider the growth of the Kingdom in history.

In order to compare Barth with others on this matter, we will first note briefly the major interpretations of the growth parables (i.e. mustard seed, leaven, etc.): (1) small beginnings compared with great results have been stressed by many scholars, who thereby concentrate primarily on the two ends, 162 whereas (2) many others have emphasized rather the process between those ends, speaking of the growth involved as either speedy 163 or gradual. 164 Some variations of these two are as follows:

---

160. G. E. Ladd, JK 35f; H. Anderson, JCO 166, 331, fn. 52.
161. See fn. 2 above.
162. E. Brunner, EH 67; R. Bultmann, TNT 8, where the contrast is said to be between the minuteness of its beginning and the magnitude of its completion. W. M. Taylor, POS 54-69; J. S. Candlish, KG 139; T. W. Manson, MMJ 525,414; E. F. Scott, KM 102f - not slow gradual growth but transition from something small to something great; A. M. Hunter, IP 43f - unremarkable beginnings unimaginable endings, p. 45; A. N. Wilder, NTFT 95; A. T. Cadoux, TJ 35ff - growth from the smallest to the largest; G. Cambell Morgan, POK 81-93 - small (this age) and big (age to come); W. G. Kämml, PF 131 - not the how but certainty of coming, not the process but the effect; W. O. E. Cesterley, GPJB 73-78. (Mustard seed = extensive, leaven = intensive character of Kingdom,99).
163. E. C. Hoskyns, CS 20f - miraculously quick growth imminent to Jesus; E. von Dobenschütz, EG 136f - Jesus view was rapid growing.
164. A. B. Bruce, PTJ 63, 117-143 - long course of development through which the Kingdom has to pass (mustard seed = extensive growth, leaven - cont./
C. E. B. Cranfield looked away from a contrast between small beginnings and great ends (as partial and complete) to a difference between the reality veiled compared with its future manifestation. J. K. Howard likewise saw the contrast between obscurity and revelation. Similarly, C. K. Barrett compared the Kingdom as come near in secret with its future coming in power. On the other hand it is not growth but the secret behind it that primarily interested V. Taylor. H. B. Swete was interested in the automatic growth without human intervention, save at both ends. W. Manson stressed the surety of the harvest rather than the process, emphasizing the God-givenness of the start and the divine inevitability of the end. Similarly, W. G. Kümmel stressed the certainty of fruition which is neither hastened nor hindered by man.

T. W. Manson not only emphasized the small beginnings and far-reaching consequences, but also emphasized that the Kingdom must run its course to inevitable consummation because it began in the mission of Jesus.

S. B. Babbage spoke of the Kingdom’s "gradual, unobtrusive growth" on the one hand and the "final, great, conclusive result" on the other.

164. cont.

intensive growth, pp. 90-143); TKG 273-275 - gradual development in history (ascension to parousia is dispensation of the Spirit and growth is automatic, pp. 16-21, 179f); T. W. Manson, TTJ 133-140; J. Orr, HDB 854 - slowly developing; G. S. Duncan, JSM 190 - long process of developing; J. Drummond, WL 34-69 - Kingdom subject to same law of growth as the visible creation, p. 42; S. Goebel, PJ 93-105 - process of growth illustrating the rule minimo maximum; T. F. Torrance, SJT 1963, 121 - growth of the Kingdom till all nations are under its rule; E. Schlink, SJT 1957, 1-23; J. Bright, KOG 218f - stress not on length of time but on growth, not on small beginnings and large result but on forces already in motion; J. S. Stewart, SJT Vol. 8, 1955, 192.

165. GM 66, 669f.
167. SJT Vol. 6, 1953, 231.
168. GSM 265-269
169. PK 16-21
170. CVKG 96
171. PF 128f
172. SJJ 122ff.
173. EQ Vol. 12, 1940, 63.
Perhaps Calvin also combined the two interests when he spoke both of the feeble and dispicable commencement and the unexpected progress.\textsuperscript{174} It should be said that all those cited who concentrate upon the growth of the Kingdom, place this on-going work in the time of the community or church, i.e. from the time of Jesus Christ until the final \textit{parousia}. (G. Bultmann is an exception as far as the \textit{parousia} is concerned as we shall note in Chapter Seven.) However, C. H. Dodd interpreted these parables as the growth that took place in the Israelite community, so that the harvest was present rather than future in the time of Jesus Christ.\textsuperscript{175} This was in keeping with his "realized eschatology" (we shall come to this in Chapter Seven). J. Jeremias likewise considered the Kingdom to be the final stage, or harvest.\textsuperscript{176} Together with these are the two unusual interpretations of G. C. Morgon, in his (1) considering the greatness of the mustard seed's growth to represent the loftiness and false pride which is opposite to the true Kingdom faith as a grain of mustard seed,\textsuperscript{177} and his (2) consideration of the leaven as the evil principle and not the Kingdom as leaven usually represents sin.\textsuperscript{178}

How does Barth's understanding of the on-going Kingdom in history compare with these different interpretations? (Note the important footnote.)\textsuperscript{179} First, it should be noted that all but one of his references

\textsuperscript{174.} CHE 126ff. \hfill 176. PGJ 90. Cf. 79
\textsuperscript{175.} TFOK 139-145 \hfill 177. PML 46-51
\textsuperscript{178.} Ibid. 51-56. O. T. Allis refuted these positions (EQ Vol. 19, 1947, 254-273.)

\textsuperscript{179.} This section on growth appears to do justice to spiritual growth in the community as the Kingdom being realized below. However, as we shall note in Section 10, there is no ontological reality in the community below. Growth to Barth must therefore be seen in terms of noetic awakening by the Holy Spirit. Even the sacrament as appropriation is peripheral to the central response to enlightenment. Also there is a change in his thinking on appropriation from KD 1/2 to 4/1. These facts qualify what otherwise appears to be a genuine understanding of growth. Although for Barth growth is primarily cont./
in the *Kirchliche Dogmatik* refer to the present time of the Church. In that one unique reference he specifically identified the mustard seed growth into a tree with the Kingdom in the very being of Jesus Christ, involving the double movement of the Son of God going into a far country and the homecoming of the Son of Man. This is consistent with his two-fold understanding of the Kingdom as both come (in Jesus Christ) and yet only drawn near in waiting for future manifestation (to the world). Thus in the very life of Jesus Christ, from incarnation to crucifixion, in the *munus sacerdotale* and *munus regium* dynamic movement in His being and acts, we have the primary growth, and thus the true harvest and the genuinely realized Kingdom. Whereas C. H. Dodd's growth emphasis was upon the "kingdom preparation" in Israel, and whereas R. Bultmann, E. Brunner, F. F. Bruce, H. B. Swete, W. O. E. Cesterly, J. Orr, T. W. Manson and G. C. Morgan etc. place this growth within the subsequent time of the Christian church; Barth, at least in this one reference, explicitly places it between these two interpretations; namely, within Jesus Christ who was the realized Kingdom for both Israel and the Christian church.

179. cont.

intensive and spiritual rather than extensive and numerical, he is not speaking of any justification or sanctification taking place in the community (CD 4/2, 655). That "being of the community is exhausted and enclosed in His" i.e. Jesus Christ's (Ibid.). It is Jesus Christ who is present in the quickening presence of the Holy Spirit rather than in a creative indwelling. The *communio sanctorum* is in the event of a repeated encounter rather than as a dependent reality in given charismata. As such there is only a provisional representation within the community of the new humanity in Jesus Christ, and as such only a reflection rather than a created ontological reality. In other words, this is not spiritual growth in the sense of the New Testament doctrine of pneumatology (See Fn. 761 and 762). Barth's only reference to that which "indwells" to "create" (the New Testament witness to genuine growth) is to the reality in the "one man Jesus Christ" (4/2, 652f). We conclude that there is no genuine ontological growth in the community below in Barth's theology.

180. CD 4/2, 47

181. We have noted the non-ontological aspect of this growth in Section 4, pp. 238-244.
The rest of Barth's direct and indirect references to this parable refer to the munus propheticum period of the ministry of Jesus Christ, to the time of the community since the resurrection, which, in contrast to the realized Kingdom in Jesus Christ, is the time also for what W. Manson called the "eschatology of the unrealized". In applying the parable to this time, Barth mentioned that neither humanity nor the cosmos can be given any "more excellent determination" than that which was given with "the planting of the seed of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. For what has still to happen is simply the growth and fruition of this seed." This was the "new seed of life planted in world occurrence." Why did not that seed, Barth asks, "spring up without delay and bring forth in every dimension the fruit of fulfilled redemption and consummation?" (We will come to the answer later.) This seed form of Easter moves towards the manifestation of the Kingdom in the full visibility of the tree. This is the community growing irresistibly larger towards its full stature. The individual Christian life is also said to be a seed of eternity sown in the present world, or rather the seed of the coming salvation of the whole world.

"It is only seed, and therefore still alone and concealed from the rest by a hard and wintry crust of earth. Yet it is living seed which must die as such but which will come to life again in the springtime,

182. CD 4/2, 641-660
183. SJT CP No. 2, 1957, 7. 186. CD 4/3, 316f
185. CD 4/3, 316
188. CD 4/2, 645. Cf. E. Schlink, "Christ and the Church", trans. by M. Lusk, SJT Vol. 10, 1957, 1-23, esp. 6f where the Church is considered as growing. Barth speaks of "increasing power" of God's history in every age (CD 4/3, 277) but also of the increasing power of darkness (4/3, 392). Growth is represented as "opening up and enlargement" of the closed circle of election in Jesus Christ (i.e., the realized Kingdom) by "frontier crossings" - an invasion into the "dark Kingdom" (2/2, 417).
and like the grain of mustard seed in the Gospel (Matt. 13:31) grow greater than all plants and become a great tree..." 189

Although these references could all be understood as literal growth, Barth understood the growth of the community in the New Testament (this parable and elsewhere) to be "primarily and predominantly, although not exclusively, spiritual progress"; so that his interpretation is both extensive (numerically) and intensive (spiritually, i.e. renewal) with the latter being more important. 190 Here, as with N. A. Dahl, Barth is seemingly concerned with growth towards "eschatological perfection", i.e. towards Jesus Christ, 191 and would agree with R. Otto that increase in numbers is secondary. 192 Behind this growth is the immanent power of Jesus Christ, 193 so that instead of an abstract or one-sided this worldly interpretation, Barth understood this growth as the ongoing process 194 of the totus Christus, with the reality only so in the body, which is the community below, because of the reality which is in Him as the head above.

"It is He who lives as it lives and grows as it grows...It is as He indwells the community and is immanent to it (as the Head to the body) that it grows: from Him as its Head, but also in and with Him as He has in it His body: the earthly-historical form of His existence." 195

In other words, Barth is not saying that the once-for-all reality in

189. CD 4/3, 934
190. CD 4/2, 648; 4/2, 650f - this is the progress of the sancti (community below) in their relationship to the sancta (community in Jesus Christ above). The spiritual emphasis is not that of Schleiermacher, rather it refers only to "a provisional representation within the old humanity of the new humanity sanctified already in Jesus Christ.
191. BNTE 44lf, But note Section 10, pp. 301-338.
192. R. Otto calls it "trivial", RGM 124.
193. CD 4/2, 651
194. CD 4/2, 645, 650 195. CD 4/2, 659
Jesus Christ (realized Kingdom) is called into question by a growing totus Christus (the Kingdom being realized), but rather that any genuine growth of the community is never a Pelagian result (as eg. with C. J. Cadoux 196), but is primarily that of Jesus Christ. The community is therefore freed from winning the world for Christ (as in the early T. W. Manson 197) as He has already won it, is free to attest to that already completed fact instead of worrying over spatial expansion (as with moral rearmament and certain onesided evangelistic and missionary schemes) or concerning itself merely with a social gospel (as with W. Rauschenbusch 198). It is concerned more with quality than quantity, and whether small or big will have faith in Jesus Christ and thus in the ongoing process of the totus Christus rather than thinking only of itself as such 199.

Through word and sacrament, the growth of the community is being realized. In them Jesus Christ is Himself present, 200 so that the Eucharist is not only "sign" 201 but "event". 202 For He gives Himself to them not ideally or partially but really and totally to refresh them in analogy to the mystery and miracle of the nativitas Jesu Christi 203. Thus although the τοῦτό εστιν of the Eucharist is impossible from man's side, it is actual from God's. 204 This Barth refers to as "spiritual

196. The initiative for the Kingdom is with men and not with God, for it is not God's triumph but man's acceptance of His fatherly rule - C. J. Cadoux, EMJ 206.
197. T. W. Manson, TTJ 190 - "In this aspect the church is, so to speak, the army of the kingdom of God, engaged in the task of conquering every hostile power and winning the world for Christ and ultimately for God". Later Manson gave more credence to the eschatological act of God, eg. SOJ 345.
198. W. Rauschenbusch, CSC xi-422, key on pp. 65f - Kingdom always a social hope.
199. CD 4/2, 542-660
200. CD 1/2, 162
201. CD 1/1, 62
202. CD 1/2, 230
203. CD 4/3, 542
204. CD 4/3, 761f
He concludes that the Lord's supper and teaching should take on the character of a "festival" for in them Jesus as the exalted man at the right hand of God summons and draws the Church onwards and upwards and transforms it into His image, giving it already participation in His resurrection and therefore in the future life of eternity. Or put another way, the community is fed with the body and strengthened with the blood of Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit. This movement of the Church upwards with its relationship to the ministry of Jesus Christ at the right hand was not developed by Barth as was the opposite movement of God coming to the community through the Holy Spirit. In fact, it is through the Holy Spirit's awakening, calling, up-building and sending forth of the Christian community that he says its growth is effected. Thus, "It accomplishes its own growth - in virtue of His real presence". As such "it moves from its origin, in which it is already complete, to its goal in which it will be manifest as such".

8. The Time Between the Times

If the Kingdom was fully realized in Jesus Christ, why is there a subsequent growth? Why has the Kingdom only come near as well as come? Why is there this time between the times (resurrection to parousia)? Before coming to Barth's answer, it is important to first realize that he took very seriously the fact that the Kingdom came once-for-all in Jesus Christ, and as such brought history and time to an end.

a. Barth's Once-for-all Emphasis
This ἐπί τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, which we find in Hebrews, is basic to Barth's realized Kingdom in Jesus Christ. He spoke of this in various ways. Thus, the cross was the end of time, 212 of old things, 213 of history, 214 of death, 215 of sinners and the flesh, 216 of ourselves, 217 and of the world. 218 It was the end in which Jesus Christ was the beginning for all, 219 and through it came the new man, new world, new aeon and the dawn of the new heaven and the new earth. 220 This radical alteration of the human situation through the cross was but revealed in the resurrection, 221 as it manifested what had already taken place in the cross, 222 adding nothing new, 223 being neither a second or further stage. 224

Thus, in the sense of revealing the already completed reality (old passes away, the new come, and therefore the realization of the Kingdom) the resurrection was "consummatum est", 225 full of completion, 226 with the perfect goal already included, 227 having redemption already actualized in it. 228 Furthermore, nothing new is to take place beyond Easter, 229 for it will not be augmented or superseded; 230 and therefore nothing different is to take place between the resurrection and the parousia. 231 Rather,

212. CD 3/1, 168 218. CD 4/1, 311f
213. CD 3/1, 110 219. CD 4/2, 348
214. CD 2/2, 342 220. CD 4/1, 254, 257, 259.
215. CD 3/2, 633. Cf. 3/4, 594. 221. CD 4/1, 751
216. CD 4/1, 348 222. CD 4/1, 774
217. CD 4/2, 294 223. CD 4/2, 145
224. CD 1/2, 111. Although Barth could speak of old things passed away in the cross and resurrection (3/1, 110) even connecting the end with the cross and the new beginning with the resurrection (4/1, 334) it should be understood that this new beginning refers to the revelation of the already actualized new reality (4/2, 133) because the resurrection added nothing new to what the cross accomplished (4/2, 145). Even without the resurrection, Jesus Christ would still have been both the end of the old and the beginning of the new (4/2, 133), and thus the fully realized Kingdom. However, without the resurrection, ascension and witness of the Holy Spirit, Jesus would have been unknown (4/2, 168).
225. CD 3/2, 488, 492. 229. CD 3/2, 498
226. CD 4/3, 915 230. CD 4/2, 142
227. CD 4/3, 793, 326. 231. CD 4/3, 293
228. CD 4/3, 325
during this interim, the Easter reality can only be repeated, renewed and consummated in another form. \(^{232}\)

Even the final manifestation of the realized Kingdom in the parousia will not alter or improve anything, let alone introduce anything new. \(^{233}\)

In other words, the cross was the end of the old and the beginning of the new, beyond which we do not expect any other end or beginning. It was the end of the old as the beginning of the new and was the beginning of the new as the end of the old. \(^{234}\)

(1) Specific facts are embraced in this basic "once-for-all" realized Kingdom reality, and indicate what this subsequent time (after the cross) is not for. Thus it is not only potentially realized and therefore needing to become actual now to individuals through the Holy Spirit (as with G. Thomasius). \(^{235}\)

Likewise it is more than a possibility of life which can only become actuality to believers (as with R. Bultmann). \(^{236}\)

Thus this subsequent time is not an extension or prolongation of the incarnation into post-resurrection history (as with J. W. Bowman). \(^{237}\)

---

\(^{232}\) CD 4/3, 319. Cf. 305

\(^{233}\) CD 3/2, 301. Christ and His community cannot be surpassed, deepened or enriched by anything still to come, as this totus Christus is the complete fulfillment of the promise given in the history of Israel in covenant with Yahweh.

\(^{234}\) For Barth the Gospel preceded the law because Christ is Alpha as well as Omega and thus the one eternal covenant of grace embracing not only the Old Testament and New Testament but all human history. The cross as such reaches not only forwards but backwards. T. F. Torrance expressed the same thought succinctly, "At the cross God puts the clock back", CAC Vol. 1, 255.


\(^{236}\) TNT Vol. 1, 252. Barth repeatedly emphasized the once-for-all reality in Jesus Christ, in whom was set up in anticipation the fully accomplished atonement (CD 4/2, 274) and not merely a possibility that is available but has still to be realized (4/2, 276). Kerygma therefore declares actualities, not possibilities (4/2, 275). Reconciliation in Jesus Christ comprehends every man virtually, prospectively and de iure, and the Christian actually, effectively and de facto (4/3, 278f. Cf. 537).

\(^{237}\) PRG 223. As in Romanism and Eastern Orthodoxy, CD 3/2, 502; 4/1, 317f, 767; 4/2, 113; 4/3, 836.
the purpose of a repetition or re-enactment of the once-for-all realized Kingdom in the existence of those who receive the kerygma concerning it (as with D. Baillé and R. Bultmann 238). As "realized eschatology" in

238. D. Baillé, GIC, referred to in CD 4/2, 55f.

(1) There are many things which are rightly involved in repetition: The signs of Jesus' humanity (CD 1/2, 513) relationship between Jesus and the apostles repeats or reflects in some degree the economy of the incarnation (1/2, 487). To some extent we repeat as elected men the election of God (2/2, 105). As children of God, Christians are, in analogy to Jesus Christ, existing in repetition, confirmation and revelation of the manner, will and act of God (4/3, 533). Christian's personal calling needs constant repetition and renewal, and therefore never stands so fully behind him that it is not also before him (4/3, 496). The Christian community has no finished task as such, although progressively building; for every step forwards, includes a repetition of those already taken (4/2, 631). μετακομίσατος is constantly repeated or renewed (4/2, 568). Sunday is the weekly repetition of Easter (4/3, 290). In the Lord's Supper we have the repeated and conscious unification of the people manifested in the sign of common eating and drinking (4/3, 901). In the event of the Supper (as in confession and baptism) the event of Christ's own life is repeated as a reflection or imitation (4/2, 703f). Jesus Christ's being and work repeats, represents and expresses itself in our earthly history in that the fellowship of the Trinity creates fellowship between God and man (4/2, 341). There is, in some measure a repetition of the relationship between the community and the world as each receiving the Gospel in turn passes it on (CD 4/2, 636). In answer to God's love, we love Him, and in repetition of this we love our brother also (4/2, 817). There would be no history of salvation between God and man without its reflection and repetition in a history between man and man (4/2, 818). Without this brotherly love repetition, it would not be real (4/2, 828). There is a situation between the two comings (resurrection and parousia) which can only repeat and renew itself at every moment of the continuing interim (3/2, 509). The resurrection is the great divine "yea", after which everything that follows can consist only in repetitions, developments and confirmations (4/3, 297). The Easter revelation will be repeated, renewed and consummated in another form (4/3, 319). The prophetic work is a kind of repetition and multiplication of the Easter revelation (4/3, 304, 319). Christians give a ministering repetition of the self-witness of Jesus Christ (4/3, 642), copying or repeating His revealing and proclaiming in co-operation with His prophetic work (4/3, 607. Cf. 840). God does not replace, amplify, nor supersede what He said once-for-all but does repeat and confirm it at a given time which demands new clarity, attention etc. (4/3, 895). In the creation theatre there is repeated the events of reconciliation, yet they are not identical with the event of reconciliation (4/3, 137). The καὶ τινῶν with Christ's sufferings are no continuing or completing of them, but according to Phil. 3:10, they are reflected, analogically copied, and to that extent repeated on the very different level cont./
Jesus Christ, the realized kingdom for Barth does not need this time between the times to make it real, to prolong or continue it, or to repeat it.

(2) Specific facts are embraced in this basic "once-for-all" realized kingdom reality, and indicate what this time (after the cross) is by contrast. Thus the history of the realized Kingdom is "history in the

238. cont.
of the sending out and existence of His disciples (4/3, 638f). In this sense Christians are placed in this repetition of His own passion (4/2, 279) and the crucifixion of Christ is always being repeated in the Church (1/2, 680).

(2) There is one thing which is unrepeatable: Barth takes very seriously the once-for-all atonement, and all it connotes. Thus the passion of Jesus Christ is "absolutely unique and unrepeatable" (4/3, 635). Even though Paul could describe his experience as a repetition in his own person of the dying of Jesus (4/3, 633), the στίχωμα (2 Cor. 4:10) were not a repetition or representation (4/2, 601). However, severely we are buffeted, there can be no question of repetitions of the cross - not merely quantitatively, but qualitatively (4/2, 487). The cross is therefore not provisional, but entire and perfect, needing no continuation, repetition, or adding to, nor will it be superseded (4/1, 281). It is thus not simply the creation of a possibility, needing representation or repetition, nor even an actualization which has still to be effected (4/1, 295). Human acts attest and confirm the great acts of God, but are not able to continue or to repeat them (2/2, 577). Holy Scripture and history of the Church are not further revelations, continuation or a repetition of the one revelation (3/3, 198-210). Our reconciliation does not need to be repeated or augmented (4/2, 369). It is not a process which has to be kept in motion towards some distant goal. It does not need to be repeated, extended or perfected (4/1, 76). The Christian life does not repeat but reflects His life (1/2, 468). Human love cannot repeat or represent Divine love (4/2, 753). Human words can only attest, not repeat, replace or rival the Word of God (4/3, 98). The Church exists for the world in correspondence with Christ, but its sending is not a repetition, extension or continuation. His own sending does not cease as He sends it (4/3, 768). God loved us from all eternity. This does not need our assistance, completion, co-operation or even repetition (4/2, 296). The objective reality of Jesus Christ presses in for subjective correspondence in us; not for a repetition, but for an accompanying or following (4/2, 302f). We are not second Christs (4/2, 305, 319). Thus His humiliation and exaltation, death and resurrection, are reflected though not repeated in the community (4/2, 325). As the second form of His body, there is no repetition, or extension of the incarnation, nor His likeness or analogy (4/2, 59f). There is no identification with Him per se (4/2, 264, 276). "Once-for-all" means that there is no need to repeat (4/3, 300).
supreme sense, history in which we have a share. Whether we realize and like it or not, history in which our own history takes place." 239

As the centre of all history240 or central history of all histories,241 including within itself all history,242 it is within it that world history really and properly takes place.243 It is "world history"244 which takes precedence of all other history,245 as it is "the new reality of world history".246 This Kingdom or event of reconciliation was "exhausted" in the life and death of Jesus Christ,247 and as such is "completed history".248 By contrast with the "fulfilled time" of this realized Kingdom, subsequent time is completely dependent upon it for its existence, significance, content and goal.249

(3) Specific facts are embraced in this basic "once-for-all" realized Kingdom reality, and indicate what this subsequent time (after the cross) is for. Thus the realized Kingdom is likened to the sowing after which has come the subsequent time of harvest.250 This is in agreement with its complete realization as having come in Jesus Christ but in agreement also with its only having drawn near as far as final manifestation is concerned. This subsequent time is that growth from the hidden kingdom to the unveiling of the Kingdom. It could have been fully unveiled, in the ultimate sense, in the resurrection, but space is given to man for participation in the work of Jesus Christ as He did not will to go over their heads. He did not will to be majestic and sovereign without being mindful of the freedom of the creature, and thus gracious.251 Therefore,
in this subsequent time, He came and comes again to reveal the realized Kingdom and its reconciliation effected in Himself, in order to gain a response from man. Before turning to this on-going ministry of Jesus Christ, we will first come to consider what Barth says about this time between the times, and to note the eschatological tension involved.

b. The "on-going Time"

This period of time, which K. Heim called the "creative interval", and which E. Brunner called the "interim period", has been described in numerous ways by Barth. He considered it to be the intervening time between the return of Jesus Christ in the resurrection and His final return in the parousia. This phrase, "time between the times", has been associated with Barth from the beginning of his career, for it was given to the periodical "Zwischen den Zeiten" (Between the Times) which he edited from its first appearance in 1923.

The following indicate the numerous ways Barth spoke of this time. It is the final time, last time, interim time, or His time. It is end-time, the time of the Word, time of great opportunity and mission, the time of God's patience, the time of the community, and the time of harvest. It is not continued time, but a new time, a new aeon or so-called era, the Christian era, or strange era, because really not a new epoch but the eschatological age. It is thus advent
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time or one long advent season, the seventh and last day, or age of the Holy Spirit. As such it is the fulfilled καίρος as Jesus Christ is the content. It is limited time (καίρος συνεκκλησίας), a short time (μήκος ἔρωτος), and extension of time, which is really only expiring time, time that is moving away from the centre of the cross and resurrection. It is the regnum gratiae which already bears its end in itself. It can be called the time of faith between the two times of sight, and the time of a postscript history. It is the time between Christ’s knocking and entering, the time of the Deus praesens.

It is a time in which the Church can be likened to the being of Christ in the tomb, and thus before the resurrection revelation, or to the time between resurrection and ascension, and thus in the full revelation of the resurrection reality. It is a time between the Easter manifestation and the coming of the Lord in His new Easter form. It is a time when man is set in movement and not arrested by pauses in life. Compared with the beginning of time posited in creation, and perishing time under the sign of the fall, it is the dawn of the new time of freedom.

But it is also the time when the hour of the clock stands already at completion, when the last hour of the existing form, and the first of
the new form of the world has already struck in the resurrection; so that the world is now only transitory and retiring, and the time left is only running out to an appointed end, a time that is expiring quickly, because ended and now in process of completion. But that last hour is also still striking, for the hour for the community has struck only provisionally and not yet definitely, and so the pendulum can still be said to be making its final swing. It is like the last stroke on New Year's eve which strikes the first hour of a new time.

c. The "Eschatological Tension"

That the "dialectical tension" of "timeless eschatology" has been replaced by the "eschatological tension" of "christological eschatology" is seen in two respects in what follows. (1) Barth's holding together of past, present and future in this time between the times, and (2) his holding together of fulfilled time above in Jesus Christ and provisional time below in His Body, the Community.

(1) Past-Present-Future

Recollection, presence and expectation - Christians live in all three, coming from the "completed Messianic event" and moving towards it again, with faith in Him who was, love for Him who is and hope in Him who comes, and with each as important as the others so that the collapse of one would mean the collapse of all. Here is the integral and indissoluble
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union of the soteriological (past) pneumatological (present) and eschatological (future). Thus the present is always full of the future as well as the past, because we proceed from God, are accompanied by God and must return to God, and the Kingdom has already come, is now present and will one day be manifested in glory. Thus, for Barth, the New Testament consciousness of time embraces three points in detail and in their interconnexion; "come from", "wait for", and "hasten to".

This time between the times is "end-time" because bounded by the first end that came in Jesus Christ and the final end to come. Although Barth did call the end in the Easter event penultimate, in contrast with the future parousia as the ultimate goal, it is important to note that this only concerns its revelation to man and not its reality in Jesus Christ. Barth therefore referred to this time between the times as the "incomplete" between the "completed" and the "completed". This is the time of incomplete revelation between the two complete revelations of the actuality in Jesus Christ.

Barth spoke of the world already abolished in Jesus Christ, as passed away, and yet as passing away to be totally dissolved in the future. This is from the standpoint of the old aeon and old cosmos. On the other hand, he spoke of the world as reconciled already in Jesus
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Christ, already transformed, and yet as in transition to consummation as to be redeemed. This is from the standpoint of the new aeon and new cosmos. Both are de iure an event in Jesus Christ but are not yet revealed as such de facto. Thus the radical alteration effected in Jesus Christ is still in process and not yet accomplished.

Because of this reality we cannot merely look for some future alteration of the world. Rather, because the past is unconditionally and irrevocably ended, the future is unconditionally and ineluctably imminent and even pressing in already. Barth could therefore write that the text "God shall wipe away all tears" was fulfilled to the disciples in the resurrection, is being fulfilled now, and will be fulfilled in the future. Past, present and future are held together christologically so that in this on-going time there is a coming from (εἰς αὐτόν ) God and a going to (εἰς αὐτόν ) God.

As beings under promise and beings in transition we are caught up (in this interim time) in a movement from the accomplishment of salvation to its revelation, from a process inaugurated to its consummation, from God's goal achieved to its wider fulfillment, from God's universal rule as a completed fact to its being disclosed, from the Eschaton come to its manifestation, from an intensive to an extensive
fulfillment, from conclusive event to the revelation of the conclusion, from reconciliation to redemption, from possession assigned to possession given, from the accomplished coming to the awaited coming, from Jesus Christ's past to His future epiphany. It is the time of Jesus Christ who has come and is present and who is present and has still to come, the One who was and is as such and who comes and is as such. He is the One who has already spoken the ultimate word and has not yet finished speaking it, who has already fought the fight and won the victory and still the fight goes on in His continuing victory. This interim time is thus fulfilled time. It has already accomplished consummation behind it and a promised consummation before it, and thus a consummation that can be appropriated in it. For Jesus Christ the end of earthly history has been brought about so that its continuance can only hasten towards its end.

(2) The Time of Jesus Christ (above), of the Community (below)

Christians not only live with reference to three distinct times (past-present-future) but in two different times, or two worlds. These are the two conditions of the Kingdom held together in dynamic tension, the ecclesia triumphant with Jesus Christ above, and the ecclesia militans in the world below. It is the difference between humanity (humanitas)
in Jesus Christ who is the Head, and the community which is His body, in which there is a time-lag in the justification, sanctification and glorification accomplished for it in Him. The two times (eternal reality above and provisional time below) are separated by the "not yet" (νεώς), although, from another viewpoint, Barth affirmed, it is correct to say that even this world below is not the same since the resurrection, as the "already" is in the midst of the "not yet", and the "will be" is "already" now rather than a restrictive "only" to be, or non-eschatological minus sign "not yet", for the community lives eschatologically in correspondence with the "already" of Easter.

It is with this in mind that Barth's reference to Jesus Christ as the "mid-point" in time has a very different connotation (in one respect both are agreed in Jesus Christ as the mid point between the expectation of the Old Testament and the recollection of the New Testament) to O. Cullmann's use of the same phrase; for, to Barth, (as with F. F. Bruce, T. F. Torrance, N. Q. Hamilton, and G. Gloege) there is an overlap of the ages in this interim time so that the age of gloriae (above) is concurrent with the age of gratiae (below) instead of the age of gloriae being subsequent (post-parousia) to the present age of gratiae, as in O. Cullmann. For Barth, Jesus Christ is not only the one to whom (in
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expectation) and from whom (in recollection) people in time have looked, but (as with T. F. Torrance, J. Crr and E. von Dobschütz)\(^\text{371}\) he was the "decisive turning point" in history.\(^\text{372}\) For Barth there will be no other turning point in history,\(^\text{373}\) but only the unveiling of Jesus Christ as he was, is, and will be (in contrast to J. Moltmann's "not only unveiling, but also final fulfillment").\(^\text{374}\)

This time left us below is for the working out of the destiny that overtook mankind and is now a reality in him above,\(^\text{375}\) and, as such, is the time of sanctification, the time of the \textit{tolerantia crucis}\(^\text{376}\) and the time of realization.\(^\text{377}\) We are therefore two people, one already at the goal, and the other at the beginning, going forward to the goal.\(^\text{378}\) Barth considered these two conditions of human existence as (1) superior, dynamic and future in the work and Word of Jesus Christ, and (2) subordinate, static and present in the Christian.\(^\text{379}\) We now come to consider them separately.

(a) The Time of Jesus Christ (Above)

God's coup d'état is accomplished in Jesus Christ,\(^\text{380}\) so that the covenant is actualized,\(^\text{381}\) reconciliation completed\(^\text{382}\) the world is past,\(^\text{383}\) its conversion is a completed fact,\(^\text{384}\) and thus its future is already present in him.\(^\text{385}\) Therefore, our salvation,\(^\text{386}\) justification,\(^\text{387}\) sancti-
fication, 388 and glorification 389 are already an event in Him. He as totus Christus is our effectively realized future 390 in whom has already taken place the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις. 391 We are not only already above in Him, 392 in the life beyond, 393 but are as such genuinely. 394 For there our life is realiter, 395 actualized 396 as our true, if hidden, life. 397 Thus our true life has already begun in Jesus Christ 398 as it is already at the goal, 399 in the sense of being blessed, 400 invested with God's glory, 401 as living and reigning with Him at the right hand, 402 with eternal life as an event. 403 This is because the homecoming of the Son of Man has already taken place in Jesus Christ, 404 so that every man has already returned to his home above in Him. 405 Barth therefore considered that Christians lack nothing, for in Jesus Christ they already have their home, citizenship and inheritance, 406 Fatherland, 407 Sinai, Zion, Bethel, Jerusalem, Heavenly Jerusalem and country 408 actualized and present. The reality is then that Jesus Christ has put our sin and death behind Him once and for all, in our place and for us, so that in Him there is our future which cannot become the past. 409 Thus the pledge of man's future has already taken place in Jesus Christ, 410 so that in agreement with the Heidelberg Catechism, Barth could say that we have in Him our flesh in heaven for a pledge. 411 Thus our promised life is certain because
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transcendent in God and cannot be called into question. 412

(b) The Time of the Community (below) 413

Although we are secretly present in Jesus Christ, our reward, house, city, country still awaits us, 414 for although the community knows it is at home, it is only so in the there and the one day, and not in the here and now. 415 Its members also know that in Jesus Christ they are the righteous and living men that they shall be, 416 and are already (even if in nuce) what they shall be. 417 This is because the fulfillment is in Jesus Christ alone 418 with man's "future being as event" only in Him, 419 with everything in Jesus Christ still lacking in the new heaven and new earth 420 because the ἱερόν κτίσις is real in Him 421 and nowhere else. Thus there are "two levels" (as with W. A. Whitehouse), 422 (see also C. K. Barrett with his biblical terms for these two 423) or as we have previously noted, the "two times" of the Kingdom. These two times during the time between the times are the time of Christ that we considered in the previous section and the time of the community to which we now come.

The community is now the église du désert, a moving tent like the biblical tabernacle, 424 living in this tent because its building is in the heavens. 425 Christians are pilgrims, 426 nomadic aliens, 427 or colonists 428 who are squatters and not citizens in this world. 429 Even Jesus Christ, from the standpoint of His on-going work in this world, is called
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a pilgrim. His Church then does not really belong down here, it is a stranger, and should therefore not try to commend itself to the world by building houses, cathedrals and even basilicas to St. Peter, instead of camping. Neither should it attain to a venerable religious institution or even a holy state within a state becoming similar to other factors in world-occurrence. Rather, it should confess its character as the pilgrim people of God, the homeless in this world, as this is the "time of its 'sojourning' (1 Pet. 1:17)."

Whereas the character of the time of Jesus Christ above is actual, real, realized, event; the character of the time of the community below is provisional; and thus the Church, the Christian situation, with its provisional promise and provisional little fulfillments, the provisional form of the gift of eternal life, and everything possessed only provisionally and with reservations. Thus the community moves from one reality in the resurrection to another reality in the parousia, and does so in this interim provisional sphere.

Having before us the eschatological tension between past-present-future and between the time of Jesus Christ above and of the community below, and having seen that Barth holds them all together christologically, so that the Kingdom is fully realized in Jesus Christ the Head, but is being realized in His community or body; we have considered the two conditions of the Kingdom in the totus Christus which can be put alongside the difference (earlier noted) between the Kingdom come in Him, and yet only
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come near in revelation for us. With this before us, we now need to return to the reason for this time after the cross, to further consider why there is this "puzzling tension" between the perfectly realized Kingdom in Jesus Christ now above (the time of Jesus Christ) and the merely provisionally realized Kingdom in the Church below (the time of the community).

9. The Kingdom Realized as Revelation

As Barth held together being and act in pre-resurrection Christology, he likewise did so in post-resurrection Christology. Whereas the former had to do with justification and sanctification as accomplished once-for-all, the latter has to do with the revelation of this reality. Thus the realized Kingdom in the being of Jesus Christ is one with the act of revelation through the self-revelation of Jesus Christ. The life of Jesus Christ as such is light, His being is name, His reality truth, His work is word, His event is message, His covenant is word, and His history is revelation. As such He is the Mediator both in His reality (being) and in His revelation (act). This Barth spelled out under the title "The Glory of the Mediator". Jesus Christ is therefore His own Revealer, Proclaimer, Prophet, Apostle, Guarantor and Witness, being the Mediator between God and man in the God to manward movement of mediation. What is involved here is the self-revelation of the realized Kingdom.
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forgotten is that being a Mediator also includes the man to Godward movement as Representative, Advocate, High Priest, Forerunner, and Intercessor. We have already noted that Barth takes the "once-for-all" realized Kingdom in Jesus Christ seriously, so that he has referred to that reality as "completed history". Thus the resurrection was "not a second history of Jesus Christ with a different content, but a "perfected history" which began to come to light both intensively and extensively. In this sense there is an "ongoing history of salvation", variously referred to as "ongoing fight", "history of triumph" in which "Jesus is Victor"; "ongoing prophetic work", or "self-multiplying history" in which the historicity of the reconciliation transcends itself in a third dimension, grounded in the first two, and evokes its own reflection in the world. Thus "salvation history is both the establishing and establishment, the truth and the verification, the enlightening and the enlightenment, the address and the answer". The "prophetic work is this reconciliation in its transition to consummation in redemption". It is "the disclosure of completed reconciliation and man's opening up to it". It is both the "manifestation" and "real outworking" of the realized Kingdom so that the goal reached in Jesus Christ can be reached outside of Him (i.e. in man). Involved here is the "self-attestation and self-impertation of the living Jesus Christ", and thus a movement of the objective reality manward to accomplish subjective realization.

"As the history of salvation enacted in Jesus Christ imparts itself as such, and is thus the history of
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revelation, it reproduces itself. Invading the history of the world and men, it again creates salvation history in the form of Christian knowledge."

"Seen from above it is actual in the free act of grace for which God determines Himself and upon which He resolves in Jesus Christ. Seen from below it is actual in the free act of obedience in which man acknowledges its actuality as a free act of grace and obedience, it is a new thing between God and man. It is the sphere and character of this new thing in that the life is also light, the covenant Word and the reconciliation revelation. It is still a matter of Jesus Christ and His activity, but now in His prophetic office and work." 459

It is in this sense that Barth spoke of the uniting of God and man as still taking place 461 and of the Son of God's journey into the far country and the Son of Man's homecoming as still taking place. 462 It is because the realized Kingdom in Jesus Christ is eternal, so that it overcomes all differences between what we call past, present and future. The past in Jesus Christ is not any past, for it is not only once-for-all, but present and future as He is eternal. 463 In this sense we are concerned with a qualified past and a qualified future. 464 Thus His history, and therefore that of the realized Kingdom in Him, takes place "not as one which is merely present at a single point, but in the power of a history which has already taken place and will do so again." 465 Therefore, this realized Kingdom, or "accomplished reconciliation, has spoken, and continually speaks". 466 Thus Barth's presentation is the dynamic, rather than merely static, understanding of the once-for-all realized Kingdom. 467 Just as eschatology is no mere appendix to theology, for Barth, so likewise the munus propheticum which is the Kingdom realized as revelation, is no mere
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appendage or echo to the munus sacerdotale and munus regium.

This realization of the Kingdom taking place as revelation in this post-resurrection period is the ministry directed from the right hand of God where Jesus Christ as kyrios Christos is the Redemptor-King of this last time. This reign from the cross is in space and time as a spiritual reign through the Holy Spirit. It will be as this royal man that He will come in the final perousia when it will be revealed that He has sat on the throne in divine ruling during this time between the times.

"The fact that He is there at the right hand of God means that He is in full possession and exercise of the freedom of action, the authority of rule and the disposal of grace of God Himself. It means that He exercises them here and now, in the sphere of existence left to us, on this side of the fulfillment of the prophetic work..."

Here the reason for the rule is seemingly exhausted in the Christus Praesens. The other side of the divine rule, its God-ward implications, are not mentioned. However, the regnum Christi involves the rule of Jesus Christ for us in the presence of the Father as well as with us in the presence of the Holy Spirit.

For Barth, this time of God's rule is therefore not empty time, but the time of the Deus Praesens; when through the Holy Spirit, Jesus Christ

468. CD 4/3, 358. In contrast to Federal theology (with its covenant study broken up into a series of different covenant acts of redemption, which follow one another step by step, and then were reassembled into a single whole) Barth's theology understood the Bible as testimony to only a single event - the covenant, or realized Kingdom, in Jesus Christ. His discussion of Federal theology is given in 4/1, 54-66.
469. CD 3/4, 470; 4/1, 6; 4/2, 606.
470. CD 4/2, 291f
471. CD 4/2, 210. Cf., 3/3, 168, Jesus Christ is "the Ruler of world history."
472. CD 3/4, 147
473. CD 3/4, 263f
474. CD 4/2, 527
475. CD 3/3, 205
476. CD 4/3, 357. Cf. 4/1, 319.
is mediating Himself to us. It is the time when the Holy Spirit awakens people to the reality in Jesus Christ, and therefore to the realized Kingdom. It is the time of call and challenge: "Be what thou art". Whereas J. Moltmann equally stressed "Become what you are" and "Become what you will be", and O. Cullmann emphasized that "man is that which he will become only in the future"; Barth stressed the realized Kingdom in Jesus Christ by saying that we are what we shall be, or shall become. We are already (even in nuce) what we shall be. We are truly what we will be, and are therefore to become what we are. In virtue of the cross and resurrection, "they are no longer what they were but they are already what they are to be." To make this known is the purpose of the munus propheticum. It is the Holy Spirit that does this awakening, and it is upon His work that Barth concentrated, rather than stressing that "preaching awakens" (as with Schleiermacher), or that "you must awaken" (as with R. Bultmann). With this before us, we come now to the Kingdom realized as revelation in the Easter history.

a. The Easter History

---

477. CD 4/1, 292
479. Ethik 22, 25, 35; R 207; 1/2, 386; 4/2, 363.
480. TH 162
481. CT 75
482. Ethik 4
483. Ibid. 23
484. CD 2/2, 541. Cf. 4/1, 557, 594 f.
485. CD 4/3, 806
486. CD 4/3, 763. Cf. exceptions: In Christ the elect man is who he is and will be who he will be (2/2, 410) and the one he is already in process of becoming (4/3, 810). The overwhelming stress is on the reality now in Jesus Christ (objective) rather than the corresponding reflection in the Christian (subjective).
487. CD 4/1, 316
488. CF 87
489. HE 155
490. G. C. Berkouwer noted (from K. Heim) the difference in Rome's "theology of glory" emphasis on the resurrection of Jesus Christ by virtue of which the Church already participates in His power and glory, and Protestantism's stress on the consummation at the end of time. He saw in Barth's earlier eschatology a point of contact with this Protestant understanding, but with the resurrection coming cont./
The resurrection (as revelation) was as important to Barth as the cross (as realized Kingdom). Thus he wrote, "We can say confidently, and we have to say, that the whole New Testament thinks and speaks in the light of this event, and to understand it we must be prepared to think with it in the light of this event."\(^{491}\) This is precisely what he did in considering New Testament eschatology. Thus the resurrection was considered as the basic form of the **munus propheticum** of Jesus Christ,\(^{492}\) as it inaugurated His prophetic work.\(^{493}\) Thus, (as with C. K. Barrett) Barth saw in the resurrection of Jesus Christ the end that has been anticipated and proleptically disclosed,\(^{494}\) which (as with G. C. Berkouwer) was an "absolute revelation" of His triumph.\(^{495}\) He underlined the fact that there was not only one Easter event, but many, and thus an Easter history, because the return of Jesus Christ through resurrection was not a continuance of time, but a commencement of a new time.\(^{496}\) Easter history was thus the "new" or "fresh" coming of the One who had come before,\(^{497}\) a new life,\(^{498}\) a radical newness,\(^{499}\) which was genuinely, totally and absolutely new,\(^{500}\) as well as universally and definitely so,\(^{501}\) and thus it was absolutely unique.\(^{502}\)

This unique new time, or revelation time of Jesus Christ, is considered as the resurrection and ascension together,\(^{503}\) as one event.\(^{504}\)

---

490. cont.

increasingly to the fore, a shift to a decisive triumph already realized, but yet to be manifested, has taken place (TGKB 203). Barth's understanding of the Church in the role of a servant as Jesus Christ was before the resurrection is opposite to participation in His glory as believed by Catholic theology. An exception to this is Alois Winklhofer (CHK 152).
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497. CD 4/3, 291ff
498. CD 4/1, 318
499. CD 4/3, 317
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502. CD 3/2, 621
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being inwardly coherent.  

This period is designated the forty days, and is spoken of as beginning with the sign of the empty tomb and ending with the ascension to rule at God's right hand, for it had both a beginning and an end as the first form of the life of Jesus Christ had both.  

The number forty, Barth considered to be typical rather than literal, connected with other forties, such as the days of the flood, of Jesus Christ's temptations, and perhaps with the forty days the spies spent in Canaan, and the time it took Elijah to get to Horeb where angels fed him. They were days in which the pure presence of God was a reality in Jesus Christ as the one alive eternally even in that time.  

Barth included with them the Damascus road appearance to Paul of this risen eternal Lord, considering it an epilogue to the forty days with the transfiguration glorification of Jesus Christ as its prologue.  

This time of revelation (the forty days period) is called "self-enclosed time, as it does not return, or rather, returns only in and with the future return of Jesus Christ. It is eternal time which overarches our temporal time and is referred to as the "arch of His time," which vaults over the interim time enclosing us before and behind.  

"The time which Jesus filled up to His death, and revealed in its fullness during the forty days, this last time up to its last day and its last hour, was as such the future day of the apostles and their community. The day of His death was revealed on Easter Day to be the day of their life. And they now stand in the grey twilight before the dawn. They now advance into this day, which will eventually be theirs, but for the moment is only His."  

Here we meet, in a different context, the tension between the time of
Jesus Christ (which had been manifest during the "forty" days) and the time of the community. But here we see that it will be with the return of Jesus Christ that this tension will be resolved, when His eternal time, that now overarches our time, will return and with it will come the end of our time.  

Our time is only between Easter History and final parousia, whereas the time of Jesus Christ is not merely present but future.

This resurrection history is very important to Barth. As "the central history of all history", it is differentiated from myth, both formally and materially, because about a real man of flesh and blood; but is couched in imaginative, poetical style of historical saga because describing an event beyond the reach of historical research and depiction, and therefore has no apologetic value. It revealed Jesus Christ in its once-for-all and all-sufficient event of manifestation. Barth termed it the "Gospel of the forty days". In it Jesus Christ made a self-revelation of His glory and victory, unveiling the hidden presence of the Kingdom of God, and doing so as a definitive, comprehensive, decisive and unequivocal event of revelation. In it he was the coming of the Kingdom of God in power, pointing to Himself as the disciples hope and future. It was the post festum realization of Christ's life, the Οναπνεωματικου, or body made alive by the Spirit, not just as one man (abstract) but representatively for all men; the bearer of their new right and life, and it was as such that He revealed their future. (It

---

516. CD 4/1, 323
518. G. W. Bromiley was right in referring to it as "visible, tangible and not docetic" (SJT Vol. 15, 1962, 196).
519. CD 3/2, 452
520. CD 4/2, 143
521. CD 2/1, 20
522. CD 4/2, 142. Cf. 1/2, 111
523. CD 1/2, 424
524. CD 3/2, 621
525. CD 3/2, 479
526. CD 4/2, 140
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528. CD 4/1, 117. Cf. 356
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is this bodily resurrection and its representative reality in the
sesso ad dexteram that Barth did not spell out. In other words, it is
precisely what he has said above that we wish he had fully, and not just
one-sidedly, developed.) This was the dawning of the last day within
earthly history, 531 which really was the end in a penultimate way, 532 the
ussering in of the final day, 533 which was really the preliminary indi-
cation inaugurating the last time. 534 It was the dawning of redemption
and consummation, 535 pointing beyond itself to the day of Christ's
return; 536 and as such, the new age took place typically in the resur-
rection of Jesus Christ, 537 which was the eschatological event. 538

Just as previously we noted the Kingdom as only drawn near in revela-
tion and yet fully come in reality, so Barth considers the "forty days -
Easter history" as both (1) partial in its manifestation, and yet (2)
perfect in itself. Not only is our life hid with God in the time between
the times, but even in that first time (resurrection) it was hidden from
the disciples. 539 Further, the partial nature of that first revelation
(resurrection) lay in its commencing rather than consummating manifesta-
tion, and is thus referred to as preliminary, 540 transitory, 541 and provisional. 542
Thus Barth could even speak of it as the ἀρπαγών and ἀρπαγχή of the final
totality to come. 543 Yet, from the other viewpoint, Jesus Christ was
already the perfect reality of the eschatos, for the origin and ways of

531. CD 4/1, 662; 4/3, 916. 532. CD 4/1, 734
533. CD 3/2, 624 534. CD 3/2, 623
535. CD 4/3, 316 536. CD 4/3, 324
537. CD 3/1, 167 538. CD 3/2, 445
539. Although the hidden presence of the kingdom was unveiled during the
forty days (CD 3/2, 479) and the disciples through it became witnesses
of its "full, conclusive, definitive and general revelation" (3/2, 488)
it still was but "a foretaste of their inheritance and a glimpse of
the new creation" (3/2, 488).
542. CD 3/2, 468; 4/2, 107.
543. CD 3/2, 502
God "took place initially but perfectly in the resurrection." In this sense the resurrection was a definite, not provisional, determination of the world; the actual initiation, not only indication, of the final return of Jesus Christ; and gave, as such, to all that followed a total, universal and definitive determination. Thus Barth referred to Easter as Advent, the second time of Jesus, the first clear ray of His final return, and as the actual beginning of His parousia in glory.

b. The Munus Propheticum as One Parousia

We come now to consider Barth's understanding of the parousia. As T. F. Torrance has said, its double significance as both future and present is that which "makes parousia such a difficult thought". As we have already noted, Barth together with the majority of scholars understands this eschatological tension between the present and the future, in terms of a Kingdom both as come and as come near. Now we are ready to consider how he relates this to the parousia.

Although there are places where Barth spoke of more than one parousia, perhaps the earliest reference to the resurrection as the second coming by Barth was made in 1920 (WGMK 90). As such it is not unique to Barth, as we find C. H. Dodd, in 1935, combining the resurrection, exaltation and second advent in Jesus thought as three aspects of one idea. There are also others who speak of the resurrection as the parousia as we shall note in Appendix No. 5. Perhaps it is sufficient to say that Barth's understanding of an on-going parousia (to be presented in this section) is, as far as we can discover, a unique presentation in certain respects, although having other aspects in common with other scholars.

544. CD 4/3, 793
545. CD 4/3, 306
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552. Perhaps the earliest reference to the resurrection as the second coming by Barth was made in 1920 (WGMK 90). As such it is not unique to Barth, as we find C. H. Dodd, in 1935, combining the resurrection, exaltation and second advent in Jesus thought as three aspects of one idea. There are also others who speak of the resurrection as the parousia as we shall note in Appendix No. 5. Perhaps it is sufficient to say that Barth's understanding of an on-going parousia (to be presented in this section) is, as far as we can discover, a unique presentation in certain respects, although having other aspects in common with other scholars.
553. EQ Vol. 25, 1953, 101. Cf. T. F. Torrance, CAC Vol. 1, 46 where this "eschatological doubleness" is pointed out as being rooted in "Chalcedonian doubleness".
554. The term parousia was not, Barth considered, used of the pre-resurrection history of Jesus Christ (CD 4/3, 292f). The resurrection is called the first parousia (4/1, 333, 734f) and the coming parousia is called the second parousia (4/1, 726, 732, 736, 739), second coming (4/1, 334) or final parousia (4/1, 333).
his major emphasis is on the one parousia which began in the resurrection, and continues on beyond in this time between the times, and does not conclude until the final parousia.\textsuperscript{555} These together constitute the one munus propheticum of Jesus Christ.\textsuperscript{556} Rather than concentrating upon a future final return of Jesus Christ, in the narrower, traditional sense of eschatology,\textsuperscript{557} Barth considered (1) the resurrection, (2) the coming of the Holy Spirit, and (3) the final parousia to be a "unity".\textsuperscript{558} He saw in the Johannine account that Easter, ascension, Pentecost and parousia are a "single event" with much the same foreshortening of perspective as when we view the whole range of the Alps from the Jura.\textsuperscript{559} This is what G. W. Bromiley has rightly referred to as "the pregnant exposition of the three forms of the coming again of Christ",\textsuperscript{560} and which T. F. Torrance considers as the "trinitarian understanding of parousia that is of the very essence of eschatology".\textsuperscript{561} Although not arguing the one parousia in three moments like Barth, J. N. Geldenhuys nevertheless used almost identical words to illustrate this prophetic foreshortening of perspective.\textsuperscript{562} Throughout the illuminating presentation of the three moments of the one parousia, Barth concentrated upon the God to manward (prophetic) movement\textsuperscript{563} involved and therefore primarily upon the Christus

\textsuperscript{555} CD 4/3, 606  
\textsuperscript{556} CD 4/3, 910  
\textsuperscript{557} CD 4/3, 294  
\textsuperscript{558} CD 3/2, 504  
\textsuperscript{559} CD 3/2, 497  
\textsuperscript{560} SJT Vol. 15, 1962, 203.  
\textsuperscript{561} CAC Vol. 1, 309  
\textsuperscript{562} In speaking of the prophetic perspective of Jesus in Matt. 24 (end of Jerusalem and end of world), Geldenhuys observed, "The whole future lay as it were as one great unity open before His prophetical vision - just as when we look at a mountain range in the far distance all the mountains, although some are nearer and some farther, seem to be blended into a single unity" (EQ Vol. 19, 1947, 161f). (This was written one year before Barth's similar reference.)  
\textsuperscript{563} C. O'Grady speaks of Barth's prophetic ministry of Jesus Christ as "a movement outwards" in contrast to the downward and upward movement in the priestly and kingly ministries. However this outward moving revelation is actually the result of the ongoing downward movement of God's self-revelation reaching out to all men.
Fraesens in His resurrection, Holy Spirit and final manifestation presence. He is speaking about our contemporaneity with Him as having "been made possible in the most radical form" for He is "alive eternally even now in time".

The resurrection and final manifestation with the interval between is thus "one revelation", as the one Word of God, as the one and total coming which has its primal and basic pattern in the Easter event. The resurrection is therefore more than just the "prior event" to the parousia (as with G. R. Beasley Murray). It, and not death (as with E. F. Scott) is the beginning of the consummation.

It is one event, with nothing different taking place in any of the three forms, for in them all we have to do with the one new coming of Him who came before. It is thus the one consummating and conclusive act of God. Barth considered the first and second parousia of Jesus Christ as actually the same event, a single happening divided in two, for although the parousia seems two separate events to us, it is a single event for Jesus Christ, in that the resurrection anticipates the parousia and the parousia completes the resurrection.

This one munus propheticum, or revealing work of Jesus Christ, has already commenced, and now continues, but is not yet completed. Thus His prophecy is already the presence and pronouncement of His last word, as even in its commencement and continuation it is

564. CD 4/1, 348 567. CD 4/3, 103
565. CD 4/1, 352 568. CD 4/3, 293f
566. CD 4/2, 131
569. G. R. Beasley Murray, JF 216, where he speaks of every parousia saying of necessity entailing the death and resurrection as a prior event. Barth, by contrast, considers the resurrection as identical with the parousia (in the first moment) rather than being only a prior event.
570. E. F. Scott, KM 249
571. CD 4/3, 293 574. CD 4/1, 735
572. CD 4/3, 294 575. CD 3/2, 490
573. CD 4/3, 574 576. CD 4/3, 910
secretly but very really full of completion. In this time between Easter and the final appearing, Jesus Christ is the prophet of God, the same Jesus Christ who was and who will be, and it is because He is the same that Easter, the Holy Spirit and final parousia are the same. As there are three modes of the divine being, these are three in one, being comparable to the perichoresis of the trinity. Thus, with H. J. Cadbury, the resurrection, coming of the Holy Spirit and final parousia are "literal events" which find, for Barth, their full reality in the one Jesus Christ.

Barth further put it that the Easter event is too great to be exhausted in a single Easter occurrence. Thus it is repeated, renewed and consummated in another form. This is a repetition in a more complete form, but it is still the first, second and third parousia, which are but different forms of the one parousia or coming of Jesus Christ as God and man. In all three forms of His revelation, Jesus Christ is victory, with the first and second forms of the one parousia like an
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582. CD 4/3, 325
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584. CD 4/3, 905. Here Barth uses the term "second parousia" for the time of the Holy Spirit, whereas in CD 3/4, 582 he spoke of this same "interval" time as not yet that of Jesus Christ's second parousia. This latter obviously refers to the third parousia, or the final manifestation as used in the narrower traditional sense. However, not for the future, nor the present alone is this term reserved by Barth, for his major emphasis is upon the one parousia of Jesus Christ from resurrection to return, and thus the second parousia is, from man's viewpoint, also past as well as present and future. We submit that it would be better not to call the coming of the Holy Spirit the second parousia as this is precisely what the de-eschatologized "time-less encounter" in the writing of R. Bultmann and J. A. T. Robinson etc. calls it. (To be considered in Chapter 7.)
585. CD 4/3, 911
586. CD 4/3, 357f. Cf. 378 where three forms of His coming again as this man Jesus Christ.
587. CD 4/3, 390
arrow pointing to the third form, 588 which will be the full development or fruit in redemption and consummation of the commencement of the revelation and continuance of the same in the other two forms. 589 Although Easter day and the day of the Lord are therefore very different, on the one hand; 590 they are but different moments of the one same act on the other. 591 Barth noted that the New Testament only knows one coming again of Jesus Christ, which he therefore considered as one continuous event in all its forms 592 which was His munus propheticum as "the great course of His new coming". 593

Thus Barth's eschatological tension not only involves a Kingdom come in Jesus Christ's being and acts, and yet only drawn near as far as the final manifestation is concerned, but also points to that final revelation as already an on-going reality in the resurrection and in the Holy Spirit. Here again is evidence that his earlier dialectic of time and eternity, which cut across the eschatological tension and removed the parousia beyond time, is now overcome by taking time, and therefore history, seriously. Put another way, there is no longer only a vertical relationship, but also a horizontal relationship involved. There is not one without the other. Thus, instead of his earlier flight from time (timeless eschatology) he now can speak of a "flight through the times". 594 Thus when he said that "time does not continue after the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, it can only move away from this its centre- moving to the already appointed end," 595 he was not failing to take history seriously; but, on the contrary, apparently took it most seriously as it has the unbelievable end in God who has already taken it up within Himself and given it eternal
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reality and determination, so that history now has the greatest meaning it could have. Barth took history seriously in this highest sense because he concentrated upon its reality actualized in Jesus Christ, which by contrast makes its former fallen, empty state (and hence this old aeon) but a fleeting shadow. Thus the on-going history in the one parousia is real history with a real end.

c. The Intermediate Parousia

With the one parousia in its three forms before us, we will now concentrate upon the intermediate or second form which is during the intervening time between the first and final forms, which Barth has called the "living present" of Jesus Christ, which is another way of saying Christus Praesens. This emphasis upon the presence of Christ with us rather than upon His work before the Father for us is again evident, therefore, in this section. This "intermediate parousia" is known as the second or middle form of the parousia between its inauguration and consummation. We are in the time of the community, or the time between the times, in which the community is said to be strong as the first parousia stands behind it, and the second parousia before it, and yet said also to be weak because the time between is a time of faith and not of sight (as in the forty days and final parousia) so that it moves from the first to the second parousia like a ship sailing over an ocean one thousand fathoms deep.

"The Lord Himself is in the midst, but He is also at one point and the other, as the One who has come and the One who comes..." 

596. What men are in Jesus Christ is what counts. "It is on this basis that Paul takes himself and the world seriously" (CD 4/1, 77). It is also in this same basis that Barth takes history seriously in the highest sense.

597. CD 4/3, 349, 373.

598. CD 4/1, 318

599. CD 4/3, 794

600. CD 4/1, 727

601. CD 4/1, 728. Underlining added.
"As the risen Christ cannot fall behind it and become merely historical, so the Christ of the parousia cannot yield before it, so that it has only a profane and empty future not determined by Him, and its situation between the two comings can only repeat and renew itself at every moment of the continuing interim. The community lives under the Lordship of Jesus in the form of the Spirit. In the Spirit that double proximity is actual presence. In the Spirit Jesus at every moment of the interim is not only at the right hand of the Father, but also here on earth."

The community thus comes from His resurrection and moves to His return with He Himself "present in the midst" as its Head. Not only has it the completion inaugurated with the resurrection of Jesus as the driving force behind it and the consummation in His parousia as the drawing force before it, not only does it come from the revelation of the man Jesus as it moves towards it and moves towards it as it comes from it; but has the living Lord present today with it. Here the emphasis is clearly on the Christus Praesens and therefore upon the "on-going work of His self-declaration" in our midst. Here Jesus Christ is present in His munus propheticum surrounding and leading the community from the goal to the goal, from hidden and partly manifested reality through its present revelation to its final unveiling. This is what Barth calls the "dynamic teleology" of the munus propheticum. This is the time when Jesus Christ "stretches through the ages" to the final revelation, "striding" from commencement to the goal, "marching" through history as He "strides
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607. CD 4/3, 343. Of interest is the movement between the times concurrent with the tension between the time of Jesus Christ and the time of the community in this same time between the times. Only when this dynamic teleology of the munus propheticum reaches its telos will the tension be removed.
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towards His future". Here Barth gives us a very descriptive portrayal of the Christus Praesens in his on-going work of revelation in the world. At the same time Christians are in a "forced march" under the Holy Spirit. Two important facts emerge: (1) Here is involved a movement (and thus present), which began in His return in the Easter history and continues now in the second form of the parousia and will finally culminate in the final form of the same one parousia. (2) Over-against R. Bultmann, E. C. Hoskyns, C. H. Dodd's non-teleological or anti-apocalyptic thinking, Barth's present parousia does not exhaust the eschatological reality in timeless encounters. It is precisely this that he has left behind from his earlier thinking. Parousia as genuine revelation is thus preserved, for, (as with T. F. Torrance) it is not considered as having been "absorbed into our orbit". Not even the Easter resurrection glory exhausted the second Advent possibilities, and thus, (as with J. K. Howard) Barth's Easter revelation is only presented in the context of a final consummation.

d. The Holy Spirit as Parousia of Jesus Christ

Of particular importance is the Holy Spirit as the parousia of Jesus Christ during this second form of the one parousia. The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Jesus Christ. The existence of Jesus Christ "as the Guarantor of truth is itself ultimately grounded in the being and work of the Holy Spirit". As H. Hartwell said, "It is at this point that in

611. CD 4/3, 902, 942; 4/4, 199, 201, 207.
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613. To be considered in Chapter 7.
614. EQ Vol. 25, 1953, 170. See also T. F. Torrance, STI, 1-90, esp. the "Eucharistic Parousia reaching out towards the 'final parousia' and therefore the present parousia is not exhausted, p. 32f. Cf. "real presence" now and "advent presence" still to come, EQ Vol. 25, 1953, 228.
616. CD 4/2, 131; 4/3, 351, 503, 794f.
617. CD 4/2, 359; 4/3, 351ff, 357f.
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Barth's doctrine of reconciliation the being and work of Jesus Christ becomes the being and work of the Holy Spirit", 619 and as P. L. Lehmann noted, it is a change "to be regarded as a shift of emphasis which changes, so to say, the center of gravity of Barth's theology." 620 Barth understood the Holy Spirit as the awakening, quickening and illuminating power of Jesus Christ's history, 621 in that He in His prophetic work of the munus propheticum reveals to faith the actualized reality in Jesus Christ, so that the Christian is made to hope through His presence. 622 Thus, through the Holy Spirit, individuals are "(1) awakened to faith, (2) quickened in love, and (3) enlightened in hope". 623

Barth could speak of our potential and provisional participation in the existence of Jesus Christ being made actual and definitive participation through the Holy Spirit. 624 The community in its relationship to those not outwardly members is dealing with virtual, potential but not actual Christians. These are christiani designati, christiani in spe, and are already in process of becoming Christians. 625 None of these terms are meant to detract from the reality of all men reconciled in Jesus Christ (as actualized event, ἐν Θεῷ), but point to the yet to be realized subjective reflection of the same, to man's coming response for which this time between the times is given. This is where vocation for the community comes in. As a part of the totus Christus, the community, with the Holy Spirit, is also involved in the munus propheticum witness. To this we now come.

e. The Community, and the Munus Propheticum of Jesus Christ

Rather than try to build the Kingdom or become the Kingdom, the community

619. ThKB 138
621. CD 4/4, 99
622. CD 4/3, 929
623. CD 4/1, 153. Barth's development of these is found in (1) CD 4/1, 740-779, (2) CD 4/2, 727-840, and (3) CD 4/3, 902-942.
624. CD 4/3, 492. Cf. 799
625. CD 4/3, 810
bears witness to the Kingdom. Barth saw as the most profound need of the world, its need to have such a witness, and considered that the Christian community has no other raison d'être apart from the Kingdom and its manifestation. It is its special vocation to bear Christ witness to the Kingdom, for it is not only the community of His coming Kingdom, but declares it, and can only really serve God as it hopes for its consummation. This proclamation of the Kingdom as the end of all strife is the central, if not the exclusive service which the Christian community has to render. The community knows this as the only one end in itself. This is to be done in its gatherings which Barth called assemblies for the proclamation of the Kingdom. Thus Christians are used as the light of God's imminent Kingdom kindled in the world, not only publicly but through their love which reflects it, and showing it by really caring. In this way the community is an analogy and counterpart, a preliminary sign is poleptic and prefigurative; being an echo, equivalent, illustration of the accomplished Kingdom in Jesus Christ. It thus indicates, reflects, portrays, denotes, duplicates, resembles and is a replica of Jesus Christ; but neither identical nor an alter Christus. Thus Christian existence is prophetic existence, as Jesus Christ sets them in His prophetic office and

---

626. CD 3/4, 502
627. CD 3/4, 492, 494
628. CD 3/4, 264
629. CD 3/4, 493
630. CD 3/4, 150. Barth would agree with Ladd that the mission of the community is "to display the life of the eschatological Kingdom in the present evil age" - G. E. Ladd, JK, 333.
631. CD 1/2, 686
632. CD 3/4, 541
633. CD 4/2, 646f
634. CD 3/4, 497. The meaning of Sunday is the celebration of the feast as expectation of the Kingdom - CD 3/4, 68.
635. CD 1/2, 760
636. CD 3/3, 260
637. CD 4/2, 832
638. CD 3/4, 503
639. CD 4/3, 659
640. CD 1/2, 558; 4/3, 719f
641. CD 4/3, 675
642. CD 4/3, 761
643. CD 4/3, 792-795
644. CD 4/3, 939
work, which is "very fragmentary and indeed distorted and at best but a confused reproduction" compared with the reality in Himself. They are utterly dependent upon that reality in Jesus Christ, and not this reality on them. Thus even though the reality in Jesus Christ is stamped upon, or reproduced in the Christian life, his own little history is as a little light announcing the coming great light, a little reflection of the great history of the Lord Jesus Christ. Or, put another way, the Church and its witness, are "purely contingent" having only a relative significance. In this way, during this time of faith between the two times of sight (resurrection and final parousia) the Church is the provisional sphere for the glory of God manifest to the world. In this limited sense the entire munus propheticum of Jesus Christ has to do with a visible manifestation.

The community knows that the Christian and the world are really one, that every man is a citizen of His Kingdom (de iure above) and is preserved for the kingdom (de facto below). The community knows sanctification de facto and gives witness to others upon whom it has already come de iure. Thus, from God's viewpoint there is no difference between men as actualized in Jesus Christ, but there is a difference in the realization of the

645. CD 4/3, 650
646. CD 4/3, 656
647. CD 4/3, 654
648. CD 4/3, 674
649. See CD 4/1, 46
650. CD 2/1, 677
651. This is inspite of what W. G. Kümmel said concerning Jesus never intimating that the presence of the coming Kingdom of God would show itself between Christ's death and the final parousia (FF 140). Here is a reflection or revelation (as the purpose of this post-cross interim) rather than a repetition, a making real or a prolongation of the already actualized reality of the realized Kingdom.
652. CD 3/4, 502. They are one through the incarnation of Jesus Christ as humanitas, which is not, as Van Til asserted, a continuation of the Incarnation comparable to the Church as the continuation of the incarnation in Roman theology (BC 27). It is not a continuation but an inclusion that is involved.
653. CD 2/2, 734; 4/2, 29
654. CD 3/3, 85
655. CD 4/2, 620
of the reality in Him, and hence this is the reason for the (munus propheticum) revelation of this actuality, which is the calling into the Kingdom by God’s Word,\textsuperscript{656} and the invitation by the community.\textsuperscript{657} These are really two sides of the same one munus propheticum of the totus Christus.

Even though we enter the Kingdom in the death of Jesus Christ,\textsuperscript{658} it follows that there is an entrance into this Kingdom (below) through water and spirit,\textsuperscript{659} through faith\textsuperscript{660} which is our entrance at conversion,\textsuperscript{661} or the new birth.\textsuperscript{662} It is when God reaches us that His Kingdom of glory comes to us\textsuperscript{663} so that with genuine response and acceptance, through the subjective realization of reconciliation in the Holy Spirit, Christians can be said to have seen and accepted the Kingdom of God,\textsuperscript{664} to have come to hear and to taste of it.\textsuperscript{665} This entrance is through no ordinary rights of initiation,\textsuperscript{666} but does begin, Earth considered, through adult baptism which in itself is a form of the petition for the coming of the Kingdom,\textsuperscript{667} the prayer which becomes a part of the active life of the Christian.\textsuperscript{668} Transferred into the Kingdom of God’s Son,\textsuperscript{669} as citizens,\textsuperscript{670} living under Christ in it,\textsuperscript{671} as well as having Jesus Christ rule in the community until the new age is consummated,\textsuperscript{672} is the objective reality and subjective reflection of the community which is the basis of their munus propheticum. They then reveal the Kingdom already set up – that Kingdom otherwise hidden above in Jesus Christ, and do not set it up themselves,\textsuperscript{673} nor do they

---

\textsuperscript{656} CD 2/1, 539
\textsuperscript{657} CD 4/3, 563
\textsuperscript{658} CD 4/4, 16
\textsuperscript{659} CD 1/1, 515
\textsuperscript{660} CD 4/4, 3f, 46
\textsuperscript{661} CD 4/2, 562
\textsuperscript{662} CD 4/4, 181
\textsuperscript{663} CD 2/1, 647
\textsuperscript{664} CD 3/4, 513
\textsuperscript{665} CD 3/2, 328
\textsuperscript{666} CD 4/4, 120
\textsuperscript{667} CD 4/4, 76ff
\textsuperscript{668} CD 3/4, 534
\textsuperscript{669} CD 1/2, 391
\textsuperscript{670} CD 1/2, 408
\textsuperscript{671} CD 1/2, 292
\textsuperscript{672} CD 3/2, 475
\textsuperscript{673} CD 4/2, 721, 723, 125.
bring about the transition from faith to sight of this Kingdom, and neither do they continue to complete it but only proclaim it. Thus the Kingdom is more than the Church (in contrast to E. Sommerlath). Rather the community can only exist as it points beyond itself, witnessing to the οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ which is not the result of historical completion but is from above; for God is the builder and not man, and as such the Christian community is indeed the Easter community - theologia resurrectionis and theologia gloriae, giving weak, provisional but living tokens of the consummation.

The munus propheticum is therefore a God to manward movement of Jesus Christ in visible manifestation in the first and third forms of the one parousia; but is, in the time between these times, a coming through the Holy Spirit of the objective reality in Jesus Christ pressing in upon man for a subjective correspondence in them. It is only through the Holy Spirit of Jesus Christ that the reality in Jesus Christ (or realized Kingdom) is revealed to us. This revelation shows that we are already in His Kingdom, and to enter it at His command is to realize that already in Him we are inside. This is the calling to the Kingdom of God. It is through the same Holy Spirit that the community comes to witness to this the same reality for all men. Thus,

"they are the witnesses of the alteration of the human situation which has taken place in Jesus Christ: not the men who are altered in it - for as such they cannot so far be seen - but certainly, and this is the astonishing thing - as those for whom it has happened and not not happened, as the witnesses of it."

---

674. CD 4/3, 715
675. CD 4/2, 775
676. ESST Vol. 16, 1939, 573.
677. CD 4/2, 623
678. CD 4/2, 627f
679. CD 4/2, 632
680. CD 4/2, 355
681. CD 3/4, 264
682. CD 4/2, 303
683. CD 1/2, 198
684. CD 4/1, 99f
685. CD 4/2, 107
686. CD 4/1, 752. We question this because witnesses of Jesus Christ are also changed men, so that others take knowledge that they have been cont./
This is, we submit, only one part of the community's witness - as vital as it is (see fn. 686). The apostolic church not only witnessed to the radical "once-for-all" alteration of the human race through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ (eg. Peter - Acts 2:31-33), but also pointed to the continuing ministry at the right hand of the Father as an equally important on-going result of that once-for-all event (eg. Paul - Romans 8:34).

This witness, resulting from accepting God's call, is possible through the Holy Spirit and His gifts which derive from the resurrection, and empower the community till the final manifestation. It was this resurrection which gave men the sure promise of His final appearing in the ultimate; and in the penultimate, the promise of the Spirit. If we do not honour the little penultimate pledge of the Holy Spirit hic et nunc, Barth affirmed, we cannot appreciate the great ultimate pledge for the eternal illic et tunc. But the community does have gratitude for the present order being established through the Holy Spirit and longs for the new order of the future world. This gratitude is the first glow of eternity through the Holy Spirit, whose presence not only makes Christians hope, but makes them possessors (which to Barth means they are possessed) of the promise of redemption. Although eternal life is future to this life, they already share in the future glory.

---

686. cont.

with Jesus (Acts 4:13) as they have the fruit of the Spirit (Gal. 5:22f), and thus are like epistles, known and read of all men (2 Cor. 3:2). This important aspect of the munus propheticum of the community is not found in Barth's theology. We shall return to this aspect in Section 10 of this chapter.

687. CD 4/2, 836
688. CD 4/3, 351f
689. CD 4/3, 360
690. CD 4/3, 359
691. CD 4/3, 916
692. CD 4/3, 929
693. CD 4/3, 353. Cf. 4/1, 330
694. CD 1/2, 499; 2/1, 274; 2/2, 558f; 3/1, 283; 3/4, 594; 4/2, 317; 4/5, 302 etc.
695. CD 2/1, 642
the ἅπαξλειτουργία, or first installment, of the final gift, actually testing the powers of that future. This is possibly what Barth was referring to when he spoke of the consummation even being appropriated in the present. Thus the promise of the future comes alive through the Holy Spirit, the objective becomes subjective. Future glorification in participation of the glory of God is a present pledge through His presence.

The final result of receiving these first fruits from the Holy Spirit of Jesus Christ is the abiding in us of eternal life, its possession in temporal form, its pure present as the hidden thing in every present. Thus, although repeatedly Barth pointed to the future as our eternal life, and although he speaks of having it only now in a form of promise, not in that of fulfillment; he also referred to participation in eternal life in the shadow of death, for it is not only the goal of vocation, but as Christians are called to be witnesses - to participate in the munus propheticum of the totus Christus - they actually come to participate in eternal life. This Barth called "this future thing, the pure present of eternal life." Thus "the man who comes to hear of the Kingdom of God comes also to taste it." The important thing to note is that although there is the tension between the "time of Jesus Christ" (where our redemption is consummated, where the Kingdom is realized, where our life is hid with God), and the "time of the community" (where all is

---

696. CD 3/2, 494; 4/2, 329f. Because we have through the Holy Spirit the first installment, or firstfruits, our hands are not altogether empty (4/1, 330).
697. CD 4/3, 643f
698. CD 1/2, 883
699. CD 4/1, 119
700. CD 3/2, 358
701. CD 1/2, 271
702. CD 2/2, 733
703. CD 4/1, 604
704. CD 4/4, 198
705. CD 4/2, 317
706. CD 4/3, 648f
707. CD 4/1, 604
708. CD 3/2, 328
provisional); there is (seemingly) through the Holy Spirit during this time between the times, an inbreaking of that reality from above into the community below as a first installment of what is to become fully realized (subjectively) by it in the final consummation.

Before coming to determine if this participation in eternal life in the present is ontologically real in Barth's theology, and thus to determine if statements which seem to indicate its reality are normative, we conclude this section by taking a look at the munus propheticum as the sole ministry engaged in by Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit and in which the Church participates. We have already pointed out that the opposite High Priestly ministry has all but been forgotten. Now we must argue that even though the three ministries of Christ are indissolubly connected as "being-act", "actualized atonement - proclaimed" and "realized Kingdom - revealed", it nevertheless follows that Barth finds both the ministry of Jesus Christ and that in which the Church participates to be solely in the prophetic proclamation of the realized Kingdom. In other words it is in this one ministry that Christ and community are primarily engaged according to Barth. This is not to say that the intercession by Christ for us and of the Church for the world is not mentioned, but it is to note that they are only related at the periphery for the munus propheticum is central. The importance of Christ's continued High Priestly ministry will be taken up in Chapter Seven, so here we will only consider this question from the standpoint of the community.

From this viewpoint, the ministry of the Church should be a participation in the full ministry of Jesus Christ as Prophet, Priest and King rather than just in the prophetic (which for all practical purposes is Barth's position709). We find support for this from both the Protestant

709. There is a section that specifically states that as a member of the cont./
and Catholic sides of theology. Thus T. F. Torrance (Prot.) wrote:

"the Church's ministry is to be undertaken with reference not to a part but to the whole of His ministry. Christ is Prophet, Priest, and King, and the Church's ministry is correlative prophetic, priestly, and kingly." 710

Similarly, C. O'Grady (Catholic) has said (and specifically against Barth):

"The Church exists in the service of Jesus Christ and therefore of the world. It fulfils this service in its triple ministry of priesthood, kingship and prophecy. One should not let the three aspects of Christ's ministry run into the one aspect of prophecy in this time between the times, nor should one treat of the Church's ministry solely under the aspect of prophetic witness." 711

Changes in Roman theology, as evidenced in the documents of Vatican 2, have been in part credited to Barth's tremendous influence. 712 However, when going through those documents one is not only amazed by the apparent advances made 713 (this involves the acceptance of

709. cont.
community the Christian participates in the prophetic, priestly and kingly office of Jesus Christ (CD 3/3, 273-288). But the context clearly shows (eg. p. 287) that Barth is speaking of the Christian in Christ's being above. Coming to the subjective reality below in KD 4, we do not find these three spelled out anywhere. Apart from references to the community as the representatives and predecessors (4/1, 92) and thus in a vicarious position for the rest of the world (4/1, 150) we find only the prophetic ministry of Christ and man's participation in it spelled out. Just as the munus propheticum of Christ is Barth's all-consuming interest in post-resurrection Christology, so the corresponding prophetic witness of the community is central to the Church's vocation in his presentation.

710. RP 36f 711. CCT 147
712. Eg. by Catholic theologian, C. O'Grady, CCT 338: "The ecclesiology of Vatican II is an immense step forward in meeting the legitimate demands of a theologian like Karl Barth", and "Barth has contributed enormously to the recent renewal in Catholic theology, and especially in the theology of the church. He epitomizes in fact many of the advances made by Vatican II" (p. 340, Cf. pp. 1-3).
713. (a) Proclamation of the Word (so central to Barth's Dogmatics) - appears in 51 pages scattered from DV 28-605. (b) For the first time in the history of ecumenical councils, the council addressed itself to all men (Lumen Christi, Lumen Gentium). (c) 8 times the Church is referred to as under the cross, and (d) its pilgrimage is mentioned on 14 pages, both pointing to the fact that "she is not set up to seek earthly glory" (p. 23). For the first time those of other churches cont./
eschatology) but sees a position beyond Barth in considering that the Church participates in the full three-fold ministry of Jesus Christ. Although not agreeing with all the applications made (eg. the priestly work in the mass and certain aspects of hierarchial representation), it is nevertheless an advance beyond the restricted vocation of Barth's ecclesiology (in KD 4), which needs to be corrected by its fairer presentation.

10. The "Subjective Reality of the Kingdom Below" Questioned

Did Barth really take history seriously? Was his understanding of

713. cont.

were called "Brethren of separated Churches" (eg. 383), whereas previously the status of church would never have been given, nor the term "brethren". Also, for the first time the laity have been given an official place in a conciliar decree (489-521), and the emphasis is upon hierarchy and laity together forming the Church rather than just the hierarchy as previously considered in Roman theology. Also unprecedented is the decision to conduct the liturgy in the language of the country instead of in the ecclesiastical Latin (159). The sermon as part of the liturgy is another step forward (149).

714. On some 60 pages (of DV) we find references to eschatology, scattered throughout from p. 15 to p. 691.

715. Nine times the council referred to the participation in the full munus triplex of Jesus Christ (DV 26-602). The Church as such reflects the three-fold ministry of Christ in its functions of worship (ministry) witness and communal life (26-32). Every member of the Church is a participant - (a) Bishops as teachers of doctrine, priests of sacred worship and officers of good order (40); (b) Priests in teaching, sanctifying and nourishing the people of God (547, see also 533, 442); (c) Pastors and assistants in teaching, sanctifying and governing (418f); (d) missionaries in exercising priestly, prophetic and royal offices (602) and (e) The Laity also share in the priestly, prophetic and royal offices of Christ (491). The three-fold office shared by every member incorporated into the body of Christ is considered as the "common priesthood" and the "hierarchical priesthood" which differ from one another in essence and degree but are interrelated, each in its own special way in participation in the one priesthood of Christ (27).

716. Because the prophetic ministry of Christ was apparently neglected in theological presentations of His offices, Calvin warned that it "must not be overlooked" (Institutes 2.15.2). However, he would not have been happy with the swing of the pendulum to the other extreme so that it alone is given attention and the other two overlooked as in Barth's post-resurrection Christology (KD 4).
the incarnation of the eternal in time (including the logos ensarkos) sufficient to overcome the Docetism of his earlier "Wholly Other" God above time? Was his risen Christ, and his parousia in the Holy Spirit a realizing of the Kingdom in time that fully does justice to Heilsgeschichte? Do the statements we have already given concerning the growth of the Kingdom and participation in Jesus Christ by the Kingdom do justice to historical reality? Does Barth's Christus Fraesens fully overcome his former Ganz Anderer God? It is obvious that as God's sovereign being and act these all involve more than empirical history, but the questions concern that aspect of each which is either given or not given in time or history. These questions ask - is the realized Kingdom above in Jesus Christ being really realized ontologically in man below as the genuine eschatological θανάτις?

In this section we must penetrate beyond the collected statements and references already given (which seem to do justice to history) to the deeper level from which we can see that in the end they actually do not do full justice to it. What, we submit, is seen (in this Section 10) from that level is that Barth still holds apart the world of reality above from that of mere reflection below. What is involved is more than a proper eschatological reserve between the Kingdom fully realized above and the Kingdom yet in process of realization below. What is involved is a wedge

---

717. Barth's earlier use of Urgeschichte (above history, original history etc.) does not appear in the KD (according to German Index) whereas Geschichte and Heilsgeschichte are used. The question is therefore, is this change of terms sufficient to overcome fully the earlier Docetic understanding of history?

718. For prior indications of this, see "The Time of the Community Below" (pp. 273f. Cf. 281f above). Note also, "The Community and the Munus Propheticum of Jesus Christ" (pp. 292f above) where words such as echo, equivalent, illustration, duplicate, replica, resemblance and portrayal - used of the community's vocation - will, in the light of this Section 10, be qualified by the other words that Barth used, such as preliminary sign, proleptic, prophetic and prefigurative.
forced between the fully actualized reality above in Jesus Christ the Head and what should be a growing reality below in the community as His body. Barth's sole concern came to be with the reality above to the detriment of a true ontological reality below.

**KD 4** is the place where Barth spelled out both the objective and subjective aspects of the Kingdom. It is here where we must turn to discover his definitive as well as his developed position, and it in turn must be the final context for deciding the interpretation of his latest position. By comparing what he actually did write on the subjective aspect of the Kingdom with what he had promised to write more than twenty years before (in **KD 1/2**), we shall note a development in his thinking. In the light of this development we shall take note of the entire context of **KD 4**. From both the development and context we will attempt to show that Barth was "absolutely and exclusively" concerned with the realized Kingdom in Jesus Christ above, to the detriment of its ontological reality below.

a. The Subjective Aspect of the Kingdom as Outlined in 1938 and Written Later

In concluding his prolegomena in **KD 1/2**, Barth looked ahead and surveyed the outlines he proposed to cover. Of the subjective realization of the Kingdom, he wrote,

"The third (i.e. circle of thought) is man's subjective appropriation of the atonement by the presence of Jesus Christ in the Holy Spirit within the sphere of the Church, on the path marked out for man by the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper, by his calling, justification, sanctification and perseverance." 719

In the twenty-one to twenty-nine years that elapsed between this proposed outline and its writing in **KD 4/3** and **4/4**, there are definite evidences that Barth's thinking changed. Thus, instead of baptism and

719. CD 1/2, 882. Parenthesis and underlining added.
the Lord's Supper considered as a part of man's subjective appropriation of the atonement, we find that the community is spoken of as being sent forth in its prophetic ministry of witness as a reflection of the glory which is Christ's alone. The change here is from an emphasis upon subjective appropriation to subjective reflection. With this change has come the removal of the sacraments from this third part of the doctrine of reconciliation to the last section on ethics. This is important, as they are no longer considered from the standpoint of man's subjective appropriation but primarily from that of his subjective response. This is evident in Barth's change from infant baptism (a view he held until 1943) to adult baptism as personal decision. With this change came a turning from baptism and the Lord's Supper as sacraments to consider Jesus Christ as the sole Sacrament. In effect, this meant that the entire change could be considered as a change from emphasis on man's appropriation in baptism and the Lord's Supper as sacraments to emphasis on man's response to and reflection of Jesus Christ as the sole Sacrament.

720. CD 4/3, 794
721. As far back as July 1922 Barth spoke of only one sacrament. He said, "The verbum visibile, the objectively clarified preaching of the word, is the only sacrament left to us. The Reformers sternly took from us everything but the Bible." (WGWM 114). This comment in an address to ministers in Schulpforta seems to consider proclamation as the only sacrament. His appeal to the Reformers is not born out by the facts. Calvin, for example, did not leave us only with the Bible. Rather, he took seriously the fact that the Lord gave his church the Eucharist communion. He spoke of the sacraments as signa of the covenant, or as "mirrors in which we may contemplate the riches of the grace which God bestows upon us." As such he found himself in agreement with Augustine's understanding of the sacrament as "a visible word" (Augustine in Joann, Hom. 89; Institutes, 4.14.6). Thus Calvin saw the sacrament as also verbum visible, and not just proclamation as Barth asserted. It is of passing interest that at least by 1938 (or 16 years later) even Barth could write that "as such a signum visible the sacrament is a symbolum, and an externum symbolum." (CD 1/2, 229). Concerning Luther, it seems very unlikely that Barth had forgotten transubstantiation as part of his theology together with sola scriptura. Having said this, we go on to note that this one sacrament of 1922 (the Word of God as Bible or proclamation) became at least by 1955 cont. /
"sacrament" comes from the Latin "sacramentum" which is a translation

721. cont.
the Living Word of God, Jesus Christ, as the sole sacrament of which "there is in the strict and proper sense, no other" (4/2, 407. Cf. 4/1, 296 - 1953, where the death of Jesus Christ is said to be the one sacrament.) Behind this change is the change from the "Word of God of KD 1 to "Jesus Christ, God and man" subsequently (Cf. H. U. von Balthasar, DDS 124; also see Ch. 2, fn. 110 i and j - p. 51 above - where references are given indicating Barth's opinion that such a change had taken place). This means that there should be evidence of Christ being called the sacrament before 1955. This is precisely what we find. Thus in 1940 Barth said that "the humanity of Jesus Christ is as such the first sacrament" (2/1, 54). That this first of sacraments had now become the sole sacrament shows the development taken from KD 2/1 to 4/2. In line with this emphasis on Christ alone, Barth could speak of "the sacrament of the being of Jesus Christ" (4/2, 107) and the "sacrament of the history of Jesus Christ" (4/4, 102). That he was now considered the only sacrament is perhaps best seen in the following: "Was it a wise action on the part of the church when it ceased to recognize in the incarnation, in the nativitas Jesu Christi, in the mystery of Christmas, the one and only sacrament, fulfilled once and for all, by whose actuality it lives as the one form of the one body of its head, as the earthly-historical form of the existence of Jesus Christ in the time between His ascension and return?" (4/2, 55).

Having noted this earlier reference to only one sacrament of proclamation and the later reference to only one sacrament in Jesus Christ, it is of interest to note that proclamation returned to the centre, i.e. proclamation as sacrament, but of the sacrament Jesus Christ. This we have seen is the emphasis in the ministry of Christ's self-proclamation (munus propheticum), and of the vocation of the community. In this context of the munus propheticum's centrality, the Eucharist became only a human response to this central act. In this sense proclamation had an important place both in the earlier and in the later theology of Barth. His earlier concern was that the sacrament would take the lawful place of preaching (1/2, 778). This was understandable in view of the Roman mass without preaching before Vatican II, and also in view of Klaas, Harms, Vilmar and Löhne - all Lutherans in the 19th century who considered the sacrament altar as centre to the detriment of preaching (see 1/1, 797). Barth the preacher in his KD to guide preaching, rightly defended the importance of proclamation. But, we submit, that his later concern should have been that proclamation as revelation-response does not take the lawful place of the sacrament as ontological appropriation.

Between proclamation of the Word (earlier position) and the proclaimed Word (later position) as the one sacrament, Barth spoke in terms of both proclamation and the sacraments, eg. 1/1, 61f. In fact, he specifically stated that the "thing to be made clear will be that proclamation sensibly enough and actually consists of preaching and sacrament" (1/1, 64). He spoke also of the church as sacramental, i.e. to be understood on the analogy of baptism and the Lord's Supper (1/2, 232), and also considered that revelation means sacrament (2/1, 52).
of the Greek word \( \mu \nu \sigma \tau \rho \iota \pi \omicron \nu \) \( \).\(^{722}\) In 1938 Barth could speak of that \( \mu \nu \sigma \tau \rho \iota \pi \omicron \nu \) as "offered to humanity in the church".\(^{723}\) Involved is the concept of "sign giving" which belongs to revelation and "mediates" objectively to the human subject.\(^{724}\) Thus Barth could say that eating and drinking the Eucharist can never be understood "too realistically",\(^{725}\) and that Christians live "by the Grace of God's Word" given in proclama-
tion, and "mediated" through the prophetic and apostolic word, concluding that "we have to say in all seriousness that sacraments are an indispen-
sable 'means of grace'".\(^{726}\) This was all expounded as a part of the subjective reality of revelation. Twenty-eight years later (in 1967), he expounded baptism (and applies this to the Lord's Supper too)\(^{727}\) as a part of the subjective response (Ethics) in which neither baptism nor the Eucharist are sacramenta or \( \mu \nu \sigma \tau \rho \iota \pi \omicron \nu \) for "the New Testament used the term exclusively with reference to God's work and revelation in history, not to corresponding human reactions."\(^{728}\) Now Jesus Christ alone has become Sacramentum or \( \mu \nu \sigma \tau \rho \iota \pi \omicron \nu \). Whereas in 1938 "the sphere of subjective reality in revelation is the sphere of the sacrament",\(^{729}\) with appropriation of the reality through the Eucharist, it became, at least by 1967, solely to do with Jesus Christ above as He had become the only \( \mu \nu \sigma \tau \rho \iota \pi \omicron \nu \).

Hence all mediation through the Church was ruled out, for "In the New Testament \( \mu \nu \sigma \tau \rho \iota \pi \omicron \nu \) denotes an event in the world of time and space which is directly initiated and brought to pass by God alone."\(^{730}\) This act of God necessitated or resulted in only a human response. Here we see that Barth's change of thinking on the sacraments so that Christ was considered

---

723. CD 1/2, 228
724. CD 1/2, 229
725. CD 1/2, 231
726. CD 1/2, 231f
727. CD 4/4, ix
728. CD 4/4, 108
729. CD 1/2, 232
730. CD 4/4, 108
as the only sacrament was a change from his earlier theology of mediation to his later theology of revelation-response which is the very essence of his munus propheticum. Behind this development lay the definite change of Barth's emphasis from the Word of God (written) as mediating revelation in KD 1 to the Word of God (Jesus Christ) - the Revelation as Mediator in subsequent volumes of the KD. H. U. von Balthasar noted this change, and Barth has confirmed it (see fn. 110 j, p. 51 above). In agreement, C. O'Grady put it this way,

"The problem of a correlation of Word and answer (Wort und Antwort) takes the place of the problem of mediation. One could say that he substitutes a theology of reflection (Reflexionstheologie) for a theology of mediation (Vermittlungstheologie)."

We will have to disagree with the Catholic solution to this lack of ontological reality below (to be taken up in Chapter Seven), but at least we find support from them on this critique we are making.

But our main concern must be with Barth's own confirmation of this change, and therefore primarily with noting evidence for it within his writings. Thus, already in 1955 (in KD 4/2) we find him giving the reason for this change as an acceptance of "a cautious and respectful demythologising, as expedient and practicable." He admitted that the change will expose him "to many suspicions" but considered that "the rearrangement (of baptism and the Lord's Supper to Ethics) is not as I see it of essential import". We agree that suspicions have been confirmed in the development of KD 4/2 to 4/4, and reveal that his rearrangement is, inspite of what he said, of "essential import". In fact, in direct contrast to what E. Brunner thought was a "new Barth", because a stress upon man was

731. CTB 77
732. CD 4/2, xi
733. CD 4/2, xif
given in KD 4/1, there actually came to be a return of the "old Barth" at least to the degree that the man that was being stressed was solely the man in Jesus Christ as man's only reality to the exclusion of any ontological reality below. What we mean by a return of the "old Barth" concerns a return of the "Wholly Other" God (of his earlier theology) in the form of the "Wholly Other" God-man. This is not to discredit his corrected interpretation of the incarnation of the Eternal in time, nor is it to detract from the fact that he presented the Holy Spirit as the self-revelation of Jesus Christ not only in time but also in the hearts of responding men. It is therefore not to detract from the fact of his Christus Praesens. What is involved is an assessment of these very facts on a deeper level. In other words, our concern is the absence of a resulting ontological reality in man.

This brings us to the criticism, raised by some scholars, of Barth's λόγος ἐνοχρόνος that we considered in Chapter Four, Section 8a. Their point was that the reality of Christ's humanity is seemingly called in question. Their concern was that full credit to the ζητέω involved in the incarnation was not given by Barth in certain quotations at least. Now we come to look at this critique more closely from the advantage point afforded by the context that we have come to. Those accepting the criticism of Barth's λόγος ἐνοχρόνος as valid may perhaps ask if it has any connection with the development in his thinking that we have made reference to above. Thus in KD 1/2 we find Barth stating that "In a way which preaching can never do, the sacrament underlines the words θεός and ζητέω." Here the ζητέω is taken seriously because this was the earlier period when Barth took

---

734. See SJT Vol. 4, No. 2, 1951, 123ff and CD 4/2, xi.
735. CD 1/2, 230. Note that the Holy Spirit dwells in man as the eschatological ἀπαρχη and ἀγαπη in 1/1, 519 where He is only encountering men in the actus purus emphasis of the later KD volumes. Cf. fn 736, 769. Even in 1/2, 203-279 the Holy Spirit is for enlightenment or revelation.
seriously the "givenness" of God to man, at least as far as appropriation in the sacrament is concerned. It was not until after this above quote, as far as we can determine, that Barth came to speak of the \( \lambda^\circ \delta \)os \( \varepsilon \nu\gamma\iota\kappa\rho\o\sigma\). This may have a connection or just be purely coincidental? At least it would seem that there is no connection, because CD 4/2, 20-377 was written after this change concerning the sacrament, but witnesses to the reality of the incarnational \( \varepsilon\iota\gamma\nu\varepsilon\iota\o\). More important than whether the incarnation is removed somewhat from history or not is the subjective realization of it which is removed from history (from an ontological reality below) to its sole reality within Jesus Christ. Just as Earth's anhypostatic emphasis engulfed the reality of the man (homo) Jesus with God, so the ontology of all other men is likewise engulfed (see Section b. below). This would seem to follow from the "non-givenness" from God to the man Jesus, who was only in the encounter relation (i.e. communicatio gratiarum) with God. In this sense the "Wholly Other" God of his earlier theology is (inspite of the incarnation of the Eternal in time) the "Wholly Other" God-man, the "Wholly Other" Jesus Christ or the "Wholly Other" Holy Spirit.\(^{736}\)

In other words, we are now looking at the fact of the Christus Praesens from an entirely different viewpoint to that taken previously in this chapter. Without negating what has already been said about the reality of His presence, we are now noting that it is His presence which remains as such and which constitutes the reality of the Holy Spirit in man rather than a resulting ontological reality in man himself. Thus man is only left with a response to and a reflection of the reality in Jesus Christ which remains therefore outside of his ontic (i.e. is not appro-

---

\(^{736}\) Of the Holy Spirit in Barth's theology (context is about tradition, but applies generally), C. O'Grady would agree with this "Wholly Other" God-man, for he wrote, "the presence and action of the Holy Spirit always remain transcendent to his church" (CCT 232).
priated), and as such remains "Wholly Other" in distinction from him. This places his otherwise good historical statements (prior to this section) in a new light.

Does not Barth's theology need to be righted by developing his earlier insight that the sacrament underlines the reality of ἐβάπτυ, as well as ἐπίγευσεν, with the full implications of "appropriation"; rather than consigning the Eucharist to the ethical response of man? Could he not then bring to the centre, what is at best only at the periphery in his later position, i.e. the references to growth and nourishment in Eucharistic participation? (Just as the Christus Praesens is now seen from a different viewpoint in this context, so are the references in this chapter which speak of growth and nourishment in Eucharistic participation. See pp. 251-258 above.) With a return to his earlier insight on the Eucharist, his earlier position could come back into its own as normative, i.e. "It is quite right that we should learn from John 6:52-58 that to our eating and drinking unto eternal life there necessarily corresponds a perfectly definite corporeal eating and drinking. We can never understand these and similar passages too realistically." 737

With this change in his thinking before us, it is of importance to see how Barth considered his developing thought in 1955. In the Foreword of KD 4/2 he wrote,

"Perspicuous readers will surely notice that there is no break with the basic view which I have adopted since my parting from Liberalism, but only a more consistent turn in its development." 738

Here Barth is really saying that, as he saw it, his christological revolt against anthropocentric Liberalism has through the years become more

737. CD 1/2, 231. Cf. ZdÄ 1929, heft 5, 427-460, "Die Lehre von den Sakramenten". See also Chapter 7, Section 2, and Appendix No. 4.
738. CD 4/2, x
consistently christological. Previously we have used this statement with this interpretation. What it means, as such, is that the later positive emphasis of his Christology in the *Dogmatics* was already present, if hidden, behind the otherwise negative emphasis of his earlier theology. Now we have to see this from the opposite viewpoint, i.e. the earlier negative emphasis of his Christology in the pre-Dogmatic writings is still present, if hidden, behind the otherwise positive emphasis of his later theology. Put another way, although he did largely overcome his earlier negative Christology, it still remains in his non-ontological reality in man below. As T. W. Ogden put it,

"In important respects he has simply carried forward the central thesis of the *Epistle to the Romans*, namely that we must under no circumstances confuse the action and revelation of God with human life and history, not even with the religious and moral dimensions of that history." 739

As such his correction needs to be carried through more radically. Looked at from the standpoint of eschatology, his earlier "timeless eschatology" still needs to be fully overcome by accepting a real participation, appropriation or tasting of the firstfruits as an ontological reality experienced, rather than just an emphasis upon repeated encounters to cause only response and reflection, which actually differs very little from his earlier timeless encounters. It is true that those earlier encounters only tangentially touched man, whereas the later development sees them as the Holy Spirit entering men. This is development in the right direction, as is the subsequent final *parousia* in time instead of the ultimate coming relegated to a point beyond time. But, although a step in the right direction, it is only coming half way back to take man seriously as a covenant partner of God. Over-against his earlier theology, God is no

longer radically removed from man, but still He is kept at a distance from him which is more than a proper eschatological reserve demands, for the eschatological firstfruits are, according to biblical evidence, an ontological reality in man through the sovereign grace of God. Thus the "Wholly Other" God has become the "Wholly Other" God-man not only in the infinite gulf removed from man ad extra, but in the infinite gulf removed from man ad intra, and thus not merely in terms of distance without, but in terms of being within.

Before proceeding to the second point (i.e. context of KD 4), which enforces what has already been said, perhaps we should note this critique is complementary to the one already made relative to the almost non-existent man to Godward movement of the risen Jesus Christ. Whereas Barth did not spell out this movement, and hence did not do justice to the humanity of Jesus Christ above for man, we see now that he also has not given full place to the divine-humanity of Jesus Christ below into man, and consequently has evidently not appreciated the meaning of the eschatological firstfruits in the humanity of those who come to taste and experience the same. Looked at from the christological standpoint, both His on-going heavenly-historical existence and His on-going earthly-historical existence as an ontological reality, central to the on-going reality of the Kingdom, are missing. Looked at from the pneumatological standpoint, even the excellent on-going parousia is only to awaken, quicken

740. See fn. 761 and 762 below. Cf. Gustaf Wingren, ThC 23, "It is characteristic of Karl Barth's thinking that God and man are understood as two different kinds of being. This ontology has left its stamp on his whole literary production. The changes which have taken place within his theology in the course of time are changes within this original framework...From this point of view the difference between earlier and later parts of Barth's theological production appears insignificant." (underlining added), Also p. 28, "The foundation was laid in the earlier works, and that is never changed."
and enlighten in relation to the new being or Kingdom above in Christ rather than to also bring ontological appropriation in the new being of the Kingdom below.

b. Jesus Christ the Sole Context of KD 4

With the development of Barth's thought before us, we now come to consider the context of KD 4, as seen in the books themselves. One fact emerges above all others, that Jesus Christ had become the sole interest of Barth. Thus in concluding his introduction to the doctrine of the Kingdom, or reconciliation, he emphasized that Jesus Christ is not only the starting point but also the concluding point for both the objective and the subjective aspects of the Kingdom. For,

"The doctrine of reconciliation must end where it began...although we are dealing with our existence, we are dealing with our existence in Jesus Christ as our true existence, that we are therefore dealing with Him and not with us, and with us only in so far as absolutely and exclusively with Him." 741

We are not arguing against the sovereignty of God which maintains that He is always Lord and as such indissolubly Subject. Against immanentism which supposes it has God on easy terms, and thus possesses the Kingdom etc., we support Barth. Against Roman theology which supposes the realization of the Kingdom is a second mystery involving works etc., we support Barth. But here in KD 4 he has seemingly gone beyond this position to stress that there is no kingdom reality in man, no ontological fruits of the Spirit, no results of grace, and thus no eschatological firstfruits. Rather, man's kingdom reality is only within the man in Jesus Christ above. Thus, here Barth goes beyond the correct eschatological reserve which points away from man below to his true reality above because, although in no sense identical with his reality above, a real growth towards that

741. CD 4/1, 154, underlining added.
reality through appropriation of it is clearly witnessed to in the Bible understanding of the new birth, growth in sanctification and being like Christ when the parousia takes place (see fn. 761f). Barth's mere response-reflection theology at best could only expect a revelation of man's reality in Jesus Christ at the parousia without any corresponding ontological reality below in man. This makes all men the same both above in Christ and below in themselves. Such leads directly into universalism as we shall note in the next chapter.

This pre-occupation with the objective reality of the Kingdom is consistently adhered to throughout KD 4. That his circular thinking, rooted and grounded in Jesus Christ as the sole content of theology, begins, stays and ends within the area of the life-act of Jesus Christ, so that the subjective realization of the Kingdom reality is only considered as reality in Him, and not in man himself is seen in the following. Thus (1) under the heading of Jesus Christ the Lord as Servant\(^742\) (starting point), there is developed the movement of the Son of God as Priest for our justification; followed by the Holy Spirit as the awakening power of the same Jesus Christ in gathering of the Christian community so that there is in His earthly-historical form of existence only a provisional representation (not appropriation and therefore reality) of the humanity justified in Him (ending point the same as starting point). Again, (2) under the heading of Jesus Christ the Servant as Lord\(^743\) (starting point) there is developed the movement of the Son of Man as King for our sanctification; followed by the Holy Spirit as the quickening power of the same Jesus Christ in the upbuilding of the Christian community so that there is in His earthly-historical form of existence only a provisional representation (not

\(^742\) CD 4/1, 157-779  
\(^743\) CD 4/2, 3-840
appropriation and therefore reality) of the humanity sanctified in Him (ending point the same as starting point). Again, (3) under the heading of Jesus Christ the True Witness, \(^{744}\) (starting point), there is developed the movement of the God-man as Prophet to witness to the accomplished reconciliation, followed by the Holy Spirit as the enlightening power of the same Jesus Christ in the sending of the Christian community so that there is in His earthly-historical form of existence only a provisional representation (not appropriation and therefore reality) of the humanity of the called in Him (ending point same as starting point). Hence man's subjective reality is solely in the man Jesus Christ. This, we submit, is only half right. In revolt against the wholly subjective position of Liberalism, Barth has swung to a wholly objective position. Therefore as C. Brown has concluded, "All God's dealings with men are effected in and through the person of Jesus Christ." \(^{745}\) Thus within Himself there is an ontological relationship with man, but ad extra there is only a noetic relationship with man through the awakening enlightening work of the Holy Spirit. (There is also a sending to witness, and a word to man to which he responds.) But there is no ontological reality done into man through appropriation.

This brings us to make an observation. We have already said that neither the humanity of Jesus Christ above as the realized Kingdom for us, nor the realized Kingdom being appropriated in humanity below, is given its proper place in Barth's theology. But we must now go a step further and see that in the place of a continuing human response of the risen Jesus Christ for us above Barth is emphasizing the human response of man below. \(^{746}\) If he was concerned to look away from any ontological reality

\(^{744}\) CD 4/3, 3-942
\(^{745}\) C. Brown, KBCM 35, 76.
\(^{746}\) In the CD 4/4 ethical fragment.
in man below to his actualized reality in Jesus Christ above, then we would ask him why he did not follow on to spell out the human response of the bodily risen Jesus Christ for us rather than coming back to only a human response by man below. (In the risen Jesus Christ there is both Ζων ἄρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ and πρὸς ἐν ἑρυθρῷ λόγος Heb. 4:12f). It seems a paradox that with his increasing preoccupation with the kingdom reality in Jesus Christ above that he did not go on to spell out the full implications of the same, turning rather towards man himself, even if he did not do him full justice as far as ontological reality is concerned.

What is missing in Barth's theology is the truth expressed by Christ, "Abide in me and I in you" (μείναί μεν ζε καὶ λογια ζεν ζεν John 15:4). Christ was not speaking of a false subjectivism or immanentism but of the true indwelling of God in man, an indwelling of the Creator to recreate man's being, i.e. to bring an ontological realization of his new being as a genuine new birth and growth reality within. This was the burden of his talk with Nicodemus (John 3:1-21). This he had in mind when speaking of the branches being nourished, kept alive and made fruitful as they remain in the vine (John 15:1-5). Barth's exclusive actualism has no room for such a reality below, for reality is actus purus in the event of encounter. Thus ἐκκλησία (as evocatio or congregatio) only becomes ever again the Church in the event of God's coming.747 It follows that Christian freedom is not possessed but must be given again and again.748 All hinges on Barth's understanding of revelation as God's act. Thus, as the Bible has to become the Bible again and again for man and does so in the act of God's encounter, so likewise does the Church become the Church again and again through God's act, and hence the Christian becomes ever anew a Christian

747. CD 4/1, 651f
748. DO 139
in the event of God's act to and in him. We concur with Barth in this dynamic understanding of the reality of all three, for it brings forcefully into relief the utter dependence that the Bible, Church and Christian will always have upon God's act in order to be Bible, Church and Christian. But again this is only half of what is involved. The other side has to do with the being of God. God's act and being are one (as Barth has so clearly taught) but they are one in such a way that his act of encounter is not only the revelation of His being (munus propheticum with noetic results) but the creation within man of a new being not separated from his acts of response and reflection. Properly understood, being and act cannot be separated in man either, but they are in Barth's theology. This has implications for his Christology, for the emphasis is wholly upon the act of God (i.e. upon the Kingdom's rule) which of necessity overlooks the equally important being of God (i.e. earthly historical existence as the Kingdom's realm). Whereas being and act are one in that part of the Kingdom above (in Jesus Christ the Head) there are only repeated acts without any resultant being in that part of the Kingdom below (in the body of Jesus Christ). 749 We find G. S. Hendry in agreement with this critique. He said,

749. This has implications for ecclesiology, for whereas Roman theology has a history of emphasis upon the Church as Institution (apostolic succession) and hence concentrated on it as being, Barth has swung to the opposite over-emphasis in considering the Church as event ("Gemeinde" which is actus purus, amounting to a type of Congregationalism) and hence concentrated on it as act. To the extent of their over-emphasis both are abstract for the community is act and being, where both the Holy Spirit as Lord and His ontological results into changed subjects are in covenantal communion.

It therefore follows that this has implication for pneumatology (in Barth's theology as one-sided as his post-resurrection Christology). Briefly put, his pneumatology is only an act of revelation (munus propheticum) severed from a resultant new creation of being into man. As T. F. Torrance put it, "through the Spirit Christ dwells in us and we in Him in a new relation of being" (SF civ).
"The first difficulty has to do with the dynamic actualism of his thought, his preference for the categories of act and event over those of being and structure. While Barth's intention may be approved, it may be questioned whether it can be carried quite as far as he attempts."  

It is this we have questioned, and shown to be carried too far as it does not do justice to the ontological reality within man, and as such places a wedge between his acts and being. Then G. S. Hendry continued:

"So far as christology itself is concerned, an earlier tendency to discount the historical life of the incarnate Christ has been overcome, in some measure at least. But as regards the church, there is still a tendency to deny it any continuous being on the horizontal plane of historical existence. The church is an event which takes place, so to speak, only when the lightning of divine grace strikes vertically from above, and apart from that it has no real existence."  

That is to say, it has no ontological reality, and therefore neither do Christians. Rather than "Ye are the light of the world", Jesus Christ is the sole light. Of course He is the only light, but He is this light as Creative-light, that works into man his new being as well as to give

---

751. NB: This supports our critique of the need for a more radical correction.  
753. In 1938 (CD 1/2, 688f) Barth could say that "the church, like the created world as a whole, lives by the divine creatio continua". This was still his position in 1945 (3/1, 60), but at least by 1950 (3/3, 6, 68f) he had given it up. His idea of conservatio replaced the former creatio continua. Without minimizing the good reasons he gives for this in 3/3, 68-70, we would submit that the Holy Spirit does recreate by effecting within man the new birth which is the subjective realization of his new creation in Jesus Christ. Although the new creation is complete in Christ (and in this sense there is no creatio continua as prolongation of the incarnation) there is a re-creatio as an ontological reality in man. In speaking of the Holy Ghost as Creator in 1929, Barth spoke of His work as "not a datum but a dandum" (i.e. not as something given to man, but to be given) (HGCL 16, Cf. 28-39). This remained his position, for when in 1950 in 3/3, 286f he said "grace is creative" so that God participates in the creature and enables the creature to participate in Him, it is not man below that he is considering, but man and God together in Jesus Christ. The not datum is consistent, the dandum is the ever new giving which is God's repeated acts. This is an actio continua with cont./
new enlightenment. G. S. Hendry was right when he observed that what is involved in Barth's theology is a "shift from a dialectic of God and man to an inner-divine dialectic" which is another way of saying that the reality is only above in Him with no ontology below in man.

This extreme actualism of Barth apparently overlooks the fact that God does not only act upon and even in man, but gives Him his very being - not to be possessed but to change and possess him. This is what the Holy Spirit does, and this is what is so clearly portrayed in the Eucharistic communion. Involved here is not just repeated acts of God with no ontological results, but a real participation and appropriation, for the Holy Spirit is the "Creator Spirit".

In 1931 Bonhoeffer criticized Barth's pre-KD theology for having only act and no being. In 1937, after KD 1/1 had appeared (1932),

753. cont.
no resulting creatio in man and hence fails to do justice to the Holy Spirit as Creator.
Again, in 1953 (4/1, 752) he spoke of the "new being", "new creation" and "new birth" of Christians as "not the men who are altered in it - for as such they cannot so far be seen - but certainly, and this is the astonishing thing - as those for whom it has happened and not happened, as the witness of it". The creation is completed in the man Jesus. Christians only give witness (act) of this fact but do not have being in it below. This is to divorce the being of man from his act, or what is as bad, to separate the creative result of the Holy Spirit from His illuminating act, the ontic from the noetic. Faith, love and hope are considered as acts in response to His Being in Christ (4/4, 757). The Christian life in Barth's theology can exist only in act. Even in 1967 (4/4, 13) the change of being is only in Jesus Christ, to whom man responds in the act of baptism (NB. "divine change" and "human decision", 4/4, 41, Cf. 72).


755. Cf. T. F. Torrance, RP 31. That this ever coming and going of God is an over-emphasis is seen, not only from this viewpoint of God coming to create within the individual a new being, but also from His abiding in the midst of the community. Thus John spoke of the Son of Man as "in the midst" (ἐν ἑαυτῷ) of the seven churches (Rev. 1:11-13). This is in agreement with Christ's promise, "Lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world" (Ἰδοὺ ἐμαυτῷ ὑπάρχω ἐναντίον τοῦ πάσης ἡμετέρας ἐός τοῖς συμφερόντος τοῦ αἰῶνος) Matt. 28:20.

756. AB 80ff.
H. R. Mackintosh spoke in terms of "excessive actualism" and the whole idea of being (state) as apparently "distasteful" to Barth. In 1968, after all the KD volumes were published, C. O'Grady spoke of Barth's actualism as "divine economic mono-actualism" as being in man is non-existent. It is this consistent emphasis on God's act (rule) to the detriment of His being (realm) or community and Christian reality below which we are questioning, and therefore we differ with H. Hartwell, who in 1964 considered that Barth's actualism is not one-sided because man's response is also an act, and that Barth leaves room for being (or state).

Barth's problem is still one of over-emphasis, for in order to counteract the Christian as sole-subject in liberalism, he has concentrated ever more consistently upon Jesus Christ as the sole-subject. We would suggest that both need correction with a Subject-subjects relationship understood in the covenant communion (κοινωνία) context of forgiving Saviour-forgiven sinners. The difference of this Subject-subjects relationship over the Christian as sole subject or Christ as sole subject is that it gives justice to the subjective realization of the Kingdom as an ontological reality in history. It is perhaps best demonstrated in the Eucharist where God as the subject is present to graciously enable His subjects to participate in His creating and renewing presence. They depend utterly upon Him as servants upon their Lord. He is their very life. This Subject-subjects relationship is therefore not the same as the false con-

757. Types 299f  
758. CCT 339  
759. ThKB 85f  
760. Cf. O'Grady, CCT 235 where the principle we have in mind is enunciated as follows: "Justice is done to the witness of Scripture neither by a pure immanentism nor by a pure transcendentalism, but by a transcendentalism with and in immanentism." (Underlining added). We would differ with the Catholic position that follows from this, i.e. with the hierarchy as representative of Christ, as only the Holy Spirit can really occupy this position.
tract idea of Federal Theology, nor is it Pelagian or synergistic as in some Roman theology; but rather, it sees communion as central to the covenant, and thus understands that an ontological reality of the Kingdom in the community and Christians below as subjects is actual through the ontological reality of the Kingdom in Jesus Christ for them above as the Subject. Rooted and grounded in that Kingdom reality for it above, it is safeguarded from any false immanentism or existentialism below. This we see as the needed correction of Barth's sole emphasis upon the ever coming Christ (as welcome as his eschatological on-going perousia is) in exclusion to a growing ontological reality in man. What is involved is the double reality given in Isa. 57:15, i.e. "I dwell (shaken) in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble heart." It is this dwelling in man and its ontological results in man that are missing in Barth's theology, but are very much in evidence in the Bible. 761 The

761. Barth's position of ever renewed encounters with only human responses and reflections resulting from them does not do justice to the following two strands of witness in the biblical documents.

(1) The Creator God indwells. "He that keepeth his commandments dwelleth (μένει) in him, and he in him (ἐν σοὶ)" (1 John 3:24). "If we love one another, God dwelleth in us (ἐν ἡμῖν μένει)" (1 John 4:12). It was because God had promised "I will dwell in them" (Ἐνοικίζομαι ἐν σοις) (2 Cor. 6:16) that Paul could say that "Christ liveth in me" (ζεσθεὶς ἐν σοί) (Rom. 10:16). Christ promised that He and the Father will not only come to men, but come "and make our abode with him" (John 14:23) (The word abode is a translation of the Greek "μονή" meaning "a remaining place". The English word "mansion" from the Latin "mansio" is almost equivalent to the Greek "μονή", the Latin and Greek not however referring to a pretentious building. The Greek "μονή" means "dwelling place" and its only other use in the New Testament should be so interpreted - see v. 2. The idea of permanence in μονή is reflected in 1 Macc. 7:38, the only occurrence of the word in the LXX.)

(2) The indwelling God creates. "Even though we have this treasure in earthen vessels" (2 Cor. 4:7) (cf. Barth, CD 4/3, 917) "the inward man is renewed day by day" (εἰς ἐσού μὴν ψeta ἀνακαινισθαι καὶ ἐνεργήσει) (2 Cor. 4:16). This is a process of being transformed (μεταμορφώσθητε ἐν Γάλ: metamorphosis) by the renewing of the mind (ἀνακαίνισθαι τοῦ καρδιάς) (Rom. 12:2). It is a letting of this mind be in you (ἐν γῇ) which was also in Christ Jesus (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησου) (Phil. 2:5). The results are seen in the fruit of the Spirit which is (ἐστιν sing.) love,
fact that these are missing in his thinking has serious implications for his eschatology which does not do full justice to pneumatology.

761. cont.

manifested in "joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance" (Gal. 5:22f) (NB. δόξη is the fruit of the Holy Spirit which is so appropriated under grace that it is the greatest gift, 1 Cor. 13:13). Referring to this ontological growth Peter wrote, "if these things be in you and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things is blind." (2 Pet. 1:8, Cf. vs. 5-7). This development within the very being of man involves a real partaking of the divine nature (δὲνθε Θεός κοινωνοὶ φύσεως) (2 Pet. 1:4). This is the reality of the subjective realization of the Kingdom, the putting on of the Lord Jesus Christ (Rom. 13:14), the being "filled with all the fulness of God" (Ephes. 3:19), the "renewing of the Holy Ghost" (Titus 3:5), in whom we are made partakers of Christ (Heb. 3:14). It is the perfecting of His love (δύνη) in us (τετελεσμένη έν δύνῃ) (1 John 4:12). Paul put it this way: "That in everything ye are enriched by him, in all utterance, and in all knowledge: Even as the testimony of Christ was confirmed in you (έν δύνῃ): so that ye come behind in no gift: waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall also confirm you unto the end, that ye may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. 1:5-8). In agreement, John affirmed, "when he shall appear, we shall be like him" (έν δύνῃ θεοῦ οὕτω οὕτω Εσώθεθα) (1 John 3:2). Here is evidence of an ontological preparation for the parousia. Hence from the standpoint of man, this is an important eschatological preparation which is neglected by Barth.

762. Serious implications

As noted in the former footnote, there is an ontological growth under the Holy Spirit which will lead to a telos at the parousia. Speaking of the gifts of the Spirit, Paul noted their importance not only to the edifying of the body of Christ but also for growth "unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Πληρώματος του Χριστοῦ) Ephes. 4:12f. To Nicodemus Christ said, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again (ζευγνηθὰς ἀνωθεν - i.e. born from above, not just born above in Jesus Christ as with Barth) he cannot see the kingdom of God" (John 3:3). Christ continued by showing that this must be a birth of the Spirit (ζευγνηθὰς Εσώρματος) (v. 5) and not just a baptism of the Spirit as in Barth's objective reality - ethical response context of KD 4/4. That the Holy Spirit is either in or not in man, and that with important results, is a reality that compliments the fact that all men are in Christ. Although all men are one in Jesus Christ above, have their new being in Him and are as such all sons of God, it still is also true that it is only those who are led by the Spirit of God in their lives who are the sons of God (Romans 8:14). It is also true that "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his" (Romans 8:9). These are serious texts. Together with them is the fact that man can repel (i.e. sin against) the Holy Spirit to his eternal loss (Matthew 12:31). Barth's pneumatology is strong in his one on-going parousia presentation, but is very weak in

cont./
Thus, instead of the ἀρχή τοῦ πνεύματος (Rom. 8:23) being only "the nearness of his redemption" as Barth one sidedly wrote, they are the new creation in Jesus Christ (or Kingdom) made subjectively real in man, so that man does come to taste and experience as firstfruits that yet to be tasted and experienced harvest. Eschatology as the firstfruits has really broken into time and history for it has become in the Holy Spirit an ontological reality in those having been awakened. Barth stops short at the awakening. No being or reality follows (or is complementary with) the acts of man, save the being of the Holy Spirit. But such makes man's response to the awakening, enlightening and sending of the Holy Spirit only acts of faith, love and hope, severed from a changed being below. We submit, therefore, that this position of Barth's apparently does not present the Holy Spirit as the Creator God who dwells in man and the

understanding the vital importance the Holy Spirit has in preparing (ontologically in man) for Christ's final return. John, by contrast, was clear that the Holy Spirit is "another (ἄλλον - of the same kind as Christ (not ἡ τερον) Comforter" (πάρεξῆς καλεόν - from παρακαλέω - called to the side of) who will "abide with you for ever" (ἵστοις ὑμῖν ἐκεῖνον ἐὰς ἐπὶ πάντας) (John 14:16). This aspect of "abiding" needs to balance the one-sided emphasis on the repeated "coming" of the Holy Spirit. This is because a preparation for the ultimate parousia will include a present coming of that future reality into the firstfruits of the Spirit (τὴν αρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος) (Rom. 8:23). Also, in Barth's presentation the very nature of the Holy Spirit is often seemingly over-looked, as the inbreaking of His presence into the realm of man is stressed (to overcome immanentism) and thus his very gentleness, meekness and patience (which all have much to do with this time between the times given for his quiet and longsuffering preparation of people for the final advent) is overlooked. Barth's theology needs to include the fact that the Holy Spirit can be grieved (Ephes. 4:30) (eg. CD 4/2, 370, the Holy Spirit is said to "not tolerate either sorrowful neglect or ebullient extravagance in our attitude"), that Christ stands and knocks at the door rather than breaking in vertical from above (Rev. 3:20) and seizing us (CD 4/1, 148); that the difference between men in this time between the times is not merely noetic as Barth thought but rather concerns the ontological difference between those who have the fruits of the Spirit (Gal. 5:22f) and those who "receive not the things of the Spirit of God." (1 Cor. 2:4)

762. cont.

763. CD 4/3, 916

764. See CD 4/1, 757-779; 4/2, 783-824.
Indwelling God who creates in man (see fn. 761). Did not Barth need, rather, to understand eschatology as embracing the present ontological reality (ἐπικαταγωγή) in man as well as the coming ontological revelation to man? 765

765. Even though Barth spoke of the Holy Spirit as Creator (eg. HGCL 11-27, 1929 lecture) and "as the divine conditio sine qua non of the creation and preservation of the creature" (CD 3/1, 57), and spoke of the one Whole God as Subject and Author of creation, reconciliation and redemption; nevertheless he ascribed the work of creation per appropriationem to the Father, that of reconciliation to the Son and - always per appropriationem - that of redemption and consummation to the Holy Spirit" (CD 3/4, 33). Even though the Creator is the "Father with the Son and the Holy Spirit (3/1, 49) and thus the Holy Spirit participated in creation, and as Creator-Redeemer will effect the final resurrection of the dead (3/1, 17; 3/4, 25) it is his work as Creator in this time between the times that is missing in Barth's theology. Thus even though specifically called "the Spirit of God the Creator" (3/2, 359) appropriation, participation, i.e. a new creation in man as his new being realized subjectively, is not found in Barth's theology. Rather, only the act of the Spirit's coming to and into man is given (1/2, 222). Thus "Spirit is the event of the gift of life whose subject is God; and this event must be continually repeated as God's act if man is to live. In this sense Spirit is the conditio sine qua non of the being of man as soul of his body." (3/2, 359). But how can the Creator-Spirit act without there being an ontological result? We submit, against Barth, that the ontological reality resulting from the Creator-Spirit as Reconciler is just as real (as His unique creative work) as the first Adam reality of the Creator-Spirit as Creator, is just as real as the nativitas Jesu Christi from the Creator-Spirit in the conceptus de Spiritu sancto, and is just as real as the final resurrection from the dead by the Creator-Spirit as Redeemer. In this time between the times the Holy Spirit for Barth, only awakens, enlightens and sends the community forth in its vocation. In this its work, Barth gives it only an encounter relationship with the earthly historical form of Christ's body. What is missing is the Holy Spirit as Creator-Reconciler which goes beyond mere acts to their telos in new being (see fn. 761, 762 and 753).

Barth has often referred to the prayer "Veni Creator Spiritus" but apparently the emphasis is always upon the Veni (come, and therefore upon the act) to the detriment of the Creator (the purpose of His act of coming). Thus he said, "We must therefore every day and every hour pray Veni Creator Spiritus..." (DO 139) for "At no time...in the life and ministry of the community, in the fulfillment of Christian fellow-humanity, can one dispense with the petition: Veni Creator Spiritus. Always and everywhere this must be prayed afresh" (4/4, 38, Cf. 4/2, 126). This is because "in all its actions the work of the Holy Spirit is always and everywhere a wholly new thing. At each moment of its occurrence it is itself another change, a conversion, which calls for even more radical conversion" (4/4, 39). This, however, is only one side of the life-act of the Holy Spirit and man in encounter.
In short, Barth's "one-sided dynamic act-event-encounter theology" needs to be balanced with the indwelling reality which results from this. Evidence for such can be found in Roman theology, Eastern, Orthodox theology and Reformed theology. Thus in the Vatican II document on the Church we read,

"The Spirit dwells in the Church and in the hearts of the faithful as in a temple (Cf. 1 Cor. 3:16; 6:9)." 766

765. cont.

The other side is given by T. F. Torrance in his chapter, "Come, Holy Spirit, for the Renewal of Worship and Witness" (TR 240-258), where he rightly points out that "Come, Creator Spirit is a prayer of participation in this new happening, a prayer in which we allow it to overtake us" (TR 240). It is because the "Creator Spirit of God is abroad among men" (Ibid.) so that "On our lips the prayer, Come, Creator Spirit, is a prayer of commitment to what God has already done in Jesus Christ, and a prayer of participation in the divine nature..." (241f). It is this participation as an ontological reality in man as a genuine result of the Spirit's repeated acts that is missing in Barth's theology. In other words, Barth's actus purus pneumatology needs to be corrected by the equal emphasis upon the Holy Spirit as the eschatological firstfruits in the being of His followers. As T. F. Torrence put it, "Because Jesus Christ through the Spirit dwells in the midst of the Church on earth, making it his own body or his earthly and historical form of existence, it already partakes of the eternal life of God that freely flows out through him to all men." (TR 193). Barth does justice to the dependence of the community upon the Spirit, but does not do justice to union with Christ through the Holy Spirit, the latter which is just as truly an eschatological reality as the former. By contrast, T. F. Torrance keeps the balance between both of these eschatological realities, thus doing full justice to pneumatology. This is evident in the following, "Thus the Church has no independent existence, as if it were anything at all or had any life or power of its own, apart from what is unceasingly communicated to it through its union and communion with Christ who dwells in it by the power of the Spirit and fills it with the eternal life and love of God himself" (TR 205). The biblical evidence for the Holy Spirit as indwelling Creator is given in footnotes 761 and 762 above. Cf. The Greek Orthodox view of the Holy Spirit "realizing the incarnation in man", N. Missiotis stated, "Christo-monistic tendencies in theology have serious consequences for the Christian doctrine of man, for they prevent us from seeing the whole man as portrayed in the Bible. The neglect of the work of the Spirit as the regenerator of the life of man has led many theologians to fail to recognize even in Pauline theology, the Lordship of the Holy Spirit, who changes man into the glory of His Lord" (OE 42, 58). Is not Barth one of these theologians?

766. DV 17
Thus the Eastern Orthodox Nikos A. Nissiotis wrote,

"We must have a clear idea of the Holy Spirit as the Paraclete, that is to say the personal Being which fulfills, makes present and works among men here and now the salvation given in Christ. He is...the re-creative God amongst us." 767

Thus Calvin said,

"We must now see in what way we become possessed of the blessings which God has bestowed on his only begotten Son, not for private use, but to enrich the poor and needy. And the first things to be attended to is, that so long as we are without Christ and separated from him, nothing which he suffered and did for the salvation of the human race is of the least benefit for us. To communicate to us the blessings which he received from the Father, he must become ours and dwell in us." 768

Barth did speak of the One who "indwells" to "create" but this was delimited to the "one man Jesus Christ". 769 Therefore of the Holy Spirit in relation to others he wrote, "His only work is His provisional revelation; His only effect the human knowledge which has Him as its object..." 770

Unfortunately Hans Küng thought that Barth's theology had a definite ontological reality in man, and went on to identify this with the Catholic gratia increata or inhabitatio Spiritu Sancti. 771 But this is precisely what he does not teach, and is therefore the weakness of his pneumatology, as he does not do justice to the eschatological firstfruits in man below.

It is within this dynamic actus purus, Holy Spirit context that Barth came to write about the Christian community which is gathered (KD par. 62),

767. OE 39
769. CD 4/2, 652f. Cf. fn.735 and CD 3/1, 57 where the Holy Spirit is said to be "the divine conditio sine qua non of the creation and preservation of the creature".
770. CD 4/2, 654
771. JCR 248. Küng even said of this ontological reality, "In faith man is in fact re-born and newly created in the root of his being. The sinner and the just man are radically distinct" (Ibid.). This is not, however, substantiated by the Dogmatics.
upbuilt (KD par. 67) and sent forth (KD par. 72) by this third mode of God's being.\textsuperscript{772} Without detracting from many excellent points made in these section,\textsuperscript{773} we find that the consistent emphasis is upon the Church as His body, His earthly-historical form of existence,\textsuperscript{774} so that "the being of the community is exhausted and enclosed in His" for "He - and in reality only He, but He in supreme reality is the community."\textsuperscript{775} It follows that Barth could say that "the community is not merely future to itself, but transcendent."\textsuperscript{776} What apparently is involved here is Barth's consuming interest in Jesus Christ as the totus Christus, as the autobasileia, as the already actualized Kingdom or community.\textsuperscript{777} In other words He was concentrating upon the objective reality of the community, upon its union already a reality above. This is why he stressed that the Eucharist "does not create and put into effect their union with Jesus Christ Himself - which is unnecessary; it reveals and publishes and documents that union..."\textsuperscript{778} Also, this is why he emphasized that "the community is not σῶμα" for Jesus Christ "is Himself and primarily the body".\textsuperscript{779} But is there not a union produced below through the Holy Spirit in word and sacrament? Is this not what Paul meant when he wrote, "we being many are one bread, and one body, for we are partakers of that one bread"? (\textit{ὅτι εἰς ἄρτος, ἐν σῶμα, ὅπως ἔσονται οἱ ἄνθρωποι πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου μεταχειρίζοντωσι} (1 Cor. 10:17). Also, is the community not the body of Christ below? Is this not what Paul meant when he wrote, "Now ye are the

\textsuperscript{772} See CD 4/1, 643-739; 4/2, 614-726; 4/3, 681-901.
\textsuperscript{773} Eg. Many points raised against Roman Catholicism, CD 4/1, 674, 715-720; 4/2, 669, 693f; 4/3, 729, 744, 836.
\textsuperscript{774} CD 4/1, 661. NB. in CD 1/1, 3 he spoke of Jesus Christ as the essence of the Church, and referred to this in 4/2, 655. This emphasis was then even evident in the first pages of the \textit{Dogmatics}.
\textsuperscript{775} CD 4/2, 655, Underlining added.
\textsuperscript{776} CD 4/2, 628
\textsuperscript{777} See CD 4/2, 624f, 658
\textsuperscript{778} CD 4/1, 665
\textsuperscript{779} CD 4/1, 663
body of Christ" ( ὑπείρασεν καὶ ἦπερ σώματος Χριστοῦ) (1 Cor. 12:27). We submit that this reality below has not its proper place in Barth's presentation as His absorbing interest was in the sole subjectivity in Jesus Christ above.

Because of this one-sided emphasis, Barth did not consider Ephes. 5:22f in his presentation of the Body of Christ. Paul speaks there of the Church as the spouse of Christ. Here, we would submit, is further insight into the Subject-subjects covenantal communion between Christ and His bride. (See also Rom. 7:4, 1 Cor. 6:13f, 2 Cor. 11:12 etc.) C. O'Grady related Barth's failure to treat this passage as common to Protestant scholars. Evidently he had not seen T. F. Torrance's treatment of it, in which he wrote, "When St. Paul speaks of the Church as the Body of Christ, He is expressly distinguishing the Church from Christ..." This is precisely what Barth did not do in his comments given above, for Jesus Christ alone was the body.

T. F. Torrance has gone beyond Barth, preserving the Pauline balance between the reality of the Subject (Jesus Christ) and the ontological reality in the subjects (community). Thus he succinctly stated,

"Through the consecrated elements the church partakes of the very body and blood of Christ, and there is enacted a true and substantial union, an ontological union, between Christ and His church, Christ has become bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, but in the Eucharist we become bone of His bone and flesh of His flesh. No union, save that of the Persons of the Holy Trinity, could be closer, without passing into absolute

780. CCT 278
781. RP 31
782. Both T. F. Torrance and C. O'Grady speak of Christ as He who bodies Himself forth in the Church with the word, Eucharist and Holy Spirit making the Church His body. See T. F. Torrance, RP 83; C. O'Grady, CCT Vol. 2, 283, 300. Cf. DV 447 where the same words "bodies forth are used in connection with Ephes. 5:32f."
identity, than that between Christ and His church as enacted in the Holy Eucharist." 783

"It is in the sacraments above all, therefore, that the church called into being by the Word of the Gospel of forgiveness really becomes the Body of Christ reaching out to the parousia. In and through the sacraments, therefore, we are given our clearest understanding of the participation of the church in the redemption of the body and the redemption of time." 784

Thus, instead of the church becoming ever again as such in the act (or rule) of God's encounter (as with Barth), T. F. Torrance has rightly penetrated beyond the abstract act to link it together with the being (or realm) involved, stating that "it is in the Eucharist, then, that the church really becomes the church, both as the ontological and eschatological reality." 785 Barth has only the eschatological emphasis. But T. F. Torrance, as does Calvin, gives the ontological reality its proper place in the eschatological reserve characteristic of the Church in this time between the times. Hence the feeding on the vivifying flesh and blood of Christ is more than just a human response, and as such is not primarily considered as ethical. 786 Involved here is more than a noetic acknowledgement to the Holy Spirit, for as Calvin put it, by "raising our minds beyond the visible sign, we attribute to it blessings which are conferred upon us in Christ alone, and that by means of the Holy Spirit, who makes us to be partakers of Christ." 787 T. F. Torrance can therefore speak of the Church as "so united to the risen Humanity of Christ that within the Church the new creation is a concrete reality reaching out

783. CAC Vol. 2, 188f. This agrees with Athanasius who said, "Christ became sarkophoros that we might become pneumatophorus" (quoted in N. A. Nissiotis, OE 59).
785. RP 189. Cf. C. O'Grady, CCT 254: "the eucharist is the most intense actualization of the church."
786. Institutes 4.16.30 - called "vivifying food"; 4.17.1 - "sacred food".
787. Institutes 4.16.16
through the ages of history to the parousia. Here is an ontological fact which is vital because "Here we are concerned very much with the humanity of Jesus. We are members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones" (Ephes. 5:30). Thus the Lord's Supper is "sharing in Christ's humanity" that is "exalted to the right hand of the Father."

It is this humanity of Jesus that becomes our nourishment in the effective presence of the Creator Spirit. Thus a cry like the Psalmist's "Create in me a clean heart" (Psa. 51:10) is answered. Here the Hebrew word "bara" is used - the same word used of fiat creation in Gen. 1:1. If that first man was created an ontological reality with a view to Jesus Christ (Barth's position) then was not David's heart re-created an ontological reality with a view to the same Jesus Christ? To this reality Ezekiel witnessed in 36:26, "A new heart also will I give you". Likewise, because of our new being in Jesus Christ above, is there not a work of "bara" with ontological results or a subjective realization below through the Creator-Spirit in Word and sacrament etc.? Is this not the reality of the on-going new birth (John 3:1-21)? Is this not the perishing of the old man as the inward man is renewed day by day (2 Cor. 4:10-16) so that the Church will one day be presented to Christ without spot or wrinkle or any blemish (Ephes. 5:27, 2 Cor. 11:2)? This strand of witness which runs through both testaments is presented effectively in a passage in The Shepherd of Hermas (3.10-13). In vision the shepherd sees the Church as an aged lady seated before him. He called her Ecclesia presbytera. Looking again at her he noticed the same old person except for a change in

788. RP 46
789. Ibid. 44. Cf. 56 - the church "lives as the Body of the risen and ascended Lord".
792. C. H. Hoole, SOH, 3rd vision, Section 10, p. 28f. See also sections 11-13, pp. 29ff.
her face — it was getting younger. Now he called her Ecclesia neotera. Upon looking the third time, he noticed that inspite of her white hair she had become young again and was beautiful and happy. "That", says T. F. Torrance in comment, "is the Biblical doctrine of the church". It is this ontological reality, this change of being in the community and thus in man that has been severed from his acts of response and witness in Barth’s theology, thus not giving justice to the humanity of Jesus Christ. Inspite of his few comments on being nourished in the Eucharist, his relegation of it to the context of human response is central making these peripheral. C. O’Grady was right when he concluded that "Karl Barth’s ecclesiology is very weak with regard to the sacraments". This is because

"Event for Barth is repeated giving, and never a gift. The response does not participate in the divine life and power, but remains a purely human reflection".

As G. Wingren put it,

"That which disappears from our attention through the theological work of Barth in this generation is the living and active God of the Bible, this God who continually creates and gives."

Man comes with empty hands, but in reality they are never really filled — only encountered. From the foregoing it is clear that Jesus Christ is the sole context of KD 4, and as such there is a sad neglect of the ontological reality of the Kingdom below as the Body of Christ nourished through His creative presence in word and sacrament.
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794. Eg. see pp. 257f above and CD 4/4, 40.
795. C. O’Grady, CCT 113.
796. Ibid. 140
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799. CD 4/2, 128. The giving of the Holy Spirit is equated with Christ’s encounter. Even Barth could say, "Our hands are not altogether empty" (CD 4/1, 330) because of the Spirit’s firstfruits. This is, however, peripheral and not central to his actus purus central concern. Cf. CD 4/3, 840 — we come with empty hands.
c. The External Context of KD 4

Having established a development in Barth's thinking from KD 1/2 to KD 4, and having identified this with his ever more consistent preoccupation with the objective, realized Kingdom in Jesus Christ above; we now come to an external influence which undoubtedly had some part to play. We speak of R. Bultmann's existentialism. Having been the leading theologian on the continental scene for twenty years (1930-1950) Barth's revolt against the subjectivity of Schleiermacher in particular had a wide influence in Europe. On the one hand liberal theologians had become largely discredited through their support of German nationalism, and on the other hand the firm stand of Barth in opposition to such support and the resulting Barmen confession (1934) had given him deserved credit. But inspite of these facts, and inspite of Barth's attempted christological correction of his earlier one-sided "Wholly Other" transcendent emphasis, there was still a felt vacuum which came to express itself in the existentialism of Bultmann, and brought him into theological leadership in the fifties. By contrast with a God removed from man, this was a reparation of the God within man of Schleiermacher. Barth considered Bultmann's position to be the "modern culmination" of this Neo-Protestantism. The chair of philosophy at Marburg was held by Martin Heidegger, a colleague whose understanding of "Existenz" was taken over by Bultmann to form the basic presupposition to his thesis on existentialism, which was looked to to fill the gap created by Barth's opposite emphasis. What is important for us to note here is that it was during these fifties, when Bultmann was the leading influence in continental theology, that Barth was writing his KD 4 with its ever consistent pre-occupation with the existence of man in

800. CD 4/2, 57
Jesus Christ. In 1953, in his introduction to KD 4/1, Barth wrote,

"The present situation in theology and also the peculiar themes of this book mean that throughout I have found myself in an intensive, although for the most part quiet, debate with Rudolf Bultmann. His name is not mentioned often. But his subject is always present, even in those places where with his methods and results before me I have consciously ignored him. I respect the man, his mind and aim and achievements, and the zeal of his following. I only wish that I could do him greater justice."

As we shall note in Chapter Seven, Barth really did answer Bultmann as far as presenting a far better and more credible eschatology than Bultmann's "timeless eschatology". But, it must be said, Barth did not do him greater justice (or at least counteract him more successfully) because he did not present a true ontology in man to overcome Bultmann's existential emphasis. What is needed to overcome Bultmann's eschatological moments of encounter which are timeless and therefore without a final goal in time, is the eschatological εἰκόνα within an eschatological reserve which points beyond to that final parousia. But this givenness to man is non-existant in Barth's theology. Put another way, Bultmann's "timeless encounters" are the same as Barth's earlier "timeless eschatology". The fact that Barth was still speaking of the coming God in repeated encounters (inspite of a real incarnation in time and a final parousia in time) in KD 4 meant that he had not been able to offer the full correction to his transcendent God, even though he tried to by his Christus Praesens emphasis. It is our opinion that Barth's decision not to spell out the man to Godward movement of the risen Jesus Christ before the Father, turning rather to the opposite God to manward movement may well be because he was trying to do justice to God's working in history, i.e. trying to overcome his earlier removal of God beyond history, and precisely to meet Bultmann's

801. CD 4/1, ix
challenge. But he did not completely counteract Bultmann's human existentialism because he had no historical ontology. 802

And here is a paradox. Barth would have been more successful in meeting the challenge of existentialism if he had done greater justice to the humanity of Jesus Christ. Even though his pre-occupation was with man in the true man Jesus Christ instead of man in general, as with Bultmann, he did not do full justice to the humanity of Jesus Christ as man's representative above and as his reality below.

d. Opposition to Barth's Pre-occupation with the Kingdom Above

Our critique places us in agreement with what could perhaps be called a fairly unified concensus of opinion amongst scholars of Barth's theology. Thus his position has been considered as "christological constriction" (H. U. von Balthasar), 803 "exclusive transcendence" (P. Tillich), 804 "objectivism of grace" (K. Runia), 805 "transcendent subjectivity" (J. Moltmann), 806 "Christ's sole subjectivity" (C. O'Grady), 807 the "Christ-principle" (C. Brown), 808 "Christomonism" (Neo-Calvinists in the Netherlands), 809 and "radical christocentricism" (G. S. Hendry). 810 Although we disagree with most of C. Van Til's unsympathetic criticism of Barth, we find him in agreement with those already cited in stating that "the objective fact to which he (i.e. Barth) appeals is primarily Geschichte rather than Historie", 811 i.e. to the reality within Jesus Christ Himself rather that within man as an ontological reality. G. C. Berkouwer put it this way, "the grace of God is straight-jacketed by a wholly objective conception of the triumph of grace." 812

---
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These ten examples of reaction to Barth's Christomonism come from both the Protestant and Catholic sides of theology. The Eastern Orthodox have also spoken against Christomonism, and although Barth's name is not mentioned in the following quote from N. A. Nissiotis, he perhaps had him in mind. At least it speaks to Barth's situation, and supports our critique against his lack of ontology. Thus Nissiotis wrote,

"The second kind of monistic tendency is of a far greater interest from the Orthodox point of view. We mean Christomonism, which is the most common deviation from the true doctrine of the Trinity in contemporary western theology. It is a very delicate task for contemporary theologians to discern the non-Trinitarian character of this deviation, because it is camouflaged by a Christocentric theology which is the true heart of the Christian Gospel. Therefore Christomonism appears at first sight to be the true Christian theology; in modern times it has won great acclaim for purifying Christian theology from a number of elements which it borrowed from philosophy in order to explain the mystery of the Trinity of the Christian God. In reality, however, Christomonism in its extreme form can be a great threat, not to the doctrine of the Trinity, but to the fulness of the life and action and worship of the Church...Christomonism is inevitably related to a partial and inadequate vision of the mystery of salvation seen only as redemption, as a cross-centred event, failing to see salvation also as regeneration, as a continuous process of the Biblical oikodome and as a perfection of the whole of creation. Resurrection and the cosmic Christ play a secondary role, the Church is regarded as only a juridical institution, and the sacraments as superfluous ceremonies not absolutely necessary for salvation."

813. G. W. Bromiley was not so happy with considering "Christomonism" as Barth's basic principle. He wrote, "Christomonism is perhaps a more valid description (i.e. than others mentioned) but this falls rather wide of the mark in view of the ultimate Trinitarianism of the Dogmatics and the lofty New Testament view of Christ. A master key to Barth's weaknesses might resolve many problems, but it is hard to feel much confidence in those suggested." (CMCT 52). However, we would submit that Barth's Trinitarian starting point does not result in a genuine pneumatology because of Christomonism, and there is no "external history" between Jesus Christ and the Father in pre or post resurrection Christology. Therefore both the Holy Spirit and the Father are not given their full place because of sole interest in Jesus Christ. Barth himself considered the word "Christomonism" to be an "unlovely term" (CD 4/3, 713).

814. OE 35f. The Church considered only as a juridical institution does not apply to Barth. (Underlining added).
e. The Reality of the Kingdom above swallows up the Reality
of the Kingdom Below

Previously we noted that in 1955 Barth stated, "the community is not
Jesus Christ. But He - and in reality only He, but He in supreme reality -
is the community". This non-identity of the community with Jesus Christ
is correct, but we question (in the context of KD 4) the identification of
Jesus Christ alone with the community, for the community also must include
His followers. Barth's pre-occupation with the objective Kingdom reality
to the detriment of its subjective on tological reality is to say that his
Christology swallows up history. Such, we would submit, is as one-sided
as Schweitzer's history which swallowed up eschatology and Bultmann's
eschatology which swallowed up history.

In 1956, Barth's self-criticism of his earlier theology was described
as "the swallowing of immanence by transcendence". Although in that
now-famous lecture on "The humanity of God" he also spoke of a "new task"
or "revision" of that earlier overemphasis, which undoubtedly had already
been attempted in KD 1/1 to KD 3/4, and was being written into the pre-
resurrection Christology of KD 4, yet was it not now an engulfing of the
man Jesus in the anhypostatic assumptio of God, and was it not this action
of God that still was of primary interest in his post-resurrection Chris-
tology? It is true that in KD 4/4 he even spoke against the "christo-
monic solution", stating that,

"On this view the in nobis, the liberation of man
himself, is simply an appendage, a mere reflection,
of the act of liberation accomplished by Jesus Christ
then, is fundamentally alone as the only subject truly

815. CD 4/2, 655
816. See R. Bultmann, HE 37 and J. Moltmann, TH 165.
817. HG 43
at work. The faithfulness of the man who is distinct from Him cannot be an answer to the word of divine faithfulness spoken in His history. It is not man’s free action. It is simply an aspect or manifestation of the act of God fulfilled in Jesus Christ. It is not an act of grateful human obedience which though awakened and empowered by God’s grace, is still achieved by man himself...An anthropology and soteriology are thus swallowed up in christology. Even in their most far-reaching statements, however, the New Testament witnesses, including Paul in Gal. 2:19f, did not think or say this. They do not ask us to entertain any such “subjectivism from above.”

Here Barth is clearly against a chrestomonism or “subjectivity from above” which overrides man’s genuine response with a passive reflection, and thus against a Christology which swallows up anthropology and soteriology.

This seems promising, but it must be seen as only referring to human response and not to a human ontological change. This human response is still only linked to God’s act as Revealer, Proclaimer, Prophet and Apostle of the salvation history of all men already accomplished in Himself. What is involved is the self-impartation of Jesus Christ. Thus, we would agree with C. O’Grady’s position,

"But I insist that the response or reflection, despite the distance from that to which it is the response or reflection, takes place on the basis of a participation in divine life and power." 819

It is this ontological participation that is missing (the nearest he comes to it is the word "empowered", but this must be understood in his mono-

819. This is basically the same position as noted in 1950 in CD 3/3, 284 where the Christian under the universal Lordship of God the Father is "far beyond any idea of a merely subjective reality" and therefore altogether different from a "supposed transendence within this immanence". Barth’s sole pre-occupation with Christ to the detriment of God’s transcendent reality in ontological change in man is seen in 3/3, 287 where he said, "Originally and properly the Christian who is at the side of God and has his own voice and responsibility in the divine rule is the one Son of Man, Jesus Christ."
820. CD 4/4, 25
821. CD 4/4, 33
822. CCT 336. Underlining under "response" and "reflection" added.
actualism context). In his understandable and commendable concern against "man come of age" controlling a God considered as no longer Sovereign, Barth apparently overlooked the fact that an ontological reality in the community and Christians below which respects the distance between God and man is really on a different level from that of domesticated existential immanentism on the one hand, and christomonistic sole subjectivity on the other. Therefore the result is "a christology which swallows up ecclesiology" (and therefore the Kingdom below). 823

Our critique is simply that the same Paul who wrote that our life is hid with God in Christ Jesus (Col. 3:3) (which Barth emphasized) 824 also wrote about Christ in you (Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν) the hope of glory (Col. 1:27), and did so without loosing a true objectivity in a false subjectivity. The Lord Himself also spoke of "I in you" (ἐν σοί) as well as "you in me" (John 14:20). It is also significant that in His high priestly prayer before the Father in His risen humanity His intercession embraces both the community in Him and He in the community (ἐν σοί) (John 17:20-23). Rooted and grounded in that objective ministry of representation for us above, could safely come the subjective ministry of reality in us below; and both have important connections with the Eucharist beyond Barth's emphasis upon human response. What concerns us in these three is the proper understanding of worship in this time between the times. It also concerns a lacuna in Barth's attack on Catholicism, which with Protestant liberalism he always had before him as a background over against which he wrote. (These are to be taken up in Chapter Seven.)

823. C. O'Grady, CCT 277
824. CD 4/2, 240. This he calls "the factual, objective, ontological standing of man - not all men, but certain men...As Paul says, they are "in Christ". But nowhere does Barth speak of a subjective ontological reality through the indwelling Creator Spirit. Only encounter acts are experienced by man in this world (4/2, 366). Cf. 4/2, 274-280 - "To be a Christian is per definitionem to be ἐν Χριστῷ" (277).
11. Conclusion

There are three things that we now need to do in this conclusion:

(1) summarize Barth’s position over-against the debate on the Kingdom,
(2) specify his advance over that of Schleiermacher and Ritschl, and
(3) summarize our critique.

a. Barth’s Position over-against the Debate on the Kingdom

Whether speaking of the Kingdom as come, or only drawn near, of the Kingdom’s growth or on-going revelation of it, or of the Church’s participation in this prophetic work (in response to and reflection of the reality rather than repetition completion or elongation of it), Barth is referring to one reality, i.e. the movement of the Kingdom from hiddenness to final revelation. Thus, (1) the cross is "the comprehensive turning in the history of all creation", 825 so that (2) the future is bringing "Not, once more, a turning point in history but the revelation of that which is. 826 As such, the resurrection was the beginning of this manifestation, or "lifting of the veil". 827 The emphasis, therefore (with T. F. Torrance, G. W. H. Lampe) is upon the decisive event that happened rather than upon some still greater things to take place (as with D. Ritschl and C. K. Barrett). In short, the theme and content of this chapter is Jesus Christ, and Him only. It has shown Him to be "the penetrating spearhead" of God’s will, as both its "realisation and revelation in the creaturely world." 829

That eternal Kingdom, as both God’s rule and realm (with W. G. Kümmel, J. Orr and A. M. Hunter) has fully erupted into time, involving both continuity and discontinuity (with T. F. Torrance, E. F. Scott, S. D. F.

825. CD 4/1, 247  
826. DO 133, 135  
827. CD 4/2, 133  
828. CD 1/1, 177  
829. CD 3/2, 144. Underlining added.
Salmond, F. F. Bruce, H. H. Farmer, C. E. B. Cranfield, C. K. Barrett, A. R. Ford, G. E. Ladd, B. Vawttr, G. R. Beasley-murgy, A. T. Cadoux and G. S. Duncan) as well as full realization in Jesus Christ. Thus, Barth wrote, "as eschatology it is realized eschatology"\(^{830}\) (with the ἔνδεικνύει of Dodd's "realized eschatology" and "has come" of H. Lightfoot). But in contrast to Dodd's "realized eschatology", "it has come and comes".\(^{831}\) The full reality (present) still looks for a full revelation (future). Only as such is it still in "process of realization" (to use the words of J. Jeremias and N. A. Dahl) and therefore not in the sense that its full reality is still future (as it is for R. H. Fuller, G. S. Duncan, J. Moltmann and W. Pannenberg).\(^{832}\)

Barth's Kingdom "come" in Jesus Christ and subsequent "being revealed" through Jesus Christ holds together in eschatological tension the two realities of the Kingdom; in which the Eschaton was inserted into history in the incarnation, death and resurrection, and is moving through history; involving spiritual growth as well as revelation until the final unveiling of its reality at the telos (with J. K. Howard, C. E. B. Cranfield, and C. K. Barrett). However, we have seen also that this reality in history in man is not ontological and therefore does not fully correct Barth's earlier Docetic theology. The final manifestation will be a revelation both of Jesus Christ the Head and of the community His body as we shall see in the next chapter. Because of this "realized Kingdom" in Jesus Christ, its final revelation is inevitable (with T. W. Manson, and S. B. Babbage). The Eschaton is therefore interpreted teleologically and the

\(^{830}\) CD 4/1, 598  
\(^{831}\) CD 4/2, 656  
\(^{832}\) We will reserve detailed study of the eschatology, or lack of it, of such men as C. H. Dodd, J. A. T. Robinson, W. Manson, R. Bultmann and J. Moltmann until Chapter 7. Cf. W. Pannenberg who spoke of Jesus knowing "himself functionally to be one with God's will in pre-actualizing the future full reality of the kingdom of God" (JGM, 334 Cf. 369f).
telos is interpreted eschatologically, so that the reality of the Kingdom is neither exhausted in the past (as with C. H. Dodd), nor in the present (as with R. Bultmann), nor removed to the future (as with J. Moltmann). (To be studied in Chapter Seven.)

This eschatological teleology and teleological eschatology has somewhat overcome the God above time and fully overcome the parousia beyond time of his earlier "timeless eschatology". Here as far as it goes the eschatological tension has effectively replaced the earlier dialectical tension. The former one-sided eschatology is quite largely corrected. But with this correction there has developed (1) a pre-occupation with the parousia in time to the neglect of the human Jesus Christ above time and (2) a pre-occupation with the sole subjectivity of Jesus Christ to the neglect of the human ontological reality below.

Because of this change of emphasis from a non-historical parousia to a pre-occupation with the parousia in history, Barth's "christological eschatology" speaks of the "kingdom, which is coming, which has already come and is secretly present."833 This "kingdom is really on earth and in time and history."834 Thus, although Jesus Christ (as the realized Kingdom) is "primarily as the exalted Son of Man, at the right hand of the Father, in the hiddenness of God (with the life of Christians)...He does not live only there but lives too (in the power of His Holy Spirit poured out from there and working here) on earth and in world history..."835

Even though Jesus Christ (as the realized Kingdom) has both a heavenly-historical form and an earthly-historical form, Barth said that "Our present concern is with the second form: His earthly-historical form of existence."836 This remained his concern. It is a position between the

833. CD 4/4, 26 834. CD 4/2, 656. Underlining added.
836. CD 4/2, 653. Cf. 4/3, 357.
representative reality for us above and the ontological reality into
us below. This is not to say that he did not realize the significance
of the heavenly historical form of the Kingdom, or of the *sessio ad
dexteram* (as we shall see in Chapter Seven), but he did not spell it out;
and by contrast with the many hundreds of pages given to the God to man-
ward movement of post-resurrection Christology, he has given only a few
scattered lines to the man to Godward movement of the same. This God
with us concentration at the expense of the God for us (above) side of
the same on-going ministry of Jesus Christ is, as we will attempt to show
in Chapter Seven, a serious lacuna in his post-resurrection Christology.
What is not good enough is the one reference stating that "For Himself He
is in heaven with the Father. Here He is for us and the world in the work
of the Holy Spirit."837 Having shown that Jesus Christ is both God's word
to man and man's answering word to God in pre-resurrection Christology, we
would expect Barth to continue this double movement with Jesus Christ as
both God's word of revelation to man and man's responsive word to God in
his post-resurrection Christology. It is this latter part that is missing.
What needs to be fully (and not one-sidedly) spelled out is that "He is
the same here and now as He was there and then: the Mediator between God
and us men".838

From the one-sided "Wholly Other" of his "timeless eschatology" he
went on to develop an opposite one-sided "Christus Praesens" in his "christ-
tological eschatology". This, however, was still a "Wholly Other" God-man
as no ontological reality into man resulted. Thus in both his earlier
and his later eschatology, the kingdom is distanced from man more than it
should be. This on-going *parousia* of the realized Kingdom not only pre-

837. *CD* 4/2, 97. Calvin put it better when saying, "he reigns more for
us than for himself" (*Institutes* 2.15.4).
838. *CD* 4/1, 314
occupied Barth with only spelling out the God-to-manward movement of post-resurrection Christology, but tempted him to change the title of *Kirchliche Dogmatik*, Vol. 4, from the *Doctrine of Reconciliation* to the *Doctrine of Revelation*.

In the final paragraphs we pause to turn back to Chapter One to compare Barth's advance over the positions taken by both Schleiermacher and Ritschl.

b. Barth's Advance over Schleiermacher

The only seeming agreement between Schleiermacher and Barth is their understanding of Jesus Christ as the Kingdom (in the narrower sense). However, not only is their interpretation of this fact opposite, but it is the key to Barth's advance over Schleiermacher. Simply stated, the human Kingdom in the man Jesus has been replaced by the Divine Kingdom in the God-man Jesus Christ. This is the basic presupposition to Barth's contribution over-against that of Schleiermacher.

Thus, the Kingdom is no longer in man's hands, but in God's; no longer in the realm of grace below, but also in the realm of glory above; no longer tied to some inherent evolutionary process in history, but in the process of being revealed in the God-to-manward *parousia*. It is no longer a reality separate from the state, but embraces the whole cosmos;

---

839. This information was given to the writer by Barth's assistant, Eberhardt Busch, during a morning session in Barth's study in Dec. 1968. Cf. CD 4/3, 8 - "Revelation takes place in and with reconciliation: Indeed the latter is also revelation." Cf. 4/3, 38, 182, 221. In its three aspects (justification, sanctification and revelation) reconciliation has to do with God with us, or the Christus Praesens. It is this emphasis on the God to manward *parousia* (i.e. the *munus propheticum*) which occupied Barth's post-resurrection Christology, and thus we find ourselves questioning the statement of J. McIntyre that in the KD "it is the fact of the reconciliation in Christ which increasingly comes to take the strain of the argument, while the idea of revelation to some extent recedes." (SCC 165). It would seem, rather, that the revelation of this fact is what is in the foreground of his presentation.

840. See Ch. 1, pp. 12-22, 30f.
is no longer cut loose from a future bodily resurrection as it is identified with the resurrection of the glorified new humanity in Jesus Christ; is no longer considered fulfilled (in the sense of nothing lacking) in the outpouring of the Spirit as the Holy Spirit is considered the second moment of the one parousia that leads to the final coming. Therefore eschatology is no longer considered as alien to faith because outside our ken and beyond the present for it is integrally related with the eschatological tension which is the characteristic reality of this present time, and as such is central to faith. Thus the Kingdom is no longer identified only with the being of Jesus separate from his acts of resurrection, ascension and return, for the being of Jesus is the being of God as well as the being of man, and only as such is His whole life-act (including the future revelation act of His being) the Kingdom.

C. Barth's Advance over Ritschl

Ritschl's theology lay in the same anthropocentric emphasis as Schleiermacher's, even though different aspects of it were emphasized. Hence, Barth's advance over Ritschl's position is identified with his Christology. Thus, no longer is the Kingdom only related to the moral actions of Christ, but to His being; no longer is it related of man's moral efforts to bring it full realization, but is seen to have been already perfectly realized in the life-act of the God-man Jesus Christ. It is therefore no longer some human goal in the future but grounded in the divine goal already actualized. Hence it is no longer dependent upon man but completely dependent upon God.

Barth's advance over Schleiermacher and Ritschl is therefore completely identical with his christological advance over their anthropology.

---

841. See Ch. 1, pp. 22-31.
Put more succinctly, if there are hints that Schleiermacher looked to the being of Jesus whereas Ritschl looked to His moral acts, and in doing so both looked to only a quantitatively different human person; then Barth looked to both the being and acts of the God-man who is qualitatively different from the rest of humanity, and as such was, is and will be the genuine Kingdom for all mankind. However, as noted already, his post-resurrection Christology returned to an overemphasis on His acts (rule, revelation) to the detriment of His being (as our representative above and our ontological reality below) and in this sense resembles his earlier one-sided christological emphasis.

d. Summary of Critique

Simply put, Barth's contribution over the subjectivity of Schleiermacher and Ritschl was in emphasizing the objectivity of the Kingdom. It was more than just a Kingdom in man (Schleiermacher) and a Kingdom by man (Ritschl) for it was primarily a Kingdom to man (Barth). This was a necessary correction which we gladly recognize. Our critique calls for (1) a further development of this Kingdom to man in spelling it out as a reality for man above, and rooted and grounded in that objectivity (and therefore against all anthropocentric subjectivity), (2) a further development of this Kingdom to man in spelling it out as ontological reality into man below. The for man above and therefore into man below emphases are as much a part of biblical eschatology as the to man emphasis. Therefore Barth's eschatology is not complete.

The common weakness in Barth's earlier "timeless eschatology" and later "christological eschatology" is his overemphasis upon God to the detriment of the humanity of Jesus Christ. Whereas in his earlier eschatology the stress was upon the coming God, who only tangentially touches man, thus not giving full justice to the humanity of Jesus Christ as in time; his later eschatology, inspite of its attempt through the incarnation and
Christus Praesens emphases, still does not give full justice to the humanity of Jesus Christ as in time, as seen in (1) the overriding Kingdom rule in the Kingdom realm in the life-act of Jesus Christ, and (2) the absence of an ontological appropriation of His humanity through the Holy Spirit, Word and sacrament. In a sense, the coming God is still the emphasis of his later eschatology, a coming which is for all practical purposes still only tangentially touching man in encounter as no ontological being resulted, either in the man Jesus Christ or in other men. At the same time his later eschatology does not give full justice to the humanity of Jesus Christ above time in the sessio ad dexteram. Although the earlier parousia beyond time became a continuing one-parousia in time, and the earlier Ganz Anderer became the Christus Praesens in the on-going munus propheticum, it is still the coming God overemphasis to the detriment of the humanity of Jesus Christ that is the consistent weakness of Barth's eschatology. To the extent of not giving full justice to the humanity of Jesus Christ in his later eschatology, Barth has not fully corrected his earlier Docetic emphasis, and thus still needs to take history more seriously. Stemming from this is the fact that he has not a completed pneumatology or ecclesiology. They, together with his eschatology, are one-sided because his basic Christology, that controls all of his dogmatics, is one-sided.

The emphasis, therefore, is upon God's rule, God's acts, God's revelation, to the detriment of man's realm, man's being and man's appropriation. Primarily this man is the man Jesus. It is Jesus as man's realm that is swallowed up by God's rule: it is Jesus as man's being, or being a true man as man's redeemer that is swallowed up by God's act in the unique "inner history" of determination of the human by the divine: and thus it is the appropriation of God's gifts by this man Jesus that is swallowed
up by the unique relationship with the Holy Spirit. As for other men, their being as the genuine realm of the Kingdom because of genuine ontological appropriation through the Holy Spirit, Word and Sacrament, are swallowed up in the ever repeated encounters of God's rule, in His overcoming revelation or munus propheticum.

But God's rule, acts and revelation are only one side of eschatology. Man's realm, being and appropriation are the other side. To complete his eschatology Barth would need to give full place to the humanity of Jesus Christ so that the Kingdom is equally rule and realm, act and being, so that its realization is equally revelation (munus propheticum) and appropriation (ontological). This would understand the "Lord's Supper as the great eschatological meal of the Kingdom of God through which that very Kingdom is realized here and now." 842

These two sides of the eschatological reality are really God and man as Subject-subjects, in the vital (κοινωνία) covenantal communion. Rooted and grounded in the man Jesus Christ the Head, who is the Forerunner, Representative, Advocate, Intercessor and One true worshipper before the Father above, those incorporated into His body the Church appropriate, i.e. are given a participation in His risen and therefore realized Kingdom humanity with the genuine ontological experiencing of the eschatological firstfruits. This, we submit, is the balanced eschatological Subject-subjects union and communion between the risen man Jesus and His community to overcome the sole-subjectivity of man in Liberal Protestantism and Catholicism (against which Barth wrote) on the one hand, and to overcome the sole-subjectivity of Christ in Barth's theology on the other. As T. F. Torrance said,

"Because we are united to Christ, anchored to Jesus

who in our flesh has risen from the dead and now lives on the resurrection side of death and wrath and darkness, we are eternally anchored to hope. That is the cardinal fact upon which eschatology hinges." 843

In speaking of the Eucharist communion of Christ with His Church, H. B. Swete wrote,

"...behind all this, and the sole cause of its efficacy, is the direct mediation in heaven, where the One Mediator stands between God and man. The Church needs and can have none other." 844

Thus as J. S. Stewart has written in comment on the book of Hebrews, we have there the "intersection of two worlds and the 'anchoring' of the Church to the world unseen". 845 As H. Anderson has stated, the Book of Hebrews is important as a counterpoint to the restrictively anthropological existential interpretation of the New Testament message. 846

Put another way, whereas Barth considered Calvin's theology lacked in eschatology (which we had to challenge in Chapter Four), the same critique is now made of his own theology. The important point is that in this precise aspect of eschatology Calvin has made a real contribution. Thus we find he took very seriously the humanity of Jesus Christ, and therefore his ministry for us above, and our participation in that risen humanity in the sacraments below. Barth's eschatological lack needs to be corrected by the very theology that he thought lacked eschatology. Our thesis critique is partly a criticism of Barth through Calvin as we shall see in Chapter Seven. Where Barth has an incomplete pneumatology and no real contribution on worship in this time between the times, Calvin's eschatological concern has contributed to both. Thus, unlike Barth,

"The crucial issue in Calvin's eschatology is the humanity of the risen Christ, and our actual participation in His humanity through Word and Sacrament." 847

843. CAC Vol. 1, 99.
844. AC 90
845. FTP 27f
846. JCO 280f
847. T. F. Torrance, CAC Vol. 1, 98. Last two underlinings added.
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CHAPTER SIX

THE FINAL PAROUSIA

In the preface to KD 4/4, the last fragment of his Dogmatics, Barth mentioned that he has "been tackled with particular zeal on the question of the doctrine of redemption (eschatology) projected for Volume V", which of course he was unable to write. With characteristic humour he continued,

"Some of those who have questioned me I have put to confusion by raising the counter-question whether, to what degree, and with what attention they have read and studied the material already to hand. Others I have asked whether they have noted how much about the desired sphere of eschatology may be gathered indirectly, and sometimes directly, from the earlier volumes." 1

The simple and yet staggering fact is that an average of one page in every five throughout the Dogmatics has some direct contribution to make to eschatology (see appendix No. 2). The other fact which is just as important, and which we have already seen from the chapter on christological teleology, is that Barth's entire presentation is eschatologically oriented. It is here in this chapter that we must remember that, for Barth, eschatology preceded the creation of man, for its content and criterion is the Eschatos - the eternal Jesus Christ. Therefore, first,
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eschatology must be considered as that eternal reality enfolded within the inner-trinitarian being of God, and only then considered as the temporal revelation unfolded within history. It is here that the last chapter showed that all history moved towards the coming of the Kingdom in Jesus Christ in His life-act, and that subsequent history is the mere passing away of the old aeon which has really been done away in the cross. The revelation of this fact is the new aeon, or more precisely, is the new man, the glorified man Jesus, revealed in the resurrection, as the first moment of the parousia, and this new aeon has continued to be unfolded as revelation in the continuing munus propheticum of the Holy Spirit.

This chapter brings us to the telos of the eternal God to manward movement of Jesus Christ, i.e. to His ultimate in the sense of universal revelation. This final parousia thus brings us to the consummate realization of the munus propheticum, and therefore to the third moment of the one on-going parousia.

1. Eschatology no mere Appendix

It follows that eschatology is certainly not just an appendix in Barth's theology, and apparently this has been so from a very early time. Thus, even before his Römerbrief he wrote in September, 1919,

"God could not redeem the world if he were not its Creator. Only because it is his possession can it become his possession. Genuine eschatology casts a light backwards as well as forwards. Jesus Christ yesterday - and not for the first time today."  

In agreement with this concentration upon the Eschatos, and therefore upon eschatology, we find Barth saying twenty-nine years later, in 1948,

"There is not a single eschatological statement even in the New Testament which allows us to ignore this One. His death, resurrection and coming again are the basis
of absolutely everything that is to be said about man and his future, end and goal in God. If this gives way, everything collapses with it." 

Therefore, whatever the christological change from the earlier "Wholly Other" God (Ganz Anderer) to the later "Wholly Other" God-man (even though the Christus Praesens) as noted in the previous chapter; one can still speak fairly in terms of a consistent linking of eschatology with the Eschatos, in both the "timeless eschatology" and in the "christological eschatology" of Barth. As such, one can rightly say that eschatology has never been an appendix in his thinking because Jesus Christ has always been central to his theology.

2. The Final Parousia

Previously we have noted that the cross was the end of the old world, man and time, and the beginning of the new world, man and time. We have seen that the resurrection added nothing to the reality accomplished once-for-all in the cross, but only revealed it as such. This realized Kingdom as revelation has been traversing through history in the munus propheticum, moving to the final unveiling. It is with this third moment of the one parousia of Jesus Christ, the telos of the Eschatos, that we are concerned in this section.

There are a host of different ways that Barth spoke of this final parousia. As the last day it will be "wonderful" because the "final victory" or "day of God". It will be the goal of the last time, the second and final parousia or second time of Jesus; the last revelation
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or final appearing. It will be the "final thing" or "ultimate dénouement". It is also called the third parousia. But, whether termed second, third or final etc., all point to the coming of Jesus Christ to complete His revelation which already began in the resurrection, and thus speak of the fulfillment of His return, or His last and manifest appearance. It will therefore be the consummation of His parousia referred to as His consummating revelation, or concluding return in glory.

This finale of his one on-going return will be the ἀποκάλυψις τοῦ Κυρίου as Judge, new Creator, King and Hero in his self-revelation or conclusive self-declaration. As God's unveiling it will be the joyous revelation of God's mystery, the manifestation of the reality of reconciliation, because the revealing of Jesus Christ as the One He is. As such it will also be the final manifestation of God and man, the revelation of the conclusion which has already taken place in the conclusive event of this God-man. Therefore this will be the revelation of "what they became on the day of Golgotha", and hence simply a drawing aside of the veil. Thus,
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"Jesus Christ will be the one Word and we shall then see the final and unequivocal form of His own glory which even now shines forth from His resurrection into time and history, all times and all histories." 35

This revelation is repeatedly spoken of as conclusive, comprehensive, definitive, direct, final, general, ultimate and universal; 36 and less frequently referred to as heavenly, supreme, perfect, great, immediate, exclusive and eternal. 37

3. The Parousia and Surrounding Events as a Novum

With the general picture of the parousia before us, we now come to some further details concerning it. We will follow Barth in what he said concerning the parousia and surrounding happenings or conditions as new events or states to come in the future. Prior to the parousia will be the great mystery of iniquity (2 Thess. 2:7). 38 The parousia itself is identified with the creation of the cosmos as both are supra et contra naturam, 39 for involved in the parousia is a miracle, 40 the new act of God, 41 new things, 42 the ἐπιφάνεια 43 or cosmic change. 44 As the first creation brought forth something new so this final creation will be to bring forth a new heaven and a new earth. 45 The two events are related as the provisional form to the final form, our time to God's time, this life to eternal life, and this world to the world to come. 46 This "new creation" 47 is the different completion that Christ looked forward to on the Sabbath.
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ending creation week. This is because it will begin the eternal Sabbath.

This parousia will bring redemption, which will be given by Jesus Christ. Thus Barth could speak of liberation and redemption as still to come. Involved is the fact that the book of life will not be opened till that last day, the "Behold I make all things new" (Rev. 21:5) will not take place till then, which will be the conversion from potential Christians to actual Christians, will be the change from mortality to immortality (1 Cor. 15:53) and will be the transformation of walking "δικαία πίστεως" to "δικαία εἰδούς". Involved is the change of our bodies to be fashioned after Christ's glorious body (Phil. 3:21). His coming to fulfill all things as they are already fulfilled in Himself, in that He "cometh to fulfill and complete the relationship founded between us and Him at creation, renewed and confirmed at the reconciliation." Involved is the consummation of the Church, when it will be destroyed like the Jerusalem temple, dying as Christ did to enter into glory, after which it will then be able to give an infallible confession as the body eternally united to its Head, Christ. Involved is the completely new future of the community, when it will receive the crown of life, when it will share eternal life in fellowship with God, and become outwards what it is already within Jesus Christ. This is the wholly new order to come in the future redemption.
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This redemptive *parousia* will be the passing from the relative temporal world to the absolute eternal world. It will be the coming of the heavenly Jerusalem, the actualization of a royal humanity, the removal of any lack of final validity. It will be the genuine, radical and absolutely new and unique coming of Jesus Christ. It will be the coming new age with all its benefits for which we are set free in Jesus Christ. In this future world the temptation to do evil will be eliminated, the ethical problem will not exist (just like temple in Rev. 21:22) "since even from man's side the relationship between God and man will then be finally ordered and ruled." The enemy will then be destroyed, and all suffering will be over, and in this eternal life man will receive back many times over that which he lost for the name of Christ.

4. The *Parousia* and Confident Joy

It is this new future grounded in Christology that is the basic presupposition behind the obvious rejoicing and joyous confidence that constantly occurs in the *Dogmatics*. As Barth focused all his attention upon the reality in Jesus Christ as a once-for-all realized redemption for all men, that could not be altered, and that hastened towards manifestation, he could not help but break out in his prophetic like language to witness to this new reality in world occurrence which placed history and all men under a new and true determination. From this christological viewpoint, he dismissed all kinds of abstract (i.e. non-christological) *Weltanschauung* which either erred in being optimistic or pessimistic. He therefore
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opposed any being in smooth transition from an indefinite past to a similar future, considering magical, naturalistic, idealistic, sceptical, historical-political, aesthetic and moral world views as worthless. This is because man's true being is in Jesus Christ with its definite resurrection revelation in the past and its definite parousia manifestation in the future. Therefore, the adversary's attempt to deceive man concerning himself in the light of the living Jesus Christ is useless. Barth put it this way,

"However glistening the soap-bubbles which he blows up in the attempt to deceive man concerning himself, what can he accomplish against Him?...one little word will fell the adversary." 80

The Christian is therefore released to the freedom of rejoicing in his future which is already a present reality in Jesus Christ. This is in complete contrast to a future based upon the anxiety of a supposed failure of the return to materialize, for the fullness of its actuality was an event in the resurrection. 81 It is also in complete contrast to all human thoughts and plans made without the knowledge of this already realized future in Jesus Christ. Such, Barth said, are like a carriage-way on a broken bridge, leading only into the void and therefore having no future. Changing the simile, he noted that they are as futile as a mere snatching at the wind. 82 This is because the future of such is blocked up in the person of Jesus Christ. 83 Barth's emphasis and attention was solely upon the fact that already "Jesus is Victor". Thus there is no dark future when seen from Jesus Christ as the center of time, 84 for in Him
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God has removed all fear of His return. \textsuperscript{85} In short, He is the Subject of hope. \textsuperscript{86}

It follows that Barth could say that the future of the Christian is not therefore obscure, neutral or ambivalent, \textsuperscript{87} for "Christian hope has the power of that uninterrupted positive and certain expectation of the future." \textsuperscript{88} The community therefore "rejoices with a merriness of heart... wholly confident and joyous." \textsuperscript{89} This he called a "resolute confidence", \textsuperscript{90} and a "great confidence". \textsuperscript{91} It is a joyful course, coming from Christmas joy, through Easter joy, Whitsun joy and moving to consummation joy. \textsuperscript{92}

5. The \textit{Parousia} as a \textit{Revelatio}

Although, as we have seen in Section 3, Barth could speak of the future \textit{parousia} and surrounding events as \textit{novum}, these references are qualified by the reality-revelation context of this "time between the times". In other words, this reality is already actualized and merely awaits revelation, and hence the joy as noted in Section 4. Thus the newness of the future \textit{parousia} is seemingly not in its reality but in its revelation. Hence, concerning the one on-going \textit{parousia} of Christ’s resurrection, Holy Spirit and final dénouement, Barth said that there is nothing different that takes place in any of them. \textsuperscript{93} It follows that for one to acknowledge a progress in His coming again so that the last judgment and the creation of a new heaven and a new earth are considered as only future would be to speak too modestly of the once-for-all reality in Jesus Christ. \textsuperscript{94} Rather than this, Barth stressed that although this is the radically, totally and absolutely new coming of Jesus Christ, \textsuperscript{95} that this is only
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so because in a more complete form from the standpoint of revelation.

In many different ways throughout the *Dogmatics*, he emphasised that this universal *parousia* was simply the final revelation unfolded in time of the eternal reality enfolded in Jesus Christ.
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97. "In God's eternal counsel, in His epiphany, and finally in His revelation at the end of the age, He was and is and will be this *totus Christus* - Christ and Christians" (CD 4/2, 60). Jesus Christ is the origin and future of man in the cosmos (2/1, 112). His unveiling is the goal of His way and ours (2/1, 215). Thus eternity is before time, God before creature and therefore the future before the present (1/1, 581). Eternal life in eternal light is thus grounded in Jesus Christ as its origin, theme and content (4/3, 939f).

In this context Barth could speak of the *parousia* as the "eschaton of creation and reconciliation" (4/3, 103) of redemption as the revelation of the meaning of man's creation (2/1, 620), and of the second advent as the "revelation of the creative and reconciling act of God" (3/3, 195).

What is central and therefore determinative for Barth is the fact that it is the revelation of Jesus Christ that is to take place in the *parousia*, and that He will then be revealed as the One He already is (4/4, 198). This involves His revelation as the Fount of our mortal life (4/4, 40), as it will manifest what has already taken place in His life-act (4/3, 715). The actualized reality of reconciliation will be revealed (4/4, 195), the realized salvation will become manifest (2/2, 297), the accomplished redemption will be seen (2/1, 510). Thus the reality of the altered world hastens to its definitive manifestation (4/3, 835). It follows that the *parousia* is not a second reality distinct from a supposed first reality here and now, for this present, hidden worldly reality will then be revealed (4/3, 489). This new world reality is in Jesus Christ (4/3, 715) which is only known now to faith but will then be known to sight.

The community looks forward to this revelation, waiting for Jesus Christ to emerge from His concealment in world occurrence. When the new reality will appear in the *parousia*, then the present form of the world will disappear (4/3, 720). Barth can then speak of the *parousia* as the eternal heavenly form of the alteration of the world which we can only now know in its temporal earthly form (4/1, 328f) and considered that the resurrection of all the dead to be the revelation of the altered creation (4/1, 319). Thus the community moves towards its hidden but realized future (4/2, 625), towards the revelation of the already completed work (4/2, 588), towards the resurrection which is the unveiling of the fact that already its life is hid with God in Christ Jesus (3/2, 295). Hence there is no new turning point in the future *parousia* because there is no new figure to come (3/4, 143). It is this same Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today and forever, who is to come.

His *parousia* will be the revelation of time in Himself (3/4, 581) i.e. the "change of the times accomplished and to be revealed in Jesus Christ" (3/4, 492). In Him nothing is past or only future (1/2, 503). In this sense Barth can speak of the new heaven and new earth as yet to be manifested (4/4, 199), as well as the last judgment cont.
6. The Parousia as Illuminatio

Barth's eternal world of reality above and temporal world of reflection below is also expressed in his "light-darkness" dialectic. Thus the consummating revelation of Jesus Christ can be likened to the rising sun which chases all shadows, to the morning, or rising of the Sun of Righteousness and to man's new beginning in light. This parousia is the dawn of eternal light, which as yet has not irradiated the world. Christians will be translated from darkness into coming light, and it is this eternal light which will be their eternal life, grounded in Jesus Christ as its content. Besides speaking of the parousia in these terms, Barth could also refer to death in the same way. Thus "those whom He calls out of their temporal existence and ministry, He does not set in the darkness of no more being. He rather takes them out of the darkness of present not yet being into the light of His consummating revelation." This eternal light is also eternal truth as it is the eternal Jesus Christ that Barth is speaking about. It is His parousia revelation which will so enlighten the entire world that the darkness of untruth will be banished. Is this the doctrine of apokatastasis? Will all mankind be saved in this final manifestation? Does Barth teach universalism? To this question we now turn.

97. cont.

as yet to be revealed (4/4, 122). As mentioned before (Chapter 5) the cross was the end of the old and the beginning of the new, and it was this reality which was revealed in Christ's resurrection. The reality was total in Jesus Christ in His resurrection, but the revelation there made was but the beginning. It was but the seed from which will become the full visibility of the tree in the universal parousia. Growth in this time between the times (see Chapter 5) is therefore an increasing of revelation and not a development of reality (4/3, 792).
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7. Does Barth Teach Universalism?

Barth categorically denied that he taught universalism, and even stated that *apokatastasis* is not a necessary correlate from Christology. Nevertheless, he also leaves it open concerning whether God will finally save all through His sovereign grace and mercy. But is this not a puzzling paradox as he seemingly is literally negating his first position by the second? This is perhaps the most difficult part of Barth's eschatology. Constantly one is reaching to grasp his thinking only to find it slipping away from reach. Throughout the *Dogmatics* one finds evidence concerning the impossibility of God's failure to save all mankind and yet the actuality of some being lost. One finds paragraphs witnessing to the freedom of God which overrides man's freedom and also others speaking of man's freedom within the sovereignty of God. To complicate matters, one sees the carefully worded logical presentation of the systematic theologian at his best together with the exuberant preacher whose words carry one beyond the dogmatic preciseness into the freer, if less accurate, area of kerygma. There are at least 503 pages in the *Dogmatics* which specifically incline the conclusion towards universalism, but there are also at least 192 which do the very opposite. When we consider the comment of H. R. Mackintosh, that all theological systems ought to be read backwards at least once "since it is in the conclusion that we find the truest index to the whole", we find ourselves with a weighty responsibility to be fair to Barth in this his conclusion. To fail to understand Barth here it would seem is to fail to understand him everywhere, and yet it is so difficult to come really to grips with Barth at this very crucial point. In 1937
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Mackintosh could write that "Barth has not made things easy for his critics." This is still as true today, especially when considering this question of universalism.

Our method of presentation is as follows: (1) A brief consideration of the positions of Calvin and Schleiermacher as the broad background over-against which to consider Barth's. This could be considered as the external context to Barth's presentation. (2) A brief notation of Barth's own given guidelines which form the internal context to his position. (3) We will then present both aspects of Barth's thinking on the question, which at times seem completely contradictory. (4) Finally, with all the material before us, we shall then make an evaluation which will attempt to show that behind the problems which Barth's presentation raises there apparently lies the cause in his God-enclosed understanding of the real humanity of Jesus Christ.

a. External Context - Calvin's Position

Although Calvin does refer to the divine decree in the singular, he was really concerned with the praedestinatio duplex that results in the divine fore-ordination of all men. These two decrees are thought of as hidden or secret in the immutable sovereign will of God into which it is not lawful to pry. Nevertheless, he interpreted these decrees as one to redemption and one to damnation, a dividing of mankind not according
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to merit but according to God's so-called pleasure. Both groups are raised up to display God's glory, and the fact that some are chosen for redemption is due to God's mercy. Thus election is "special" and not general, and faith is a "singular" pledge. Although Calvin could speak of Jesus Christ as the mirror of our election he also, and seemingly primarily, read back into the hidden counsel of God the two groups of mankind revealed in the Word of God. These two groups occurring in such comparisons as the sheep and the goats, the wheat and the tares, and the wise and the foolish virings, etc. Calvin's starting point and criterion was therefore not Jesus Christ alone as the divine election of all mankind, who is the Word of God revealing the non-hidden one universal decree. This was to be Barth's correction. Unlike Barth's eternal election as the living movement of God, Calvin's was perhaps more of a determinist view of election.

Although Calvin could quote Rom. 11:32.5, "God concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all", he did not take the latter part seriously. Likewise his quoting Heb. 2:9, "he tasteth death for every man", had no control over his contrary presentation. Neither did reference to God giving His Son in love for the world (Rom. 8) nor that
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118. The division of mankind into two separate groups (elect and reprobate) is thought of in the final eschatological sense, having seemingly been read from the Word of God where such a final separation is witnessed to, and then this fact has apparently been read back into the sovereign will of God as two separate eternal decrees. Although Calvin rejected prescience and taught sovereign will instead, this understanding of it seems nevertheless to have originated from the witness in the word to the prescience of God.

119. Thus instead of considering election well over half way through his system as Calvin did (3.24 - the last but one chapter of Bk. 3) Barth considered it in the heart of his doctrine of God which followed the prolegomena (see CD 2/2, 3-506, "The Election of God").
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Christ suffered for "the salvation of the human race," have definitive determination. This is not to say that he did not have concern that the mercy of God be justly presented. In fact he commended as "admirable" the Roman Bishop Leo's statement concerning all being crucified, buried and raised in Jesus Christ. He also rightly attacked the restrictions of God's mercy as sponsored by the Schoolmen, Servetus and the Anabaptists, Catholic priests and "inhuman philosophy". He quoted Ezekiel 18:21, "when the wicked shall turn away from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, he shall not die", stating that "he who presumes to add to this declaration binds not sins, but the mercy of God". Again he rejected such restrictions upon the mercy of God saying, "they think, indeed, that they are most fully persuaded of the divine mercy, but they confine it within too narrow limits". However, must not his own charge in the end be made against himself, for although he could speak of a universal overruling providence, a universal call, and a universal promise his two decrees somewhat abstracted from Christology resulted in no mention anywhere of universal redemption?

Has Calvin's inability to think predestination christologically
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134. In Institutes, 3.24.5 we find the correct starting point for this doctrine of election, which unfortunately was not determinative in Calvin's Institutes - "But if we are elected in him, we cannot find the certainty of our election in ourselves; and not even in God the Father, if we look at him apart from the Son. Christ, then is the mirror in which we ought, and in which, without deception, we may contemplate our election". This precise insight, not normative for Calvin's system, became so for Barth's Dogmatics.
135. Rather than universal redemption, there is evidence of its being confined. Thus evangelism in the time of Israel and in that of the cont./
to its ultimate conclusion (inspite of so much marvellous material to
the contrary in the Institutes) caused him to do grave injustice to the
mercy of God? He rightly attacked the merit-works of Catholicism as unjust
to the mercy of God, only seemingly to turn round to bring to this mercy
equal injustice by limiting it to an arbitrarily chosen few. The conclu-
sion of his thinking led to blaming man as the "evident cause" of
damnation but only under the sovereign will of God's ordination in which
he placed the "hidden cause". He considered, therefore, that destruction
was caused by the secret counsel of God, for God gives the external
invitation without giving the internal efficacy of grace, the Holy Spirit
of regeneration, to those who will be damned. Not only, at His own
pleasure, did God arrange Adam's fall, and arms the devil for conflict;
but also holds man's conversion in His own hands, giving to some a heart
of stone and to others a heart of flesh. Then "why should God blame
men for things the necessity of which he has imposed by his own predesti-
nation?" The evident paradox in Calvin's theology is his purpose to
overthrow human merit by resting election solely upon the mercy of God,
exhorting that there be prayers offered for all men and stating that
"God enjoins us to be merciful even to the unworthy;" and yet inspite
of all these promising pointers in the right direction, he apparently ends
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Church is seemingly restricted. Eg. Was it not restrictive to
consider the office of evangelist as "extraordinary because it has
no place in churches duly constituted"? (Institutes, 4.3.4). Was it
not also restrictive to consider that to Israel alone "he confined
the covenant of his grace" so that other nations were merely "allowed
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word"? (Ibid. 2.11.11.)
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up by imposing a greater restriction on God's mercy (only the few elected) than upon the mercy man is to show (to all).

b. External Context - Schleiermacher's Position

It is to the credit of Schleiermacher that he rejected the double predestination of Calvin. Although, in his system, he did make references to decrees, he nevertheless presented "a single divine fore-ordination, according to which the totality of the new creation is called into being out of the general mass of the human race". Rather than Calvin's fore-ordination which "passed over some" (see Institutes 3.23.1) Schleiermacher put it this way,

"Only in this limited sense, therefore - that is, only at each point where we can make a comparison between those laid hold of by sanctification and those not yet laid hold of - ought we to say that God omits or passes over some, and that He rejects those He passes over, and hence that election always and only appears with reprobation as its foil." 148

Obviously with Calvin in mind, he spoke out against ideas of divine arbitrariness or caprice and therefore against any foreordination to reprobation. Rather, there is one undivided eternal divine decree, which is universal; an election rooted in the divine government of the world.

Schleiermacher went beyond the "divided humanity" of Calvin's theology, to present the "solidarity" of all men (a term Barth was to use). This came under the umbrella of God's world government in which everything
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conditions everything else. This reciprocal activity or influence between the world and individuals was due to each individual being a constituent part of the whole. Included is a universal causality, both eternal and temporal, with a universal interrelatedness of nature, and also an interdependence of nature, with world dependence upon God, involving both the evil and the good. Thus, like Calvin, he considered that evil was ordained by God, not evil in itself, but in relation to the good. Thus God willed sin, through His divine causality. Even though he admitted that it was strictly true that God did not create sin, yet its reality was due to the commanding and not the efficient will (i.e. creating will) of God; and thus, he concluded that God cannot
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the world wars shook nineteenth century man's optimism, yet Teilhard de Chardin, for one, could speak of the atomic bomb and man's omnipotence (FCM 145-148) so that man must now assist in his own genesis (FCM 150) for there is an "anthropogenesis" within a "cosmogenesis" (FCM 274) emerging to the "ultra-human" (FCM 273) and to the "collectivisation of mankind" (FCM 131-134) when there will be but "one single consciousness" (FCM 321). Is this not to some degree the same as Schleiermacher's finitatem capax infiniti and consciousness development emphases? There was no parousia for Schleiermacher, but he, like Teilhard de Chardin, had a natural teleology. Thus the latter wrote, "the parousia will be realised in a creation that has been taken to the climax of its capacity for union" (FCM 322). At least both Schleiermacher and Teilhard de Chardin could speak of the totality of mankind or of its universal unification (see FCM 323). By contrast, Barth's teleology moved towards and from Jesus Christ as the totus Christus with an almost inevitable universalism (see Chapter 4 above and Sections c. to h. below). In this context, unlike Teilhard de Chardin, he did not consider an identity between man's omnipotence and the atomic bomb but spoke of it as "atomic sin" for "all the elements of confusio hominum meet at this point" (CD 4/3, 701).
be thought of as the author of sin in the same sense as that in which He is the Author of redemption. Although he could speak of God's ordaining man's revolt, sin is only a mere defect, a disturbance of nature, like the mere "change for the worse" of the Tridentine Decrees. Sin was therefore a part of the mutual interaction of the part to the whole and the whole to the part, and therefore between the good and the evil, and was thus for advancement.

Repeatedly throughout his system he refers to development of the God-consciousness, which is destined finally to be universal. With this contemporary evolutionary world view presupposition (or divine omnicausality - which Barth was to reject) he moved from this general starting point towards a Christology. Thus he could write of God that "in willing Himself, willing the world is already included." The world is thus good (another phrase adopted by Barth in his later Dogmatics) for although there is a universal sinfulness and corporate guilt, there is a universal need of redemption which has been answered by the activity of Christ which extends to all mankind. Thus, unlike Calvin, Schleiermacher could speak of the "universality of redemption" for redemption is universally and completely accomplished in Jesus Christ, (another truth taught later by Barth). To Schleiermacher this meant that all men were placed in relation to the Redeemer, as Christ came to possess an "absolutely powerful God consciousness" which through his influence and communication enriched human nature as a whole. He was indeed the
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completion of creation, and as such the completion of redemption. Schleiermacher dismissed the radical distinction (in the final sense) between the elected church and the reprobate world, speaking of it as a "hampering antithesis". Whereas Calvin could write that "the whole world no longer belongs to its Creator...he leaves the world to the destruction to which it is doomed," and therefore turned his attention from world government proper to primary concentration upon God in His body the Church, Schleiermacher went back to Luther's "simul peccator et iustus" in repeatedly showing that there is both the consciousness of sin and the consciousness of grace within the self-consciousness. He could even say that there is a continuous existence of the God-consciousness in every individual, and yet that no Christian is free from universal sinfulness. This solidarity with those not justified caused Schleiermacher to consider the world that part of the human race which is "not yet" church. Consequently, far from causing a dichotomy between them, Christians found within their self-consciousness a "race consciousness" or "universalised self-consciousness" termed a "world consciousness". (This was to be Barth's position, but he was to put it in a christological context, with Christians being both the one they are in Christ (elected) and yet also still the one that has been overcome in Christ (rejected).

Although overcoming part of Calvin's problem, Schleiermacher added
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192. Thus Calvin wrote, "He takes care of the whole human race, but is especially vigilant in governing the church, which he favours with a closer inspection" (1.17.1). He spoke of God choosing the Church for His abode (1.17.6), speaks of salvation extending from the head to the whole body (2.6.3) and mentioned that the Triplex munus was for "defending the church" (2.15.5).
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his share to the distortion. Thus his Christ was only quantitatively different from other men, was the one man in the natural development of the \textit{finitas supax infinita} to take in the absolute presence of the God-consciousness which through a prolongation of His activities is gradually being communicated to all mankind, awakening, evoking, stimulating and impressing them with an all-pervading influence. Throughout his system the word 'totality' appears in different contexts. It is the teleological movement from creation to its completion in Christ, and on through the prolongation of His influence which in the common spirit in the corporate community is to become the \textit{totality} of mankind. This makes universalism a necessity, reminiscent of Augustine's "irresistible grace."

c. Tentative Statement of Barth's Advancement over the External Context

It is in Barth's Christology where the most important advance was made over the positions of Calvin and Schleiermacher. Even though Calvin has the same objective Christology with Jesus Christ as the mirror of our election, it is perhaps fair to say that this was not so all controlling an emphasis in the outworking of election for mankind in Calvin's \textit{Institutes} as in Barth's \textit{Dogmatics}. Barth's advance over both Calvin and Schleiermacher could perhaps most fairly be put as follows. Whereas Calvin could speak with definiteness concerning a \textit{divided humanity} in the eternal decrees, and Schleiermacher could speak with full assurance about a \textit{totality} of mankind in the final development of the God-consciousness, Barth placed his only confidence in the revelation of Jesus Christ, and thus in \textit{objective universalism}. Or looked at from the christological viewpoint, whereas Calvin seemingly at times looked \textit{passed} the God-man to a \textit{Deus absconditus} who is not really God at all, and whereas Schleiermacher looked \textit{passed} the God-man to a developed-man who was not really God at
all, Barth looked only to the God-man to the Deus revelatus who is really God. Perhaps, therefore, it would be correct to view Barth's position as somewhere between the "divided humanity" of Calvin and the "totality of humanity" of Schleiermacher.

Although we would submit that Barth's christological starting point has in one respect given him an advance over Calvin and Schleiermacher, this is only one side of the question. On the other side we must also see that it was Barth's Christology which finally makes his presentation on this question unacceptable. Simply put, whereas Schleiermacher had a Jesus who was only man with a universal influence to evoke total salvation of all mankind; Barth by complete contrast has a Jesus Christ (God and man) who was Redeemer only through God, and as the totus Christus was the actualization of objective universalism. Calvin by contrast had in Jesus Christ not only the vere Deus (in contrast with Schleiermacher) but the vere Homo as man redeeming man through His human life in our place (in contrast with Barth). If Schleiermacher and Barth can to some degree be considered as correcting Calvin's one-sided predestination, then Calvin's Christology as far as the how of "objective universalism" is concerned can also be considered (anachronistically) as correcting Schleiermacher and Barth's opposite one-sided emphasis on man and God respectively. Barth's strength over Calvin and Schleiermacher is that in Jesus Christ as God and man is "objective universalism" realized, and as such is the central and normative or determinative fact in his presentation. But, Barth's weakness lies squarely in how Jesus Christ became this "objective universalism" for all
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200. It should be noted that both Calvin and Barth have a "double predestination", Calvin in the two groups of mankind as the elected and the rejected; and Barth in the one Jesus Christ who was both the elected and the rejected (eg. see CD 2/2, 352f).
mankind. It is here that Calvin's understanding of the way redemption was obtained would seem to be more correct than Barth's.

d. Internal Context - the "Time Between the Times"

Tentatively, above, we have noted that Barth's position is one of objective universalism. This has yet to be spelled out, but now in continuing this prior introduction on the context to his presentation we come to note that objective universalism was not his final word. In other words, Barth makes it very clear in his *Dogmatics* that the reason why the all important resurrection parousia was not the ultimate parousia, and therefore why this "time between the times" has been given by God, is so that man can have an opportunity to respond to God. Barth specifically said that God does not wish to go over the head of man, to complete the work of the Kingdom without him, to have only an objectively realized Kingdom without a subjective realization of it. 201 This is very promising indeed, for it seems to suggest that although Jesus Christ is the new man for all men above, that nevertheless He needs to become the new man in men below for salvation to be actualized within men in history. Such a specific distinction between objective universalism above and the subjective non-universalism below would have saved Barth from the trouble that his presentation has given to his own theology and to those who try to interpret it. But, as we saw in the previous chapter, his *actus purus* pneumatology without any ontological reality in man makes the only purpose of this "time between the times" a time for revelation rather than for a creating within man the subjective reality of his objective justification and sanctification. This means that the difference between men below is only *noetic*, i.e. having to do with knowledge. 202 Some know about their new human
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reality being hid with God in Christ above whereas others do not. This
time is given to allow for this awakening and enlightening to take place.
This entails a corresponding response to and reflection of this reality
in man, giving man a part with and under the Holy Spirit in this all-
absorbing revelation (munus propheticum) to those who yet do not know of
it. Although admitting that Barth does give room for human response, one
has to go on to ask how significant such a response is if it has no ontolo-

gical results, i.e. no eschatological firstfruits to prepare for the
ultimate parousia? If knowledge alone divides man below, then why could
not the resurrection have been sufficient for giving that knowledge to
all men, as the apostles soon took the resurrection message to the entire
then known world; or if such a knowledge is all that is indicated by the
"time between the times" then why is vocation so very important after all
when God Himself will make a universal revelation for the knowledge of all
men in his ultimate universal coming in the final parousia? In fact, if
knowledge is the only division between men below, does it not logically
follow that this division will be no more at the final parousia revelation
and that all men will then be saved? In other words, would not an inclu-

dion of the ontological preparation for Christ's final advent have pro-
tected Barth from the charge of universalism?

e. Internal Context - Two Boundaries Stated

As we shall see, the absence of a real ontological reality in man as
a necessary preparation under the Holy Spirit for the final coming of
Jesus Christ will be the determinative factor in our interpretation of
Barth on this question. Although we have said that this lays him unpro-
tectedly open to the charge of universalism we must now go on to see that
he has at least tried to stake out definite safeguards, which we are bound
to say - in the light of the section above - are insufficient. These
safeguards are in the form of two boundaries to his presentation, i.e. 
(1) a limit which steered him away (he thought) from a cheap universalism, and (2) an openness which directed him (without foundation) to hope in a genuine universalism. We now come to briefly present these.

(1) A Limit - Grace is Dear not Cheap

"grace is 'dear' and not 'cheap'...There is no doctrine more dangerous than the Christian doctrine of the atonement, it does indeed make 'wild and careless folk (heid. Cat. qu 64), if we do not consider it with this warning in view. The fact that it speaks of God making good what we have spoiled does not mean that we can call evil good (unless we would also call good evil). All our thinking and all that we say on this matter must be disciplined by an observation of this limit, and a refusal to transgress it in any circumstances, sense or direction." 203

There are four classical statements in the *Dogmatics* concerning this "dear" grace, which not only indicate the precise limits involved, but also the openness. Here we see Barth, the systematic theologian, thinking out from his christological reference with measured words,

"Caution is demanded. We say too much if we try to deduce from the overcoming which has come to me in Jesus Christ that it has taken place in me...It is a poor theology that grasps at equality with Jesus Christ - a perfectionism which will not accept any distinction between me and Him. But we say too little if we allow and accept the overcoming of my pride and fall which has taken place in Him, but are then acquiescent and content that it should not take place in me...It is a poor theology that persists in the inequality between me and Jesus Christ - a pious cushion which is content to maintain the distinction from Him." 204

This "equality - inequality" comparison is repeated in a "similarity - dissimilarity" contrast with equally well chosen words. 205 It is in such statements as those given that one has to continually ask himself if he has really understood Barth, if he really is meaning what the words seem to imply, if these are in fact the guidelines for his presentation, if
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they are consistent with the context in which they are given? It should be noted that these all appear in KD 4/1 where Jesus Christ is the sole subjectivity of the Kingdom reality with no ontological realization in man (as seen in the previous chapter), and therefore they must be qualified accordingly. Thus, again, the key to our interpretation must be this lack of ontological reality.

(2) An Openness - Grace is Free to Remove the Final Threat

Barth considered the other limit as another aspect of the same grace. Thus, if the limit against cheap grace could be considered as the negative limit, then the nature of grace as openness could be considered as the positive limit. Put another way, although grace is dear and not cheap, and man must therefore observe the limit or difference between a genuine grace and a cheap grace, Barth now comes to include the fact that this genuine grace is free grace and therefore God is the only One who will determine how many will be included within the final reality of dear grace without it being changed to cheap grace.

"It is His concern what is to be the final extent of the circle. If we are to respect the freedom of divine grace, we cannot venture the statement that it must and will finally be coincident with the world of man as such (as in the doctrine of so-called apokatastasis). No such right or necessity can legitimately be deduced. Just as the gracious God does not need to elect or call any single man, so He does not need to elect or call all mankind. His election and calling do not give rise to any historical metaphysics, but only to the necessity of attesting them on the ground that they have taken place in Jesus Christ and His community. But, again, in grateful recognition of the grace of the divine freedom we cannot venture the opposite statement that there cannot and will not be this final opening up and enlargement of the circle of election and calling... We avoid both these statements, for they are both abstract and therefore cannot be any part of the message of Christ, but only formal conclusions without any actual substance." 206

Barth's basic presupposition is made clear in the following sentence.
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"there is no good reason why we should forbid ourselves, or be forbidden, openness to the possibility that in the reality of God and man in Jesus Christ there is contained much more than we might expect and therefore the supremely unexpected withdrawal of that final threat." 207 Although there is to be no counting on this as a claim, from man's side; Barth is clear that God is sovereign and free and thus the unexpected can even eventuate, from God's side. Throughout his Dogmatics Barth has consistently spoken of the sovereign freedom of God which puts man in his proper dependent, receiving and grateful position. But, as right as this emphasis is against man's supposed usurped sovereignty in anthropocentric systems of so-called theology, we submit that Barth has overstepped the proper limits here. In other words, the very sovereignty of God that he is anxious to defend he has here violated, no doubt unwittingly, but nevertheless very really. Simply put, God has already acted in His sovereignty to tell man in His condescending grace what will be the outcome of salvation. He has not told us who will be saved but what kind of person, and that there will be two groups - the saved and the lost. Barth's seeming inability to do justice to the already given sovereign revelation of God in the Bible on this question is related to his refusal to accept seriously the ontological reality in man as preparation for the final parousia. In other words, Barth was afraid of givenness either in the biblical revelation or in the heart of man. His one-sided actus purus emphasis makes of all men equally simul iustus et peccator; 208 so that just as all men are the same in Jesus Christ
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208. Barth's position is not Calvin's "either-or", but a "both-and". Thus Christians are "simul (totus) iustus, simul (totus) peccator" (CD 4/2, 572) because their past is totus peccator and their future is totus iustus and both are present (4/1, 596). This is so because both are present in Jesus Christ. Thus whilst He is the "pure present" as our totus iustus (4/1, 603) the community below is still the communio peccatorum (4/2, 642), for the community of Ephes. 4:12f is absolutely cont./
above, so they are all the same in the world below as far as ontological reality is concerned. \(^{209}\) Men's ontological reality is only above. Thus Barth could not accept seriously the biblical witness that speaks of two groups now or in the \(\text{parousia}\), and therefore seemingly found a way out by claiming that God is free and may yet choose to save all. As G. W. Bromiley rightly stated,

"What Barth fails to see is that to deny the possibility of the salvation of all is no infringement of the divine sovereignty if God Himself has made it plain that all will not be saved. But on any reading this is surely the Bible's teaching. We may not know who will be saved, or how many, but we do know that there will be the lost as well as the saved. Hence the divine sovereignty cannot be involved in favor of a state of suspense on this matter. Unless Barth is persuaded, and can show, that the biblical data are different, his hesitation here is a violation of his own scripture principle. To use an admittedly biblical doctrine of divine freedom to contradict evident biblical data is an illustration of the arbitrary and illegitimate dogmatic thinking which elsewhere Barth rightly deplores. And it casts a sinister shadow over what is from many angles an admirable and forceful statement of the divine reconciliation in and through Jesus Christ." \(^{210}\)

---
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future (4/2, 625). Thus a Christian is in process of becoming a totally new man in his totality as the old man of yesterday (4/2, 571). This is what is called the forward pointing \(\text{totus iustus}\) and the backward pointing \(\text{totus peccator}\) (4/1, 602). This removes the ontological reality from time to above time (in Jesus Christ) and to the end of time (in \(\text{parousia}\) revelation of Jesus Christ). With this we note that since Christ there is not the "lost- not lost" division of man (4/2, 327f) for now man is not lost (4/2, 397) as the lost man was destroyed in Christ on the cross (4/2, 400). However, every Christian is a Christian and a non-Christian (4/2, 497) as saints especially are sinners (4/2, 586), and wicked rascals (4/2, 666).

209. Cf. CD 4/3, 342: "it is only with one foot, and perhaps only with out toe-nails, that we are on solid ground, but that for the rest we dangle over the abyss in daredevil acrobats. This will not do. But it is what we do. We cannot be Christians and non-Christians. But we are...it may be that in fact we are far more virulently and intensively non-Christians than Christians...our real distinction from non-Christians will consist in the fact that we know that Jesus Christ Himself, and He alone, is our hope as well as theirs...He alone is the perfect Christian, but that He really is this, and is it in our place."
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To conclude this introduction which is only looking at the context of the presentation to follow, we should summarize by submitting that Barth's exclusive objective universalism in Jesus Christ is both his strength and weakness on this question. The former is seen in his improved starting point over that of Calvin and Schleiermacher (as before mentioned), but its weakness is that Barth remained only at this starting point, never following the biblical witness to the creative work of the Holy Spirit who subjectively realizes in some men below the ontological reality that is already there in Jesus Christ above. It is this present eschatological reality dwelling in man that is overlooked and thus the final eschatological conclusion is incorrect. What is involved here is the now familiar problem of not taking seriously the humanity of Jesus Christ as a real ontological appropriation of God's grace and thus normative for the eschatological preparation for other men. His sole reality in, because sole subjectivity of, Jesus Christ above overlooked the equal reality of the beneficia Christi, imitatio Christi, and participatio Christi involved in the ontological subjective realization in men below.

f. Barth's Objective Universalism

Objective universalism is another way of saying sole-subjectivity of Christ when realizing that no subjective ontological reality is included. It is also another way of saying God acted solely as God, which does not give the act of the human Jesus its proper place. It is these facts we must keep in mind whilst noting some of the characteristic things Barth said concerning this reality above and what it means for those below.

In this section, therefore, Barth is not speaking from the standpoint of some abstract future, but from a present, though hidden, reality. 211 He
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speaks from the position where God has already overtaken all men and
taken their place in Jesus Christ.\textsuperscript{212} He speaks from (not towards)
"universal atonement" as it is already an event in Him.\textsuperscript{213} His viewpoint
is exactly the same as his consideration of ecumenism - a speaking from
(not towards) its actualization in Jesus Christ. Consequently, he speaks
of the new man for all men, the one who has passed from the rejection of
the cross to the acceptance of the resurrection. This is all mankind in
Him which has been crucified and risen as the new humanity. Therefore
rejection cannot again become the affair of man,\textsuperscript{214} for "by permitting the
life of the rejected man to be the life of His own Son, God has made such
a life objectively impossible for all others."\textsuperscript{215} He alone is the rejected
man.\textsuperscript{216} Apart from Him, "there is none who can be consumed by the fire of
His love which is the wrath of God."\textsuperscript{217} "God has never forsaken, and does
not and will not forsake any man as He forsook this man."\textsuperscript{218} From this
viewpoint, Barth affirmed that godlessness, or sin, is an ontological
impossibility.\textsuperscript{219} Even though it does occur, the sinner is still the good
creation of God.\textsuperscript{220} This new man for all men cannot be altered by our
inhumanity. God will not go behind this event and undo the incarnation-
resurrection. Man may become godless, but God will never become manless.\textsuperscript{221}
In Him God has fully confirmed Himself as Creator,\textsuperscript{222} not being against the
creature, but absolutely and utterly for it.\textsuperscript{223} Thus "every other choice
but obedience is cut off...so majestic and penetrative is the call of Jesus
Christ that when it is heard as such, when we know and discern that it is
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He who calls us, it is **irresistible**. Therefore, "there is no such thing as a future that is dark". In Him, "He will not cease to be ours, as we cannot cease to be His." In Him God does not abandon the covenant even in the face of covenant breakers, for "even where man does not keep the command, the command keeps man." In Him, irrespective of our success or failure, He justifies, sanctifies and glorifies us. These are not required of us. In Him, we cannot cease to be the covenant-partner, because "God will not be unfaithful either to himself or to man. He will not throw men over. He will not withdraw what He has given." Human refusal "cannot alter in the least what the man Jesus is for us and for all men". In Him there is only one future intimated to man, the beginning, direction and end of the Christian's course has already been fixed, and they cannot reverse it because they are deprived of all possibilities but one. Thus the Christian has freedom to hope unconditionally and uninterruptedly as the definitive decision has already been reached, his righteousness in Jesus Christ completely overwhelms his own, so that "what he is in and of himself has already been excluded, superseded, destroyed and removed by what he is in and of Jesus Christ; that it is now behind him and therefore cannot have any true power over his present; that it belongs wholly to the past and has fallen from him like a withered leaf." This is why Barth said,

"it is the unbelief of Lot's wife to try to look back and again reckon or even trifle with the reality or the possibility of damnation and death. For this is not a serious calculation but a wanton trifling. It can only be a false Christian earnestness which causes a man to

---
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suspend his faith as it were, to lay aside for a moment the decision about his salvation contained in God's revelation, and to place himself at the critical point where it is seen that the end of one way is eternal glory and of the other way everlasting fire. All heathen eschatology thinks in this symmetrical way, but Scripture never puts these two ways before our eyes. We are not called by its summons to faith to stand at this critical point."

Here Barth is anxious that Christians do not take their eyes from Jesus Christ as their only goal. To do so would be unbelief. With this we agree, but could not his example of Lot's wife be used against him? Rightly, he stated that her sin was unbelief, and was so because she evidently *doubted what God had revealed* (i.e. that Sodom would be destroyed, Gen. 19:15-26). But God has also revealed that there will be people destroyed at His "parousia, that there are two goals - one for the true Christian and one for those who oppose Him. To doubt this destruction is surely to doubt as Lot's wife did. It was not good enough when Barth looked back from the destruction of the wicked as given in John's Revelation, saying that it is "not a very evangelical conclusion". As Calvin said concerning Lot's wife, "the desire of looking back proceeded from incredulity; and no greater injury can be done to God, than when credit is denied to his word." Although Christians look for Jesus Christ and therefore hope, does not Christian eschatology include destruction for those who refuse to accept such a future?

Barth thought that the Word of God in Jesus Christ was the only sovereign revelation made by God. Thus he could say,

"Our reference is to the Word spoken by Jesus Christ, to His present declaration concerning these and similar presuppositions which have been done away in and with His existence, concerning the future which is blocked up in His person and work for all those who still try to live by such presuppositions."
It is His being as God's act in humanity that reveals "objective universalism" which has made any other future possibility impossible. Again this would seemingly lead inevitably to apokatastasis. Barth only looked to the existence of Jesus Christ as the Word and therefore at times seemingly found the greatest difficulty to take the words of Christ aijfpig? de'la lettre. In a sense this is to separate the being of Jesus Christ from His acts, i.e. from his act of prediction, his foreknowledge. Is not Barth here overlooking the foreknowledge of Jesus Christ relative to what will happen at the parousia (two groups, sheep and goats, wheat and tares, wise and foolish virgins etc.) whilst concentrating solely on the reality of His Being? Would not a proper understanding of the humanity of Christ - the role of His human being in redemption, have saved him from this divorce?

Is it good enough to speak of the righteousness of Jesus Christ overwhelming that of man? Is it good enough to speak of man's old nature as now having no more power over him? This is true for the man Jesus Christ but is it necessarily true for every other man? If it is, would not universalism be inevitable? Of course it is true for the genuine follower of Christ who depends upon Christ's righteousness as His own, but is it not true that even such a one can still choose against God at some later time? If he could not, would not temptations to him be meaningless and grace irresistible? Would not these problems have been removed if Barth had presented the humanity of Christ in such a way that as man he made decisions for the Father and overcome temptations? Is He not, therefore, more than the content of objective universalism because also the criterion concerning how it can become subjectively real in other men?

(1) Conquering Grace, or the Sovereign Freedom of God

Looking from this accomplished victory of grace, and therefore from
actualized sovereign freedom and will of God in Jesus Christ the new man for all men, Barth considered that "What God has created He will also uphold, and sooner or later control by His grace." God has the power to deprive man of recourse to his own freedom or weakness. He can will to restrict man's will, and can "weaken, break and finally destroy it. He actually does this. And when He does, obedience may not be withheld from Him." Jesus Christ "does not allow Himself to be foiled in this far-reaching purpose for man by the opposition of man." The goal of reconciliation is the "complete conversion of the world to Him." Therefore, all human opposition can never be more than a shadow dispersing before the light. Of this non-Christian resistance, Barth considered that "their blindness and deafness still stand like a dam against the surging and mounting stream. But the stream is too strong and the dam too weak for us to be able reasonably to expect anything but the collapse of the dam and the onrush of the waters. In this sense Jesus Christ is the hope even of these non Christians." 

"He and not the resisting element in man will finally conquer. As the living One, the Risen from the dead, He is not only Victor at the beginning but will also be at the end... unconditional certainty of the final victory which is still awaited but which comes relentlessly and irresistibly." This is all rooted in the fact that the unconditional atonement has been accomplished in Jesus Christ who has therefore an "inescapable and definitive claim." 

"The required conformity of our action with the gracious action of God is that we accept the fact that our opposition is already met, that a term has already been set to it, that it has already been liquidated by what God has done."
This inevitable victory of sovereign grace is the logical result on the subjective side of Earth's eternal victory of sovereign grace in Jesus Christ the objective side. Barth's emphasis on God's act in Jesus Christ, and as such a real victory before the fight began is his incorrect basic presupposition in these statements which seemingly bespeak of irresistible grace. Again, if Barth had accepted the accomplished redemption of humanity through the act of the man Jesus, it would have radically altered his teaching on the subjective side of redemption. These statements all reflect the fact that Barth did not do justice to the humanity of Jesus Christ as the criterion for other men's redemption as well as being the content of it as previously stated. This, we submit, is the crucial weakness of Barth's theology, which effects it throughout.

(2) The Gospel is only Good News - is the New Man for all Men.

This exclusive concentration on the new man for all men resulted in Barth's inclusive concern for all men. Such was basic to his understanding of the community's vocational outreach to the world, for

"if we do not look exclusively to Jesus Christ and therefore to God we lose the capacity on this basis to think inclusively." 249

Again, therefore, his starting point was from the actualized reality in Jesus Christ and not just towards its future reality. The world is already changed in Him, and not just to be changed. 250 All men, whether they know it or not, and whatever their attitude to it, are already in Him the new humanity. 251 This has profound implications for evangelism. Barth holds together the utter solidarity of all men as sinners and the unique salvation of all men as reconciled in the life-act of Jesus Christ. All men - with none excluded - were hopelessly bound by sin, but all men - with none

249. CD 4/1, 58. Cf. 350, 354; 4/2, 274.
250. CD 1/2, 423
251. CD 3/4, 654; 4/2, 275, 335.
excluded - are wondrously liberated by Him. This is the surprising good news, the unexpected gospel that He is the new man for all men. It is this sheer fact of grace that rings through the pages of the *Dogmatics* with its renewing hope. It is this fact in Jesus Christ that Barth came back to repeatedly, never tiring to think out from its actuality. It is the very heartbeat of the *Dogmatics*. It is in these passages where the preacher Barth shines through the professor, sometimes going beyond systematic language to the language of the pulpit. It is here, as G. H. Clark has pointed out, that "in reading Barth, the preacher-professor, it is sometimes difficult, very difficult, to distinguish what is precise from what is exuberant."\(^{252}\)

In opposition to immanental and existential theologies, for Barth, the Christian is not the centre, but only the circumference, and as such "he belongs to the reconciliation of the world with God."\(^{253}\) The order of presentation is world, community and finally the Christian,\(^{254}\) embraced as such in the being and action of Jesus Christ.\(^{255}\) It was for the world that He was born, lived and died.\(^{256}\) (In contrast with Calvin\(^ {257} \)) his was and is a cosmic, all-inclusive burden, and the community as His body cannot have less of a purpose in its vocation to and for the world.\(^ {258} \) (In contrast with Calvin\(^ {259} \)) it must first of all realize its complete solidarity with the world. The community was elected through His rejection, and cannot help but hope the same for others.\(^ {260} \) It knows that it cannot boast of its being in Him, for "the better can have a part in Him only in the most loyal solidarity with the worse."\(^ {261} \) It knows (in contrast with
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Calvin and in agreement with Schleiermacher) of no divisions between the
good and bad, elect and reprobate, saved and lost, but only in a relative
way considers one difference between Christians and non-Christians as
one of assured knowledge.  

Another difference concerns the non-Christian as one yet to be
called (as with Schleiermacher) and the Christian as one yet to be re-
called, for the latter is ever called anew. Rather than conformity this solidarity sees the difference between the community and the world in
terms of the former being representatively and typically for the latter as
its firstfruits and precursors. As such its business is not to deter-
mine who are the elect and who the rejected, for it points in a different
direction (i.e. from a different direction) where all are elected already.
It knows that such judgment is taken out of its hands for God is the
only one who knows what is in man, is the only one who knows between good
and evil.  

"He thinks he sits on a high throne, but in reality
he sits on a child's stool, blowing his little trumpet,
 cracking his little whip, pointing with frightful
seriousness his little finger, while all the time
nothing happens that really matters."  

It is only the body and not the head. It therefore turns away from His
task to its own task - to make Him known as the new man for all men, the
man judged for them.

It speaks only of Jesus Christ as God's "yes" to man, and not of a
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"no", or a "yes or no"; having "no freedom to obscure the great Yes by an arbitrary Yes-But. There is no freedom either to begin or end otherwise than with the goodness of God." It knows then that the non-Christian's position is untenable, having been already transcended in Him, and so points to the door open for all. It is therefore "absolutely open" in respect of all other men, having a "genuinely unlimited openness" to all non-Christians.

Therefore the community is called to hope for all men, knowing that there is none who might not become a Christian. It must proclaim to the world and all men - "Not lost". This is an "ontological declaration" about every man, a genuine apostolic witness. Consequently, the community is not an end in itself. It must not pass by like the priest and the Levite, but hear the Macedonian call that the world is giving. Thus, "coming from the table of the Lord, it cannot fail to follow His example and sit down at table with the rest, with all sinners."

This vocational emphasis in the Dogmatics is true to the Gospel outreach found in the New Testament. The community goes forth with only one gospel, i.e. the good news that all men are already objectively saved in Jesus Christ, a fact that not only makes all man-made divisions absurd, but sends the community forth to all the world to spread the good news to Jew and Gentile. It breaks down every temporal man-made boundary whether national, racial, ecclesiastical, social etc. for all are already made one in the eternal Jesus Christ. This emphasis is a positive contribution to the motive for the Church's vocation to serve in a desperately needy world.
It must be said that Barth’s vocational nature in his objective universalism is certainly a welcome advance over Calvin’s non-vocational, divided-humanity, position.

g. Barth’s Subjective Realization of the Objective Universalism

Barth stated that if “objective universalism” had been forced upon man whether he wanted to subjectively accept it or not, this would have been a "godless grace", "brutal grace", and "abstract grace". Turning from such non-grace, he spoke rather of this post-resurrection period as the "time of grace". Therefore from this christological viewpoint, we are again concerned with the munus propheticum of Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit, but this time from the standpoint of man’s response to the awakening revelation of the "realized kingdom", or "objective universalism". This is perhaps why adult baptism, in contrast to Calvin and Schleiermacher’s infant baptism, was considered so important by Barth.

(1) Corresponding Gratitude, or the Subjective Freedom of Man

To Barth, man’s obedience to God is that of a child and not that of a slave; it is seeing and not blind, it is free and not coerced. Although totally determined by the reality of "objective universalism" we are nevertheless "determined as the act of our self-determination". God could annul man’s corrupt and twisted existence, destroying the perverse and tortured will, and substitute His own good will as the sole effective reality, but His will is both victorious and merciful, and therefore involves μακροθυμία. It is both efficiens and permittens. (In contrast with Calvin) it is potestas rather than potentia for His lord-
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ship is not despotism, not the might of an autocrat, but the power of fatherly majesty.\textsuperscript{291}

It therefore follows that man is not submitted to a superior force as thought by the Stoics in facing an all powerful destiny, or as thought by the Moslems in facing the inscrutable will of Allah.\textsuperscript{292} God's relationship to man is therefore very different from Charlemagne's harsh baptism of the Saxons, or the sixteenth century Spaniards forced baptism of the Indians. Barth concludes, "a forced Christian is not a Christian".\textsuperscript{293} What is at stake here is the covenant relationship itself. God's goal is "communion and fellowship" of man with Himself.\textsuperscript{294} Thus His power

"is not a blind, brute power working causally and mechanically. He does not force or suppress or disable in His exercise of it. He is not the rampaging numinous which strikes man unconditionally so that he can only be petrified and silent before it, yielding without really wanting to do so. He does not humiliate or insult man. He does not make him a mere spectator, let alone a puppet." \textsuperscript{295}

Therefore of man he said,

"If it were not his free action, but took place naturally or inevitably or automatically that he had to love what God wills, under constraint and not voluntarily, how could it be real obedience? A puppet does not obey. It does not move itself. It dances and gesticulates as it is moved. But to be quickened by the Holy Spirit is to move oneself." \textsuperscript{296}

"That He causes His divine power to come on him does not mean that He overtakes and overhelms and crushes him, forcing him to be what He would have him be. He does not dispose of him like a mere object. He treats him, and indeed establishes him, as a free subject. He sets him on his own feet as His partner." \textsuperscript{297}

The problem before an interpreter of Barth revolves around the seemingly opposite statements he makes. In the material presented thus
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far we have seen that a case could be made for a type of irresistible grace whereas a case could also be made for the freedom of man. What would Barth have us decide? As G. H. Clark has rightly pointed out, "not always, but often enough, it is possible that one critic should choose as Barth's real meaning one series of these contradicting pairs, while another critic could choose the other series. Thus two widely different impressions of Barth can be given." In several sections to be presented in this chapter we shall see that this is so. How then can one be fair to Barth? Whatever we do we shall endeavour to be fair to him, for his contribution to theology has been immeasurable. He has restored its proper object, and even if an overemphasis on this objective Subject has resulted, it was at least made in an understandable reaction to a very opposite one-sided anthropocentric theology. Whatever we say in way of question, and even occasional critique, we wish to keep the same in perspective, i.e. to see them in the light of his conscientious concern to give true witness to Jesus Christ. In other words, we shall need to realize that the opposite position to his is often one which we would also not wish to take, and hence question of Barth's position will be mainly over the degree of emphasis he has given to his presentation.

Continuing in this section on man's subjective freedom, we come to consider what such should involve. It would seem that true freedom would give to kerygma a part to play in obtaining free decision. However, L. Berkhof considered that kerygma for Barth is "reduced to the announcement of an eternal salvation which is in Christ, as it were, self-evidently present and no longer confronts us with a decision." His own view was that God's "yes" necessitates man's responding "yes" or "no". G. C. Berkouwer
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considered that "it is difficult to see how Barth could answer Berkhof's objection." To be fair to Barth, one must say that he does speak in almost identical terms to those expressed in these criticisms. Thus he could say that man is "to give the answer of his little human yes, his modest praise of God and his actions, to the great yes which God has spoken to him," for "in relation to this special revelation, the special decision of repentance, faith and obedience on the part of man himself" is also seemingly vital. But we would have to ask what meaning such a decision and response have when they are made within the irresistible grace context of God's encounter with merely noetic results? Without an ontological result below, one is found agreeing with Berkhof and Berkouwer that in the end it does seem that kerygma is only an announcement for Barth.

If man is truly free then does Barth take seriously the danger of unbelief? Berkouwer concluded that Barth does not "do justice to the unmistakable earnestness with which scripture clearly speaks of the seriousness and danger of unbelief." Here again we are faced with some statements in Barth's writings which seemingly disagree. Thus he could write that in eternity God "determined the goal of all His willing, the salvation of all who believe..." It follows that it is those who believe in Him who will be justified and go to eternal life at the second advent. Thus in apparent full harmony with the "whosoever believeth" of John 3:16, Barth affirmed that,

"those who believe in Him, however, are not all men, not mankind as such in its totality. They are always distinct from this totality...few in relation to the total number of the rest...Nowhere does the New Testament say that the world is saved, nor can we say that it is without doing violence to the New Testament."
Although this could be referring only to a present fact, and not to a future reality which would seemingly agree with his idea of an openness to the final outcome; nevertheless he could point out that those who believe do not perish, \textsuperscript{308} that condemnation is through unbelief, \textsuperscript{309} and that "only those who do not believe will be damned." \textsuperscript{310} Inspite of these statements, is not Berkouwer right to say that Barth fails to do justice to the danger of unbelief because of his far greater emphasis on God's sovereignty, and therefore on the impossibility of unbelief? Is not the once-for-all redeemed cosmos in Christ the central emphasis of Barth which therefore makes any yet unredeemed cosmos with statements on unbelief peripheral to his presentation? Does he not so concentrate upon the objective reality that the importance of its actual subjective realization is not given its full place? Is this not because God's sovereign awakening power with its noetic results surrounds any unbelief of man, just as God's eternity surrounds man's temporality? Does this not follow from the humanity of the man Jesus being surrounded by the acting God? Does this not involve what Colin Brown noted when stating that in Barth's theology "the decisive factor of human response is taken out of time." \textsuperscript{311} Is this not what Brunner concluded when saying that for Barth the real decision takes place in the objective and not in the subjective sphere? \textsuperscript{312}

It would seem that man's freedom is simply man's one-way response to a revealed knowledge that cannot be doubted. Again, here, we are reminded of the final \textit{parousia} revelation of light which simply dispels all shadows. This one decision, this one result makes one ask - is this really freedom after all? For example, Barth often says there is no Hercules-like decision
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to be made at the cross-roads, for it is not an either-or, but only one.\textsuperscript{313} Seemingly there is only one way, the way of positive response. But Barth also used this same expression (Hercules-like decision) to indicate the same one-choice situation in the first temptation to man.\textsuperscript{314} Therefore, if Adam, the first man, made a negative response to God's love, and thus sinned, which Barth considered to be the impossible possibility, then why cannot any other man do the same? If man's freedom is not taken as seriously as it should be now, then how did man exercise it as such in the fall? If Barth means that there is only one choice in the sense that this is the only real one, i.e. the only one that is worth making, then we would completely concur with him. But our concern here is with this one-way street which apparently barricades all other avenues so that one is left asking - universalism after all? Is not the biblical witness clearer when it speaks of choosing between good and evil, choosing this day whom ye will serve? Is this not why it indicates that both choices will be represented in two distinct groups at the \textit{parousia}? Does this not do greater justice to human freedom than some of Barth's statements which seem to teach the reverse?

(2) The Gospel is not Grace without Judgment - is the New Man in Some Men

That Jesus Christ as \textit{God's life-act} is the new man for all men is Barth's main burden in his \textit{Dogmatics}. This is the central emphasis which constitutes a "strong universalistic strain" (G. C. Berkower)\textsuperscript{315} bringing his thinking "to the brink of universalism" (C. Brown),\textsuperscript{316} as in it "is the trend toward an ultimate universalism" (G. W. Bromiley).\textsuperscript{317} Stopping
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short of committing himself to saying that the totality of man will be saved, there is a short brief look given to the fact - the impossible fact - that some will be lost. Thus Barth could say that Christ suffered "on behalf of many\(^{318}\) and not all - as we find Mark 10:45 interpreted by Vatican II.\(^{319}\) It is therefore "certain men" who are baptised with the Holy Spirit,\(^{320}\) "specific men" who are opened up for His history in this interim time.\(^{321}\) This is the community that will always be a "small minority".\(^{322}\) It is therefore the "many" that will be represented righteous in the last judgment,\(^{323}\) who are the "company" of men made perfect,\(^{324}\) who are the "some" over whom the second death will have no power.\(^{325}\) Thus he could put it,

"Many are called, but there will only be a few who in following the call will prove worthy of, and act in accordance with, the fact that as the called of God they are His elect, predestined from all eternity for life with Him and for His service. There will only be a few who in the words of 2 Pet. 1:10 are obedient to their calling and make sure, i.e., validate and confirm, their election." \(^{326}\)

What will become of the large number - the majority - that are not included in this few? This brings us to the negative side, the setting on the left hand in the last judgment. Barth referred to the list of those mentioned in 1 Cor. 6:9ff, who will not enter the Kingdom,\(^{327}\) those who are unrighteous and will be shut out of that inheritance.\(^{328}\) This is according to the principle that what a man sows he shall reap.\(^{329}\) This reaping, for those having sown badly, will be eternal destruction,\(^{330}\)
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eternal death, \textsuperscript{331} and therefore damnation and hell, \textsuperscript{332} wrath and perdition; \textsuperscript{333} with even unfaithful members of the Christian community "banished, at the return and final revelation of the Lord, into outer darkness, where there can be only weeping and gnashing of teeth instead of the promised banquet". \textsuperscript{334} These will be those kept as fatted beasts for the day of slaughter, \textsuperscript{335} rejected and condemned for their inhumanity. \textsuperscript{336} This is the coming and perilous conflagration, \textsuperscript{337} an end in terror \textsuperscript{338} for the burning of the chaff, \textsuperscript{339} and thus the utter fate of nothingness. \textsuperscript{340} Of this Barth said that the "godless will sooner or later be overtaken by merited destruction", \textsuperscript{341} in which he will ultimately "perish and be lost". \textsuperscript{342}

These scattered references seem to say the same thing, i.e., that there will be a final judgment on the wicked. Thus it appears that the final wrath of God in the last judgment is not abstract from His eternal grace, for "His grace would not be grace without His judgment". \textsuperscript{343} Thus Barth could say that "the grace of God would not be grace if it were separated from the holiness in which God causes only His own and therefore His good will to prevail and be done...if God always had to show Himself monotonously as 'love.' Judgment is not judgment without grace and grace is not grace without judgment". \textsuperscript{344} Thus he could say,

"We read expressely in 2 Thess. 1:6f: 'It is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you'...when the Lord Jesus Christ shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his
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power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints." Revelation speaks to the same effect; and on what page of the New Testament is not the same message directly or indirectly proclaimed?...the judgment which we certainly will not escape without faith." 345

Here is an unequivocal "we certainly will not escape without faith" which we are asked by Barth to hold together with God's sovereign freedom to unexpectedly save all finally. But does not one negate the other? Are they not mutually exclusive? Barth's problem seems to be this - whereas he admits that judgment is on every page of the New Testament, directly and indirectly, its place has been taken by objective universalism (and its final teleology) in his own Dogmatics which qualifies all these scattered references given above just as the onrushing water will finally break down the dam.

h. Final evaluation

There are several possibilities before us. (1) It is possible to say that Barth teaches both the possibility that only some will be saved and the possibility that all will be saved. (2) It is possible to say that he is indecisive about the final outcome, not wanting to accept a logical apokatastasis but equally not wanting to accept the biblical predictions of the final outcome, and tries to transcend both by an appeal to God's sovereign freedom. (3) It is possible to say that Barth is so concerned with the vocational mission of the community that he stressed the vital importance of the reality of all men saved in Jesus Christ as an objective fact and saw this as the only message, the only gospel that should be preached. (4) But, although all these must have their place in any final evaluation, we would submit that apparently basic to them all is Barth's understanding of the humanity of Jesus Christ. As we saw in Chapter Five,
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the man Jesus was exalted to the consortium divinitatis in the incarnation, and enjoyed a determination from the divine nature in the special "inner history" between the two natures. We noted, therefore, that it was primarily as the royal man, as the servant who was Lord, that He lived on earth rather than as the suffering servant. Hence it was as the acting God that Jesus Christ redeemed our humanity rather than in His role as a man. We saw that Barth said that He had to win against temptation, having already done so before entering the battle. Inspite of the fact that he could also say there was a risk involved, the overriding emphasis was upon the sovereign act of God which engulfed the humanity of Jesus. Is this not precisely the position in this question of the final victory for all other men? Is not their freedom also engulfed in the sovereign determination of God's action? In other words, if Barth had started with a proper humanity of the man Jesus and therefore with Jesus as the criterion and not just the content of this question, would he not have been able to spell out a balanced uncontradicting presentation, that witnessed to

346. CD 4/1, 72, 75.

347. As we have seen throughout this presentation, Barth can give apparently mutually exclusive opinions. He might have objected (1) that these opposite views (eg. saying that the dams of resistance will finally be overrun by God, and yet also that man will never become a mere puppet in the hands of God), are really dialectical, penetrating to the very edge of the both sides of the same question, and thinking from the two extremes throwing the inbetween area into bolder relief. (2) He might have suggested that he was primarily concerned with the God of grace and therefore with salvation, and so only gave a quick look at the opposite, just as he gave only a brief look at "nothingness". (3) He might have therefore said that the theme and content of any church dogmatics is Jesus Christ who is the saviour of all men, because He is the new man for all men. No doubt there is truth in all three. But, our concern is that Jesus Christ is more than the content because the criterion of this question as a man consubstantial with us in every respect. Would not an equal concentration upon this double reality in Jesus Christ have removed all contradictions? It is of interest that even Barth admitted the presence of contradictions in his KD (TT 12).
both the redemption of all men as already realized objectively in His life-act, and also to the importance of having it subjectively realized within each man as it was in that man so that preparation for the \textit{parousia} can eventuate? Isn't the ultra uniqueness of Barth's Jesus so removed from our ken that he had to stress the salvation for all actualized in Him with only a response by man which removed the differences between men, except for the noetic? Is it not this mere distinction of knowledge which makes the final \textit{parousia} revelation almost identical with a final \textit{apokatastasis}? By contrast does not the New Testament witness to an ontological difference in men, to those growing in grace and to those unpossessed by the fruits of the Spirit? Is this not why it also witnesses to a final judgment and separation of these two groups? It is to this final judgment that we now come.

8. The Eschatological Judgment

This section is closely related to the former one. In fact, some statements about the judgment have already been given in the former. A separate section to consider the problems involved seems justified, however, as it further indicates that Barth's consideration of God as the only reality raises questions.

As we come to this section we find ourselves again on familiar ground, for Barth speaks not only of Jesus Christ as the Judge judged in our place on the cross so that the judgment has already once and for all been expedited on us in Him, so that we can only move towards the final \textit{parousia} revelation of this fact, but he also speaks of Jesus Christ as the Judge to judge in the final \textit{parousia}. Together with this, Barth not only speaks of judgment as salvation for all, but also as perdition for some. Again we are faced with apparent opposites, and again it would seem that Barth would have us understand that for him the judgment in Jesus Christ,
and therefore to salvation, is central and therefore determinative in his theology, thus relegating any future judgment to perdition to the periphery. This is in complete harmony with his central emphasis on "objective universalism" which makes any loss of salvation by some of secondary importance. Again it is his consistent concern with the sole-subjectivity of Jesus Christ which apparently looks beyond the importance of the ontological subjective realization in other men. It is therefore not correct to speak of Barth's presentation of the judgment solely in terms of its fulfillment on the cross without giving Barth any credit for including the final judgment to come as Colin Brown apparently does.\textsuperscript{348}

In fact, it would be more correct to speak of the final judgment on the cross and its consistent outworking in repeated judgments throughout life with a final revelation of it in the \textit{perousia}. Since Barth's earlier "crisis theology" the judgment has always played an important role in his thinking. We saw in Chapter Two that it was no mere desperation theology arising from the crisis of the first world war, but arose from a reconsideration of the New Testament. Although the "yes" of the Gospel was rather hidden by the "no" of its judgment in those earlier days, it was brought right to the fore in the \textit{Dogmatics} so that the "no" was no longer man's because taken by the man Jesus Christ. In a general comment on the influence of German idealism, P. Althaus noted how the judgment was removed from the future into the present.\textsuperscript{349} Although rooted into the cross judgment, this removal of emphasis from the future to the present is also applicable to Barth's theology. With this introduction before us we now turn to follow Barth's presentation in the \textit{Dogmatics}.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[348.] KBCN 134. Cf. Theo Freiss. in 1954, considered that for many years Barth had ceased to speak of the final judgment. Quoted in Leon Morris, \textit{BDJ} 54.
\item[349.] TTM 271
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
a. The Eschatological Judgment Realized on the Cross

On the cross Jesus Christ was the Judge judged in our place, the Righteous for the unrighteous, the Sinless for sinners, and the Just for the unjust. This is clearly spelled out in KD 4/1. 350 Barth not only showed that theologia crucis includes every human being, thus negating the need of capital punishment for criminals, 351 but that it does so because judgment and thus the end of the age took place in Christ's death on the cross. 352 It is here that we must understand the cross as the end of the old aeon and the beginning of the new as presented in the previous chapter. In this sense the last judgment has already been actualized in Jesus Christ who took man's place for him. Thus the Christian "has judgment, condemnation and death behind him, and not as an alternative ahead", 353 for "it has already been executed and suffered". 354 Thus Barth could say,

"The divine judgment itself in its reality is only what happened at Golgotha. But it did really happen there. We therefore find its traces and tokens, its announcements and echoes, in the environs of Golgotha. These environs are Israel, the Church, the world, and our own lives." 355

This "neighbourhood of Golgotha" can be spoken of as no more than "signs and shadows", for "our cross is not the cross of Calvary". 356 Again we are on the familiar ground of sole reality in Jesus Christ and only reflections in man. Naturally only Jesus Christ's death could save man as He was the man who was also God, and therefore our cross can never be equated with Calvary. But Barth's concern seems to go beyond this, for the reality of Golgotha's judgment apparently can only be revealed as completely executed in this time after the old aeon's passing. Thus he radically
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reinterpreted the eschatological judgments found in Revelation. Rather than judgments to come just prior to the final parousia, he wrote,

"(the outpouring of the vials of wrath, Rev. 15 and 16), is not yet or no longer the judgment of God Himself. None of these plagues either was or is the merited end. We have always continued, and do continue, like Israel. Whether we make good or bad use of them is another question, but we always have time and space...If God's wrath and judgment were really to strike us in all this, and not merely its token (Rev. 15:1), foreshadowing and reflection - where should we be, where should we have been long since...God's real judgment would mean the end of us. But there is obviously not an end of us, any more than there was or will be of Israel. We obviously still have, and will always have, time and space. Therefore, even though what comes on us from time to time pierces us to the heart, it cannot yet be, or any longer be, the real judgment of God, but only a serious token of it...The wrath of God which we had merited, by which we must have been annihilated and would long since have been annihilated, was now in our place borne and suffered and though it had smitten us and yet in such a way that it did not smite us and can no more smite us." 357

Does this not swallow up the history of man in the act of God on Calvary? Is this not in complete contradiction to the basic purpose of the book of Revelation, for John the beloved expressly stated that it was to show "things which must shortly come to pass" (ος ἐν τῇ ἐνέσθαι ἐ

357. CD 2/1, 396f
358. This future emphasis is found at least seven times repeated in Revelation, eg. 1:3, 3:11, 22:6, 7, 12, 20 as well as 1:1. Indirect references to the same idea are found in 6:11, 12:12 and 17:10.
only the ultimate revelation (and not a new event) of the reality already actualized in the cross, and revealed in the resurrection? Thus he spoke of the resurrection as the manifestation of the gracious Judge stating that "nothing which will be has not already taken place on Easter Day". This is because His appearance in the resurrection was as the Judge that had already been judged for the unjust, so that His future coming as Judge and Redeemer is the same revelation as the resurrection. We are now looking at the one on-going parousia from the standpoint of judgment. Here Barth's munus propheticum is the revelation of the already completed judgment, and therefore he can say concerning the resurrection, Holy Spirit and final advent that "nothing different takes place in any of them", for "His final coming to resurrection and judgment is only the completion of what He has begun in His own resurrection and continued in the outpouring of the Holy Spirit". Behind this one on-going revelation of the one reality of judgment lies the fact that, for Barth, "judgment is the form of God's eternal predestination and the effectual working out of it in time", so that "the judgment of God...is the sum of every earthly realization of this decree, its temporal explanation and revelation". Again we are on the familiar ground of the eternal reality and its temporal revelation. Reality belongs to God alone for He alone is eternal, and therefore the reality of the judgment belongs to Him alone. Its reality was revealed in the resurrection parousia and continues in the revelation of the enlightening Holy Spirit and will finally conclude in the ultimate manifestation in the definitive parousia. Therefore, there cannot be any new revelations, any new judgments even by the sovereign and free Jesus
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Christ. Inspite of this, there is (as before noted) a "continuance of judgment" witnessed to in Barth's theology. If there is no final new judgment to come, then does not Barth call in question the very sovereignty of God that he has always been anxious to safeguard, because he negates the very pre-eventu texts of Revelation which have already been given through His sovereign foreknowledge and His exercise of freedom in choosing to speak of these future events?

Before leaving the book of Revelation, it is of interest to note Barth's own criticism against Catholic theology for their not taking its message to heart. He said that "the Church of Rome is the typical form of...de-eschatologised Christianity", having de-eschatologized Christianity with a vengeance for it considers itself already to be on the throne with its returning Lord, and therefore already on the far side of the ultimate parousia. Therefore, he concluded, "The Church has completely forgotten Matt. 25, and the Seven Letters of the Apocalypse." But would not the Catholic Church have every right to return the charge, not against Barth's ecclesiology as putting man in a ruling position per se, but in placing man's sole reality within God so that there is in fact only the ruling man (i.e. Jesus Christ) since the cross and resurrection? Further, and what corroborates this, is his own apparent refusal to really take seriously the seven letters of the apocalypse (i.e. Rev. 2 and 3) for in each we have a post-resurrection message calling for the members to overcome sin, to gain the victory, or else be lost (2:7, 11, 17, 25, 3:5, 12, 21). This call to overcome (τιμωθείτε ἄνω Θέου) is the consistent message given to each church without exception and with it is the alternative of judgment (eg. 2:5, 16, 23, 27, 3:19). That Christ overcame and took our judgment is not the whole gospel as these seven letters clearly show, for man must

366. CD 3/2, 511
also overcome (in and through Christ) or be himself judged. Therefore they say "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne" (3:21). Is this not the answer to Catholicism's man on the throne with God below and not Barth's sole reality in Jesus emphasis, or man on the throne with God above, so that the judgment is already realized once for all? Is this not a pre-parousia emphasis as dangerous as the one he was opposing in Catholic theology? This would appear so because it led him to say that judgment "can no more smite us", for we "will always have, time and space".\(^{367}\) In complete contradiction these seven letters not only warn of these post-resurrection judgments on God's people, but also clearly warn that man does not always have time and space, for the clear warning is that the churches must gain the victory or else Jesus Christ will return and they will be unready, for His parousia will be as a thief in the night (3:3). Remarkably, this was also the burden of warning in Rev. 16:15. Barth said this chapter was concerned with no future judgment because the real judgment had already been actualized, but John said, "Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame." These garments to cover nakedness are clearly referred to in these seven letters, i.e. in 3:17f where the invitation is given to receive white raiment to cover the shame of thy nakedness for "Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me" (3:20). This is in complete harmony with the saying of Jesus about the necessity to have the wedding garment on (Matt. 22:8-14) as preparation for His coming, and to watch and pray (Luke 12:35, 40; Matt. 24:1-51; Luke 21:36) for it would be as a thief in

\(^{367}\) CD 2/1, 396f
the night (Matt. 24:43. Cf. 1 Thess. 5:2; 2 Pet. 3:10; Rev. 3:3, 16:15). At stake here is the subjective side of the Gospel, the ontological realization of Christ's righteousness into the characters of Christians so that they will have the fruits of the Spirit, the vital preparation, the spiritual clothing, so that victory will be theirs, so that they will be overcomers and thus not caught unprepared in the sudden thief-like coming of Jesus Christ. Is not Barth's placing of all reality solely within Jesus Christ and therefore having no ontological reality in man, and then saying that man will always have time, contrary to the burden of these seven letters in Revelation and to the burden of Jesus Christ Himself? Does not Barth's understanding of Christ's humanity (as swallowed up in God's act) also lie behind his position? By contrast, do not these warnings of post-resurrection judgments, and therefore for Christians to overcome, consider that Jesus Christ is not only our victory accomplished, our judge judged in our place, but also say clearly,

"to him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne." (3:21)

He overcame as a man, and not just as God. He therefore has a right to ask other men to overcome just as He overcame. His victory is not ours unless it becomes ours subjectively realized and ontologically actualized in us. Again Calvin was right when he said,

"so long as we are without Christ and separated from him, nothing which he suffered and did for the salvation of the human race is of the least benefit to us." 368

Calvin's position agrees with that of Revelation. 369 As far as we can assess, this position never became normative in Barth's Dogmatics, because he had no place for the human victory of the man Jesus.

368. Institutes, 3.1.1.
369. Even though Calvin did not write a commentary on the book of Revelation.
b. The Eschatological Judgment Revealed in the Parousia

We begin this new section with a reference that grounds it solidly in the former one. Thus Barth wrote,

"But the real judgment of God is alone the crucifixion of Christ, and the terror of this event is that it is the reality which all other judgments upon Israel, the world and mankind can only foreshadow or reflect." 370

He would have us consider all judgments in pre-crucifixion time (or old aeon) as foreshadowing the reality of Christ’s judgment to come on the cross, and hence all the judgments which came upon Israel are considered in this light. Further he would have us consider all judgments in post-crucifixion time (or during the passing of the old aeon whilst the new aeon is being revealed) as reflecting the reality of Christ’s judgment actualized on the cross, and hence all the judgments which come upon the Christian community and the world are considered in this light. We will only consider the post-crucifixion period in this section, and primarily with the final parousia in mind. (The judgments upon Israel will occupy us in the next section.)

Although Barth speaks of the community as subject to the future judgment, 371 when they must give an account for their present actions, 372 for Jesus Christ will be "judge at the last day" 373 "coming again as Lord and King and Judge" 374 in His "concluding judgment of the world", 375 in which He has yet to pronounce His verdict, 376 and yet to speak His last word; 377 he also speaks of their moving towards it with "joyful expectation". 378 This is because it is Jesus Christ, and not some unknown person, who is to be the Judge, 379 and therefore,
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"If the gracious God is the Judge to whom we move we cannot be mesmerised before him like a rabbit before a giant snake or a condemned criminal before his executioners."  

Rather, we face the one who became the rabbit or condemned criminal for us, freeing us for He "intervened and made Himself responsible for us in His almighty mercy." Therefore any judgment by this Judge must be considered as salvation. Hence Barth spoke of judgment as the "saving rejection of the elect". It was the elect Jesus Christ who was rejected in order that our rejection might be in Him our election. It is this unchangeable realityactualized in Jesus Christ as the Judge already judged for the unjust which determines any future judgment of this Judge in Barth's presentation. Perhaps this is best seen by noting various ways he spoke of judgment. Thus the day of the Lord, or day of judgment is called the day of salvation and grace, it is as He "forgives sins in His mercy that He judges", it is "in the process of judging, rejecting and punishing", that "God does not break but keeps His covenant, and therefore comforts, helps and saves".  Thus "the judgment which overtakes him can only confirm that he is God's", "the love of God is the real presupposition of the divine judgment", and "the purpose of God in His judgment is the sanctification of man, i.e., his direction, preparation and exercise for the eternal life ordained and promised." Thus the "day of the last judgment" is also the "day of redemption", because the "coming of the Judge means basically the coming of the Redeemer and Saviour". Thus his coming to judgment is equated with the resurrection of all the dead to live
through Him. Therefore, Barth could speak of the human constitution as being unshakeable. He put it this way,

"It can, of course, be disturbed and perverted by human sin, but it cannot be destroyed or rendered nugatory. Hence man remains man even in his deepest fall, even in the last judgment of death; and even in death he is still man within the hand and power of God. In no case, therefore, does He become another being, a being which is deprived of the promise of the covenant of grace and cannot even in death and hell appeal to this covenant." 392

This agrees with what Barth said in the former section, i.e. that man always has time. In other words nothing can separate him from the covenant. This sounds like Rom. 8:38f, i.e. nothing can separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus, but Paul although leaning towards universalism at times certainly stressed the necessity of putting on the whole armour of God that ye might be able to stand (Ephes. 6:11), 393 and therefore his ontology qualified his presentation and saved him from what Barth apparently could not save himself from, i.e. from the charge of inevitable universalism. This seemingly is included in statements like the following one concerning the final verdict of the Judge.

"He can bring on him all that must come on him as a wrongdoer at the left hand of God and under His No, in order to set him at His right hand, in order finally to say Yes to him, in order to address and treat him as one who does right and not wrong." 394

Thus the "no" of judgment is for the "yes" of salvation. This is because God's "no" on the cross was for the sake of His "yes" in the resurrection. It is this same "yes" that will finally be revealed to all mankind when the setting on the left hand will be in order to set on the right hand. It is within this context that Barth's many references to the fire of the

---
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last judgment are perhaps best understood. Thus,

"the day of the final and universal revelation of Jesus Christ will be a dies irae, not only for the world but also for the community in its present ἀκομοῦ. It will be the day of judgment which begins first at the house of God (1 Pet. 4:17). It will be a day of fire, when everything unserviceable and false that has been built in the community - the wood and hay and stubble with which so much building is actually done - will be burnt up. It is in the same sense that we must understand 2 Cor. 5:10: 'For we must all (those who now take part in building) appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.' Each will receive his reward, we are told in 1 Cor. 3:8, 14. This is true of those whose work stands, being tried by the fire (v. 13). But who shall stand?...Paul certainly does not think that those whose building is shown to be false and valueless, and will be burned as wood and hay and stubble, will themselves perish (1 Cor. 3:15). Rom. 8:1 is pertinent in this connection: 'There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus.' But bad workmen (and this surely includes us all) will suffer loss". 395

In this quote Barth places the judgment of the world and the community at the parousia, even though noting that it will begin at the house of God. We ask if this can be substantiated by the New Testament? First we find in 1 Peter 4 (which Barth referred to) that for the community "the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God" (v. 17). Could this not be why just five verses before Peter wrote, "Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you, as though some strange thing happened unto you: But rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy"? (v. 12f) "Wherefore let them that suffer according to the will of God commit the keeping of their souls to him in well doing as unto a faithful Creator" (v. 19). Does this not suggest a present fiery trial for the community rather than a parousia judgment?

395. CD 4/2, 637
In 5:10 this present suffering is identified with ontological growth, which certainly is stressed in the second epistle. This second letter, unlike Barth, speaks of man partaking of the divine nature, of his ontological growth in grace (1:4-8) of giving diligence to "make your calling and election sure" (1:10), that "the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished;" (2:9) that "the heavens and the earth...are kept in store reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men" (5:7). It would seem that there is a specific ontological preparation necessary to be finally saved. It would seem that judgment is a future event that is only for the ungodly. It would seem that the fiery trials or testings, the development of character, the judgments to save are only in the present, and therefore cannot be counted on in the parousia. Thus Peter, in agreement with John in Revelation and Jesus Christ in the Gospels, says clearly, Be ready for,

"the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat? Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. Wherefore, beloved, seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent that ye may be found of him in peace, without spot, and blameless." (3:10-14)

The important point to note is that the present ontological preparation will eventuate in a prepared people to meet their returning Lord. They will be without spot and blameless through this partaking of the divine nature, and this agrees with 1 John 3:2, "when He shall appear we shall be like Him". We would submit that neither of these witness to a burning
fiery judgment for the community to take place at the parousia. Barth considers that this opposite view of a fiery judgment for the community and world at the parousia is given by Paul in 1 Cor. 3:12-15. It would seem that Paul speaks here of every man’s work being tested, rather than the man himself. Could not the word "fire" be figurative therefore? Could it not suggest that even some saved will suffer loss in the sense of having failed to do all they could have in this life? In other words, is this a real judgment? If it is used as such, would it not suggest universalism?

How did Barth use this concept of fiery judgment for the community? He spoke of "the true Christian existence which is living and will outlast the fire of the last judgment", speaking of it as a purifying and sifting and yet gracious so that Christians can be confident that it will be for him and not against him. Thus, this ultimate judgment will be to "pass through the fire in which it will be definitely shown who and what you are, and what you have done or not done as such". It will be to "pass into burning, searching, purifying fire of the gracious judgment of the One who comes, and to pass through this fire no matter what the result may be." A clue that perhaps these do not refer to literal fire is given by Barth’s reference to the first coming of Jesus Christ in which "this coming, and the fiery baptism which John proclaimed to be imminent, is to be construed as the fulfillment of the definitive, eschatological judgment of God." We submit that these references to this taking place at the parousia, however, place the judgment for the community too late.
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and make all texts concerning the thief in the night aspect seemingly meaningless in that the coming is after all a purifying judgment to save. What makes the present urgent, rather, is that the unexpected coming of the Judge will find the genuine community ready to be taken to eternal life and the others ready for judgment. Finally, could Barth be placing all emphasis on one Pauline example which is not as clear as so many other references concerning two groups being present at the *parousia*, one ready for salvation and the other for judgment? Peter's references concerning the vital need to ontologically prepare for the *parousia* have been cited, and we have noted that he clearly showed that the community will be ready by the advent, and therefore only the wicked will undergo the fiery judgment which will destroy and not save. Even if Paul's presentation is opposite to Peter's, would it be of value to note Peter's general comment that there are in Paul's writings "some things hard to be understood which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their destruction" (2 Pet. 3:16). Obviously Barth is not unlearned, but is it not wresting the scriptures to seemingly build up a doctrine on one passage of Paul and overlook not only other biblical writers, but even Paul's qualifying texts which speak of the vital necessity of an ontological preparation for the final coming of Christ? It is of importance, for example, to note that in the same letter Paul speaks of the judgments sent to Israel saying that they were written for our admonition, and therefore to take heed lest we fall (10:11f). It is important to see that Paul in the same letter (13:2) clearly warned that all knowledge (e.g. noetic understanding of the realized atonement in Christ which to Barth separated the community from the world) is worthless without the

401. Barth could even speak of this thief-in-the-night coming of Christ (CD 3/4, 582ff).
ontological reality of love (the fruit of the Spirit - Gal. 5:22f).

Would it not be fair to say that Earth seemingly only took one aspect of Paul, and not the other and therefore not in context? -for Paul is clear that only love will endure (13:8). It is this ontological reality in man that the other writers referred to (Peter and John) which clearly states that the prepared Christians will be like Jesus when He comes. It is this that needs to be stressed and not a twelth hour change. The biblical urgency of "now is the accepted time", "now is the day of salvation" and the repeatedly stated warnings of the unexpected nature of the parousia, and finally the sad fact that there will be two groups - the ready and unready - are not altogether left out of Barth's theology, but one wonders if they should have been given greater stress? Likewise, is not the emphasis of Rev. 14:6f needed in Earth's presentation? i.e. "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth...Saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come". Is this not the judgment that begins at the house of the Lord (1 Peter 4:17) and which must therefore be kept completely distinct from the judgment at the parousia which is only for the wicked?

In concluding this section, we note that on the periphery Barth does refer to the divisions of Matt. 25, and seems to take them seriously, but as has so often been seen in Barth's theology, the determinative or central stress must in the end qualify what is by contrast assigned to the periphery. It is this central context which returns us to the starting point of this section, i.e. that the future judgment is merely a reflection of the only reality of judgment on the cross, i.e. it is the revelation

402. This urgency is even mentioned by Barth (CD 3/4, 583).
403. CD 4/2, 159; 4/3, 758, 891.
of its reality which has already been given in its beginning in the resurrection and in its continuance ever since and yet awaits its ultimate and definitive manifestation. This seemingly does not understand the future judgment as a new event, a new reality which by contrast is the consistent emphasis of the New Testament passages we have cited. Instead of speaking of the cross as the sole reality of judgment to be revealed in the parousia, should not Barth have seen the cross judgment as the basis (i.e. criterion) of the final judgment? The correct position on the eschatological judgment is that it will take place because the judgment on the cross has taken place, rather than the latter being the sole content of God's judgment, which has therefore only to be manifested as such. By contrast with Barth a host of scholars seemingly take much more seriously the final judgment to come (see Appendix No. 4).

c. The Eschatological Judgment of the Jews

It would seem that what has been said relative to the question of universalism and the judgment is found in nuce in Barth's understanding of the election of the community as both Israel and the church. It is spelled out in CD 2/2, 195-305. Together Israel and Church are the one community as the "special environment of the man Jesus". As such Israel is the "reflection of the divine judgment" and the Church is the "reflection of the mercy in which God turns His glory to man", and thus they together "mirror" the "reality" of rejecting judgment and electing mercy in Jesus Christ who is both the Messiah of Israel and the Head of the Church. Here again, we submit, is this now familiar distinction between the reality in Jesus Christ and its mere reflection in man that

404. CD 4/3, 64. Barth considered that Israel is the key to an understanding of world history.
405. CD 2/2, 196, 233
406. CD 2/2, 206. Underlining added.
408. CD 2/2, 197f
409. CD 2/2, 212f
410. CD 2/2, 197f
would appear as the basic presupposition behind all Barth has to say in this section, and not simply Rom. 9-11 and "all Holy Scripture" as he claimed.\textsuperscript{411} We will attempt to indicate evidence for this after first presenting Barth's thinking on Israel.

There is an "ineffaceable differentiation", and "indissoluble unity" between the "human turning away from the electing God" (Israel) and the "turning of the electing God towards man" (Church).\textsuperscript{412} Thus the whole community witnesses to both the judgment (Israel) and mercy (Church) of God.\textsuperscript{413} In fact, Barth states, the witness of Israel is vital to the Church, and without it there is a loss.\textsuperscript{414} Therefore, what God has joined together (i.e. Israel and Church) let no man put asunder.\textsuperscript{415} This is because Jesus Christ was both the rejected and the elected man in indissoluble unity. As He became the rejected One in order to elect all mankind, as the cross of necessity had to precede the resurrection, so the Israelite form of the community had to precede the Church form.\textsuperscript{416} The irreversible order involved is Israel to Church (Jews and Gentiles), judgment to mercy, and thus from God's "no" to His "yes" as happened from the cross to resurrection. "Thus the death of Jesus unites what was divided, the elected and the rejected."\textsuperscript{417} It is this one community in its Messiah and Head that was revealed in the resurrection.

This relation of wrath (rejection) and mercy (election) is also put this way,

"all the wrath upon the one Israel is always coordinated with His mercy upon another Israel which He was preparing within the first to cause if finally to arise from it in the form of the Church."\textsuperscript{418}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{411.} CD 2/2, 203
\item \textsuperscript{412.} CD 2/2, 200
\item \textsuperscript{413.} CD 2/2, 206
\item \textsuperscript{414.} CD 2/2, 206
\item \textsuperscript{415.} CD 2/2, 201
\item \textsuperscript{416.} CD 2/2, 211ff
\item \textsuperscript{417.} CD 2/2, 229
\item \textsuperscript{418.} CD 2/2, 230
\end{itemize}
Within this context, Barth makes it very clear that the covenant made with the Jews is "imperishable", so that "neither here nor elsewhere can there be any question of its interruption or cessation". This is because over against the unfaithfulness of man there remains the unchanging faithfulness of God, and thus the "inflexibility of His purpose for His people." 419 What then of the repeated disobedience of the Jews throughout their history? Barth replied,

"...this disobedience of Israel cannot alter in the very least the content and scope of the divine promise itself. Israel suffers under this disobedience. The promise, however, suffers no harm at all because it is only heard and not believed by Israel. Israel cannot by any breach of the covenant annul the covenant of mercy which God has established between himself and man... Nor can Israel do anything to alter the fact that this promise is given and applies to itself, that in and with the election of Jesus Christ it and no other is God's elected people...It cannot infringe on God so deeply that He ceases to be God, or even to be its God." 420

Just as the exaltation of Jesus was the goal of His humiliation, the Kingdom the goal of His suffering, and His coming the goal of His passing, 421 the Church is the goal of Israel. 422 Therefore Barth could say that Israel has had "to pay dearly for being God's chosen people", 423 and that because there is now a Church, "it is not that in place of or beside Israel another of the world's peoples had now become the elected people and is revealed as such. This is in itself impossible...there are no other elected people besides Israel." 424 This is because the election of this race as a people was fully realized in the one Israelite Jesus Christ. 425 Further, it was their very rejection of Jesus Christ, their handing Him over (παράδοσις) to the Gentiles to put Him to death which handed Him over to become the world's Redeemer. 426
Following from this reasoning Barth apparently rejects the fact that only a remnant of Israel will be saved as the meaning of Isaiah (Isa. 1:8f), and Paul (Rom. 9:27)\textsuperscript{427} and turns rather to the final parousia as the final conversion of all Israel, as identified with the resurrection of the dead.

"The participation of all Israel as such (in the faith and salvation of the Church) will coincide with the revelation of the eschatological character of the Messianic present, of the whole time which follows the resurrection of Christ from the dead. In that day, when all Israel is gathered together in faith in Jesus as its Messiah, hidden things will be revealed, Jesus Christ will come again in His glory with all His angels, the dead will rise again, Christ's kingdom in the Church will reach its goal in the eternal kingdom of God on a new earth under new heavens. In that day! This is the greater riches which will succeed the riches of the reconciliation in the death of Jesus Christ on the cross now achieved and already believed by the Church of Jews and Gentiles. This is the glory of which even the Church has now only a foretaste, because, although it lives indeed in the Messianic age, it does not yet live in the revelation of the already present end and new beginning of all things, but still lives by faith...In that day all the dead will live through Him as that which they have been through Him and in relation to Him in their time. In that day! The whole Church waits for 'that day'. But that day coincides with Israel's πρότερα and therefore with the future conversion of the Synagogue, with its προσελήνωσις, its acceptance and reception, its admission to its Messiah and introduction to His community, to the faith of this community...in that day when all Israel believes in Jesus. But this will itself be the divine miracle of a resurrection from the dead, the revelation of the end of all things in the beginning of a new world. It is quite impossible, therefore, that it should be made apprehensible as an expectation within history...It is not the Church but God Himself in the act of that admission and introduction, Jesus Christ in the glory of His second coming, who will convert the Synagogue, as it is He alone who will awaken the dead...Let the Church accept its responsibility for the Jews...if it no longer reckons with this divine wonder, this is a fatal but sure sign that it is also not really looking forward to the second coming of its Lord, to His judgment of the quick and the dead...He intends to confirm all His promises to Israel as well. The Church will not be the
Church if it does not await the greater thing and therefore with it the new thing which impends for all Israel."\(^{428}\)

The above quote clearly shows that for Barth the second advent will be a revelation of what is not yet apprehensible, i.e. that God will fulfill all His promises to Israel, and will do so in their conversion, in the great miracle of the resurrection of the dead.\(^{429}\) This \textit{parousia} miracle-revelation is grounded in the fact that already the promises to Israel have been objectively fulfilled in the One Israelite Jesus Christ, for "in Him...Israel has already become new".\(^{430}\) This is why he could speak of the eschatological possibility that lies beyond the completion of Israel's rejection,\(^{431}\) that this covenant people is a hopeful eschatological riddle that points beyond itself,\(^{432}\) that Israel has an "eschatological history" to which it now relentlessly hurries,\(^{433}\) that salvation.

\(^{428}\) CD 2/2, 283f. Underlining added. Although this passage seemingly says that all Israel will be converted in the \textit{parousia}, yet in CD 4/1, 218 Barth said, "No, to obtain forgiveness of sins and to escape the coming wrath on the day when this One comes, repentance is necessary to-day". Further, in CD 2/2, 300 he clearly stated that all Israel to be saved does not mean the totality of all Jewish individuals. Those are apparently the converted remnant he refers to in 3/2, 357. However, he could still speak of all Israel gathering around the Lord at the end of all things as the eschatological solution to this hardest of all puzzles (i.e. as a people \(^{434}\)). However, the fact that Barth quotes Christ's statement that the redeemed will sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel should logically mean that not all will be saved (3/4, 662). He even noted that it was the remnant which kept alive the witness for God throughout its history (4/2, 591). If in the end only the faithful remnant are referred to by Barth in this quote, then would this be any different to the faithful Christians who also will be awakened from the dead at the \textit{parousia}, and thus is there really any eschatological riddle of Israel involved? (See above text and fn. 429-435.)

\(^{429}\) The past side of this future resurrection of Israel is what Barth terms, its natural perishing, for "just as the man formed of the dust inevitably returns to the earth, so Israel as a nation is finally doomed to sink and perish in the mass of the nations..." (CD 3/1, 248). This past and future are held together in Jesus Christ so that "what took place in Jesus Christ is precisely the resurrection of Israel from the dead" (\textit{Ibid.}).

\(^{430}\) CD 2/2, 262

\(^{431}\) CD 2/2, 487

\(^{432}\) CD 3/1, 239

\(^{433}\) CD 4/3, 59
is the final goal of the history of Israel, that the Old Testament promises a completely renewed Israel, and that all is finally summed up in the fact that to help His servant Israel is the "particular intention that He was to come, and came and will come again". The basic presupposition here is apparently the reality already actualized in Jesus Christ awaiting its final revelation in the parousia, so that the resurrection of the dead then will be because of the resurrection of all the dead that has already objectively taken place in the resurrection of the One Israelite Jesus Christ. It is over-against this context that we interpret Barth's reference to this "time between the times" as like the time between the cross and resurrection. In other words, the reality is a completed fact, leaving only its revelation to be yet completed. It follows that Barth could say, "God will break the opposition of His people, creating and giving a new heart to the men of His people, putting His Spirit in their inward parts, making the observance of His commandments self-evident to them". All these quotes when placed together would seem to suggest that all Israel will finally be saved, for beyond their rejection of Christ is His resurrection of the dead, and hence their immoveable and unchangeable election to salvation. If we have interpreted Barth aright here, then three questions need to be put to his position. (1) Does this not favour Israel over the rest of mankind - a position which Barth rejected in CD 4/2, 768? Would this be any better than Calvin's double decrees? (2) If there is no advantage to Israel, then does this not mean that all mankind will be saved, and hence means universalism? (3) Although Barth has expressed opposition to God as Almighty in the sense of power in

\[ \text{434. CD 4/1, 31} \quad \text{436. CD 3/2, 60} \]
\[ \text{435. CD 4/4, 8} \quad \text{437. CD 4/1, 33} \]
itself, he still could speak of God enforcing, imposing, driving and demanding. These would seem to agree with this breaking power, to overcome human opposition. Does not God's sovereign power swallow up human freedom in such? Is this not Barth's consistent emphasis so that it was God who triumphed over sin in the man Jesus, rather than giving the man Jesus and His human freedom the room it should have had?

Now we have noted before that this reality-revelation framework is Barth's basic presupposition in his presentation of the Jewish question, as it has been found to be in other aspects of his theology. Barth, however, considered that his position was simply the logical outworking of Rom. 9-11 and all other scripture. What we will submit in the paragraphs to come is evidence to show that the facts are seemingly against his claim.

Without getting into the involved and lengthy debate over Rom. 9-11, which would take us way beyond our present purpose, we will briefly give our interpretation of it from a biblical standpoint, and indicate where Barth's position is apparently at variance with biblical conclusions. We submit that Paul would not wish these chapters to be considered in isolation from his other writings that bear on the same subject, nor would he wish them to be interpreted in a way that would prove contradictory to the teachings of Jesus Christ. It would seem that Barth's conclusions does both.

First, it is vital to understand that Paul does not teach universalism. Even though he says that all Israel will be saved (Rom. 11:26) he also said that it will be a remnant that will be saved (Rom. 9:27, 11:5). This is not contradictory, for he clearly qualified his meaning by stating that "they are not all Israel which are of Israel" (Rom. 9:6). Thus it

---

438. DO 46-49
439. CD 2/2, 593
440. CD 2/2, 596
441. CD 2/2, 606
442. CD 2/2, 609
is all true Israel that will be saved, and thus the remnant. This agrees
with Isaiah as Paul himself indicated (Rom. 9:27f, Isa. 10:22f). Paul
is very clear that the wrath of God is not necessarily some saving result
(as it would appear in Barth). We find this in Rom. 1:18, 32, 2:1-11,
and also in 2 Thess. 1:7-10,

"And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the
Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his
mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on
them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel
of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with
everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord,
and from the glory of his power."

Previously, we noted that Barth only referred to Paul's fire as a burning
to consume the dross, saving the person even though with loss. Here is
the other side of Paul's judgment theology which is apparently missing
in Barth's interpretation of Pauline theology. Here is the parousia
judgment, which not only shows that Paul did not really teach apokata-
tasis, but that his other reference to the purging is perhaps the present
pre-parousia judgment which God allows for the developing of character,
i.e. for the ontological restoration of the image of God in man. This we
have already noted in Peter's position in 1 Pet. 4:12f, 5:1, 2 Pet. 1:4-9
and 1 Pet. 4:17. There is a complete difference between this saving judg-
ment that concerns the present preparation for the parousia and the damning
judgment that concerns the future punishment in the parousia. Barth seem-
ingly confuses the two, making of the parousia judgment a saving judgment.

Barth took seriously the Pauline statement that God has not cast
away His people (Rom. 11:1), but did he penetrate to the real meaning
of this pronouncement? Paul's meaning revolves around the remnant, and
thus he can even speak of a "casting away" of the people in the very same
chapter (11:15). The apparent difference between Paul's teaching and
Barth's interpretation of Paul is simply that Paul speaks of salvation as
still offered to Israel whereas Barth interprets this to mean that its vocation is also still valid. Thus Barth stated that Israel still has a mission to the nations which will be revealed in the last days and be a sign to all peoples. This must be understood together with his comments that Israel alone is the one elect people, and that there will never be another elect people, that their election came to its goal in Jesus Christ and now awaits revelation. However, Paul is not speaking of Israel as a people, nor of its continued vocation as such. This is why as a people, they have been rejected. This means that as a people their vocation has ceased. Their place has now been taken by the Church, and so the Jews can only participate in this Church vocation as Christian Jews and not as a separate people. Barth's idea that the Jews remind the Church of God's rejection, and therefore are absolutely vital to the whole witness of the Church is, we submit, going beyond the bounds of scripture. He even said,

"That Israel should come to faith and into the Church, and that in the Church it should perform this special service, is God's purpose for it, the promise given to it with its election."  

This is given without any hint of biblical authority. The same could be said of an admittedly brilliant section of almost fifty pages which speaks of "the passing and the coming man", the death of the old man and the resurrection of the new man in Jesus Christ, in which there must be a correspondence in the Israelite passing form of the old man and the Church coming form of the new man in the community. In this context he said,

"Without Israel, without the reminder of the transitoriness of the passing and the past of man, without the
Here Barth calls for the vocation of Israel to be continued in the Church as he considered it still has a role as a people. But, does this not go beyond "the remnant will be saved" emphasis of Paul, and more seriously, is it not contrary to the very purpose for Israel's existence, or its election? By contrast we submit that Israel was elected to keep alive the knowledge of God and thus prepare the world for the first coming of the Lord (Gen. 12:1-3, Micah 5:7, Isa. 56:7) even as the Church is elected to spread the Gospel and thus prepare the world for the second coming of the Lord (Matt. 28:19f). Is there really any scriptural evidence that Israel was elected to mirror the rejection of Jesus Christ? Cannot the real mission of Israel be seen in nuce in the ministry of John the Baptist who prepared the way of the Lord (John 1:23)? But, unlike John, the people of Israel constantly failed to fulfil their mission. Was it not their failure to be true to their election that led to rejection and not that they were elected to be rejected as a reflection of Jesus Christ?

Barth is right that more than personal salvation is involved in Rom. 9-11, that more than Israel as a chosen people and others as the rejected ones is taught. His advancement over the double decrees of Calvin is welcomed, but is not his christological interpretation just as christologically suspect as was Calvin's, for to him the election of Israel as the environment of the elected man Jesus Christ meant that the history of Israel had to be understood in terms of the rejection of the old man that finally was actualized in Christ's death? With this presupposition it logically

446. CD 2/2, 260
follows that Israel had "to pay dearly for being God's chosen people". 447 It follows that Israel and the Church as the one community of Jesus Christ must correspond to their Messiah and Head who was both the rejected One in His election and the elected One in His rejection. Therefore Barth said, of the difference between Israel and the Church that "it is in the twofold determination of Christ Himself that this difference has its basis". 448 Does this not expose his basic presupposition, i.e. his Christology as the divine God determining His human nature, the election overriding rejection, His love conquering in His wrath, His mercy saving in His judgment? Again is it not his misunderstanding of the true humanity of Jesus Christ 449 as a real person standing in our place, and therefore being our Redeemer as a man, that causes him not to do justice to the humanity of Israel? 450 To Barth the humanity of the One Israelite,

---

447. CD 2/2, 261
448. CD 2/2, 199
449. Barth's interpretation of the disciples fleeing from Christ in His crisis hour of judgment is totally unsupported by scripture. He maintained that they fled because Jesus Christ as the Lord had shown Himself their judge, "the one for whom not one of them was a match, in whom they were all broken to pieces, in face of whom they all showed themselves once more and this time finally to be sinful and lost Israel, sinful and lost humanity and - we have to see and say it - an inadequate and also a sinful and lost band of disciples" (CD 4/1, 225). Is not the very reverse true? Did they not flee and deny him - admittedly as sinners - but not as a reaction to his judging them, but in fear that He was to be judged, and therefore they feared the Roman judgment would also come upon them? The suffering servant passages speak of the man Jesus treading the winepress alone, going to judgment alone - not as a royal man, as a servant who is Lord, as a God who is Judge, but really as a man in our place, the suffering man under vicarious judgment. If one speaks of Christ's judging at this crisis, then it is perhaps only seen in His saving look at Peter which brought him conversion after his denial (Luke 22:54-62, Cf. Matt. 26:69-75).
450. Israel's rejecting of Christ "had to happen as it did. It was forseen and determined, not only in the counsels of wicked man in time, but in the eternal counsel of the righteous God, that the decision made at this point had to be made, that Jesus' last offer had to be rejected, that He must suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed" (Matt. 16:21). It is not He who is in their hands, but they in His" (CD 3/2, 504). Much of this quotation is true, as Christ only was led to crucifixion (even as a cont./
Jesus, was subsumed under the determinative act of God, which found its correspondence in Israel. Just as the One Israelite could not fail, so Israel will not finally fail; just as the One Israelite was rejected in His election and elected in His rejection so has it always been of Israel. It is its election in rejection that will be revealed in its conversion in the final parousia resurrection, according to Barth. This is why Barth could say that "it is not in the events of AD 70 that the Gospels and the rest of the New Testament find the decisive divine answer to Israel's rejection of its Christ", but rather it is in the One rejected Jew, Jesus Christ. He considered that there is no "judgment which falls directly on the guilty" as previously in the Samaria-Jerusalem invasions. But is not Matthew clear that AD 70 is a post-crucifixion judgment on Israel as real as those pre-crucifixion judgments? Thus Christ, looking to the future of His generation, said, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you

450. cont.

man) because He allowed Himself to be so led. Now His hour had come He did not free Himself as previously (Luke 22:53f). What Barth is seemingly weak on is the foreknowledge of God, stressing rather the predetermination of God. God knew from eternity how He would be rejected, but to say that He determined it this way would seem to cast the blame of human sin upon God. Does this not, to some degree, negate human responsibility? We submit that the proof that God did not determine Israel to reject His Son as they did is found in the sanctuary service. Christ's death was determined to take place on the passover of AD 31. But if Israel had fulfilled its vocational election in preparing the world for Christ's advent it would also have been ready herself. Then the Priest of the Passover day would have slain the lamb of God instead of the usual lamb substitute, and this could have been ordered and fulfilled without the guilt that came when they rejected Him - having no king but Caesar and saying let His blood be on us. Such a tragic failure to know their Lord and to witness to the Gentiles met its deserved punishment in rejection. There is no biblical evidence to support Barth's assumption that Israel had to reject Christ in the way they did.
desolate" (Matt. 25:37-38). Was this not the literal destruction of the synagogue which followed its already realized fall? Had not the synagogue been replaced by the Church?

We find further witness to this judgment and to this replacement of the synagogue by the Church in Deut. 28 and Matt. 21:33-46 which are not apparently given the determinative place in Barth's theology that they have in the Bible. In Deut. 28 there is a remarkable pre-eventu presentation of the history of Israel, indicating the basic reasons for its great blessings and its great curses. The Barthian dialectic of judgment to save is not found in the chapter, for to some extent at least it would seem that God's blessings are conditional. Thus the word "if" occurs six times showing that the faithfulness of Israel was required for the promised blessings, and that lack of it was the reason for the curses. Barth seemingly sidesteps this conditional nature of the covenant between God and man by saying that God is always faithful inspite of the unfaithfulness of Israel, and this has been demonstrated in the fact that in His own life-act He has been faithful unto death, has died for Israel, and has been faithful in His resurrection which is a resurrection for Israel. Indeed in this One Israelite the covenant has already been fulfilled on

451. Pardon is unconditionally pronounced and valid (CD 4/1, 568) so that Barth opposed Anselm's rejection of unconditional forgiveness (4/1, 486). He did so because he understood the incarnation as the proof that God's mercy is not conditional but unconditional (3/3, 309). This is certainly true as far as the objective side of the question is concerned, but Deut. 28 deals with the subjective side (which was perhaps Anselm's emphasis), and it is this side that is apparently left out of Barth's consideration. It is therefore strange to note the conditional stress appearing in other contexts, eg. (1) He cites Jer. 17:24f where promise of Jerusalem standing forever is given on condition of obedience, and its destruction on condition of disobedience (CD 3/4, 56f) and (2) Ex. 15:26 with its conditions for health is considered as the divine Magna Carta in this matter (3/4, 369). We are submitting that similar conditions concerning Israel's vocation are given in Deut. 28.
both sides, the one who knew no sin has become sin for Israel, that the wondrous exchange might be actualized for His chosen people. All this we fully accept. Where we question Barth is in the subjective realization of this objectively realized fact. As he only has a "sole-subjectivity" of Jesus Christ with no resulting ontology in man, does he not fail to realize how vital the human aspect of this covenant faithfulness is? Can Israel really expect to be saved willy nilly, because one Israelite has become its Saviour? It is forever true that it could never save itself by its own faithfulness, but is it not equally true that it can never be saved without its own faithfulness to the faithfulness of Jesus Christ for it? If salvation can be subjectively realized on any other basis then can Barth really stop short of the doctrine of apokatastasis? As he rejects this doctrine then must he not accept its only alternative, i.e. a proper emphasis upon the human responsibility of Israel that is rooted and grounded in the human responsibility of the One Israelite, Jesus Christ? Without this basis we submit that Deut. 28 has no meaning, and may just as well have been a chapter confined solely to the blessings on Israel. Is it not true that the curses on Israel have had reality, and not just a reflection of Jesus Christ, that they are therefore a result of Israel's own human failure and not linked to some inevitable vocational role corresponding to the rejection of Christ, and that this is seen not only in Deut. 28 but confirmed by Christ's parable in Matt. 21? In Matt. 21 the history of Israel is given in nuce, with the sending of the many servants of God to the people who always mistreated them. These call to mind the judges, prophets, priests and kings God used. Finally God sent His own Son and He was rejected (v. 42). Concluding, Jesus said, "therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof" (v. 43). Even the Pharisees
perceived that He was speaking of them and sought to lay hands on Him (v. 44f). It is this interpretation that does not appear as determinative in Barth's presentation. In fact, Barth speaks of "the promise of the election, which always outlasts and excels and surpasses its rejection". By contrast, are not the biblical documents (i.e. Deut. 28 and Matt. 21) clearly saying that the vocational role of Israel came to an end in its rejection of Jesus? Did they not say, we have no king but Caesar? Did not the vocational role of Israel pass to the Church? Therefore, from the vocational viewpoint, can we really speak (as Barth does) in terms of the synagogue alongside of the Church with its own unique contribution or witness to make, without which the whole witness of the Church is lacking? Is it not God's plan now, that Jews become Christians and be the same as any other Christians? Salvation has never been taken away from Israel. Salvation is not only of the Jews, in the past sense, but is still for the Jews in the present and future sense, and this is the clear meaning of Paul's emphasis on the "remnant" of Israel that is the real Israel referred to when he said that "all" Israel will be saved. In short does not Barth confuse the difference between election to a specific vocation with election to salvation? Properly understood all men are elected to salvation but not all men have been called to the unique role of vocation that God has placed within the Israel of the past and in the Church of the present. Or to be more precise, the vocational role of Israel was to take the message

452. Barth could say that Jesus Christ finally ignored Israel for the Gentiles (4/2, 168f) even quoting Matt. 21:43 relative to the Kingdom being taken from them and given to another nation (4/2, 171).
453. CD 2/2, 506
454. However, in one place, Barth could speak of no more continuance of Israel as a special people of God after Christ's rejection, saying that it no longer had it's mission (CD 2/2, 468f) This we submit is in agreement with Matt. 21, and in seeming contrast to most other comments he made on their continuing mission after Christ's rejection.
of salvation of all men to the world in preparation for the coming of Jesus Christ. Not only did it fail to prepare the world but when He came to His own even His own received Him not (Isa. 53:2, John 1:11). There was no room in the inn for Christ because there was no room in the hearts of His people for Him. In the same way, God's rejection of Israel as his special vocational tool simply followed their prior rejection of Him. This is because the human responsibility, the human decision has as much validity as it had in the human responsibility and human decision of the One Israelite, Jesus Christ. (It was just as valid as the decision and responsibility that faced Adam.) Admittedly, it was out of Israel that the Church was formed, in that "trunk" that the branches were inserted, because from that remnant that the apostles were taken. But is it not also true that they came out to form another people, the people of Christ from every nation, who had the same vocation that Israel of old had once had, i.e. to prepare the world for the coming of Christ (but this time His second coming)? The difference, however, was that this Church was as branches growing from the vine which was Christ (John 15). In this sense the Church comes from the One Israelite as well as from rejected Israel. It comes from Jesus Christ as both Christians and Jews as the complete community which does not need the unique rejection witness of Israel. For, do not Christians qua Gentiles and Jews know of rejection from their own history, and from the final judgment of the world as given in the biblical account?

Barth's saving judgment interpretation of Israel's history has been briefly shown to be questioned by Deut. 28 and Matt. 21. But does not his view of a conversion of Israel at the parousia seem to have justification in Rom. 11:15 where Paul stated that "if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life
from the dead"? We submit that this resurrection is not the parousia resurrection, but a figurative expression used of conversion. We find an example in Luke 15:24, 32, where the father rejoicing over the returning son said, "this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost and is found." This receiving of Jews as life from the dead has continued since the apostolic ministry which was primarily for them in the early post-resurrection years. This is in agreement with the before stated fact that salvation has always been available for Jews as well as for Gentiles. This, then is the new birth to membership in God's Church, in which they not only have salvation, but also have vocation. It is as fellow Christians that the Jews have both, and not in some unique sense that they have a different vocation to witness to rejection whether inside or outside the Church as Barth taught. As newborn, resurrected, and therefore as Christians, these Jews are Israel continuing in the new Israel, because it is as the new Israel (Gentile and Jew) that the Church goes into the world. Is this not what Peter had in mind when he wrote,

"ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light: Which in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God: which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy." (1 Peter 2:9f) ?

Is this not in direct contrast to Barth's position that only Israel (i.e. Jews) were and are the people of God? Is not Christ's statement, "the kingdom shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof" (Matt. 21:43), in contrast to Barth's position? Has he not overemphasized the role of Israel in this respect in contrast to its underemphasis in nineteenth century theology (eg. Schleiermacher, Harnack, etc.)? Has this anything to do with his understanding of the old aeon concluding in the crucifixion and merely running down or passing away since?
Does he really give to the Church and its election an almost enclosed position within the election of Israel? Is not Barth's presentation of Israel's election somewhat of an understandable reaction to the tragic anti-Semitism that was contemporary to his writing? Would not he have to agree that if the good angels could rebel (although he does not accept this) and Adam and Eve could disobey, then Israel also could break its covenant relationship, and that just as the angels, Adam and Eve have reaped the consequences, so Israel has? Elsewhere Barth has at least given assent to this biblical principle of reaping what is sown, but has he really applied it to Israel? (See fn. 329 above)

The next question to be raised concerning Barth's presentation, is his statement that there will be a resurrection of all men at the parousia. (See quote on p. 418) This includes Gentiles as well as Jews. We submit that biblical evidence would suggest that the contrary is true. Thus we find that Christ's return will cause some to call on the rocks to hide them from Him (Rev. 6:12-17), whereas others will welcome Him by saying "Lo this is our God we have waited for Him and He will save us" (Isa. 25:9). These two reactions are from two different types of people, which the documents refer to in terms of the tares and the wheat (Matt. 13:25-30), and the foolish and the wise virgins (Matt. 25:1-13). The parousia will mean a separation of these groups which, in some places and to a certain extent, have been together. This is spoken of as the separating to the left hand to destruction and to the right hand to eternal life (Matt. 25:31-46). The ones on the left hand include those represented by the unprofitable servant (Matt. 25:30), and the man without the wedding garment (Matt. 22:8-14), whereas the ones on the right hand include those resurrected and translated (1 Thess. 4:16ff) and therefore those who "have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb" (Rev. 7:14). Now
these references only refer to the presence of two groups at the *parousia*. Having established this, what can Barth's resurrection of all men at the *parousia* mean? Apparently it could not be figurative and thus imply the conversion or resurrection to a new life of all men, as the same references already given would not substantiate this conclusion. Could it then refer to a resurrection of all that are now dead? Again this would seem not to be substantiated if we understand Rev. 20 aright. Admittedly this chapter has resulted in various pre-millennial, post-millennial views, and that Barth has dismissed all forms of chiliasm, 455 but does it not also find agreement with the other texts cited in that two groups are distinctly evident? And even more to the point, does it not speak in terms of a first resurrection at the *parousia* after which the dead live not again until after the thousand years (v. 5) saying that those participating in that first resurrection are blessed because the second death hath no power on them (v. 6)? Does it not then go on to show that the nations will be judged and receive the second death together with the devil and his angels (v. 7-10), and thus indicate that those who were dead are raised for this judgment and hence this is the second resurrection for the second death which necessitated the seer to call the *parousia* resurrection the first resurrection which is identified as saving the people from that second death? It would seem that at least this much is given in this otherwise much debated chapter, and thus Barth's idea of all men resurrected at the *parousia* does not seem correct. Furthermore, if it were correct, then all would be resurrected in the first resurrection and thus escape the second death, and would this not mean universalism (Rev. 20:5f)?

Finally, Barth speaks of the resurrection of the dead at the *parousia*

455. CD 1/2, 680, 678ff; 4/2, 681, 686.
as the conversion of the Synagogue, as Israel's πλήρωμα, although no hint of biblical evidence is given. Can Barth find such evidence? This writer knows of none. We submit that the evidence is against such a conclusion because if that final parousia will mean the conversion of all Israel then why should it not also mean the conversion of all mankind? If this will take place then what is the meaning of the constant stress in the New Testament to be ready, to prepare because some will be caught by surprise as unready? If the Jews are treated in a special way, then what meaning has the biblical principle that God is no respector of persons (2 Chron. 19:7, Acts 10:34, 1 Pet. 1:17), the very point that Barth would seem to be arguing for when reminding Christians that salvation is still open to Jews? If the Jews are treated in a special way, because they alone are the chosen people and there can be no other, as Barth says, then is this opinion much better than Calvin's double decree? If Barth would reply that God will treat all equally, why does he appear in places (see fn. 428 above for exceptions) to stress that all Israel will be converted and yet leaves it open whether all mankind will be? In the end, it would seem that there is no real judgment against Israel, for in the past their rejection was but a reflection of that to be really experienced by the One Israelite Jesus Christ. For Barth, Jews (rejection through election) and Christians (election through rejection) merely reflect this double reality in Jesus Christ. Hence in the future the judgment does not seem real for it is a judgment to save because a revelation of that already actualized salvation, because only Jesus Christ is the One whom God has really rejected and judged, and this can no longer be the lot of man, including Israel. Although it is true that He alone has suffered this second death judgment, is it right in the face of the biblical evidence cited to say that this can never be the lot of man? If the biblical evidence shows that Israel
could be rejected in the past, does this not indicate that the Jesus Christ who is the same yesterday, today and forever, will not do one thing in the past and a totally different thing in the future, especially when the ultimate judgment is witnessed to so plainly in the biblical documents? Does not Barth's position falter because he has no ontological preparation in man below for the parousia, and no ontologically changed imago Dei in man as reason for the judgment?

d. The Eschatological Judgment of the Angels

The logical starting point for this section is Barth's angelology. This appears as the final section in CD 3/3, 369-531, i.e. the last of four divisions on the Creator and His creature which concerns the doctrine of providence over-against the opposing forces of "nothingness". Barth considered angelology to be the "most remarkable and difficult of all" that he had yet traversed in his Dogmatics, and that it was "a difficult and dangerous undertaking". Although he does not claim to give a complete biblical angelology, it is important to realize that he has chosen only to consider the angels in their relation between God and man, and that they have no ontological reality separate from their acts of vocational witness between heaven and earth, God and man (see fn. 462 below). It would seem that Barth has no answer for their existence before the creation of man, and no answer for the purpose of their existence after the ultimate parousia. On the positive side he has turned from nineteenth century outright rejection of angelology, and has given quite a thorough presentation of this subject which is reminiscent of the Doctor angelicus, Thomas Aquinas. On the negative side he has dismissed as irrelevant the need for a demon-
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ology, and thus has remained with nineteenth century theology in this respect. It is this latter aspect of his presentation which appeared at the end of his angelology\(^\text{461}\) which concerns us.

As we have previously noted that there is no ontological reality in man except in the man Jesus, so the same can be said of the angels. Barth put it this way,

"They are His, and therefore are, as He takes them with Him on His way from heaven to earth as His precursors, companions and followers, giving them a share in His own speech and action on earth. They are as they are given this share...They do not exist and act independently or autonomously. They have no history or aims or achievements of their own. They have no profile or character, no mind or will of their own. They have all these things, yet not as their own possession, but wholly and exclusively as God is so rich in relation to them. They are themselves only a possession, His possession. The lowliest creature of earth has an advantage over even the highest of angels to the extent that while it belongs to God it may also belong to itself. But conversely even the least of the heavenly hosts is more than the most perfect of earthly creatures to the extent that it belongs so fully to God and in no sense to itself. Where an angel appears and is and speaks and works, God Himself appears and is and speaks and works. The angel derives no benefit at all from being a creature and different from God..."\(^\text{462}\)

As heavenly creatures "they are in an exemplary and perfect way that which constitutes the essence of all creatures and characterizes earthly creatures as their origin and goal."\(^\text{463}\) As such, it is of interest to especially note the relationship that they have to God according to Barth. Thus, "not even to the smallest degree are they willing and speaking and acting subjects side by side with Him...They are simply servants. In their own way they are wholly what the most modest blade of grass waving on the earth by the will of God is in its very different way."\(^\text{464}\) It follows then that

\(^{461}\) CD 3/3, 477-531
\(^{462}\) CD 3/3, 480. Cf. TT 72f - "...good angels have no ontology in the Bible! In the Bible angels are only some special appearance of God's own action. They are not God, but they belong to His action. They have no separate ontology."

\(^{463}\) CD 3/3, 480

\(^{464}\) CD 3/3, 494
"they do not know...either the ground or the goal of the will of God," for according to Barth "between the beginning and the end they cannot foreknow either as a whole or in detail what God wills or how He will accomplish it." One is left wondering how far Barth wished to take this, as surely the angels know of the final outcome of history, its culmination in the parousia, of the judgment and that there will be two groups etc.?

Barth further noted that "in the purpose and end and goal of His action, God is not dealing with them", i.e. the angels, but rather it is man that is the one object of His supreme regard, and towards which all his eternal movement is teleologically related, and this primarily in the man Jesus Christ. Thus he could say,

"in the perfect kingdom of God which commences with the general and definitive revelation of Jesus Christ, and in which even the work of Christ will be consummated, and have no further future, they will not be destroyed, but will certainly lose their power in the sense that their active function will have attained its goal and will therefore be dismissed as superfluous; although it is to be noted in this connexion that, according to Mk. 8:38 and par., they themselves will first be revealed again in and with the parousia of Jesus Christ, and this time in their full relevance for the earthly occurrence which is concluded. Something of this suppression of the angels is to be seen already in the first parousia of Jesus Christ. It is to be noted that even in the stories at the beginning and end of the Gospels they never appear with Jesus Himself, but are introduced only as messengers and witnesses announcing Him as it were from a distance... their particular light is outshone like that of a candle in the noonday sun...they fade away like the stars before the dawn." 467

This passage raises some questions. (1) Does not this very mention of the angels not being destroyed and yet loosing their power result from Barth's emphasis on their vocational ministry rather than giving their
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ontological being the possibility of a wider significance? Further, (2) is it correct to say that the angels never appeared with Jesus at the beginning and end of the Gospels? At the crisis in Gethsemane Jesus was strengthened by an angel (Luke 22:43) just as He was after His earlier crisis in the wilderness of temptation which began His ministry. Both were real ministries of strengthening to the human Jesus. Apparently Barth cannot give this angel ministry its proper place because again the humanity of Jesus has not been given its proper place. Any suggestion that they fade out of the picture as candles before the noonday sun, or as stars before the dawn would seem to be the logical result of considering the redeeming life of Jesus as solely God's sovereign act, instead of the human life-act of the man Jesus Christ, which therefore necessitated angel ministry.

It is in this context that Barth considered the few references that might speak of a demonology. He cited Isa. 14:12, Jude 6, 2 Pet. 2:4, saying that "these texts are so uncertain and obscure that it is inadvisable to allow them to push us in this direction" (i.e. to a demonology). Then he admitted that if these texts do teach a real fall of the angels, then

"literally all the insights which we have gained concerning the being and ministry of angels, and developed at least concerning the character and activity of demons, are necessarily false if this doctrine is correct. It is, in fact, one of the bad dreams of the older dogmatics. It arises from the superfluous need to ground our knowledge of the fall of man upon the notion of a metaphysical prelude which it was quite inappropriately thought should be located in heaven...it cannot be said that a real demon has ever been in heaven. The demons merely act as if they came from heaven. But the devil was never an angel." 470

468. In CD 3/2, 296 Barth said that angels will not die.
469. CD 3/3, 530
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Earlier we referred to Bromiley's critique of Barth's handling of biblical texts. With all due respect we find that he ignores certain evidences that contradict his basic presupposition that there is ontological reality only within God. To admit a demonology in Barth's terms would place their reality within God and give his theology a theodicy perhaps unparalleled in the history of theology. It is for this reason that we consider he stated that even his angelology was for him a "difficult and dangerous undertaking" for he had to spell it out with no separate ontology, for that would have negated his whole presentation of the dichotomy between the reality of God and the reflection in man. This is why his angelology is not ontological but vocational. It is an actualised angelology. In contrast to Barth, and therefore in opposition to his basic presupposition, we submit that the Bible does speak of a demonology that must demand attention. Barth only cited three texts which point towards a demonology, a way which he did not wish to take, but there are at least seven. Those he did not mention include Gen. 3, Ezek. 28, Zech. 3 and Rev. 12, and what is significant is that they come from seven different biblical writers, four from the Old Testament and three from the New Testament. Begging to differ with Barth, we submit that they together form a picture of quite remarkable clarity, and certainly would seem sufficient for a demonology. We come now to briefly present their contents.

Genesis 3 indicates that man's fall was identified with listening to and following a suggestion given to him by a serpent-like being (Gen. 3:1-7). The consequence was expulsion from Eden, where the failure

470. cont.

1953 and 1956 he said concerning this question, "I have some trouble, I will admit. Even in the New Testament these powers are 'above', 'in heaven'. But even their 'heaven' must be a lie! The notion of the fall of angels in Jude and 1 Peter:- I do not like this! But I cannot be too sure" (TT 72). Should not Barth have been surer, because in 1959 he wrote, "no true word can replace the biblical witness in any respect" (CD 4/3, 126).
occurred (Gen. 3:23). Whatever we understand by this serpent, at least it is depicted as intelligent enough to tempt and was as such against God. Ezekiel refers to such a rebelling creature in Eden as the anointed cherub that was created perfect by God until he became proud and corrupted himself (Ezek. 28:12-15). Whatever this may have said to the contemporary king of Tyrus, it evidently pointed beyond to a far wider interpretation. Further, Ezekiel looked to a future destruction of this fallen cherub (guardian angel) who would be cast down before kings, and fire would destroy him (Ezek. 28:17f). This is in full agreement with the apostle John who pointed to the final destruction of the devil by fire (Rev. 20:10). Already we find a remarkable unity in the biblical documents. But the question arises, do these indicate a dualism? We think not, because right in the beginning, before his entry into Eden and the subsequent fall of man, Satan is not only considered as having been expelled from heaven by Isaiah (14:12) (which Barth referred to) but also by John (Rev. 12:9) which he did not refer to) and Revelation also speaks of his angels being cast out with him. Therefore defeat, and as such a certain limitation (expelled) is characteristic of the powers of evil from before the fall of man. This was completely and eternally assured in time through Christ's defeat of the devil in his victorious life, death and resurrection, and will be finally implemented (and not just revealed as in Barth's theology) when these forces of evil are annihilated. In this sense, especially since Christ's victory, Satan and his angels have been reserved until the great day of judgment (Jude 6 and 2 Peter 2:4). Furthermore, the word cherub refers to a type of angel. In the pattern of the heavenly sanctuary, Moses was commanded to place two cherubims on the ark of mercy in the Most Holy Place where God's shekinah glory dwelt (Exod. 25:8-23). That a perfect cherub should become proud, should be found in Eden instead of in heaven,
should tempt man instead of praise God would surely indicate the origin of evil in heaven as a biblical teaching rather than a metaphysical prelude? We submit that there is really nothing obscure (as Barth thought) about these texts as together they point in the same direction. But there remains another factor for consideration. Barth is here facing the recurring problem of theodicy, and no one has ever pretended that this is an easy problem. The reverse is true. Although it is correct that evil or chaos (to use Barth's language) is "Nothingness" and yet not nothing in the sense that it only has reality through God's permission, as the shadow side of his creative "yes" etc., is it not also true that man as a fallen creature only has existence on the same basis? Apart from God's eternal redemption man is nothing. Further, if man as God's good creation could fall, why could not the devil and his angels as His good creation also fall? As Berkouwer has rightly said, Barth "does not make plain why man can and the angels can not fall".471 In other words, if Barth cannot accept the "forever rejected chaos" as a part of God's good creation, then it would follow that none of God's good creation will be so rejected, and therefore one is forced to accept apokatstasis as a doctrine, which we know Barth rejects. Simply put, Barth's doctrine of chaos raises many questions which he has not answered. One concerns the advisability of concentrating only on Gen. 1:1 (water representing chaos) and John 8:44 (Satan as murderer from the beginning) as sufficient basis for a doctrine of evil as the negative side of God's creation which He has passed over when these many other references cited indicate that it was a part of God's creation which did of their own choice become rebels and as such are that anti-God chaos. Basic to this question of course is the sovereignty of God. Could a sovereign God allow such a thing to happen to His creation and still be
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sovereign? Is not the fact that He allowed man to fall sufficient to indicate the same possibility for any other part of His creation? Can Barth really ignore this witness of seven different biblical writers when he has himself specifically stated that "no true word can replace the biblical witness in any respect"? (See fn. 470) Was not his sole ontological reality in God (Jesus Christ) the basic presupposition which necessitated his rejection of these seven witnesses?

Another problem should be brought in here. If we understand Barth correctly, it would seem that the incarnation of God into human flesh would have taken place irrespective of the fall, the fall merely making necessary an added soteriological factor to the eternal election of Jesus Christ in the eternal covenant of God with man. 472 We would suggest that without deterring from that eternal election or covenant, God in His eternal foreknowledge willed the covenant and election to be so because of His complete foreknowledge of the fall, and willed it to be so in His freedom without any necessity on His part for He so willed before either angels or man were brought into being by His creation. Should not sovereign will and omniscient foreknowledge be held together as equally important factors in God’s eternal covenant? However, does not Barth seemingly

---

472. Eg. CD 4/1, 47. The incarnation was not simply to combat sin for God willed to become man, and this is the primary purpose (4/1, 50). The world was created for the sake of Jesus Christ. This is why the doctrine of creation (3/1 to 3/3) is considered as the external basis of the eternal decree (i.e. of Jesus Christ) and the eternal decree (or Jesus Christ) as the internal basis of creation. This is why man is the supreme object or goal of God, with the angels only as vocationally involved. However, is not this interest in man soteriological? After all, the good angels have not fallen, and hence it is to man that God directs His efforts. Should it not be stressed that God became man to save man, and therefore soteriologically man is the goal of God? Should it not be stressed that God loves the cosmos and all its beings as the broader background beyond soteriology? Without this, could not theology still be somewhat anthropocentric? (Cf. fn. 493 below)
emphasize sovereignty to the detriment of foreknowledge because it fits into his reality-reflection framework better? Is this why foreknowledge is given such a minor mention by Barth in the perfections of God? 473

Of primary concern is the fact that the rejection of chaos in creation has replaced the biblical witness to an eschatological judgment of the devil and his fallen angels. As has been noted, this is the clear testimony of 2 Peter 2:4, Jude 6 and also Rev. 20:10. Barth's eschatology seemingly ignores these texts with the chaos rejection but the shadow side of the positive act of creation. In the end, is not this understanding of judgment the same as Schleiermacher's concept of judgment "as the shadow of eternal blessedness"? 474 Therefore, (with reference to judgment in general) is not Schleiermacher more consistent in rejecting a final judgment for the doctrine of apokatastasis, whereas Barth removed the final judgment from the future to the rejection of all men in Jesus Christ which has yet to be revealed as the election of all, and yet did not equate this with ultimate universalism? Is it not puzzling to find him speaking of "the demons who first recognize who Jesus is, and address Him as such (Mk. 1: 23, 5:7)", linking them with the power of death at work in sickness because "not merely the expression of contemporary beliefs, but a fact of theological significance"? 475 Or, was there still reason for a demonology for Barth in 1948 (KD 3/2) whereas it was rejected two years later in KD 3/3? Is it not puzzling to find Barth referring to 1 Cor. 6:2f concerning the future judgment of the angels in which the community will participate? 476 Not only do we have here a reference to a post-parousia judgment but if there are no demons (or fallen angels) then which angels will be judged? Surely Barth would not consider God's unfallen angels
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as subjects for judgment, especially by fallen man? Are these further evidence that a demonology was possible earlier than KD 3/3? These references both come before KD 3/3 where he particularly dismissed the ontological devil and fallen angels, but even after KD 3/3 he spoke of the devil just as the Bible does. It would seem that although dismissing the ontological reality of the devil and his angels, Barth nevertheless continued to refer to them in much the same way as the biblical writers, which could be misleading if the reader is not aware of KD 3/3.

e. The Criterion of the Eschatological Judgement

Although Barth's emphasis is upon Jesus Christ as the content of the eschatological judgment, and therefore as actualized already in the cross, it is not true (as with C. Brown) that he does not consider Jesus Christ as the criterion of judgment. We would agree, as we have noted above, that for all practical purposes He is not considered as such, and is centrally and almost completely considered as the universal object of the judgment. However, Barth did say (again on the periphery, which is now common ground for us) that we will be measured by Jesus and shamed by Him in the judgment for "all other men will be measured by the One who is man". But can even these peripheral remarks really mean what they seem to say, for as we have seen, Barth does not really have a human Jesus in the same sense as living and redeeming our humanity as a man? Therefore, is not C. Brown really right in the end?

f. Original Man and the Freedom of Choice with Implications for Salvation and Judgment

For Barth there apparently was no original man as the completed creation

---
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of God, for the world (including men) was created for the sake of Jesus Christ. To be our Saviour and Friend was the "eternal presupposition of His creative work". Thus God's saying that His creation was good can be interpreted by Barth as having a future reference, i.e. made serviceable for the rule of God, or made good in the man Jesus Christ. However, this future goodness, this pointing beyond itself to its culmination in the real Adam Jesus Christ is also put alongside of other statements referring to the actuality of the good creation in the first Adam. This emphasis came in later and stressed that even though fallen into sin man was still man, was still a creature of God, was still a fellow man, for "he has not lost - even in part - the good nature which was created by God". Thus without giving up the idea that the telos of man's creation was really realized in the incarnation, life, death and resurrection of the new and royal man, Jesus Christ, Barth came to equally emphasize that man had been good from the beginning in that he still was a man. Behind this lies his developing understanding of the imago Dei.

Earlier Barth had considered that sin destroyed the imago Dei. But later he changed his understanding of what constituted this image of God. Rather than an ontological reality within every individual, he came to interpret it as a fellow-humanity. Simply put, he considered that the Deus triunus is not mirrored in the homo solitarius, for He is not a Deus solitarius. Rather, fellow-humanity is the analogia relationis corresponding to the inner-trinitarian reality. Behind this developed under-
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487. CD 3/3, 117. Cf. TT 96 where Barth said that the tertium comparisonis is the "togetherness" in the man-woman relationship and the Trinitarian relationship, and TT 41, "Man is created in an I-Thou relationship similar to the I-Thou relation in God Himself."
standing of the *imago Dei* is not only a rejection of any foothold for natural theology, and therefore any *anaologia entis*, but it would seem that there is the now familiar "reality in God reflection in man" presupposition. Is it not this very framework that side-steps the ontological reality in man? Thus man can only be the image of God in relationship with his fellow-man, and thus the *imago Dei* is actualized. There is no being of man made individually in the image of God, and therefore Barth cannot have any partaking of the divine nature in redemption which brings an ontological restoration of the damanged image through sin so that when Jesus comes in the *parousia* the saints will be like Him (1 John 3:2). This is why KD 3/1 is entitled "The Work of Creation" for it is the *event* of creation and not its *being*, the *act* and not the *ontology* which interested Barth. In a sense one could say that for Barth the act of creation was not considered realized in the being of creation until the incarnation. Prior to man's genuine reality in Jesus Christ he was only on the way to that completion. Here it would seem is the foundation for all the lack of ontology in his later theology that we have already noted. It is here that we find the reality in God alone, and also the sole-subjectivity of Jesus Christ. Thus at best man as male and female can only be the likeness of the covenant of grace, 488 for in Jesus Christ is revealed the twofold form of the good creation. 489 Thus man is created for salvation, 490 for of that future Christ, Barth said, "it is He, and not Adam, who is in the state of original innocence." 491 There was therefore no golden age, for "the first man was immediately the first sinner." 492 It follows that the incarnation was not simply to combat sin, but was the primary purpose of God who eternally
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492. CD 4/1, 508. However he could say that between the lines there could be a Golden Age (3/1, 210).
willed to become man. 493 Thus the eternal decree (or Jesus Christ) was
really the internal basis of creation, and creation was but the external
basis of the eternal decree (or Jesus Christ). It follows that Barth
should say that we should hesitate to call Adam the primus inter pares
because his sin was so "slight" and "trivial". 494 This "purified

493. Concerning the doctrine of election, Barth, unlike Calvin, placed it
at the head of his theology in the doctrine of God (see CD 2/2, 3-506).
Calvin's treatment only appeared near the end of Book 3 of the
Institutes, see 3.21 to 3.24. As such Barth opposed any separate
consideration of creation (given in 3/1-3/4) apart from the eternal
election of Jesus Christ. Such to Barth would be an abstraction. He
said, "this makes it appear as if the universe and man might well have
been created and sustained without any inner necessity of the continu¬
ation and completion of the divine work in reconciliation and redemption" (2/2, 90). Rather, he considered that creation, reconciliation and
redemption are "grounded in that election and ordained in reference to
it" (2/2, 104) for not in Adam, but in Jesus Christ (the other Adam -
or real Adam - see Barth's "Christ and Adam" (SJT OP No. 5) was the
goal of creation reached. Thus God "gives to creation its meaning and
goal in that man" (2/2, 142. Cf. 3/2, 302). He, therefore, did not
accept that creation can be understood on the basis of scripture per
se, except as understanding the Creator through the Redeemer (3/1, 24).
In fact, it was only in Jesus Christ that the perfection of creation
was realized, that its aridity was redeemed and its death was born
away (3/1, 239). And that "history of creation" will finally reach
its goal (i.e. as revelation) in the ultimate parousia (3/3, 87). Man
is considered, therefore, as created in a teleology (3/4, 524). Barth
could not accept any creation of man for its own sake (3/3, 36), nor
apparently any incarnation of God for man's sake. Both seemingly were
for God's sake. Thus "the reason why He created the world and man was
to be the scene and instrument and servant of His self-manifestation"
(2/1, 532). This world is only a sphere for revelation of the eternal
reality in God. The first man, Adam, cannot therefore have any inde¬
pendent reality, nor was he really the first created man, for Barth
stated "that the work of God (the work of all works!) is not creation,
but that which precedes creation both eternally and in effect temporally,
the incarnate Word of God, Christ" (2/2, 80). Here seemingly the eternal
logos ensarkos as sole reality swallows up any reality that Adamic man
is given in Genesis, relegating him rather to the temporal signitive
role of pointing to a future revelation of his completion in Jesus
Christ. Barth's entire theology is placed in a "revelation framework"
so that all that is ante natum Christi points to the real revelation
and all that is post natum Christi points back to the real revelation.
Real man is only revealed in Jesus Christ and perhaps will only ever
be revealed in Him because reality is only in God, in the world above,
in the eternal, and never in man, in the world below, in the temporal.
(Cf. fn. 472 above and Section 10 below.)

494. CD 4/1, 509
Supralapsarian view of the relation of creation and redemption could be considered as Barth's answer to G. W. Leibniz who considered that "there can and must be sin within the context of the whole. Without the possibility of sin there could be no creaturely good." By contrast Barth is saying that whether there is sin or not there must be a completion of creation in the God-man, i.e. in Jesus Christ. But, does this not fail to take sin in man seriously, although Barth certainly does take it seriously in connection with the death of Christ? In apparent contrast to Barth, Calvin did take sin seriously and thus instead of calling man the good creation of God whose \textit{imago Dei} (i.e. \textit{analogia relationis}) is unaffected by sin, he said,

"It cannot be doubted that when Adam lost his first estate he became alienated from God. Wherefore, although we grant that the image of God was not utterly effaced and destroyed in him, it was, however, so corrupted, that anything which remains is fearful deformity; and, therefore, our deliverance begins with that renovation which we obtain from Christ, who is, therefore, called the second Adam, because he restores us to true and substantial integrity."  

It followed, for Calvin, that the \textit{beneficia Christi} through the ontological restoration of the \textit{imago Dei} was the vital subjective realization of the objectively accomplished atonement. Such an ontology is not possible in Barth's theology since man has supposedly never ceased to be the good creation, to be the \textit{imago Dei}. (We will return later to question one aspect of Calvin's \textit{imago Dei} - see text p.463ff and fn. 573.)

We must ask if Barth's man-woman \textit{Imago Dei} (or \textit{analogia relationis}) does justice to the humanity of Jesus? In other words, if the image of God

495. Barth's term for his position, \textit{CD} 2/2, 142.
496. \textit{CD} 3/3, 317
497. \textit{Institutes}, 1.15.4. Cf. Athanasius, \textit{DI} 3/3, man was made in the image (\textit{ caval }) of God. The fall defaced this image with corruption (\textit{opp} 3.5, 4.5) This necessitated internal remedying (44.4) a restoration by the one "whose likeness it is" (14.1). We submit that the \textit{imago Dei} as \textit{analogia relationis} is foreign to Calvin and Athanasius.
in man is only an actualized relationship of man and woman, then how could the man Jesus have had this *imago Dei*? At least J. McIntyre could conclude,

"If the humanity exists only in the man-woman form, and if this form is interpreted normatively in terms of the marital relationship, then the humanity of Jesus Christ is incomplete, and the full demands of the Chalcedonian definition are not met: as touching his manhood, he will not be one substance with men. It is no help to add, as some of Barth's apologists have attempted to do, that in the Church as his bride, our Lord fulfils this requirement." 498

Barth perhaps would say that as the *humanitas* Jesus Christ was not only one man and woman, but all men and women. But we would ask if his sole ontology in God actualizes all other ontologies, so that the *imago Dei* became an *analogia relationis*, so that angel beings became vocational instruments, so that the man Jesus (as homo) became a *communio gratiarum* between God and *humanitas*?

It is in this context that we must present and interpret Barth's understanding of the freedom of choice that Adam had. Repeatedly Barth has emphasized that Adam was not created like Hercules at the crossroads with the choice of obedience and disobedience. 499 The fact that he chose to sin was his commission of the impossible. 500 Man is not forced to sin, there being "no reason for it". 501 It is catastrophic, 502 and is "wholly irrational and inexplicable". 503 This seemingly presents a dilemma in Barth's theology, i.e. the fact that sin is the impossible impossibility, that "Nothingness" is also the impossible possibility, 504 and yet even man who was not a Hercules entered into this active rebellion against God (albeit by what Barth would call a trivial deed). In his understandable
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revolt against anthropocentric "man come of age" so-called theologies, Barth has apparently worked hard to give man no place except in the man Jesus Christ, but has this not devalued man as the originally good creation of God (ontologically speaking) leaving one puzzled concerning how such a man without the ability of choice between good and evil could have sinned? Naturally one cannot explain sin or it would cease to be sin, but apparently back of Barth's presentation is his placing of all reality in God, so that there is no ontological devil, no ontological first Adam with a real imago Dei as an individual, and therefore no ontological results from that first sin. With this removal of all ontology from creatures etc., the actuality of man's freedom of choice has also been removed. This is why Barth could speak of a Hercules-like choice between good and evil as "pure illusion", for such a concept is only "in the imagination of the invincibly ignorant". Thus man has no other possibility than obedience, which cannot be chosen or avoided. This is because there is only the possibility of repentance and not sin since the cross, for only one thing is possible in view of Jesus Christ.

Another way of putting this was to say that it is as impossible for the Church to loose its existence as it is for Christ to loose His. Therefore he repeatedly said that the called have no option. Behind this lies his sole-subjectivity in Jesus Christ emphasis. Because He triumphed, and with Him we all triumphed, then there has been, is and always will be only one possibility, i.e. triumph. However, one must point out that basic to this triumph is the way the triumph was gained by Jesus Christ, which again reveals that Barth did not give full justice to His humanity, for he said,

---
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"When the Son of God, who was sent by the Father, does the Father's will on earth, and fulfils it to the end, what advantage or reward or honour does He get because of it? He does the will of the Father simply because He is the Son. To be sure, He does do it, and He has no choice not to do it. He does it necessarily. He could not be the Son of God if He did not do it. This is the great pattern of Christian obedience..." 513

From this christological centre which emphasized God's act in Jesus Christ to the detriment of His real humanity (human choice etc.) Barth has considered the humanity of all other men as determined by the will of God and therefore only able to follow one option, i.e. obedience. From the creation onwards this has been the reason for Barth's rejection of any choice between good and evil. But was it not precisely this choice that Jesus constantly made as a man in our place, and that Adam the first man made, and that every man has and will make? Is it good enough for Barth to say that every step is a choice, 514 when it really is not a choice after all? Of course it is true that there is only one worthwhile choice, and that this has always been so. This is the choice of obedience. But to say that the other choice is not open to man is not really doing justice to the reality of either creation (and therefore to the fall) to the crucifixion (and therefore to the end of a human life of good decisions, and not just the permanent removal of any true decision) and to the last judgment (and therefore to the fact that decisions for and against God are both open to man or else the future judgment is unnecessary - which is seemingly Barth's position).

It follows that Barth's treatment of sin is given only within the context of grace just as his judgment of sin is only considered in the context of the atonement. He admits that sin interrupted the divine purpose, 515 that it was an episode contrary to the plan and purpose of God, 516 and even

---
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that it was a breach in the covenant. He could even say that it was more than an interruption, because it menaced God's whole creation, and as such was a radical compromising of man's destiny. However, as seen before in other contexts, these are peripheral to the central christological emphasis which almost brushes aside the fall as at best a subsequent but certainly not the primary purpose for God's will to become man. Although rightly disagreeing with Leibniz and Schleiermacher's teaching that "without sin grace could not exist", Barth apparently went to the other extreme of saying only in "relationship to His grace" does sin exist, for "God is its Author as He negates it". In one place he could even say of opposing darkness that Jesus Christ as the Light opens the conflict and is the Agressor rather than the reverse. Could this not in the first instance be identified with chaos as negated in the positive act of the creative separation of light and darkness? Thus "nothingness does not exist at all except in relation to redemption", which was the "remarkable insight" (Barth's words) of Schleiermacher, which Barth seemingly accepted into his christological theology. "Nothingness" is therefore only an "antithesis to the grace of God", and as such is "not something malign, sinister and monstrous". We would agree that looking to Christ's victory over the powers of darkness is far better than the very negative concepts of "nothingness" as given by Heidegger and Sartre etc. But to go beyond this, i.e. to say that it is only the object of God's opus alienum, that it
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only "had power over the creature" and that it would therefore be wiser and more consoling not to call the devil the subject of hominum confusio, would seem to be because Barth does not take seriously the ontological reality of the devil, and the ontological reality of sin and its effects in man. Behind it all lies the sole reality in God and the mere revelation in creation, which even includes the destruction of "Nothingness". Barth put it this way,

"Nothingness may still have standing and assume significance to the extent that the final revelation of its destruction has not yet taken place and all creation must still await and expect it. But its dominion, even though it was only the semblance of dominion, is now objectively defeated as such in Jesus Christ. What is still is in the world, it is in virtue of the blindness of our eyes and the cover which is still over us, obscuring the prospect of the kingdom of God already established as the only kingdom undisputed by evil." 531

This again is seemingly contrary to a real future judgment, because only a revelation of one that has already taken place. It is true that the judgment has taken place objectively, but is it not equally true that it will just as really take place subjectively both for the devil and his angels, as well as for those who still have the freedom to choose for or against God even though the lives of all men are hid with God in Christ Jesus in the objective sense? (Col. 3:3) What Barth apparently did not accept is a Subject-subject covenantal relationship between Jesus Christ and the first Adam that was broken through the fall, and which damaged man's imago Dei. This affected his understanding of Israel which he considered could not be rejected because its choice did not really count in the end. The ontological impossibility of all godlessness is simply because man is ontologically godly in Jesus Christ. 532
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despair of some Nihilistic philosophies there are in this presentation, are there not also losses to the responsibility of man, which opens Barth's theology to the charge of *apokatstasis*? Behind it all is his failure to understand the humanity of Jesus Christ who really did choose as a man, who really did war against the ontological forces of evil, who really did overcome them as a man in order to help other men overcome them now in His *sessio ad dexteram*, and who will finally judge men on the basis of their decision for or against Him, with the final conclusion in the eternal destruction of the devil and his followers. He will be man's judge and the judge of the fallen creatures called the rebel angels because He was a man and thus a creature. Herein lies the justice of God.

9. The End for Individuals

Against anthropocentric so-called theologies, Barth has reversed the order considering first the world, the Church, and only last the individual. We follow him in this order by only now coming to consider that aspect of eschatology which concerns personal death and what takes place after.

Barth has spelled out his position in *CD 3/2*, 587-640 in the section on "Ending Time". Although this *KD 3/2* is on "The Creature", it is christologically given so that at the beginning of each new section is a consideration of the man Jesus. Thus #44 concerns Jesus, man for God; #45, Jesus, man for other men; #46, Jesus, whole man; and #47, Jesus, Lord of time. This christological context is important to keep in mind in order to appreciate and interpret Barth's presentation. Again, in *KD 3/3* the doctrine of providence, and the doctrine of preservation refer to man's ending time and again within the Creator and His creature context.

a. Natural death and judgment death

First, Barth would have us consider this matter of death against the
broad background of the difference between God who is eternal and man who is temporal. Contrary to J. Hamer's opinion that Barth no more speaks of the infinite qualitative distinction between God and man in his *Dogmatics*, we find it explicitly mentioned several times, and implicitly understood throughout. Thus it is over against God's "unallotted eternity" that Barth considered man's "allotted time". This allotted time meant that man as the good creation of God was not only given a "beginning time" but also because finite was given an "ending time". This "set span" given to man is his mortality, which the immortal God assumed when becoming temporal man with His own natural end. But just as He also died the second death vicariously for man's sin, so man would have had to die this eternal death if God had not intervened on the cross taking away this second death in His own death for Him. Barth therefore distinguishes between natural death as a part of the good creation of God and the unnatural or second death which is the wages of sin. Although he often referred to death as a "reality" we find him more often considering it as a "sign" of the judgment that has already been born on the cross for us. In CD 3/2, 587-640 the word "sign" appears at least thirty-nine times compared with the eight references to its "reality". This is indicative of the emphasis upon the fact that death is no longer real in the sense of "to be feared", for the judgment death, the real death to be dreaded has already been experienced so that man has his real death behind him in his death in Christ on the cross. Consequently, only his natural death lies before him, but this is not an enemy per se, for God is His end and future.
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He thus comes from God and hastens to God, so that his natural death can at worst only be a "sign" of the already actualized judgment.

It is a paradox that Barth's textual evidence for the second death comes from the very chapter (Revelation 20) which clearly shows that it is a future reality in the last judgment upon those who oppose God, including the devil, his angels and a multitude of men. Does not his acceptance of one aspect of the chapter whilst rejecting the other show his arbitrary handling of this scripture? The second death, however, will be no mere sign for those mentioned even though it perhaps can be considered as such for Christ's followers. But even they do not have this second death forever behind them. They too can do the incredible act of turning from Christ, just as the first Adam did in the beginning. Man really does have this freedom in spite of what Barth thought to the contrary. This is what gives the gospel a sense of urgency. Is there really any incontrovertible evidence in the Bible for a once saved always saved idea? Paul said that he died daily (1 Cor. 15:31), that for him to live was Christ (Phil. 1:21) and that he knew that it could be possible that having preached to others he himself could become a castaway (1 Cor. 9:27). That our lives are hid with God is a Pauline expression, but it is not his only emphasis as it is in Barth, and thus the fact that Christ died for us once and for all on His cross must be held together with the fact that we must die daily to self and sin as we take up our cross and follow Him. To say that death and nothingness are "utterly destroyed" in Christ's crucifixion, is only one side of the gospel, for more than a revelation of that reality will be made in the future, for the actual destruction or second death will then become reality to those opposed to God. Just as Barth concentrated upon the redeeming sole
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subjectivity of Jesus Christ and therefore overlooked the ontological subjective realization in man, so he does in this presentation of the second death. Both in the positive (redemption) and in the negative (second death) aspects, it is a reality only in Jesus Christ and relegated to a reflection or revelation in all that is ad extra to God. What is seemingly overlooked is the fact that Jesus Christ’s second death judgment was for all those who will believe and accept it (John 3:16) which means that the devil, his angels, and the rebellious wicked will be left to their own second death judgment. God does not force anyone, or else He would have made impossible the fall of the devil, his angels and men and thereby saved Himself from the tragic reality of the crucifixion. To say that only Jesus Christ will be rejected for “no other really stands under the judgment of God”, ⁵⁴¹ is to misunderstand the meaning of the cross. If the cross judgment makes impossible the reality of any future judgment, then why did not God make the cross judgment impossible? In other words, if Barth is serious about God’s act making one judgment impossible, why did He not act to make all judgment impossible? That He will not act in this way, because He has never acted in this way; is this not what the crucifixion reveals to us? Further, it follows, that it was a perfect man, a perfect created being, who was judged and died the second death, and therefore was able – had the right – to live again in the resurrection. He did not do it just as God. Although all other men are imperfect through sinning, if they believe and partake of the divine nature, appropriating the righteousness of Christ vicariously made available for them, then they too will be given resurrection or translation life because for them Christ paid the judgment second death. That this gift is possible of rejection causing second death judgment to be a future reality for the devil, angels and many men is never

⁵⁴¹ CD 3/2, 605
urgently present in Earth's theology as it is in the New Testament. He will not separate the Giver from the gift, Jesus Christ from all men, and therefore cannot convincingly reject universalism, whatever he says. In contrast the man Jesus received the beneficia Dei in his human growth, and it is now the beneficia Christi that we can (not forced to) receive in our human growth. To these alone, if faithful to the end, there is no second death judgment.

With Barth's distinction between the second death and natural death, it follows that man's allotted time was a part of the good creation that was willed by God, and indicates that he was created only to have a limited time. He admits a "narrower compass of biblical demonstration,"542 which, we submit, really fails to substantiate his claim. (We will return to this.) Barth's position seems to this writer to be strictly a post-fall reality read back into a pre-fall state, in that he seemingly takes the revelation of Jesus Christ as His only criterion in this matter of an ending time. In other words, because the man Jesus had an ending time, because as such he had assumed mortality and finitude, then He has revealed the nature of original mortality and finitude of the good creation of God.543 It is true that Barth notes that the suffering of Calvary was not what God planned for man in creating him,544 but evidently it was planned that the man Jesus die a natural death. With this in mind we read concerning the killing of animals,

"The fact that animals are sacrificed, that Yahweh graciously accepts these sacrifices, and that in view of them He enters into a quite new and positive relation with the sinful humanity...is taken for granted in Gen. 8:20f...we have to do with a new and different order as regards the peace of creation of Gen. 1 and 2."545
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If this was true concerning the death of animals, then how much truer was it concerning the death of Christ? Or, put a different way, if there is evidence for a pre-fall and a post-fall order in creation, should there not be the same difference concerning man? The first Adam also was created a ΨΥΧΗ ὅμωσι (1 Cor. 15:45), "and therefore a being which has only its own span of time". But the fact that Adamic man was made a "living soul" has nothing to do with time at all, but rather with ontology, and the same can be said of the second Adam, Jesus Christ, when made a "quickening spirit" (1 Cor. 15:45). In Barth's theology there are many post-fall texts superimposed on a pre-fall condition, eg. the Psalmist numbering his days (Psa. 90:12), Easlam's wish to die the death of the righteous (Num. 23:10), that we must give up our life if we want to save it - which is not literal as Barth supposes but applies to dying to self to really live (Matt. 16:25), Paul's similar expression, "Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die" (1 Cor. 15:36) which is a post-fall resurrection context. Does not Barth level the difference between the pre-fall and post-fall? Thus in comment on 1 Cor. 15:36 he said, "if we did not have to do with the definitive end of human life, we should not have to do with its resurrection and definitive co-existence with that of God." This is correct for a post-fall condition, but can one really read it back into a pre-fall condition without failing to take the fall seriously? In other words, if man had remained dependent upon His Maker, if he had always chosen His way, if he had ignored the devil's temptations etc., then would he not have always lived, making unnecessary a resurrection as His life would have continued in fellowship with God? Barth even went so far as to say that the tree of life in Eden was not meant for Adam, and thus he was
prevented from living forever.\textsuperscript{548} Again this is a post-fall verse (Gen. 3:22) and cannot without impunity be forced back into the pre-fall situation. By complete contrast, Calvin was correct when he said that the tree of life was to Adam and Eve "an earnest of immortality".\textsuperscript{549} It was only after their failure that they were barred from partaking of the tree. Before the fall God made it clear that they were debarred only from the tree of knowledge of good and evil (Gen. 2:16f, 3:1-3), the very statement of which would seem to make Barth's position untenable.

But this is not the only way Barth tried to find support for his theory that natural death was a part of the good creation. He next came to consider Enoch and Elijah whom the Bible clearly states were translated (Gen. 5:24, 2 Kings 2:1-18). One would think that such translations would disprove Barth's natural death idea. However, he tried to show that the very fact that the men went to be with God showed that they had lived their allotted time here below. Of course there is truth in this, but can one really beg the fact that these men did not really die, even if Barth did think that Elijah's dividing of the waters was a "type of death"?\textsuperscript{550} The weakness of Barth's theory is further seen in considering there were no parallel examples to Enoch and Elijah in the New Testament, which apparently completely overlooks the fact that there will be the greatest translation reality in the \textit{parousia} of which Enoch and Elijah were but tokens (1 Thess. 4:16-18).\textsuperscript{551}

It should also be noted here that Barth's rejection of biblical evidence for a theological demonology, as fallen creatures of God who yet exist, albeit in rebellion, has cut him off from yet another evidence that
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creatures are not necessarily made to have only an allotted time. Or perhaps more poignantly we should put it this way: Barth does have an angelology, and apparently there is no allotted time given to them, or is the cessation of their ministry at the end of the perousia an indication of this? If so, then how can Barth answer this new aspect of theodicy, i.e. that God would create the wonderful beings called angels just to do a work to help man and then let them die? If he would reject this, and there is evidence that he does, would he not then be forced with the alternative of a group of faithful, unfallen beings who will live forever? This we submit would have also been true for man if he had been just as faithful. In conclusion, we are forced to say that Barth's biblical evidence is not evidence at all, for it reads back into the pre-fall situation the post-fall condition, and does not therefore give proper weight to the translations of Enoch and Elijah in the past, nor to the final glorious translation of the living saints in the future perousia, and does not take sufficient account of God's other creatures, the good angels, whose life is never considered in terms of "allotted time" in the biblical accounts. It should be added here that this "allotted time" or death to all with its violation of what translation meant and will mean, has a determining influence on Barth's understanding of this life compared with the life beyond. We will return to this later. But for now, it should be noted that Barth's several references to the transfiguration revelation of the Kingdom do not sufficiently penetrate to the full significance of why Jesus glorified with the glorified Moses and Enoch should represent the Kingdom. Barth sees only the glorified Christ as the proleptic Kingdom autobasileia to be revealed in the glorious resurrection of Jesus. What he apparently
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did not see was that the Kingdom is more than Jesus Christ, for it includes also the resurrected (Moses) and the translated (Enoch) just as it will finally include this same Jesus Christ and these two groups of the redeemed (i.e. resurrected and translated). 553

b. The non-Immortality of the Soul

Closely associated with the former section on man's "allotted time" is the fact that man is mortal. We give it a separate section to bring out the contribution that Barth has made to this discussion, in contrast to the poor showing that he made in the use of scripture in the last section. To appreciate Barth's position on this aspect of death, it is perhaps best to consider it over-against that of Calvin and Schleiermacher as we earlier did when considering the question of universalism.

(1) Calvin's Position

Although Calvin could say that the soul can be "altogether devoid of good", 554 that it with the body, because flesh, needs to be "totally renewed", 555 that in his fall Adam was deprived of the gift of immortality, 556 estranged from God which means "the death of his soul"; 557 although he apparently considered the immortality of the soul as a future gift, so that Israel's covenant promises were "a sure hope of immortality", 558 so that in the Eucharist "our souls feed, for a true and blessed immortality", 559 so that the integrity of believers, though partial and imperfect, is a step to immortality, 560 so that he could consider the tree of life to Adam and Eve as "an earnest of immortality", 561 the transfiguration as a taste of immortality, 562 and that there is no "terrestrial immortality". 563
nevertheless wish all these many references to be considered within his
determinative context of the soul's immortality. To this we now come.

Thus, although the bodies are now mortal, man has an "immortal
nature", which meant that to call the soul mortal would be "gross igno-
rance". Calvin therefore could say, "though the whole man is called
mortal, the soul is not therefore liable to death". Involved is the
distinction between the body and the soul, for "neither is soul body, nor
body soul". Rather, Adam's clay body was made for the habitation of an
immortal spirit. This immortal spirit or soul in man can be considered
as merely clothed with mortal flesh. Calvin's most repeated way of
expressing this relationship between soul and body was to refer to the body
as the earthly prison or prison house for the soul. He considered the
conscience to be "an undoubted sign of an immortal spirit", and stated
that "the proper seat of the image is in the soul". It was for this
reason that he opposed Osiander who in "extending the image of God indis-
criminately as well to the body as to the soul, confounds heaven with
earth". It follows that he also opposed Pope John XXII "who publickly
maintained that the soul is mortal, and perished with the body till the day
of resurrection". It follows that he opposed as two dreams the idea
that (1) the whole man perishes at death and (2) that man receives new bodies

---
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in the resurrection.\textsuperscript{576} Death to Calvin therefore meant that the immortal soul or spirit continued to live on because only the mortal body slept.\textsuperscript{577}

In another place he put it this way,

"...since Scripture uniformly enjoins us to look with expectation to the advent of Christ, and delays the crown of glory till that period, let us be contented with the limits divinely prescribed to us - viz. that the souls of the righteous, after their warfare is ended, obtain blessed rest where in joy they wait for the fruition of promised glory, and that thus the final result is suspended till Christ the Redeemer appear." \textsuperscript{578}

This is taken from his famous chapter on the final resurrection of the body, showing therefore that it is only the body that will come forth in that advent resurrection, for the soul is already at rest and waiting for the final advent in joy. It follows that those alive to see the advent will not need to have this separation of soul from the body as those who died before.\textsuperscript{579}

Calvin's position leaves questions unanswered, eg. (1) if God only hath immortality (1 Cor. 15:53, 1 Tim. 6:16), how then can man's soul also have it? (2) Does not this giving to man's soul what only now really belongs to God negate his otherwise proper emphasis on the distance between God and man? (3) Calvin stressed that it is "neither lawful nor expedient" to pry into the "intermediate state", i.e. between death and the advent,\textsuperscript{580} yet he speaks of that state as joyful for the soul, and can speak of the devils as being in this state, which of course includes their ability to tempt, etc.\textsuperscript{581} He could also refer to this state as a non-living state in the sense that Noah and Job in the time of Ezek. 14:14 could be referred to as if they

\textsuperscript{576} \textit{Institutes}, 3.25.6  
\textsuperscript{577} \textit{Ibid.} 3.25.8  
\textsuperscript{578} \textit{Ibid.} 3.25.6  
\textsuperscript{579} \textit{Ibid.} 3.25.8  
\textsuperscript{580} \textit{Ibid.} 3.25.6. See also his \textit{Psychopannychia} written in opposition to Lutheran soul sleep.  
\textsuperscript{581} \textit{Ibid.} 3.25.9
"were again to come alive". 582 Although opposed to Catholic intercession by departed saints, pointing rather to Christ's sole intercession, 583 Calvin could nevertheless grant that the dead saints do pray for us in longing for the Kingdom of God. 584 This seems to go against his later statement that "the scripture...says not one syllable concerning the dead". 585

(4) If the imago Dei is only the immortal soul and has nothing at all to do with the body which is a mere habitation, or worse, prison house; then why is it so vital that it is this very same body that must be reunited to the freed soul in the resurrection, and that the soul even looks forward to this with joy? (5) If it was in the resurrection that the assumed mortal flesh of the man Jesus received immortality, 586 and thus in the final resurrection when this will come to the redeemed, 587 then what does Calvin mean that "the first entrance to immortal life, is the remission of sins"? 588 which apparently would refer to the soul which is already immortal anyway? The same applies to his statements concerning feeding on the Lord's vivifying flesh "for immortality" when already it is supposed to be a reality. Again this cannot refer to the body as he clearly states that it does not receive any immortality until the final resurrection, even stressing that upon no other subject has scripture given a clearer explanation. 589 Barth was to rebel against much of what Calvin said on this question, and yet could also say certain things which could open to question whether he did not still stay with Calvin.

(2) Schleiermacher's Position

Although Schleiermacher could say that man was not created immortal, 590 and that the Redeemer was "the mediator of immortality", 591 he also said,
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"...if personal immortality did not belong to human nature, so union of the Divine Essence with human nature to form such a personality as that of the Redeemer would have been possible; and conversely, that since God had determined to perfect and redeem human nature through such union, human individuals must all along have possessed the same immortality as the Redeemer was conscious of. Such is the true Christian assurance concerning this belief." 592

Behind this lies his *finit* capax *infiniti* presupposition, so that although man may not have been created immortal, he has through natural evolutionary development of his capacity come to the place where he has received the fullness of the God-consciousness in the one man Jesus, and the resulting union can therefore be understood as the personal immortality that belongs to human nature. This is in agreement with Schleiermacher's teleology that we have previously presented (see Chapter Two).

In this context it is of interest to note Schleiermacher's agreement with Calvin in that he also considered that Christ did not possess "natural immortality" for it "was conferred upon Christ's human nature only with the resurrection". 593 Although Schleiermacher considered life after death as a "purely cosmological question", 594 he nevertheless spoke of "the imperishability of the spirit". 595 Evidently, since man has developed to the full capacity to take in the God-consciousness into the self consciousness in the one man Jesus, and since His influence now goes out to all men to evoke the same in them, then the once non-mortal man at creation can now be considered as having an imperishable spirit. This however, is to be understood in terms of death being an "emerging into immortality". 596 It would seem then that man does really possess immortality now, and thus he automatically emerges into immortality at death because he already has an imperishable spirit. This is really no advance over Calvin's position, although it is
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given from a different context, and does not include the resurrection of the body. The interesting point to note in connection with Barth's thinking is the way Schleiermacher spoke of death. He considered that it could be thought of from two standpoints, i.e. (1) as an infinitely progressive development, or (2) as an unchanging completeness.\footnote{597} We shall note that Barth's position is the second.

(3) Barth's Position

In direct opposition to Calvin and Schleiermacher, Barth wrote,

"The Greek conception of the soul as a second and higher 'part', as an imperishable, if possible pre-existent, and in any case immortal spiritual substance of human reality, contrasted with the body as its lower and mortal part - the conception of the soul as a captive in the prison of its body, is quite unbiblical".\footnote{598}

Although no names were mentioned in the above quote, the "imperishable spirit" of Schleiermacher and "immortal soul captive in the body prison" of Calvin lies behind it. Some pages beyond this quote Barth specifically criticized the Reformation for not overcoming the Greek (i.e. Platonic) and Catholic (i.e. 5th Lateran Council) concept of the immortality of the soul, saying that "the Reformation has too little time or understanding for biblical eschatology, and therefore saw no occasion to undertake a revision of the traditional anthropology".\footnote{599} We have already seen in Chapter Five that the general charge of Barth against Reformation eschatology is groundless, but it must now be noted that he was correct in this one aspect of the body-soul relationship concerning man's individual end, and therefore

\footnote{597} CF 159.2
\footnote{598} CD 3/2, 378. Neither is soul in the body like an oyster in a shell (3/2, 376). "As soul of his body, he is neither in a foreign land, nor in a prison, nor even in a vessel, but wholly in his own house and wholly himself. Again, as body of his soul, he is not merely external; he does not cling to it accidently; he is not merely its accompanist" (3/2, 426).
\footnote{599} CD 3/2, 384
in this one area of eschatology. It is of interest that although stressing the final resurrection even Barth apparently taught a separation of soul and body in 1935, and to this extent was in agreement with Calvin. This was three years after beginning his Dogmatics and is apparently another example of his theologia viatorum.\(^{600}\)

In contrast to Calvin's division between soul and body, Barth could, at least by 1948, consider that man was man as soul and body. Thus he wrote,

"Through the Spirit of God, man is the subject, form and life of a substantial organism, the soul of his body - wholly and simultaneously both, in ineffaceable difference, inseparable unity, and indestructible order."\(^{601}\)

As such, his constitution is from God and therefore even in his deepest fall it remains, even in death he is still man within the hand and power of God, so that in no case does he become another being deprived of the

600. In his Credo Barth spoke of "Death as separation of the immortal soul from the mortal body" (p. 168), going on to state that resurrection will mean redemption from this very separation (p. 169).

601. CD 3/2, 325. Barth vigorously and convincingly opposed any separation of soul and body in CD 3/2, 325-436. Jesus is whole man (body and soul) in his death and resurrection. Man is whole man as a representative of the whole cosmos as the soul (higher, heavenly part of creation) and body (lower, earthly part of creation). The antithesis between God and man in Jesus Christ, however, is absolutely unique, because Creator and creature belong together through grace whereas soul and body as man belong together through nature. Whereas God is Creator and creature, man is only creature. Soul and body are inseparable, being understood not as two parts but as two moments of the indivisibly one human nature, the soul as that which quickens and the body as that which is quickened. It is the Holy Spirit that maintains man as soul of his body, as the ruling soul of his serving body.

Again the emphasis is upon the encounter, the soul being actualized beyond any real ontology (3/2, 404-408). Thus it is a moment in the dynamics that make up man, it responds to and is determined by the basis in the Holy Spirit. What is puzzling is that Barth can still say man "is spiritual soul" (3/2, 425) when only encounter and no spiritual or ontological appropriation is involved. However, when saying that man "is also spiritual body" although not apparent to him since "it will be the gift of grace of future revelation (3/2, 425f) the sole subjectivity of Jesus Christ instead of man's own subjective ontological realization of atonement is apparently Barth's emphasis.
covenant promise. Thus Barth could say that man is neither before, beside nor after his material body. In fact, "He is soul as he is a body and this in his body. Hence he is not only soul that 'has' a body which perhaps it might not have, but he is bodily soul, as he is also b KC_{ul}ed body." Barth therefore opposed the traditional Christian view of the qualitative difference between the soul and body as wrong, stating that it was not only a disastrous division but was as such unchristian, because an abstract dualism. He further considered that, "The doctrine of immortality ('athanism') is an illusory opinion which stands in irresoluble contradiction to the most certain affirmations of modern science, which cannot be justified in face of physiology, histology, pathology, ontogenetics or phylogenetics, and for which finally no serious rational ground can be supplied." In terms of the modern crisis that has faced the Church for several generations, Barth has given us one of the most illuminating insights into the failure of the Church to offset materialism. In its form as "historical materialism", as presented by Karl Marx, the mere step between the Church's "stating that the soul is materially conditioned to stating that it is materially constituted" has been made. This is the mere step from Calvin's platonic dualism (from his conditioned or imprisoned soul) to Communism's manifesto. If Schleiermacher's position could be included with the Idealists' celebration of the victory of the spirit over nature, then his position also was as entirely inadequate as Calvin's to stop the victory of nature over the spirit in Marxian materialism. If the soul could exist alone without the body (as in Calvin) or be the sole concern
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(as in Schleiermacher) then the one removed the importance of the body to the final resurrection and the other removed it entirely. As the Christian Church had befriended the bourgeois and not the working class, it is not surprising that an opposite emphasis on the body - on the materialistic because soulless body of man - should rise up to appeal to the proletariat. Such was the contribution of Karl Marx as viewed over-against the Christian Church in its Calvin-Schleiermacher consideration of man's soul. 612 Thus Barth said,

"The Christian Church need not be surprised at this, nor that it has come under the fire of Marxist polemic nor that it must now hear its faith denounced as a 'relic of capitalism' in the service of restraint and therefore of reaction. In all the centuries, what has it done positively to prevent the rise of that figure of the soulless man? Has it not always stood on the side of the 'ruling classes'? At any rate, has it not always been the surest guarantee of the existence and continuance of an order of classes which technically cannot be understood otherwise than as the order of superiority of the economically strong? And has it not with its doctrine of soul and body at least shown a culpable indifference towards the problem of matter, of bodily life, and therefore of contemporary economics? Has it not made a point of teaching the immortality of the soul instead of attesting to society, with its proclamation of the resurrection of the dead, that the judgment and promise of God compasses the whole man...?" 613

Barth blamed Reformation theology for failing to offset this "historical materialism", and called for an energetic revision of its anthropology in the light of eschatology. 614 Barth's point is well taken as an exceedingly important one. The Church has failed in the way he mentioned and therefore does owe a great "debt". But, although Calvin apparently did not think through his immortality of the soul doctrine with his other final resurrection doctrine, it would not be correct to say that he did not stress the importance of the final resurrection. However, for all practical purposes, his stress on the former negated the importance of the latter,
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and leaves questions concerning its importance as we have before mentioned. (See pages 464f)

Turning from this immortality of the soul doctrine which he considered to have no basis in reality, and an expression of fear in actuality, Barth gave his own presentation of man's end in death as the one form of the end that is however limited by the other end at the parousia which is the new beginning. The outcome, as we shall see, places him in one respect with Schleiermacher and yet in another respect still with Calvin. We will now come to Barth's thinking on these two aspects of man's end.

a. Similarity with Calvin's Position

Inspite of his rejection of the separation of the soul and body, and his consistent stress on the parousia resurrection of mankind, there are apparent evidences in Barth's theology that between death and that final resurrection there is an existence of the dead. Before his definitive presentation of man as soul of his body in KD 3/2, (1948) Barth said the following in KD 3/1 (1945):

"In this knowledge he will necessarily die, i.e., the process of life will be changed into a process of death, and his return to dust, the removal of the soul and life given to him, will be irrevocably introduced." 618

This removal of the soul at death is apparently different from the impossibility of separating the soul from the body as given in CD 3/2, 371 three years later. Is this evidence for a change in Barth's presentation? Perhaps the best answer is to note that in KD 4/1 (1953) Barth speaks of those who once lived, i.e. "the Church which was", as the ecclesia triumphants. Of them he said, "the ecclesia triumphants is 'with Christ' (Phil. 1:23). With Him, the Head of the body, it takes part in the glory
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which is still hidden from the *ecclesia militans*". 619 This very distinction between the Church of the past and the Church of the present shows that Barth is not thinking of the Church of all time whose life is hid with God in Christ Jesus. In that objective sense, To Barth, even the Church of the present is the *ecclesia triumphans* and therefore already participates in the glory of God. Rather, here he is concerned with the difference between the dead and the living members of the Church. Still later, in KD 4/3, (1959) he named twelve dead people as those upon whom now shines the eternal light. 620 Even in KD 3/2, where the inseparableness of soul and body is given, Barth concluded the volume by saying that man expects to be with Jesus Christ when he dies. 621 If these references do in fact speak of a continuance of existence of the dead after death, at least as participating in the glory of God, with His light shining upon them which is as yet not open to the living, then although he repudiated the immortality of the soul, its continuance as a gift from God after death seems to be supported. Thus Barth put it, "even in death God watches over him. And as on either side of death he may live by the gracious will of God..." 622 Evidence for this position is therefore found from at least 1945 to 1959, and hence both before and after his KD 3/2 definitive presentation of soul-body unity in 1948.

Barth further stated that there is a distinct difference between the spirit of man and the Holy Spirit, and that from Luke 24:39, Heb. 12:23 and 1 Pet. 3:19 "the departed or their appearances can be described" as *πνεῦμα* 623 Here, apparently, Barth is emphasizing that these verses speak of the human *pneuma* as the appearance of those who have departed this life. A different position is given in KD 3/1. There he wrote,

---
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"When Jesus died, He commended (Lk. 23:46) His Spirit into the Father's hands. When Stephen died, he prayed Jesus to receive his spirit (Acts 7:59). The spirit, then, continues beyond death, not as something belonging to man, but as the divine address and gift to man, which remains in readiness for him even when it is withdrawn, i.e., when it is surrendered by him." 624

Here the spirit is not man's, but God's address to man. From these references (with possible exception of the last one) a life beyond or the other side of death before the resurrection is indicated. This raises several questions. (1) Such a life of the ecclesia triumphans, or pneumata, would seemingly necessitate a separation of soul from body after all, because the body is not to be raised until the final parousia resurrection. Or (2) if man as soul of his body in undivided unity is present as such in the ecclesia triumphans or pneumata existence above during his pre-final parousia period, then two bodies would be involved: the present one, and the one to be raised. Barth does not answer these questions. We submit that these references are seemingly contrary to his non-separation of soul and body, and thus to that extent place his thinking with Calvin's. However, this cannot be considered as Barth's only position, nor perhaps is it to be taken as his main position. This is because the very unity of soul and body which he has so clearly and fully spelled out demands another conclusion, which is also to be found in his Dogmatics. To this we now turn.

b. Dissimilarity with Calvin's Position

The final resurrection was more normative to Barth's presentation than it was to Calvin's. Thus, instead of the soul departing to be with Christ at death, and thus separated from the body that returned to dust to be resurrected at the last day (Calvin), Barth repeatedly spoke of that final resurrection as a resurrection of the "whole man" (i.e. soul and body). 625
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Thus death and the resurrection were considered as two aspects of man's end, so that they were held together in this unity. This holding together of these two events meant that the new beginning came only in and with the resurrection end of man's temporal life. Barth put it this way,

"It is advisable and even indispensable to realise that dying is in fact only one form of the end, confronted in free superiority by the very different form of departing to be with Christ...seen in this light, can death as the first form of the end be anything more than a provisional substitute or mask of the true end, or indicate otherwise than in a glass darkly (1 Cor. 13:12) the original of this true end which comes with the coming again of Jesus Christ?" 626

The characteristic New Testament term "to fall asleep" (κοιμάσθαι) Barth considered to relate to the process of dying and not to the state of death. With Calvin he rejected any soul-sleep (Calvin's Psychopannychia).627 It seems that if man falls asleep in the process of dying, then he will depart to be with the Lord in the process of resurrection. It would seem that the latter is the other side of the former.

This logically resulted in opposition to the syllogism "All men must die". Barth rejected this because "it overlooks the parousia of Jesus Christ".628 This meant that man's end did not have to be his death. This position in 1959 is a complete reversal of that of 1948 (KD 3/2) - still held in 1953 (KD 4/1) 629 - when Barth considered man's allotted time to be a birth to death "given time". It followed, in his thinking, that even the translations of Enoch and Elijah were really deaths. These he considered to have no parallel in the New Testament.630 We have already questioned this because it tries to reinterpret the translations of Enoch and Elijah as deaths in order to remove any example which negates his idea of death being a part of the good creation. We noted, further, that the
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parousia will also find a multitude of people who will be translated without ever dying, and hence there is a parallel in the New Testament to these Old Testament translations. This position which took the parousia translations seriously (in 1959) would apparently call in question Barth's earlier allotted time presupposition. It must be noted, however, that there is even evidence of this in KD 3/2, where Barth noted that Paul speaks in 1 Thess. 4:13-18 of "the community, both living and departed", as being "caught up...in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air". It is with the same intent that he spoke in KD 3/4 of man's departing to be with Christ in terms of "when his time and all time shall have passed, he will be caught up by the eternal God..." These references are really mutually exclusive to the ones quoted in the previous section, for one cannot depart to be with Christ (body and soul) both at death and at the final resurrection. This holding together of the end of man in death and resurrection, so that the reverse side is his beginning in that parousia departing to be with Christ is clearly the logical result of Barth's indivisibility of soul and body presentation.

631. CD 3/2, 505
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633. Barth considered that (in the O.T.) there is no fellowship of the dead amongst themselves, nor with the living. They exist in a state of utter weakness and helplessness, existing only as they had been because deprived of the spirit. In this state of complete deprivation they are "sad" (CD 3/2, 589). Even on O.T. Terms how can the dead be sad when they know not anything? (Psa. 6:5, 30:9, 115:17) Barth spoke of the reality of death already present in this life, and apparently therefore referring to both the future and present he said, "the worst thing about death - the really deadly thing about it, is true already here and now, namely, that man can no longer see God, or worship Him, or praise Him and adore Him. Man is no longer present before God and for Him. He is forsaken of God. God is no longer His Comforter, Helper, Avenger and Saviour. All he can do is to cry and sob helplessly" (3/2, 592). Even in its present reference is this not an overstatement, for God has promised, "Lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the world" (Matt. 28:20), and Paul witnessed that in the final sense death cannot separate us from the love of God (Rom. 8:38f). Perhaps Barth considered this to be the Old Testament view of...
c. Similarity with Schleiermacher's Position

We come now to consider the relationship between this life and the life to come. Of this G. C. Berkouwer wrote, "It is not easy to come to a clear insight with respect to Earth's solution of the problem of ending time in its relation to eternal life". However, we shall attempt to find this relationship. If Calvin's natural immortality of the soul could be considered as a continuation of this life in the life to come, then Schleiermacher gave a choice between either "an infinitely progressive development or in that of an unchanging completeness". It is the latter that became Earth's position. He put it this way,

"The basic limitation in which the individual is what he is obviously consists in the fact that he begins and ends, that he is not therefore infinite, that his life is given a fixed span. The truth is plain, though it is often overlooked and seldom apprehended, that man exists only from the time of his birth to the time of his death. He has only this limited share in the existence of God's creation. What he is, he is in this time. God has created and preserved him for existence in his particular time and therefore in none but his own life-time between birth and death. What is beyond does not belong to him. It is part of the pure promise of existence, not in another time, but in the eternity of God. Nor do the promise of hope of this eternal life refer to a continuation of his life in infinite time, but to his limited life in his time, to its glorification..." 636

633. cont.

death as the context concerns the O.T., whereas a few pages on he specifically noted that death cannot separate us from God's love is the N.T. teaching (3/2, 620). However is not this positive understanding of death just as truly to be found in the O.T. as the Gospel? Is this not why the Psalmist could say with assurance, "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff they comfort me" (Psa. 23:4). Did not the prophet Baalas say with meaning, "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his" (Num. 23:10)? Was this not the faith of the wise man Solomon when he specifically noted that "the wicked is driven away in his wickedness: but the righteous hath hope in his death" (Prov. 14:32)? Was this not the hope of Isaiah when with confidence he declared "He will swallow up death in victory" (Isa. 25:8)? Was this positive attitude not also that of Hosea when witnessing to God's promise, "I will redeem them from death" (Hos. 13:14)?
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Man has a "beginning time" and an "ending time" which is his "given time". This is the "allotted time" given to temporal man. He only has time this one time, it is his once-for-all life-time. In this context death was to Barth, "the 'eternalising' (Verewigung) of this ending time", which perhaps has no antecedents in the history of Christian doctrine. Thus "even in eternal life he will still be in his time", for redemption is the making eternal of man's temporal life. This conclusion Barth reads out of his understanding of Christology. He saw in the life-time of the man Jesus Christ the "once-for-all". His resurrection was no continuation of His life-time, but the coming of the One who had lived that life-time. Even in the future coming at the parousia it will be this same Jesus Christ whose life-time will be revealed, as it will be the eternal manifestation of this "once and not again". In connection with this parousia and its significance for man's temporal life, Barth therefore said, "as the event of creation took place in a present without a past, so this event is that of a present without a future". Thus Barth's eternalization replaced Greek (and to some extent Calvinistic) continuation. Of this Berkouwer wrote, "Obviously this reaction to pagan dreams of glory and immortality does not bring us a step further in the understanding of the problem of the 'vita eterna'."
To this we now turn.

10. Jesus Christ as Man's Future

Although men are to receive the crown of life, resurrection, eternal bliss, palms, white robes, and a new heaven and a new earth, as the reward for their good works, their witness is not prompted, motivated or conditioned by this thought of reward, but is done for God's sake. It is merely an illusory possibility for them to work to assure promotion, not perhaps *cum laude*, but at any rate as a *rite*. Rather, it is bestowed without any consideration of merit, as God's free act, for this great reward

"is not a payment, a requital, a moral and legal obligation on the basis of a higher law. It is not an article which God must deliver to Him in virtue of the price of offering obedience and service which He has paid. God does not owe Him anything."

This is because

"The Christian can obey only as he comes from the acquisition which has accrued to him, not as he seeks some further acquisition. He thanks God for the fact that He is a Christian, but he cannot expect any thanks for it. He obeys as God has made Himself meritorious on His behalf - what further merit is to be expected? He has his reward in the fact that he is a Christian, and that as such he can obey. This reward, which precedes and follows all his own achievement, is now hidden and will one day be revealed. But the man who participates in it has no time to look for any other, because all his time is taken up in simply obeying on the basis of the reward already received in secret...Real obedience has passed the point where there is a possible choice of disobedience. Christian obedience is real obedience because in it this choice was excluded at the source."

In other words, the reward is nothing less than Jesus Christ, as the New Testament expects His coming and not abstract blessings. He is the

---
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beneficia Christi as the benefit of all benefits. And He is not just this in the sense of some future time, but is so already. The community already comes from or experiences its reward, which to Barth meant the community in God in Jesus Christ above, the humanity in the Godhead, and it was because of this that he spoke of the impossibility of disobedience, or of merit etc. as noted in the quote above. Again, it would seem that this sole concentration upon the objective reality is one-sided and must inevitably lead to universalism. It also seemingly removes the present ontological reality in the being of the community below to the final eschaton. Thus Barth said,

"Our specific topic at the moment is Christian hope. What does the Christian really expect as he hopes? What, then, will specifically determine and characterise his life in Christian hope? We have seen that he expects the coming of Jesus Christ in glory, i.e., His consummating revelation of that which is still hidden, namely that the will of God has been definitively, irrevocably and unassailably done by Him on earth as it is done in heaven. This implies something forceful and decisive even for his own personal future and expectation of it. It means even for him, too, glory and reward and gain. It means pardon in the final and strictest sense. It means his departing to be with Christ. It means his translation out of the darkness around into the great coming light. It means his transformation, his investiture with a new being which is neither exposed to corruption nor subject to death, his restoration and the beginning of his eternal life and salvation." 656

The reality of our new being is clearly already a reality in Jesus Christ and yet awaits revelation, which will also be the beginning of eternal life and salvation subjectively speaking. But is this not to remove the eschatological firstfruits from the present to the future, making this aspect of eschatology but a mere appendix?

Barth consistently stressed that Jesus Christ was the sole future of man, because not just one future open to him, but the absolute, final and

655. CD 3/3, 159 656. CD 4/3, 931
eternal future of all men as the futurum exactum of God. This was based on his christological presupposition that Jesus Christ was the origin and is the goal of all mankind. The important fact to keep in mind is Earth's sole reality in Jesus Christ, and mere reflection in mankind. This does not only seem to lie behind his removal of the eschatological first-

657. Not only does Barth refer to the liberation taken place in Jesus Christ as the presupposition of our future (CD 4/1, 554) and speaks of the man Jesus as the "prototype of all participation by creation in the glory of God" (2/1, 643) but speaks of Christ as the only future (1/2, 400). Thus there is no other telos apart from Him (4/1, 663), the reward is nothing less than Him (4/2, 192), and redemption is the predicate of which He is the Subject (1/2, 10f). Thus the reward is the Kingdom which is nothing less than Him (4/2, 192), so that the coming Kingdom of God is spoken of as "the substance of the whole future of man" (4/1, 153). Thus Jesus Christ is not just one future, but man's absolute and final future (4/1, 324), his eternal future (4/1, 328), his real future (2/2, 690), his living future (2/2, 260). He is therefore the content and hope of the Christian community (4/1, 126) as well as the future of the world (4/1, 118). Not only in Him "alone do I have the future of my being" (3/2, 178) but He is that future (2/1, 116; 4/3, 207) so that in Him I see myself as the one I shall be (3/2, 108f). Thus "He only is our hope, our future, our victory, our resurrection and our life" (3/2, 615). Hence "God is our frontier" (3/4, 580) for the man in Jesus Christ "alone is man's future" (4/1, 94). "In Him there is given us a future, and hope and room to be" (4/1, 352) for it is the "omnipotent grace of God which alone can be his pure future" (3/4, 616). It is perhaps with this in mind that Barth referred to the elected man Jesus as the destiny of human nature (2/2, 118). This destiny has already been actualized in time, but was a reality in eternity. Thus Barth stated that the fall has not changed man for what he is eternally before God and from God and with God he has a future, a very different future (3/2, 31). Here eternity would seem to enclose time, God enclose man, so that what man will become after time is already what he has been before time. Of temporal man Barth said, "Man as such, therefore, has no beyond. Nor does he need one, for God is his beyond (Jenseits)" (3/2, 632). This is because "Death is man's step from existence into non-existence, as birth is his step from non-existence into existence" (Ibid.)

658. God is both the origin and goal of human existence (CD 3/4, 330) so that Genesis 2 and the Song of Songs can depict this origin and goal of creation (3/2, 294). Christ not only gives to creation its meaning and goal (2/2, 142), and is the absolute end towards which we move (1/2, 882) but He is as such the goal and consummation of all God's doings (2/2, 149). This would seem to suggest both a separate reality as man's future (Song of Songs) as well as an inseparable reality (Christ as our future). Here Barth would have us note that the goal is an advance over the origin in the sense that more than restoration is involved (4/1, 15, 599). However, he would also point out that as we come from Christ we also move to Christ (ἐν ὄντων and ἐν ὄντων) as our frontier (3/4, 580).
fruits from a present ontology below to a possible future ontology beyond, but seemingly concentrates upon that future reality as identical with the sole reality in Jesus Christ. It is also important to see this in the light of eschatology preceding creation, and thus as not a mere appendix (objectively speaking) because an eternal reality in Jesus Christ. Just as Barth spoke of God as pre-temporal, supra-temporal and post-temporal, and thus enclosing our temporality\textsuperscript{659} he spoke of Jesus Christ as the one who "encloses us before and behind (Psa. 139:5).\textsuperscript{660} In many different ways this emphasis is repeated. Thus God's life-act in Jesus Christ encloses our eternal life,\textsuperscript{661} His act encloses our existence,\textsuperscript{662} His Kingdom encloses man,\textsuperscript{663} His promise encloses our future,\textsuperscript{664} His life encloses the life of all men and creation,\textsuperscript{665} because the royal man Jesus encloses our being,\textsuperscript{666} and as such His humanity encloses our eternal future.\textsuperscript{667} Put another way, His reality encloses our reflection, His life-act encloses our life-act, His grace encloses our response, His enfolded reality in Himself encloses His unfolding reality to us, His resurrection encloses His crucifixion, so that His salvation encloses His punishment,\textsuperscript{668} His election encloses His rejection,\textsuperscript{669} and His divine eternal "yes" encloses His "no".\textsuperscript{670} It is within this context of the eternal reality enfolded within the trinitarian being which is unfolding in revelation in time that he would apparently have us understand the future life of man beyond the parousia. It is with this in mind that Barth referred to Paul's germane text in Rom. 11:36, with its all embracing christological ζῷον αὐτοῦ καὶ χάρις αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔξος αὐτοῦ.\textsuperscript{671}
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This immediately raises the question concerning the future ontological reality of man beyond the *parousia*. Will man's life be swallowed up in the objective reality of Jesus Christ, or will it be enclosed in the sense of a covenental relationship of two subjects (speaking on individual terms), or of the head and the body (speaking on community terms)? There seems to be evidence for both in Barth's presentation. Thus he could say that "the being and activity of Jesus Christ for us bring us face to face with a vacuum, a place where we apparently have no place or future". 672 The community comes from Him as the first and moves towards Him as the last. It waits for Him. It hastens towards Him. 673 There is therefore no future still to come that is not already present, and thus we do not have to do with an empty promise. 674 Already our future is disclosed in the present, in the revelation of Jesus Christ. 675 This is because it is already a reality in and with Christ. Barth commented that "this 'with Christ' determines their past and present and future; their whole history". 676 This is the filling of the future with Jesus Christ, 677 as He is our future. 678 This is why Barth stressed that God is last as He is first because He is the absolute and insurpassable future of all time. 679 Thus he who has God has really everything, 680 including Sinai, Zion, Bethel and Jerusalem etc. 681 God assumes responsibility for this eternal future of man, 682 for in Jesus Christ "alone do I have the future of my being". 683 Not only does man have his being in Him and nowhere else, 684 but the future coming of Jesus Christ (Kingdom) is "the substance of the whole future of man". 685 It follows

---
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that Barth could speak of Jesus Christ as "the prophet of His future as ours and ours as His", as the man Jesus is the "prototype of all participation by creation in the glory of God". All of these references would seem to equate or identify man's future with His present objective reality in Jesus Christ so that Barth could say that "we are the righteous and living men that we shall be". These would seem to suggest a non-ontological future of man beyond the parousia, i.e. a swallowing up or an enclosing of His temporality in the eternity of God. Perhaps this is how the following two quotations should be read,

(1) "By His coming to His disciples after His resurrection in the revelation of the forty days He pointed to Himself as their hope and future...As He is the meaning and basis of creation, so He is the bearer and substance of the redemption and consummation which closes the time of the creature, human time. Therefore the calling to expect and hasten towards this end and goal and new beginning...the beginning of the being on the right hand or the left...The fact that man can serve God, like the fact that he is justified and sanctified before God, is His affair. It is true for us in Him. The eternal life of man will be found in Him. In Him it will be true, and it will remain true, and always be true afresh in eternity as the time of God, that man 'may live under Him in His kingdom and serve Him'. In Him He will show Himself accepted by God, worthy and capable and usable, able to be with Him to will what He wills, to do what He does, to support His cause. In Him all this will be his rest and joy in God, his eternal contemplation and adoration of God. In Him He will be clothed with the glory of his own eternal life with God. In eternal life, in the glory of the service of God promised to man, it is not a question of a future which is peculiar to man as such and in general. It is a question of His future, the future of Jesus Christ, and of the future of humanity and each individual man in Him." 689

(2) "...Jesus Christ is also the content of the divine pledge, the One in whom the christian is summoned to hope. It is terrible thing if at this point, at the last moment, we ignore Him as though He were only a means or instrument or channel, and look to something different from Him, some general gift mediated by Him, regarding this as the object
of Christian hope, the future posited for the world and man. The question of the future of the being of man and its direction to that future is such an important and burning question that everything hinges upon whether we answer it rightly or wrongly...the divine promise of the future of the being of man is not only revealed but is actual, an event, only in Jesus Christ, enclosed in Him and indeed identical with Him...we are compellingly summoned to regard Jesus Christ not only as the revelation and form of the divine promise but also as its fulfilment and content." 690

These would seem to point beyond the fact that Jesus Christ as man's redemption and eternal life actualized already to His being the content of man's redemption and eternal life forever.

However, apparent evidence for an ontological reality of man beyond the parousia is also found in the Dogmatics. Thus man's future is to be as a covenant partner, to co-operate with God, to "live under Him in His kingdom and serve Him" (Luther), to be an active subject in the fellowship of God. 691 In this respect,

"We are, in fact, dealing with what synergism of every age and type has tried to ascribe to man at a place where it does not - yet - belong to him..." 692

In parenthesis, one therefore asks, did Barth really take seriously his reference to the Christian as witness in which he said,

"...although the Christian is certainly not the subject and in no sense the author of the history of salvation which takes place in the action of Jesus Christ, although he is not himself the reconciler or even the co-reconciler, although he is in no sense an independent promoter of the kingdom of God, yet he certainly has a part in that history as a co-operating subject...For the fact remains that the Christian in whom Christ lives, and who lives in Christ, does participate as a subject, and indeed an active subject." 693

He went on to note that the man Jesus was the original minister, servant

690. CD 4/1, 116f
691. CD 4/1, 113-122. Cf. 4/3, 600ff where Christians today are said to be active subjects with Christ the Subject.
692. CD 4/1, 113. Cf. 3/3, 147
693. CD 4/3, 599f. Nb. Barth preferred the terms "service" or "ministry" instead of "co-operation" (4/3, 600f).
or slave, which means to Barth that God as God did the reconciling work, enclosing the humanity of the man Jesus with his divine determination. Is it this christological fact that he now apparently wished to apply to other men in the covenant relationship? Would this not mean that just as God's life-act (and therefore His ontology) enclosed that of the human Jesus, so it encloses all other men's? Therefore are not references to human co-operation as free subjects seemingly negated by this very "God-enclosed" framework? The question therefore for man is "To be or not to be?" 

Its importance to Barth is seen from the following,

"The question of the future of the being of man and its direction to that future is such an important and burning question that everything hinges upon whether we answer it rightly or wrongly." 

This writer finds himself in the same position as Berkouwer who said,

"In reading Barth on this subject, one asks again and again whether he has understood him correctly. How is it possible to square his sharp polemic against the idea of continuation of this life with this hope and this joy of the definite 'with Him'? What is meant by the 'eternalising' of our finite life, the emphasis on the this-side-of-death in ethics, and the urgency of life here and now because man does not have a beyond-death other than God alone?"

He considered that this is "the central problem of Barth's eschatology." Thus it would appear vital to find out which of the two views is normative in Barth's thinking. But can this be done? Simply put, will man really have his own subjective ontological reality in the Kingdom, or will it merely be enclosed within the subjective reality of Jesus Christ as it is now? In answer, one could at least submit that Barth's consistent stress on the sole reality of Jesus Christ with the parousia (resurrection, Holy Spirit and ultimate return) being only a revelation of that reality would seemingly

---
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result in a non-ontological subjectivity of man beyond that parousia, for a subjective ontology of man below would of necessity involve a radical novum. Is it not this very reality-revelation framework of Barth that makes his citing of biblical references to this mortal putting on immortality and this corruptible putting on incorruption seem out of place, for they are a subjective novum not yet experienced below? If Barth had accepted an ontological reality in the eschatological firstfruits, if he had therefore accepted such a reality in the humanity of Jesus Christ as a man reconciling us and not only as God, then would not his position concerning man's ontological future beyond the parousia have been clearer? Is there not, in a sense, the beginning of eternal life now in time? Is this not the reality of Eucharistic participation in the eternal life of the whole Jesus Christ?

It is in this context that man's future existence could be considered as similar to the present existence of the angels. We have already noted that Barth replaces an ontology of angels with his vocational emphasis. In the same way, apparently, he speaks of man's "service of God as his future being (in this life as in that which is to come)." This significant fact is the linking of the present life with that life to come, so that apparently it was service and not ontology which interested Barth. Just as the Christian in Barth's theology does not have any ontological reality below

---

698. Berkouwer concluded that it means that "there is not a continuation beyond this life, but there is a standing in the attention of God throughout eternity" (TGKB 163f). It would seem that Barth is reading off his anthropology from Christology, stressing the of man's temporal life time rather than its prolongation in eternity just as He did in the case of the man Jesus, so that the manifesting Word of manifestation simply reveals that once-for-all work (or life-act).

699. Eg. CD 2/1, 525; 2/2, 728. It is of interest that incorruptibility and immortality are considered as only proper to God (4/3, 311). Could this be why Barth stressed that God is our future?

700. CD 4/1, 114. Of course the key difference is that humanity and not angelic being is in God in Jesus Christ.
but merely responds to and is a reflection of his ontological reality hid with God in Christ Jesus, and therefore is engaged in the service of the munus propheticum, so Barth could say of his post-perousia existence that it will be "a great and final perfect being in the service of God", which "is the future of the world and all men, and therefore of his future also". Here the whole world and all mankind will apparently exist in this service. This raises questions. Is this not universalism? If not in the strict soteriological connotation of apokatastasis, is it nevertheless an eternal existence of all men in order to serve God as His witnesses throughout eternity, i.e. the rejected and the elected to witness to both aspects of the reality of Jesus Christ as the rejected and the elected One, just as he said Israel and the Church have witnessed to the same Jesus Christ in the same way in time? It would seem that no answer free from negation by its opposite can be found in the Dogmatics. Thus we have already seen that both an annihilation of the wicked as well as the loss of no created thing is given by Barth. On the basis of the latter it could be argued that all men will remain in existence to make this two-fold witness reflection in service to the two-fold reality in Jesus Christ. To Barth, this would mean that each man in his once-for-all temporality will be this small once-for-all reflection of the great once-for-all reality of Jesus Christ.

Together with the above possibility, one needs to consider that man is destined to a royal humanity. Thus, man is not only living and reigning at the right hand with God now but will reign with Christ over all

---

701. CD 4/1, 122. Barth mentioned in 4/3, 923 that only the first two moments of Christ's prophetic work can be attested to by the community before the perousia. Evidently the universal revelation will also have its attestation or reflection in that future "face to face knowledge (1 Cor. 13:12)".
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creatures hereafter. Of this future Barth said,

"They will then live with Him His own revealed life
(1 Thess. 5:10; 2 Cor. 7:3; 13:14; Rom. 6:8 and 2 Tim.
2:11). They will then be glorified with Him (Rom. 8:17).
They will then be conformed to the image of His glory
(Phil. 3:21). They will then reign with Him (2 Tim. 2:
12)... Their faces will reflect the glory of the Lord.
They will then be conformed to the image of His
(Phil. 3:21). They will then reign with Him (2 Tim.
2:11)."

705

The biblical texts cited speak of man living with Jesus Christ, but Barth's saying that they will live with Him His own revealed life seems that their life will be enclosed in His. It is apparently in this way that he speaks of heaven and earth as still distinct until the consummation, whereas after the parousia the new heaven will be made earthly and the new earth will be made heavenly. Could this changed relation between heaven and earth be considered a reflection of the changed reality of God and man in Jesus Christ, so that the community hopes in Christ, the totus Christus,

"and therefore in their own hidden but realised future
in the form of this full extent of their compass. And
it is for this that the community is already fitted –
to look and to move forward to Him in His future form,
and therefore to itself in its future form, giving a
provisional representation both of Him as the Πληρώμα
of all things, and of itself as His Πληρώμα."  708

At least the parousia will be an unveiling of the reality in Jesus Christ, and it will then be known that God is the absolute, unsurpassable future of all time. 709

Alongside of this oneness of the totus Christus (i.e. of all things seemingly enclosed within the cosmic Christ, the Παντοκράτορ), one must note the uniqueness of God and man that will continue in this unity. Barth put it this way,
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"The correspondence which alone can be considered in this connexion cannot and will not mean abolition of 'the infinite qualitative difference' between God and man. Jesus Christ will reign and man will be subject to Him, and they will always be different in and in spite of the closest fellowship between Him and His imitators. Even in the kingdom of perfection this relationship will be maintained." 710

This is because "there is an eternally irremovable difference between the Lord and His servant, between the incarnate Son of God and the witness taken up into fellowship with Him." 711 It is an "inflexible antithesis" 712 because the Holy Spirit places God on one side and man on the other side forever. 713

There remains perhaps one other way to look at this question before us, i.e. from the standpoint of what Barth has said concerning "eternal life". Although Barth could speak of the abiding in us of eternal life, 714 of the seed of eternity already sown in the present world, 715 and stressed that the future is not a mere future without present actuality, a promise without fulfillment, 716 he clearly pointed out that we have this eternal life only as a promise, and not in the form of fulfillment. 717 Put in other terms, although the will to obey the law of conscience means that one already possesses eternal life, as heaven is not just beyond the grave, but its light dawns in every pure heart, 718 he succinctly put it that such possession of eternal life is only in its temporal form and not yet in its eternal form, i.e. the possessors do not yet live eternal life here and now. 719 It follows that he could point away from the here and now below to the here and now above in Christ where man does have eternal life in the fullest sense. 720 He could therefore speak of Jesus Christ as the turning from
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the old to the new, and that as we live in this turning we experience here and now already His eternity. Thus in Jesus Christ is the fulfilled promise of eternal life and as such He is our future.

It is our life that is hid with God in Christ Jesus so that in the midst of the valley of death we can believe in an eternal life. Thus "eternal life is their human life, but as their true life, hidden and glorified with God". This would seem to indicate that man's future eternal life is identical with the humanity of Jesus Christ. This would seem to be substantiated by the fact that "eternal life is God's own life".

Yet, on the other hand, the final resurrection of the flesh "means very simply that the man will be in himself what he already is in Christ, new creation (2 Cor. 5:17)". It is in this context that Barth could say "that it is eternal in its being lived in the unveiled light of God and in so far participating in God's own life".

It follows that Barth's stress is upon our moving towards that future eternal life. Thus man is on the way to it, as He is on the way to God. He is determined for it, moves towards it step by step in this life, is liberated and capacitated for it, is free and ready for it, is ordained and preserved for it, as it is a "pledge of his total life exaltation". Man therefore is not only "sanctified for God and eternal life", but now waits for his vita futuri saeculi now concealed in the heavens. It is in this sense that eternal life can be considered as the revelation of union with God's eternal life, "the life which one day will
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finally be given him". Finally it would seem that here is givenness at last, here is participatio Christi in Calvin's sense, but only beyond the parousia rather than before it as in Calvin.

In the meantime, in the life here and now below God "nourishes us to eternal life", the Holy Spirit is the first glow of eternity, and we know that Christ's eternal life includes our own. All that Barth says about this, we submit, sprang from his genuine and understandable fight against immanentism. He said that consideration of God's futurity is necessary in the face of immanentism, but the question must be raised, has he not gone too far the other way by taking God and His futurity out of the present more than a balanced response to immanentism demands? In other words, although he stressed the Christus praesens in revelation, has he not removed the givenness of His reality to man here and now so that eternal life cannot be a reality below? Did he not go too far when saying that the times of refreshing will not begin until the second advent, when the Bible places the first fulfillment at Pentecost and the second major fulfillment prior to the second advent? When he criticized Blumhardt for emphasizing the outpouring of the Holy Spirit rather than Christ's return, could one not question whether his emphasis is the reverse, and therefore is in need of as much balancing? When in the unpublished Ethik as well as in the Dogmatics Barth spoke of the post-parousia existence as the time when Christians will be the children of God, was he not projecting to that future what really is true now, i.e. that "the spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God" (Rom. 8:16)? In the light
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of these questions it is of interest to note what Barth said concerning this eternal life and its connection with knowing God. He wrote,

"To have faith, and in faith eternal life, means quite distinctly to believe in Him; and not to have faith (and therefore to be condemned) means not to believe in Him. Eternal life (John 17:3) is to know the one true God, and with Him Jesus Christ whom He has sent." 748

Is this knowledge of John 17:3 only noetic or does it necessitate an ontological participation? Or, put in other words, does John's use of ἐνώσκω (experimental knowledge) rather than ὀδύσω (intuitive knowledge) have significance? Whatever one would decide on this linguistic usage, is it not true that Barth's rightful attack against "immanent eternity domesticated in time" position led him to remove the possibility of any givenness of God, and therefore any participation in God or eternal life, in the pre-parousia period? And following from this, does he not still leave open the question whether this will not be an eternal relationship between God and man because it is this once-for-all temporal life-time of man that is to be eternalized, which perhaps suggests that this may not necessitate any ontological givenness, but rather a continual preservation of its non-ontological presentness? This stress on the infinite qualitative distinction between God and man (as already noted) is to be forever maintained. Thus far it has never included any givenness, only determination, direction and destiny. Does Barth project this into eternity? At least he could say, "Life is only human and therefore created, and eternity as the divinely decreed destiny of man is only an allotted future". 749 In seeking for definite answers to these questions one wishes that Barth had been able

747. cont.
that we are sons of God now, then this either refers to our being above in Christ or is an advance over the position in the Ethik where it was our future being.
748. CD 4/3, 232
749. CD 3/4, 340
to write his KD 5. Constantly one has the studied opinion that he is so absorbed in looking solely to Jesus Christ (and herein lies his strength as well as some weakness) that the facts concerning man do not always seem to ring true. For example, he said of Jesus Christ's resurrection that no other man has been raised from the dead, \(^750\) and that He was the first man to return to glory. \(^751\) However, we submit, that these statements need to be more clearly qualified. Even Jesus Himself raised Lazarus from the dead, and that before His own resurrection (John 11). Moses was also evidently raised (Deut. 34:5ff, Jude 9). The latter, together with at least Enoch and Elijah were taken to heaven, and Moses and Elijah were glorified with Christ on the Mount of Transfiguration (Matt. 17:2, Mk. 9:4). It therefore does not seem correct to say that Jesus was the first man to return in glory. Could Barth be really trying to say that Jesus Christ is the only one who has died the second death, and as such is the first one to be resurrected from that death, and to ascend to glory from that death? \(^752\) This would be correct. Finally, again from this standpoint of eternal life, Barth's theology would seem to be open to the charge of universalism, because he said the whole cosmos is moving to eternal life. \(^753\) In fact, this last reference seems to identify this eternal life with light, and therefore with the parousia revelation of what they already are. This is the

\(^750\) CD 4/2, 325
\(^751\) CD 1/2, 99. Likewise his statement, "it is in Him (i.e. Jesus Christ) and only in Him that an end, a bonfire, is made of man's sin and death" (4/1, 630) (parenthesis added) is only one side of the Gospel. If it is destroyed in Christ, is it not also true that there will be a final bonfire to destroy sin? (Rev. 20:10-15 etc.)
\(^752\) Is not Christ as "firstfruits of them that slept" (1 Cor. 15:20) first in importance rather than first in point of time? Of course the firstfruits was a pledge of the coming harvest, as Christ's resurrection was of the final general resurrection (see Lev. 23:14, Luke 23:56, 24:1, 1 Cor. 15:23 and 1 Thess. 4:14ff).
\(^753\) CD 4/2, 598
"second coming of Jesus Christ, the resurrection of the flesh and the last judgment, when the saints will be revealed as such, the contradiction will be ended between what they still are and what they are already, and they will enter into the eternal life, the light, to which as the people of God they are now moving with the whole cosmos." 754

From all different aspects presented, and if we have understood Barth aright (and we freely admit our inadequacy in grasping his thought here) then it would seem that the future life of man in eternity will be both a reigning with God and yet a being subject to His reign, it will be identical with Christ's future and yet his own future, it will be enclosed within Christ's eternal reality and yet be a distinct temporal reflection. Nevertheless, there will continue the infinite qualitative distinction between God and man although there is some evidence that the present sole actus purus encounter relationship may become a genuine participatio Christi. It is with this in mind that Barth has seemingly removed any eschatological first-fruits or participation in eternal life from this temporal world of the present to the eternal world of the future. Should we not conclude that if Barth had accepted an ontological reality in man below, i.e. a genuine participation here and now in this world in the eternal life of Jesus Christ, that his position relative to man's eternal future would have been clearer?

Several scholars have expressed concern over various aspects of Barth's presentation of man's ending time and its relation to the vita aeterna. In 1949 J. B. Souček asked, "Is not the Christian hope too much narrowed down, until it becomes a quite unimaginable moment of meeting with God or an elevation of the mere finite, past and not-to-be-continued existence of man into the light of God's grace, God's forgiveness and God's purpose?" 755 About the same time (1949/50), H. Vogel expressed concern over Barth's view of the "having-been" of human life, considering that the church's

754. CD 4/2, 598 755. SJT March 1949, 81.
confession with regards to eternal life is threatened. Later (but before 1956) G. C. Berkouwer considered Barth's understanding of man's end as "vulnerable" saying that his "have been" conception casts shadows "over the true communio and over the vita aeterna. In this 'having been' the problems surrounding the idea of limitation change the triumph into a victory which is not free from ambiguity." This is precisely the point - the question of true communion and eternal life with God. This, we submit, has already begun in time through participation in the eternal life of Jesus Christ in Word and sacrament. Should not the fact that the Lord is the risen Christ in whose life we participate with ontological appropriation and growth have been Barth's christological basis for discussing this question?

Is not participation in the risen Christ the biblical continuity which, christologically grounded, is protected against all pagan concepts of natural immortality or continuity? Man participates in Christ (Rom. 8:9-13) so that for him to live is Christ (Phil. 1:21). He abides in Christ and Christ in him (John 15:5). He will be glorified with Him (Rom. 8:17). He will go with Him in the parousia (1 Thess. 4:17) and they shall dwell together (Rev. 21:5). In the meantime it is the same Christ who is with man unto the end of the world (Matt. 28:20). Here is continuity. Just as the parousia is the coming of this same Jesus (Acts 1:11) so man's coming to the eternal future will be the same men they are now. They will be changed, just as there will be a new creation involving a new heaven and a new earth. It is this novum that Barth apparently sidesteps in his eternalising of the once-for-all just as he seemingly enclosed it within the revelation of Christ's once-for-all in the parousia. Berkouwer concluded that just as

---
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Barth had to correct his earlier eschatological over-emphasis, he would wait to see if he would correct his understanding of the *vita aeterna*.

We submit that if he had lived to do this, then he would have had to accept participation in the living Jesus Christ below with all its ontological and *novum* results. Would this not have undermined his entire "sole reality in Christ above - mere reflection in and response by man below" framework?

11. God will be All in All

Whatever the exact nature of man's future existence in eternity, Barth is clear that God will be all in all. Although he could say that God is not yet all in all, for this will take place at the *perousia*, he could also say that it is not in this post-temporal sense that God is all in all, for even pre-temporally and supra-temporally He has been all in all. Again this would seem to indicate an eternal reality within God that will only be revealed as such in the final *perousia*. From this viewpoint it is also of interest to note a further example of Barth's emphasis upon God acting in Jesus Christ, for he said of Him, "God (the God who acts and reveals Himself in this history) will be all in all". Finally, not only has God always been all in all, and acted as such in Jesus Christ, but this means that His creation (which is His good creation) will not be lost for

"everything mortal and corruptible will put on and enjoy immortality and incorruption, and in which God will become and be all in all".

Is not this *apokatastasis*? If Barth would answer "No" (as he does), then one would have to ask him why the word "everything" (alles)? Is this not
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the "totality" of Schleiermacher after all? This would seem to contradict what he said in KD 2/2, i.e. "it is not legitimate to make the limitless many of the elect in Jesus Christ the totality of all men". If all mortals will enjoy immortality in an incorruptible state, then this would differ from the double reflection (rejection and election) by creatures of the reality in Jesus Christ throughout eternity that was previously mentioned. This change of everything mortal to immortality takes place at the parousia when every knee shall bow to Jesus Christ, which began according to Barth, in the resurrection of Christ (Matt. 28:17).

What Barth's last word would be on the post-parousia existence of man is difficult to state categorically. That his theological presentation almost inevitably leads to universalism, whether soteriologically or at least as an eternalised reflection of the "elected-rejected" double reality of Jesus Christ, is perhaps, a fair statement. That he denies universalism must be noted, but so must the fact that it is not given in abstraction from the possibility that God will yet work unexpectedly. Although this may seem to suggest some novum act of God, a future conversion in the banishing of darkness by the parousia glory, perhaps one must see this as peripheral to the central emphasis that this very manifestation is but the revelation of the already existing reality in the eternal Jesus Christ. Is this not what he meant when he wrote that,

"The divine promise of the future of the being of man is not only revealed but is actual, an event only in Jesus Christ, but it is therefore in every way; not only noetically but ontically, enclosed in Him and indeed identical with Him." 769

In concluding this section, we note that in 1940 (KD 2/1) Barth spoke of theologica viatorum as continuing beyond the parousia. He specifically

765. CD 2/2, 422
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noted that this was in contrast with older theology which described the 
post-parousia situation as theologia comprehensorum or theologia patriae. 
Barth expressed it this way,

"But God as God, in Himself, will still be hidden 
from us even then. Even this knowing of God face to 
face will still be a miraculous bestowal of His grace, 
an incomprehensible descent of God into the sphere of 
objectivity of our cognition...even in the eternal 
redemption, we shall not be at the goal, and the blessed-
ness of our perfect knowing of God will consist in a 
being on the way, so that it too will have to be 
described as theologia viatorum...through all eternity 
it will still be the knowledge of the Church of Jesus 
Christ and not the knowledge of the triune God Himself."770

Fifteen years later, in 1955 (KD 4/2) Barth had apparently changed his 
mind on this, which is itself a possible example of his theologia viatorum. 
Thus instead of a post-parousia continuation of theologia viatorum he could 
now at least say,

"There will be an end of the theologia viatorum as such 
and of its whole character, and its transformation and 
assumption wholly and utterly into the theologia patriae. 
Theological research and instruction will then be outmoded. 
Demythologisation will no longer be required. There will 
be no further scope for the investigation of a correct 
hermeneutics and debates concerning Law and Gospel etc. 
No more volumes of Church Dogmatics will be written. 
There will be no further need of the furref theologicus."771

12. Signs and the Time Question

Right at the end of this chapter we return to our starting point in 
the parousia and ask the question, Does Barth say anything about the signs 
of this event, and therefore of its time? This is taken up here in last 
place as it is only given a passing mention in Barth's theology.

Just as Barth considered the virgin birth and empty tomb to be signs 
of the new reality in world occurrence, he also could speak of them as

770. CD 2/1, 209. Nb. knowledge (noetic) is continuous even if this life 
(ontic) is not (as eternalized).
771. CD 4/2, 837
indications of a new heaven and a new earth.\footnote{772} Between these two terminal
signs he also considered miracles of help, healing and exorcism to be
signs of the Kingdom.\footnote{773} This does not mean, however, that he placed the
Kingdom signs all in the past, for he could also refer to the sun, moon
and stars signs of Mark 13:24 and Matt. 24:20, stating that just before
the \textit{parousia} the sun will darken, the moon cease to give light and the stars
will fall.\footnote{774} He could also speak of creaturely signs in world occurrence
which included the history of Holy Scripture, the history of the Jews and
the Church and the limitation of human life.\footnote{775} He considered that Matt.
24:6-14 indicated that the last and culminating sign is the work of the
community,\footnote{776} although finally in the \textit{parousia} Jesus Christ will be His own
sign or witness.\footnote{777} Although he seemingly opposed the summons role of
signs,\footnote{778} as it is not they which awaken us,\footnote{779} he nevertheless could say
that "each is called to understand and interpret the signs of the times".\footnote{780}
God is Lord, and thus all history moves towards the \textit{Eschaton}. It is under
His divine determination, giving to us assurance. Yet until that \textit{parousia},
Barth said there are only now signs of this lordship.\footnote{781}

\textbf{Do these signs tell us of the near approach of the \textit{parousia}?} Barth
is clear that no date is given, and that the time of the \textit{parousia} was not
even known by the human Jesus.\footnote{782} No one knows the hour of the second
advent,\footnote{783} for that time of handing over of the Kingdom to the Father is
His affair alone.\footnote{784} This may indicate that the hour of this event is now
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\item \texttt{784. CD 4/2, 406. This is in direct contrast to Teilhard de Chardin who
considered that our eschatological vision should be readjusted to
accept the fact that the \textit{parousia} will only take place when mankind
\end{itemize}
known by the risen Jesus. Barth could speak of time as short, even though its duration is unknown, for we come from Jesus Christ, wait for Him and hasten towards Him (2 Peter 3:12). Within this christological understanding of time he could say that the ultimate revelation is "expected in the near if indefinite future", that it "cannot be distant, but imminent", even though he could speak of matters concerning European peoples "one thousand or two thousand years from now".

13. Conclusion

Whatever questions have had to be raised in this chapter we must be clear that Barth has made a welcome advance over anthropocentric deschatologized theology with his christocentric eschatology. As a result, joy and hope characterize his Dogmatics, for the whole cosmos moves towards a final revelation of Jesus Christ in the universal parousia.

What has concerned us, however, is the apparent sole emphasis upon the reality in Jesus Christ which can only at best be reflected ad extra to Him. This places our conclusion in this chapter on the same grounds as that of the previous chapter. Whereas we saw there that there is no ontological participation in the eschatological firstfruits, i.e. no change of being in man through appropriation of Jesus Christ through the Creator Holy Spirit, Word and sacrament, we have broadened out in this chapter to find this same apparent aversion to ontology in other areas of Barth's theology. Thus the imago Dei was not the being of the one man Adam, but rather as the analogia relationis it was the tertium comparationis of the Deus triunus

——
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as Adam and Eve. Also there was no ontology in his angelology, with its vocational stress. Likewise, "Nothingness" or the rejected "Chaos" replaced the ontology of the devil and his demons. It would seem that Jesus Christ is the theme and content of all reality, and thus by contrast all else is either negated by (i.e. nothingness), reflected in (i.e. history of Israel and the Church) or responds to (i.e. those to whom His self-revelation is manifested) Him. It is with this in mind that in the previous two chapters as well as in this one that we have submitted that to some extent at least there is a "reality-revelation" dialectic in Barth's dogmatic theology which is somewhat akin to the "eternity-time" dialectic of his earlier thought. Put in other words, it would seem that he has consistently rejected any "givenness" from God to man as G. Wingren pointed out.789

This sole-reality in Jesus Christ emphasis leads into the heart of universalism as we have noted. Yet we have seen that Barth rejected apokatastasis. It also calls in question the reality of the final judgment. We have seen that it can also lead into a questioning of man's future. Gathering all these many aspects together, we concentrate upon the fact that Jesus Christ is the criterion of the judgment, of the question of universalism, and therefore of man's future being in eternity. As vere homo consubstantial with us in every respect he overcame as we must overcome, relying implicitly upon His Father in heaven. He did so, therefore, not just as the acting God, but in our place as a man. He therefore has a right to ask that we follow Him, and give the glorious promise that all who do so in His strength will be eternally saved and forever dwell in communion with God that began in this life. Such will be a continuation of the fellowship with Him that began in time just as that eternal life has already begun.

789. ThC 43. See Chapter 5, fn. 797.
now in the Holy Spirit. Included is the fact that a being in change now will mean a change of being at the parousia. In other words, a participation in Jesus Christ with the "givenness" of the eschatological first-fruits of eternal life here and now will culminate in this mortal putting on immortality in the second advent. We submit that this vital preparation for the final advent should have been given in Barth's *Dogmatics* rather than the mere reflection-response stress with its merely noetic difference between all mankind (Christian and non-Christian) and thus with its almost inevitable leaning to universalism.

That this participation in the risen Jesus Christ is vital has been indicated in this chapter and the previous one, but remains to be spelled out in greater detail. This is one of the two purposes before us in the final chapter.
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CHAPTER SEVEN

THE STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS OF BARTH'S ESCHATOLOGICAL TENSION

In the preceding chapters we have seen that in Barth's theology there is no "givenness" from God to man with a genuine ontological reality below in man. We have seen that the world of reality is the eternal world above, whereas the world of revelation is the temporal world below. We have seen that this reality-revelation dialectic is basic to Barth's munus propheticum or on-going parousia.

In this chapter we come to consider in greater detail the positive and negative results of this concentration on the one on-going parousia from Christ's resurrection, through the Holy Spirit until the ultimate manifestation. We will attempt to show that Barth's theology concentrates upon one eschatological tension (past-present-future) to the detriment of the other eschatological tension (above-below; or new-old).¹ We will see that this one on-going parousia emphasizes the acting God coming in ever-renewed encounter to reveal Himself, so that the man Jesus as our representative above is all but unmentioned. Whereas Barth's pre-resurrection Christology presented both the God to manward and the man to Godward

¹ T. F. Torrance refers to these two eschatological tensions in CAC Vol. 1, 203, 312; Vol. 2, 146, 163.
movements, we find that his post-resurrection Christology in the munus propheticum presents only the God to manward movement.

1. The "Past-Present-Future" Eschatological Tension

In this section we are concerned with what could perhaps be considered as Barth's most important contribution to eschatology. As far as this writer knows, the munus propheticum as found in Barth's theology has not been so fully and forcefully spelled out anywhere else. In this section we will consider the advance that this one parousia presentation has given Barth's eschatology over several of the best known eschatologies. Our purpose is to show where his understanding of the New Testament eschatological tension between past-present and future saves his eschatology from the one-sided emphasis that we find in many others. We commence with a general look at his appreciation of this past-present-future eschatological tension.

a. No Vacuum in the Parousia

He spoke against an exclusive hope of the ultimate dénouement as impossible because if tried it would be given up, being but a warm love for the eternal and a cool contempt for the temporal, where the ultimate means everything and the penultimate nothing. Such a too rigidly eschatological version of Christianity leaves the present as hopeless. Rather, a Christian can never achieve such exclusive concentration on the ultimate and therefore reject the penultimate, for as he hopes for the ultimate and definite, he also looks for the temporal and provisional. Otherwise, expectation of eternity can sound rather empty, tinny or wooden, as if the lifeless clatter of an idly turning mill-wheel, an abstract eschatology looking only to a
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distant world of Christ, to His final coming to set all things right.  

Such Barth considered as "fixed and exclusive hopelessness", for there is no such vacuum in the parousia where men are reduced to either looking backward or forward. Hence, this interim time is not just a day of small things, a delay or suppression of the parousia, is not static or empty, but is dynamic and filled and thus different from mere utopias. It is, therefore, a time which has nothing to do with a timeless gospel emptied of content.

In direct opposition to such ideas, Barth pointed to the on-going parousia in this time between the times. This he identified with the prophetic ministry of Jesus Christ who through the Holy Spirit truly and properly fills this time. Hence there is no empty absence of the Lord, but a time which is filled in each portion by the fullness of Jesus Christ, so that the risen Christ cannot fall behind the Christian and become merely historical, or the Christ of the parousia cannot yield before him so that the future becomes only empty. Rather, the substance between the two comings can only repeat and renew itself at every moment of the continuing interim. Thus the empty future is already filled, in that Christians actually taste of the powers of the future world. Far from being infinite or empty, to be filled in one way or another, this time which is marked off for a definite filling is limited time, in which Jesus Christ does not jump from Easter to the final day but moves as the hope of all between.

b. Schweitzer's "Konsequente Eschatologie"

This filled parousia reality, where the Jesus Christ who came and will

---
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come is the same one who is now present with the community, completely
overcomes Schweitzer's Konsequente eschatologie which has an interim time
of emptiness. \(^{20}\) Rather than dying a deluded man in despair on the cross,
reaching the lowest point and failure to reign (Schweitzer), he was
crowned on the cross, beginning His reign which was only revealed as such
in His resurrection and continues in this time of ours. Jesus was not then
(as with M. Dibelius) the victim of a tragic illusion. \(^{21}\) Barth therefore
considered Konsequente eschatologie to be superfluous as in opposition to
a delay or failure there is a continuing actualization of His return and
reign in the present. \(^{22}\) Schweitzer's thesis is inadequate because it over¬
looks the present time as filled with the Holy Spirit as the driving and
drawing force behind the community, with the lordship of Jesus as never
merely past or merely future but always present. \(^{23}\)

Schweitzer considered Jesus to believe that His death would bring in
the Kingdom, which is another way of saying that the parousia depended
first on the crucifixion. Although W. G. Kümmel has shown in answer that
Jesus expected an interval between His death and the parousia, \(^{24}\) this does
not disprove Barth's identity of the resurrection with the parousia, for
whereas Schweitzer wrongly equated the final moment of the parousia as
imminent to Jesus at death, and Kümmel rightly proves this incorrect, Barth
agrees, but shows that the first moment of that same one second parousia
was near. He therefore did not make Schweitzer's mistake, but fully
corrected it rather than still having an interval before fulfilment. As
before mentioned, the early Barth's timeless eschatology (Zeitlose
eschatologie) took Schweitzer's throughgoing eschatology (Konsequente

\(^{20}\) CD 3/2, 468
\(^{21}\) J 70
\(^{22}\) CD 3/2, 497-500; 4/3, 295
\(^{23}\) CD 3/2, 509f
\(^{24}\) PF 64-83
eschatalogie) the full circle, going from two failures of the parousia to come in time to a removal of it beyond time (Urgeschichte). The later christological eschatology of KD brings that final parousia not only into history in the future, but into the past and therefore into the present. In this on-going parousia which is equally real and full in every moment, Barth effectively negated Schweitzer's Konsequente eschatalogie.

It is because his eschatology is christological and holds the three moments together in one that he was able to overcome the one-sided emphasis of Schweitzer on the future time to Christ, which in the end neglected the significance of the past (resurrection), the present (Holy Spirit) and the final future (parousia).

c. C. H. Dodd's "Realized Eschatology"

Both Barth and Dodd have a realized eschatology which has repudiated the "Konsequente Eschatalogie" of Weiss and Schweitzer, but that is where the similarity ends, for Dodd's "Realized Eschatology", especially in the early days, was just as one-sided (in an opposite direction) to that of "Konsequente Eschatalogie". It is this that primarily concerns us here. The thesis for Dodd's "Realized Eschatology" appeared in 1935, and is simply that Jesus' parables must be understood in the context of the Sitzen leben Jesu. He therefore argued that with the ministry, death and

25. J. Jeremiah criticized Dodd for this one-sided interpretation of the Kingdom (PCJ 1955, 18). Rather than a "realized eschatology" he suggested "an eschatology that is in process of realization" (sich realizierenden Eschatalogie, DGJ 4th ed., 194) a term he received from Ernst Haenchen TFGJ 159) and with which Dodd later agreed in principle (IFG 447, fn. 1. Cf. Dodd, CCC 16 where he conceded his former de-eschatological emphasis.) However as Ladd noted (JK 19f) Dodd (CCC 26, 38) does give the final impression of only a parousia at death, even in the final consummation, and is thus more like Greek immortality than a Christian eschatology.

26. Following Ulrich concerning the non-allegorical nature of the parables (see DGJ) he went beyond him (as in Forgeschichte) in seeing them not as general principles but as particular to Jesus' own time (TPGK 17, 22f, 84, 146). Jeremias considered Dodd's book a "break-through" in the
resurrection of Jesus we have the eschatological event, the climax of all history, the coming of the Kingdom, in the absolute and not provisional sense and thus the new age inaugurated. He has contended that the non-realization of the parousia caused the Church to reinterpret the sayings of Jesus, putting into them an eschatological-apocalyptic reference that was not there originally, and that this was done in order to explain why the return of Jesus in the clouds had not materialized. This re-interpretation is throughout the New Testament and was a development that went through apocalyptic, Christ-mysticism to a final sublimation of eschatology, and thus a complete cycle from the original logion of Jesus in the synoptics to those finally recorded in John.
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32. Whereas J. A. T. Robinson's "Spiritualized Apocalyptic" argues for Jesus using Jewish concepts to get his kerygma across to those who were Jews and thus familiar with these apocalyptic ideas, Dodd argued that Jesus' sayings were non-apocalyptic, and that these parts were only added later by the Church faced with the delayed parousia problem. One result was the consideration of the life of Jesus as only preparation for the cross and resurrection instead of being itself a part of the decisive eschatological event (APD 103).

Dodd considered that the first example of apocalyptic re-interpretation was Paul's 2nd Thessalonians. Matthew came to have a preponderance of apocalyptic material appended to it, with a marked emphasis upon futurist eschatology (APD 121f). The original kerygma, which was prior to the Gospels, was therefore being added to by the evolving didache of the early church (127). From Mark 13 to the book of Revelation the New Testament is full of such added apocalyptic material (84f). Dodd considered that the concentration on the future in Revelation was no better than in Baruch and Ezra, and as such it denied the substance of the Gospel, and so he considered it to be "pre-christian eschatology" (88f).

Dodd further considered that Paul took the re-interpretation cycle a further step by considering this future apocalyptic as fulfilled in the Church as our lives are now hid with Christ in God. He thereby replaced futurist eschatology with this so called "Christ-mysticism" (145). Thus Paul had gone beyond his own futurist eschatology of 2 Thessalonians (149). His concentration on the present with a good ethics was opposite to that of Revelation on the future with its minimal stress on ethics (151f). Thus Dodd saw that in Paul's epistles the cont.
The radical emphasis on "realized eschatology" (even as late as 1960 in his revised Parables) has caused Dodd to do injustice to the last moment of the parousia. He argued that there is no saying of Jesus concerning the Kingdom of God that will come to balance the statement that it has come.\(^{33}\) for there is no coming of the Son of Man in history after the coming in Galilee and Jerusalem,\(^{34}\) for that coming is unrepeatable.\(^{35}\)

Rather than Jesus Christ returning in the final moment of His parousia (as in Barth) there is only a going of man to the ultimate fulfilment which is in the world beyond.\(^{36}\) Thus the coming is at best beyond history\(^{37}\) with judgment outside the historical order,\(^{38}\) and the heavenly feast and Doomsday as but symbols of the supra-sensible, supra-historical realities.\(^{39}\) Thus he could speak of judgment, unending bliss and the renovation of the universe as only religious ideas which are proper to the absolute order but not to time and space.\(^{40}\) In fact, he said,

"To conceive any further event on the plane of history would be like drawing a cheque on a closed account."\(^{41}\)

Thus he spoke of the Kingdom as a "timeless reality"\(^{42}\) and of "the day of the Son of Man" expression as standing for a "timeless fact".\(^{43}\) Here we have the same "timeless eschatology" with no goal or parousia in history that Barth expounded in his Römerbrief fourteen years before Dodd.

"Realized eschatology" considered that a future emphasis relegates to secondary place the finished work of Christ,\(^{44}\) and at best considered that

---

32. cont.
principle of "realized eschatology" is given full justice for the first time (154). But the full circle of re-interpretation was arrived at in John's gospel, which is a "conclusive re-interpretation of eschatology" (163) or is "sublimated eschatology" (168, Cf. 157) and thus is the most penetrating expression of the preaching of Jesus (181).
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the second coming of Christ was realized in the Holy Spirit's coming, or is in the Eucharist. It considered the resurrection, exaltation and second advent as inseparable parts of a single divine event which the Church later divided into two stages. It could even speak of the resurrection and coming on the clouds as one single event which the Church divided in two, but only as the resurrection in history having a supra-historical counterpart in the coming on the clouds.

Thus Dodd's "realized eschatology" is a one-sided emphasis particularly on the past ministry, death and resurrection of Jesus with some attention to its timeless reality, but with no future, historical emphasis. By contrast, Barth overcame this same earlier "Zeitlose Eschatologie" through his understanding of the eschatological tension between the past, present and future. Dodd could even say that the resurrection was the beginning of the new as the cross was the end of the old order, that the new age began and thus the eschatological hope came true in the resurrection, and even asked, "Might we go so far as to say that the 'third day' is the Day of the Son of Man?" But he did not really take the resurrection that seriously, even though he considered it the first stage of the transfiguration of human nature into the heavenly condition which apocalyptists predicted. Rather than the real day of the Son of Man, the day of his parousia, and thus really the new day not only begun but manifested as such (as in Barth), Dodd only saw it as a transition to the supra-historical above and not as a return to this world as the future advent already begun in its first moment. Thus his one single divine event is a resurrection, exaltation and second

---

45. APD 156  
46. Ibid. 234  
47. TPC 74, APD 68  
48. TPC 76  
49. Ibid. 81  
50. APD 77f  
51. TPC 76  
52. Ibid. 75  
53. APD 94
advent in a non-historical sense, whereas Barth's one single divine act is the resurrection, Holy Spirit and final parousia all as the second advent taking place in history. Dodd's overemphasis on the past leaves only a timeless relation in the present with no historical hope for the future, and (especially in the early period of his theory) it had no answer for the on-going fact of history - seemingly it would be endless. Barth's realized eschatology differs from Dodd's in that he does not artifically divorce the situation in Jesus day from that of the early church, and takes more seriously the meaning of "realized eschatology" when applied to the resurrection, not just calling it an "eschatological event" but seeing it as the Eschaton returned and is thus more fully "realized eschatology" than Dodd's. Dodd was right in rejecting Schweitzer's one-sided futuristic emphasis, but did not go far enough in his realized emphasis. Barth, as over-against both, is balanced because he saw the parousia or second advent already fulfilled in its first moment in the resurrection, and thus instead of considering the forty days as mere theory (as Dodd did54) he understood them as an integral part of that once-for-all work of Jesus Christ. Barth's munus propheticum revelation of the work accomplished in the ministry and death of Jesus Christ does not relegate the past work of Jesus to a secondary place, and thus answers Dodd's fear on this score. Neither does it agree with Dodd's critic, R. H. Fuller,55 who considers the decisive event to still be in the future, nor does it concur with Dodd's critic, John Knox, who considers the Kingdom as still to come in the absolute sense.56 Instead of any one-sided emphasis on either the past (Dodd) or on the future (Fuller and Knox), Barth holds together the once-for-all decisive event or finished work of Jesus Christ (as the Kingdom come in the absolute sense) with the
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the on-going revelation of it in the three moments of the one *parousia*, and understands it thus as not only "realized", but "being realized", and "to be realized". Dodd's eschatology by contrast was really not christological enough. It could perhaps be said that the main difference between the "realized eschatology" of Dodd and Barth lies in the difference between Dodd's understanding of Christ eschatologically and Barth's understanding of eschatology christologically. 57

d. J. A. T. Robinson's "Fully Inaugurated Eschatology" 58

We come now to consider the difference between the one *parousia* of Barth and the one *parousia* of Robinson. Whereas Barth's one *parousia* began in the resurrection return of Jesus Christ, Robinson's began in the resurrection return of Jesus only in a subsequent sense as already the *parousia* had begun in the incarnation (as with Clement 59). Beyond this different starting point is the understanding of the *parousia* return in the resurrection,

57. Cf. J. McIntyre, SCC 10 where eschatology "stands at the centre of the interpretation of Christ" in one form of christocentrism.

58. This theory of J. A. T. Robinson is perhaps not as well known as the others we are considering, but we include it because of its comparative value with Barth's eschatology. The general thesis of J. A. T. Robinson in JHC is the following: The second coming of Christ is the Cinderella of credal doctrines (p. 9) which is an unprecedented notion as found nowhere in Judaism (83, 142). With it the Church faces the last things in much the same way as it had to face the first things a century ago (14), for the statements referring to this beginning and end in the Bible are myths (10, 181f). He considered that there is no evidence that the *parousia* expectation formed a part of the earliest strata of apostolic Christianity (29) and as far as Jesus' own words are concerned, there is nothing to suggest that He shared the return in glory hope ascribed to Him (57). Rather He spoke to His contemporaries and not to the coming Church (69) the end events primarily referring to the destruction of Jerusalem (77). Thus He had far more in common with the prophets than with the apocalyptic writers (97) even though he employed apocalyptic categories of interpretation familiar to His audience (98). However, the early Church transposed these parables of crisis to a future (116) so that the teaching of Jesus went through the process of transmission by the Church as comparable with the transition within the Old Testament from prophecy to apocalyptic (104). Therefore, Robinson contended that the parables etc. should be read as originally intended and not as subsequently interpreted (68).
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which for Barth was the return of Jesus Christ to man in revelation as a new act, whereas for Robinson it was the return to God in representation as a new act, for previously the parousia had been a visitation to man but was in the resurrection a vindication to God.

This coming to God was referred to by Jesus towards the end of His life as "imminent", "immediate", and "at hand". Robinson links it with the climax of His ministry, to its perfection on the cross, for this coming to God was the single event of passion, resurrection and ascension exaltation of Jesus, so that in this sense the cross and resurrection are referred to as the inauguration of the parousia.

Thus unlike Barth's one parousia in the three moments of the coming of Jesus Christ to men in resurrection in the Holy Spirit and in the final return, Robinson's one parousia is bifurcated into two levels, (1) the coming to God to rule (vindication), and (2) the coming to men to reign (visitation) expressed as follows:

"It is, for John, the person and work of the Paraclete, who takes the things of Jesus and makes perfect in us his presence of love. It is, for the Epistle to the Hebrews, the perpetual intercession of the Priest-King, appearing henceforth within the veil on our behalf." In this double sense the one parousia still continues and will do so until all are included in it, and as such is an "abiding event".

This coronation of Jesus as King, with the twofold ministry to God and to man is the event which lies behind Robinson's term "Fully Inaugurated Eschatology", but only because it connotes a once-for-all event that knows
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no interval subsequent to the ascension and needs no second advent in the future.\footnote{72} In other words, there is now only a coming of the Holy Spirit to man, which will culminate the \textit{parousia} without a final return of Jesus Christ. Is there not here a de-eschatologization akin to Schleiermacher's, where a radical reductionism of the objective final \textit{parousia} is made through a subjective preoccupation with existential encounters by the Holy Spirit?\footnote{73} Unlike Barth's one \textit{parousia}, this does not seem to do justice to the fact that it is the Jesus Christ who came, who comes and who will come again. Barth's christological \textit{parousia} is a real inauguration, and not Robinson's, because it is the real second coming that Barth is concerned with in his \textit{parousia} whereas it is only the first coming that concerned Robinson. Where as he dismissed the second coming as unnecessary, Barth demonstrated that it was already an event in the resurrection and is continuing in the present ministry of the Holy Spirit and thus will finally culminate in the ultimate manifestation. Unlike Robinson's so-called inaugurated eschatology, Barth's has real hope as there is a sure goal or \textit{telos}. Therefore, instead of Robinson's docetic understanding of history, Barth's eschatological emphasis gives importance to history.\footnote{74}

\footnote{72. The one \textit{parousia} of Jesus for Robinson is a single event or Messianic act (JHC 102), a single eschatological act of God (John) (171), or a single final act (Hebrews) (157) so that there is no envisaging by Jesus of a second moment of the Son of Man beyond and separate from the culmination of His ministry (82), no looking by Him to a second act in history, a part two of His coming incorporating elements not identical with the first (151). Neither is there any hint (in Acts 2) of such a second Messianic act in history (143). Such a \textit{parousia} after an interval as Jesus teaching is purely an editorial feature (138), with the second Messianic moment introduced by Paul (32). Robinson thus saw in Mark a unitary conception of the \textit{parousia} (176) and in John a viewing of it as a whole (165), as a single once-for-all event inaugurating a process (169), so that the sign of the Son of Man is past and not future (173), with no second event parallel with the first (181). There is no plural for \textit{parousia}, and thus there is only one coming of Jesus Christ (185).}

\footnote{73. And to that extent, similar to immanentism, although more dynamic.}

\footnote{74. This \textit{telos} gives history meaning, direction and determination. However, if Barth had also had a givenness to history, a \textit{participatio Christi} as eschatological firstfruits, an ontological appropriation below, then he would have done greater justice to history.}
Robinson's thought is seemingly based on the assumption that one can get behind the witness of the New Testament to the actual words of Jesus. He concludes that there are none which actually point to His return. Barth dismissed as invalid this basic presupposition, for his christological hermeneutic considered that there is no divorce between the historical Jesus and the kerygmatic Christ for the witness of the documents point to this One who came, as the same One who comes and will come.

We come now to what we consider to be an unanswered paradox in Robinson's "Fully Inaugurated Eschatology", which concerns the phrase of Christ "from now on" (καὶ ἀπό τότε) "you will see the Son of Man coming on the clouds" recorded in Mark 14:62, Matt. 26:64 and Luke 22:69. Of this he wrote,

"The visitation in judgment of which he spoke would indeed merely be set in motion by his rejection. Its outworking like his own vindication, would take place 'from now on'. As in glory, so in visitation, we must speak, not of a realized, but of an inaugurated eschatology of the Son of man 'coming to his own' in all the power of God, till the kingdoms of this world shall have become the kingdom of God and of his Christ." 75

This statement apparently shows that inaugurated eschatology not only refers to the movement of vindication to God but also of the visitation to men. All is in motion towards the final "fulfilment" when inaugurated eschatology will be realized eschatology. 76 Thus, even Robinson can say that there is slender evidence that Jesus spoke of "the final crisis specifically as a 'coming of the Son of man'." 77 This, however, is mutually exclusive to his rejection of such a return, considering (eg. that in John) the glory of God has already come so completely that there is no room for a second coming. 78 Thus, concerning the visitation of Jesus to man, Robinson has presented both a fully realized (which is typical) and a merely inaugurated
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(exception) aspect of the perousia. This leaves us with the following choice, either (1) the visitation of Jesus Christ is only inaugurated and thus we are to expect Him to return in that future realized moment of eschatology, or (2) the visitation of Jesus Christ is fully realized and thus we cannot really speak of inaugurated eschatology in reference to His visitation to men. This unanswered paradox in Robinson's eschatology is non-existent in Barth's because his one on-going perousia in the munus propheticum holds together the inaugurated past with the to-be realized future.

E. W. Manson's "Spiritualized Apocalyptic Eschatology"

Nearly two decades before C. H. Dodd coined the phrase "realized eschatology", W. Manson spoke of the Kingdom as diffusing itself in the world as a religion of "realized redemption". As with Dodd, this was in reaction to the one-sided thoroughgoing apocalyptic emphasis of Schweitzer's Konsequente Eschatologie. Manson's thesis was that the teaching of Jesus concerning the Kingdom of God could not be compressed within the confines of apocalyptic, (with its opposition to the world of the present in its emphasis upon some future discontinuity) even though in proclaiming the Kingdom of God and using the title "Son of Man" Jesus was taking up apocalyptic ideas and giving His gospel an initial relation to apocalyptic hopes. Rather, Jesus only chose these apocalyptic forms of expression because they best presented the spiritual idea of God's Kingdom, because they could best be bent in a spiritual direction. This spiritual presentation involved Jesus himself as the one who had already brought down the
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apocalyptic hope to earth, giving it fulfilment in spiritual experience. 84

Thus Hanson asked,

"If Jesus regarded the eschatological hope as already fulfilled in the new life of reconciliation to God which He had opened among men, is it not legitimate to translate the whole future hope into terms of spiritual experience, and to regard the final victory of Christ as in line with the whole spiritual movement which He began on earth?" 85

This is what Hanson called "spiritualizing the content of the apocalyptic" and credited Jesus as its author, 86 for in His teaching we can see a process going on by which apocalyptic ideas are being translated into terms of present and living reality. 87 He concluded that apocalyptic is only the mould for Jesus' teaching, with His message independent of the language in which it was delivered, 88 and thus to Jesus apocalyptic language was not literal but symbolic, was not language of history but language of faith. 89

With Hanson's "Spiritualized Apocalyptic" thesis before us, we come to its basis in two supposedly unfulfilled parousia predictions, i.e. when Jesus promised that this generation will not pass till the coming of the Son of Man on the clouds (Mark 13:30) 90 and when He told those condemning Him at His trial that they would see the Son of Man come on clouds (Matt. 14:62). 91 Hanson affirmed that the literal fulfilment did not take place, nor indeed has it since, 92 and therefore specifically denied that the resurrection and the parousia can be equated as they are kept inviolably apart by the tradition. 93 Was Hanson right? Are these false predictions?

In answer we first ask, what generation did Jesus refer to when he said that they would see the coming of the Son of Man on the clouds? Was
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it the generation in which Christ then lived or the generation that would be alive when He came? Are these the same or different? For Manson they are the same and hence the predictions failed, whereas for Barth they are different and hence the predictions have not failed.

Barth's point is as follows (re. Mark 13:30). This generation listening to Jesus would experience the different disasters, which would climax in the fall of Jerusalem, which are not to be identified with the coming of the Son of Man, because between them is placed the parable of the fig tree which is a sign that the time has not come but is near, even at the doors (v. 28f). Only the prelude to and not the actual coming is then to be witnessed by the generation to whom Jesus was speaking. What Barth did not mention, but which strengthens his argument, is the fact that v. 26 speaks of they (future generation) shall see (ὅπως θάλασσα) and not you (present generation) shall see.

Now this is not contradicted by the trial prediction of Mark 14:62 (Manson's second supposed prediction failure) where Jesus is recorded as saying, ye (present generation) shall see (ὅπως ὑστερεῖτε) the parousia. Evidently, there is some evidence that this was understood apocalyptically by contemporary Jewish interpretation, and is likewise witnessed to by John in Rev. 1:7 to be the final return of Jesus which the resurrected murderers of Jesus would witness. In the same way the same John witnesses to the parousia taking place after the identical signs (sun, moon and stars) that are mentioned in Mark 13:24-26, (see Rev. 6:13-17) so that the generation that will go through those signs will witness the coming of Christ on the clouds, and that according to John is the future generation to be alive when He returns, and not those alive when Jesus spoke the words, although the
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murderers would be resurrected in that last generation to witness His coming. From this reasoning we agree with Barth's belief in the future fulfilment of these predictions rather than with Manson's consideration of them as having failed in their fulfilment. In the final sense the past generation was not the time for their fulfilment, but the last generation will be.

But what makes Barth's point stronger is the fact that he does not stop with just these two examples of supposed parousia failure, but goes on to examine two others not mentioned by Manson. As already noted, Barth's thesis is that the parousia, far from having failed has already begun in the resurrection, and that the above two examples will be realized in the third and final moment of that parousia. The next two examples refer to the first moment of that same parousia. We come first to Mark 9:1 where Jesus predicted that some standing before Him would not taste of death till they should see the Kingdom come in power. This was made earlier than the two already studied. Barth understood these words to mean that the Kingdom had already come, but had still to be seen. Verse 5 goes on to speak of the transfiguration in which Barth sees the first fulfilment of the promise, which was proleptic of the resurrection, as the resurrection was proleptic of the final manifestation. All three he considered as fulfilling the prediction (which was really going too far as they did die before seeing the last of the three). However, Barth was correct in seeing the transfiguration as the beginning of this fulfilment and then the resurrection as the Kingdom coming in power and continuing (and we would say, completing) the fulfilment.

The second example is Matt. 10:23 in which Jesus told the disciples that before they returned from preaching in all the cities of Israel the Son of Man would come. This, as before mentioned, is the text that
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Schweitzer considered as an unfulfilled parousia prediction, and which caused him to launch his Konsequente Eschatologie, which has, therefore, the same misguided basis as W. Manson's "spiritualized apocalyptic". Barth's understanding of the verse is really an answer to both. Rather than Christ being deluded, with no fulfilment taking place, Barth showed that the promise is simply that Jesus Christ will come as the Son of Man or as the σωτήρ κόσμου before the disciples had finished visiting all the cities of Israel, and that its fulfilment was in His death and resurrection in which He passed beyond His exclusive mission to His own people to become the cosmic Saviour. It was in this very transmission that He revealed Himself, and came as the Son of Man which they witnessed in His resurrection before they had finished going to all the cities of Israel. Now they too had not only a national, but a world-wide mission.

Thus Barth's one parousia in its three moments, or the three moments of the one parousia fully answers the two supposed parousia failure examples Manson cites, as he rightly refers them to a future fulfilment in the last moment of that parousia, whilst his first moment of the same parousia not only answers the other two parousia prediction texts, but shows Manson to be incorrect when he thought that neither in the New Testament or since has the parousia taken place. Perhaps it is not unfair to say that Manson's "spiritualized apocalyptic" has only a present "experiential" emphasis as it overlooks both the first and last moments of the parousia. This over-emphasis is non-existent in Barth's equal concentration on all three moments of the one same parousia. However, having said this, we must note that at least by 1952 W. Manson had come to accept the final advent as a literal event belonging to the "eschatology of the unrealized" so that his developed thinking has much in common with Barth's christological eschatology.
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f. R. Bultmann's "Existential Eschatology"

As P. S. Minear rightly said, "eschatology has exerted a strange fascination upon Professor Bultmann throughout his productive career", in which his thinking has changed little. Our reference to Bultmann must therefore, of necessity, be only brief, concentrating on his later writing. It is Barth's contribution over-against Bultmann's thinking that will delimit our interest. First, we note that Bultmann was closely associated with Barth in the early days. With E. Brunner, Gogarten and E. Thurneysen he was also in revolt against liberal theology of the nineteenth century. He was perhaps influenced by Barth's Römerbrief with its "timeless eschatology". Whereas Barth went on to correct this one-sided presentation in his minusc propheticum, it is perhaps fair to say that Bultmann's position remained much the same as that of Barth in his Romans. Perhaps it could be viewed as taking Barth's "timeless eschatology" to its logical conclusion in an existential sense.

The 1955 Gifford Lectures at Edinburgh University were given by Bultmann and were entitled "History and Eschatology". Two lectures concerned the problem of eschatology. This is the way Bultmann introduced the first,

"The problem of eschatology grew out of the fact that the expected end of the world failed to arrive, that the 'Son of Man' did not appear in the clouds of heaven, that history went on, and that the eschatological community could not fail to recognise that it had become a historical phenomenon and that the Christian faith had taken on the shape of a new religion."

This gave rise, according to Bultmann, to a new understanding of eschatology which appeared for the first time in Paul which was later developed in a
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radical way by John. Paul interpreted the apocalyptic view of history on the basis of his anthropology, and John understood the resurrection of the dead and the last judgment as present in the coming of Jesus. Thus the "time between" which for Paul was from the resurrection of Christ to His expected parousia became for John the time between Christ's end on the cross and the end of the individual in death. Thus the believers' interest was directed from universal redemption to personal salvation, from a final cosmic parousia to the immortality of the soul. Hence the significance of the sacraments with their present parousia reality.

It followed that Bultmann could say that, "today we cannot claim to know the end and the goal of history. Therefore the question of meaning in history has become meaningless." For him, as with Collingwood, "there is no end or goal in the process of historical knowledge, any more than in the process of history itself". This is because the meaning of history can only be determined if we could stand at the end or goal of history, or outside of it, "But man can neither stand at the goal, nor outside of history. He stands within history." Nevertheless, to be historical means to be taken out of this world, to live from the future. Concluding, he said, "the meaning in history lies always in the present, and when the present is conceived as the eschatological present by Christian faith the meaning in history is realised...In every moment slumbers the possibility of being the eschatological moment. You must awaken it."

It is well to keep in mind that Barth's revolt against the de-eschatologized thinking of Schleiermacher is again made in his revolt against Bultmann, in that he considered the position of the latter to be
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the logical conclusion of Schleiermacher. Both had a domesticated gospel, one an immanent – the other existential, so that the final parousia was dismissed.

In contrast to this was Barth's appreciation of the New Testament's eschatological tension which held together past-present and future which saved him from this one-sided concentration which dismissed the future. Bultmann's timeless encounters with every moment being the possibility of the eschatological necessitating an awakening to it was answered by Barth in several places. Whereas he had said in his Romans that "What delays its coming is not the Parousia, but our awakening" (which was still Bultmann's position a half a century later), Barth clearly showed in his Kirchliche Dogmatik that it is the Holy Spirit who awakens to conversion, that this is a vital part of the present prophetic ministry of Jesus Christ, and thus rather than throwing man back upon himself (as his earlier position did and as Bultmann's does) man is rather surrounded on all sides by this same Jesus, who has already begun this awakening revelation in His resurrection and will culminate it in His ultimate universal manifestation.

Nevertheless, Bultmann's point that John considered the last judgment as present in the coming of Jesus (in the past) is not counteracted strongly enough by Barth, as his concentration upon the reality of the last judgment as a novum reality became but a revelation of its already realized actualization as we noted in the previous chapter.

g. J. Moltmann's "Proleptic Eschatology"

Moltmann is well known for his "Theologie der Hoffnung" (Theology of Hope) which takes exception to Bultmann and Barth's eschatology. Bultmann's

111. Thus he spoke of Bultmann as the culmination of Neo-Protestantism (CD 4/2, 57), and considered his "anthropological strait jacket" to go back to Schleiermacher (3/2, 446).
112. CD 4/2, 553-556, 307f, 313, 363, 374f.
113. ThB 500
"disclosure of authentic selfhood" and Earth's "self-revelation of God" he considered to make eschatology the apocalypse of the transcendent subjectivity of man or of God.\textsuperscript{114} He specifically rejected Earth's understanding of the \textit{parousia} as only an unveiling of what God already is, although he said that it was the same Jesus Christ who will come in the \textit{parousia}.\textsuperscript{115} Rather, he stressed the future of Jesus Christ, when He would perform a new act, a \textit{creatio ex nihilo} so that the \textit{parousia} will be a \textit{novum ultimum}. We find this in complete agreement with our own critique of Earth on this point raised in the previous chapter.

What then is eschatology to Moltmann? He gives us several definitions. He wrote that "From first to last, and not merely in the epilogue, Christianity is eschatology."\textsuperscript{116} "Christian eschatology speaks of Jesus Christ and his future".\textsuperscript{117} "Christian eschatology is at heart christology in an eschatological perspective."\textsuperscript{118} Perhaps these could be summed up by saying that to Moltmann, Christology is eschatology, whereas for Barth eschatology was Christology. Put another way, whereas Barth's starting point was in the centre of time with Jesus Christ, Moltmann's theology begins with eschatology in that everything is thought out from that new future.\textsuperscript{119} Again, whereas the medium for Barth's theology was Christology, the medium for Moltmann's theology is eschatology.\textsuperscript{120} Again, whereas Barth therefore spoke of \textit{fides quaerens intellectum}, Moltmann spoke of \textit{spes quaerens intellectum}.\textsuperscript{121}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{114} J. Moltmann, TH 45f
\item \textsuperscript{115} Ibid. 227ff. Cf. 325
\item \textsuperscript{116} Ibid. 16. This seems to be the same position as Earth's in the \textit{Römerbrief} when he said, "If Christianity be not altogether thorough-going eschatology, there remains in it no relationship whatever with Christ" (R 314). Cf ThT Vol. 25, 1968/9, 375.
\item \textsuperscript{117} TH 17
\item \textsuperscript{118} Ibid. 192
\item \textsuperscript{119} Ibid. 16. NB. Barth rejected the possibility of eschatology as the systematic starting point of dogmatics (CD 1/2, 875-880), although P. Tillich considered it a real possibility (ST Vol. 3, 318f).
\item \textsuperscript{120} TH 41
\item \textsuperscript{121} Ibid. 33. Cf. 36
\end{itemize}
Although Moltmann can speak of the goal of redemption as already attained,\(^{122}\) and of the resurrection as the dawn of His parousia,\(^{123}\) he considers that this resurrection is an analogy of what is to come to all,\(^{124}\) as we are not yet risen with Christ.\(^{125}\) It is the future reality that we will experience rather than the reality already experienced by us in Christ that interested Moltmann. Thus when speaking of God he said that He reveals himself in the form of promise,\(^{126}\) and that "promise announces the coming of a not yet existing reality from the future of the truth".\(^{127}\) It follows that the anthropological question "who or what is man? who am I?" is learned from the future to which mission leads him.\(^{128}\) Barth would say it is learned from Christ, for we are what we are in Him. It was thus that he often stressed "Be what thou art"\(^{129}\) and "we are what we shall be",\(^{130}\) whereas Moltmann emphasized, "Become what you will be".\(^{131}\) With this eschatological viewpoint, he stressed that there was to be something startlingly new,\(^{132}\) as an unexpected novelty.\(^{133}\) It is this ultimate in newness which he identified with the event of Christ's future, or the parousia. Repeatedly it is the future of Christ that is emphasized.

When comparing Barth and Moltmann with a view to showing Barth's contribution over against Moltmann, as we have in the other examples, we find ourselves asking if we have really understood Moltmann sufficiently in order to do him justice. It could be argued that he holds together the Jesus Christ of the past, present and future, but it could also be argued that his overwhelming stress is on the future. Perhaps it would not be unfair to suggest that just as C. H. Dodd emphasized the past, so J. Moltmann

\(^{122}\) TH 155
\(^{123}\) Ibid. 220f
\(^{124}\) Ibid. 179f
\(^{125}\) Ibid. 161
\(^{126}\) Ibid. 42
\(^{127}\) Ibid. 85
\(^{128}\) Ibid. 285ff
\(^{129}\) R. 207, CD 4/2, 363f etc.
\(^{130}\) Ethik 4
\(^{131}\) TH 162
\(^{132}\) Ibid. 17
\(^{133}\) Ibid. 25
has emphasized the future, and that both in different ways understood their Christology eschatologically, whereas Barth held together the past, present and future with equal emphasis because his *munus proheticum* understood eschatology christologically.

h. Conclusion

Our brief look at these six interpretations of eschatology has shown evidence of a one-sided emphasis. This, we submit, is their common weakness. These could be perhaps most simply represented by the past over-emphasis of C. H. Dodd's "realized eschatology", the present over-emphasis of R. Bultmann's "timeless eschatology", and the future over-emphasis of J. Moltmann's "proleptic eschatology". Without trying to over-simplify, it is fair to say that Barth's presentation has overcome his own earlier one-sided over-emphasis on timeless eschatology, and is free of any temporal over-emphasis on either past, present or future because he holds all three together christologically. It is thus his "christological eschatology" which saves his eschatology from being either one-sided or not all-inclusive (past-present-future) as detected in these others cited. Whatever is said of these other eschatologies, it is perhaps fair to say that Barth's eschatology over-against theirs does better justice to the "past-present-future" eschatological tension. Hence Barth's one on-going *parousia*, or *munus proheticum* could be considered as his contribution to eschatology. His basic presupposition is his Christology which witnesses to Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today and forever, the One who was, is and will be, the One who came, comes and will come.

2. The "Above-Below", "New-Old" Eschatological Tension

It is a paradox that the very *munus proheticum* which has contributed to his eschatology in overcoming different one-sided emphases became itself, through being Barth's sole interest, a one-sided emphasis that caused a
dis-service to his eschatology. In this section, we come to spell out the implications of this lacuna. We are concerned with two aspects of the same problem, i.e. (1) the all but unmentioned high priestly ministry of the risen Jesus Christ, and (2) the all but non-existent ontological participation in the risen Jesus Christ. The first has to do with the "above-below" aspect of the eschatological tension whereas the second has to do with the "new-old" aspect of the same eschatological tension. Having said, in the former section, that Barth's "past-present-future" eschatological tension is a contribution compared with others because it represents a balanced, and not one-sided, Christology; in this section we must note that the "above-below" "new-old" eschatological tension is all but non-existent because his Christology is still one-sided. His eschatology became in KD 4 a matter of revelation to us which so absorbed his attention that its other facets, i.e. representation for us above and reality (ontological) into us below were not given the place that a balanced christological eschatology demands.

Throughout the nearly 8,000 pages of the Dogmatics we find the sessio ad dextram mentioned on at least fifty-six pages. The average reference is a sentence or two. If we were to confine our attention to KD 4 where post-resurrection Christology is spelled out then we find only half of these references included. To emphasize the relatively unimportant place which they occupy, is perhaps best accomplished by noting that 657 pages in the same CD 4, i.e. nearly one fourth, is written under pneumatology, and that by contrast the aggregate of all CD references on the sessio ad dexteram would approximately equal the mere fifteen pages Barth used to dismiss the demons in CD 3/3. In fact, other than passing mention, there is only one, two page section on the intercessio Christi in the Dogmatics (4/1, 314-316).

134. See Section "a" below and fn. 140-160 for some of these references.
What do these statistics mean? Their main service is to point out the one-sided presentation of Earth's post-resurrection Christology. He was far more interested in the one-on-going parousia revelation below (pneumatology) that he was in the one-on-going mediatorial representation above (Christology). Even the references to the sessio ad dexteram are with the express purpose of pointing to the present rule of God from the right hand of the Father through the Holy Spirit to the community below. In other words, their purpose is to indicate the origin and identity of the God to manward movement. Thus, in KD 4 revelation has taken over from reconciliation, pneumatology has become the main emphasis of Christology. Nevertheless, these references to the sessio ad dexteram do give an insight into Barth's thinking on this vital aspect of Christology. Although the man to Godward movement is non-existent as an integral and balanced part of his post-resurrection Christology, we would be totally unfair to Barth if we interpreted this lacuna as a dismissal of its importance comparable to his dismissal of the demons. At least it can be argued from the evidence found in the Kirchliche Dogmatik and other writings that he was aware of the importance of the sessio ad dexteram as we shall now note.

a. Barth's References to the Sessio ad Dexterae

Thus he stressed that of the two forms of Christ's existence (earthly historical and heavenly historical) His being at the right hand of God is His first, primary and basic form. There as a man He prays for us

135. In Dogmatik im Grundries there is a chapter on the ascension and session above, but without even a single word concerning the man to Godward ministry involved. Rather, the emphasis is upon God's manward movement (see Chap. 19).

136. Thus the risen Christ is reigning for us in the sessio ad dexteram (CD 2/2, 554), reigning as limited man (3/3, 236), as the ἀνθρώπος (3/3, 438ff) through the Holy Spirit (3/2, 492). He rules the world "ad dexteram Patris omnipotentis" (4/2, 622). Cf. 4/2, 153; 4/1, 318f; 4/2, 64.

137. CD 4/2, 653
138. CD 4/3, 755
139. CD 4/1, 135
in intercession. 140 Through Him we come to the Father, 141 for "the justification of our prayer and the reality of our communion with God are grounded upon the truth that Another, the Eternal, the Second Man from heaven (1 Cor. 15:47), stands before God pre-eminent in power and - in our place". 142 There He is the forerunner for us (προδρόμος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ). 143 In fact, Christ's love to God becomes our own as we have nothing of ours to offer God but our shame and curse. 144 It follows that Christ as our representative bears away our rejection, 145 for He is making and will yet make emends for us, 146 without which we would "necessarily be lost and damned". 147 Hence Barth called the intercessio Christi "the eternal act of the crucified and risen One for us, the one truly contemporaneous divine act to us, the To-day, Today! of the atonement against which we must not harden our hearts". 148 He correctly concluded that the Church is possible because Christ is at the right hand of the Father, 149 that He is there as "the real basis of our justification and hope", 150 that He is engaged in summoning and drawing the community onwards and upwards, transforming it into His image, 151 and called the sessio ad dexteram the "eschatological place". 152

These references, from 1921-1959, indicate the consistent belief Barth had concerning the importance of the sessio ad dexteram. Nevertheless, it never had the man to Godward determinative place in his Dogmatics that we would have expected. This is perhaps best seen in his presentation of Jesus Christ as the Mediator in post-resurrection Christology where it is the "glory of the Mediator" in His self-revelation to man that is of consuming

\[\text{References:} \quad 140. \text{ R 329, Ethik 248} \]
\[141. \text{ CHS 27} \]
\[142. \text{ R 317} \]
\[143. \text{ CD 4/2, 276} \]
\[144. \text{ CD 1/2, 384} \]
\[145. \text{ CD 4/2, 358} \]
\[146. \text{ KGSM 104} \]
\[147. \text{ CD 4/1, 315} \]
\[148. \text{ CD 4/1, 316} \]
\[149. \text{ Credo 129} \]
\[150. \text{ CD 4/1, 315} \]
\[151. \text{ CD 4/1, 152} \]
\[152. \text{ CD 2/1, 483} \]
interest. It is the *Christus Praesens* that is emphasized, with perhaps the object of overcoming his earlier emphasis upon the *Ganz Anderer*. Thus the Mediator is as such in Christians and even in non-Christians, is here in the world until the end of time, and thus bridges the time between the two advents. Another way of looking at this one-sided emphasis is to see it from the standpoint of the inter-relatedness of being and act in Jesus Christ. As has been mentioned, it is the rule above that is related to the acts below, so it is the Word or Being above that is related to the work or acts below, for it is the Mediator above who is related to His mediation below. Thus He is revealed to the community "as the one He is above". It is the importance of His mediation above that needs to be given equal place, rather than just a passing mention, for as L. Berkhof said of Christ in His *sessio ad dexteram* He "is actively engaged in the continuation of His mediatorial work".

b. The Problem Stated

With what has thus far been given as a background, we come now to state the problem before us. We have concentrated here on the one-sided christological movement which all but passes by the man to Godward High Priestly ministry of Jesus Christ. In Chapter Five we noted that the Lord's Supper became in Barth's later thought but a human response to God rather than an appropriation of His humanity. It is therefore the humanity of Jesus above as our representative and the humanity of Jesus below in whom we participate which concerns us as we consider this second eschatological tension in Barth's theology. Our specific critique of Barth is best expressed in the general critique of T. F. Torrance who said,
"The crucial issue in eschatology concerns the Humanity of the risen Christ, and our participation in His Humanity through Word and Sacrament in the Church... If in a previous generation we had to do battle for the Humanity of the historical Jesus, today we have to do battle for the Humanity of the risen Jesus ascended to the right hand of God the Father Almighty." 159

Naturally with Barth it is not a question of not teaching the bodily resurrection of the human Jesus Christ as the One man for all men. This he has consistently presented throughout his writings. 160 It is, however, the absence of the full significance of this fact that concerns us. Perhaps the best way to bring this clearly before us is to submit that the liturgy or worship of the Church is all but missing in the _Dogmatics_. 161 What we will attempt to do in the rest of this chapter is to show the importance of

---

159. RP 43

160. For example, it appears as early as 1916, or five years before the 1921 _Römerbrief_ (WGMM 31-36) and is mentioned in nearly every source considered in the early literature in Chapter 3. As Barth wrote in WGT 42 in 1919 it is "die Leibliche Auferstehung Christi von den Toten". This remained his consistent emphasis throughout the KD.

161. There are scattered references to worship and to prayer throughout the _Dogmatics_. The major section is CD 3/4, 87-115 - Prayer, Freedom before God.

Barth stressed the importance of worship as being the centre of the whole life of the community, as the true acts of its building (4/2, 695), as the central point of its order (Canon Law) (4/2, 678), as its distinct centre in which it can only stand out clearly from the world (4/2, 697). In fact, Church law as liturgical law has its divine service, its original seat, its source of knowledge and its true and proper theme in worship (4/2, 709). In worship the Lordship of Christ takes place in His community (4/2, 706, 708). It is God's will that we worship Him (2/2, 157) for in His election He made Himself the object of our worship and all that is demanded is that we really offer this worship (2/2, 32). This can be done through the ability and freedom given by God (2/1, 670ff).

These references concentrate on the importance of man's worship, and that God has commanded it, is active in it, and gives ability to effect it. One would like to have seen more said about the relationship between our worship and that of the One worshipper, Jesus Christ in the _sessio ad dexteram_. In one place Barth did say that the "church exercises worship...in view of the eternal High Priest and His sacrifice offered once for all (2/2, 203).

Barth equally stressed the importance of prayer, as indispensable in the work of the community (4/2, 882ff). Thus dogmatics and the teaching church are in a fellowship of prayer (1/2, 840), knowing that without prayer it is impossible to understand the Bible (1/2, 684), and...
Christ's continuing High Priestly ministry for worship, keeping in mind that the Eucharist is supposed to be a "higher character" of worship than other forms as F. D. Maurice once said. We shall suggest that Barth's concentration upon the opposite God to manward movement together with his ethical understanding of the Eucharist has, to some degree, called his otherwise excellent objectivity into question. Finally we shall show that it is this aspect of eschatology which has been so well presented by Calvin, and which in the end shows that he did greater justice to this eschatological tension than did Barth.

c. The Risen Humanity of Christ and the Worship of the Community

Unlike Barth, the New Testament documents do not concentrate solely

161. cont.

is impossible to do work in dogmatics (1/1, 25), for theology is always imparted until it becomes prayer (2/2, 763). Christ summons the church to watch and pray (4/1, 711). It must pray for the Holy Spirit (4/1, 355. Cf. 151) for the work of the Holy Spirit is really done when there is real prayer (2/2, 763). Thus the Church's decisive activity is prayer (1/2, 695) in which it offers itself to God (1/1, 533) has assurance (1/2, 454) and makes its ultimate response to God's activity (1/1, 83. Cf. 54). The Christian life is "one long calling upon God" (4/2, 367) in which prayer is asking (3/3, 268). Together with faith and obedience, prayer is a Christian attitude (3/3, 245).

These references concentrate on the importance of man's prayer. Again, one would like to have seen more said about the relationship between our prayers and those of the One Intercessor Jesus Christ in the sessio ad dexteram. Barth has given some statements on this, saying that prayer is heard because Jesus Christ is between us and God (4/1, 315), prayers are purified by Him and the Holy Spirit (3/4, 101) the Church asks in His name (3/3, 278) and that Christian prayer is participation in Jesus Christ (3/3, 282).

Naturally these scattered references to worship and prayer are taken from numerous contexts and have made their contribution in those contexts. All we are submitting here is that accepting the importance of both, we would have hoped for equal space given to the sessio ad dexteram as is given to the munus propheticum in post resurrection Christology in order to see that it is the One Worshipper, the One Interceder, Jesus Christ who gathers up our worship and prayers as our Forerunner above. On the community level Barth noted that the Church's priestly intercession is the presupposition of the prophetic movement towards men (1/2, 840). But the presupposition to such churchly intercession is Christ's continuing intercession, and therefore should have been given space in the Dogmatics.

162. F. D. Maurice, KOC Vol. 2, 58.
upon the God to manward movement in post-resurrection Christology. Rather, we find in them an important place for the man to Godward movement. Thus Jesus Christ stressed that He was the sole way to the Father above (John 14:6), and the kerygema of apostolic Christianity often concerned this risen Jesus Christ at the right hand of the Father (Acts 2:33f, 5:30f, Romans 8:34, and 1 John 2:1. Cf. 1 Tim. 2:1-6, Col. 3:1, Ephes. 2:18, 3:11f etc.). The dying Stephen saw Christ there in the sessio ad dexteram (Acts 7:55f) and the author of Hebrews gave the most thorough presentation of that High Priestly ministry (Heb. 1:3, 2:16ff, 4:14ff, 5:1-10, 6:18ff, 7:24-28, 8:1-13, 9:1-28, 10:10-25, 12:24). We shall limit our consideration to the book of Hebrews, although it is true as H. Anderson has pointed out that the

"Hebrews' development of the High Priestly Christology is not peripheral in the New Testament. It has a close affinity with the thinking of Paul, who himself builds everything upon the continuing ministry of the exalted Christ as based upon the once-for-all act of obedience and righteousness on the cross." 163

The book of Hebrews was not written under Platonic influence as some scholars believe, 164 for what separates it from Greek thought is "the essential nature of Christian eschatology" grasped by its writer as R. Williamson has argued. 165 As T. F. Torrance has said, the writer of Hebrews is "not primarily a Platonic idealist but an eschatologist”. 166 Barth also rejected Platonic influence in Hebrews. 167 The basic presupposition behind the theology of Hebrews is the cultic sanctuary of the Jews. 168 The author understood it as a pattern of the heavenly sanctuary. Just as the slaying

163. JCO 288
164. Those considering that Hebrews shows evidence of Platonic influence include C. H. Dodd (ACTB 140, APD 157), V. Taylor (ANTT 101f), Bishop Rawlinson (NTDC 177).
166. SJT Vol. 5, 1952, 312.
168. J. McLeod Campbell has noted that even the cultic sacrifices were
of the sacrifice was followed by a priestly ministration in the sanctuary, so the once-for-all of the cross was followed by the High Priestly intercession in the heavenly sanctuary (Heb. 9:11f). 169 Having obtained eternal redemption "for us" (Heb. 9:12), He ascended to the right hand to intercede "for us" (Heb. 7:25, 9:24). He went as our "forerunner" (πρόδρομος Heb. 6:20) to become the "minister" (Λειτουργός - Heb. 7:28, 8:1-3) of the sanctuary. He became the captain, founder or inaugurator (ἀρχιερεύς - Heb. 2:10) of our salvation, and is now our faithful and merciful high priest (ἀρχιερεύς - Heb. 2:17).

As W. Manson has said, the writer of Hebrews is concerned more with Priest-Christology than with Hero-Christology, 170 and thus we find the emphasis upon Christ gaining our salvation as a man, giving a perfect human response for us whilst here below, in order to ascend to the right hand to continue to give the perfect human response for us above. It is this representative ministry which is central. As G. J. C. Marchant put it, Jesus Christ in Hebrews is the "mediator of revelation" but He also became man "so that in suffering He might become the author of man's salvation and a mediator, a High Priest Godward, in perfect sympathy with His sinful people (chap. 1-4)". 171 A. J. Tait considered that it would be difficult to overestimate the importance of Christ's sessio ad dexteram. 172 H. B. Swete's estimate was right to the point when he said,

"To realize the work of our Lord in heaven is essential to any right appreciation of the worship of the church. If many persons who profess to be Christians forsake the assembling of themselves together for common prayer and

168. cont.
"intended to purify and cleanse for participation in worship" (NA 192).
169. Barth said Christ entered heaven in fulfilment of the High Priest's entrance into the tabernacle (Heb. 9:24) (CD 2/1, 482).
170. TEH 104f
172. HSL viii
praise and Eucharist, it is because the vision of the
High Priest who is within the veil, and yet in the midst
of every assembly of His church, has taken no real hold
upon their faith."

J. Mcleod Campbell wrote that Christ is "the way into the holiest, which He
has opened up for us, - the way to the Father, which He is to us". As
T. F. Torrance has said, the Early Church regarded "Christ in the absolute
and proper sense, as the only Minister of the Church before God." It is
this ministry of the human Christ and its vital importance to worship which
we are to consider.

The risen man for all men at the right hand is the One True Worshipper
for us all, gathering up our prayers and supplications in His name and
presenting them before the Father in our name. As C. Cullmann has said,
it is as such that our High Priest, Christ, draws the faithful into the
resurrection with Him. This is the man to Godward movement of the risen
High Priest of which Hebrews has so much to say, and concerning which we
find so little in Earth's theology. This is the intercession of the man
Jesus for us, an insight into which we also gain from the High Priestly
prayer of John 17. Together with this continuing ministry of Jesus for us
is the intercession of the Holy Spirit before the Father for us referred to
by Paul (Rom. 8:26f). Here the Holy Spirit is also engaged in the man to
Godward movement, and not just in the opposite manward revelation, or
parousia manifestation as in Earth.

J. B. Torrance speaks of all creatures as made for God's glory, with
man to be the priest of creation, to express on behalf of all creatures
the praises of God. He was to gather up the worship of all creation and

173. AC 62
174. NA 202
176. CNT 101
177. For much of what is presented in the rest of this section I am indebted
to J. B. Torrance who wrote a document entitled "Worship in the
Reformed Church" for the panel on Public Worship for the General
present it to God. But man failed to do this through sin. Nevertheless, the good news of the Gospel is that Jesus

"...came to be the Priest of creation, to do for men and for all creatures what man fails to do; to offer to God the praise man fails to offer; to glorify God in a life of perfect obedience. He who is the Son of God, by whom and for whom all things were created, Himself becomes man that as man He might carry through His purposes for men, and in our name worship and glorify God the Father (Heb. 1:2, 3; 2:16ff). The Gospel of grace is that He assumes our life, takes our responsibilities, offers to the Father a life of unbroken communion and obedience, dies our death, rises in our humanity, returns to the Father as the One True Servant of the Lord, the One True Worshipper who now by His Holy Spirit leads us in our worship. As our One High Priest, He is the Head of all creation, the Head of the Church, the Leader of the worshipping community, who lives in communion with the Father to intercede for all His creatures." 178

Therefore, Christian worship is our "participation through the Spirit in the Worship of Christ." It is our joyful response to God for what He has done and is doing. It is "our self-offering to the Father in gratitude for the One True Offering" of Jesus Christ. The Uppsala Report on Worship put it this way,

"As man opens himself to the work of the Spirit in worship, the One High Priest, Jesus Christ, lifts up our imperfect prayers and worship into His perfect once-and-for-all self-offering. Only in Him and by the Spirit, can we offer our own selves, our neighbours and our world in ever deeper humility and ever fuller joy." 179

This High Priest, this Representative Man, this One Worshipper before the Father is also the World's Creator, the World's Redeemer and therefore the Cosmic Christ. In the sessio ad dexteram He is Prophet, Priest and King,

177. cont.
Assembly of the Church of Scotland. This will be referred to as DOW. (This document has now been published in RTGA, 1970, 191-205, and in CSSA, May 1970, 41-62.) See also the articles by J. B. Torrance in SJT Vol. 23, 1970, 51-76 and in KEE 155-173, the booklet RF and the books TR and CAC Vols. 1 & 2, by T. F. Torrance.

178. DOW 1f
He is the Head of the body which is His community. He gathers it up to participate in His Prophetic, Priestly and Kingly work for the whole world. Evidence for this priestly ministry of the community is to be found in Barth's *Dogmatics*. But does not such a priestly representation for the world by the community call for the priestly representation for the world by the continuing intercessions of Christ? Whereas Barth's emphasis is upon the God to manward *parousia* revelation, the *Document on Worship* holds together the God to manward movement with the man to Godward movement in which it is grounded. Whereas Barth's *triplex munus* stresses the contemporaneity of the kingly and priestly ministry of Jesus Christ because He is eternal and therefore present today, but chooses to emphasize the prophetic role of Christ since the resurrection, the *Document on Worship* speaks of the continuing ministry of Christ as Prophet, Priest and King as one on-going ministry of the risen Lord. Whereas Barth's presentation concludes with the Eucharist as the response of man, the *Document on Worship* concludes that "the Spirit helps us in our infirmities, lifting us up to Christ who in His ascended humanity is our God-given Response, the Leader of our worship, the Pioneer of our faith, our Advocate and High Priest, who through the eternal Spirit presents us with Himself to the Father."  

The *Document on Worship*, unlike Barth, has a balanced pneumatology. It speaks of the Holy Spirit as not only the "speaking Spirit" (as with Barth) but also as the "interceding Spirit" (which is only mentioned in passing in Barth's *Dogmatics* as with the *intercessio Christi*). The *Document on Worship* raises a significant point which can be put as a question to Barth's presentation. It states that,

"It is all too possible for us in the Reformed tradition so to stress (a) that we neglect (b). (a= speaking Spirit,
b= interceding Spirit). We so stress that God comes to us as God to address us through His Word in preaching, that we short circuit the real humanity of Christ, the role of the continuing Priesthood of Christ in representing man to God, and have a one-sided view of the work of the Spirit. We can then so obtrude our own response to the Word in Pelagian fashion, that we obscure or forget the God-given Response made for us by Jesus Christ."

Adapting Gal. 2:20, the Document on Worship suggests that at the Lord's Table "we offer ourselves to the Lord and yet it is not we who offer, but Christ who has offered Himself for us and who is our offering, and the offering which we now make in the flesh we make by the faith of Him who loved us and gave Himself for us." As T. F. Torrance put it,

"We have no other answer to the will of God, no other offering, no other response or worship, for without Christ we can do nothing. Jesus Christ is our worship, the essence of it and the whole of it, and we may worship God in Spirit and in Truth only as we are made partakers in his worship. The Spirit which Christ breathes upon us then becomes the Spirit of our response to him and through him to the Father."

In another place T. F. Torrance put it this way,

"from first to last the worship and ministry of the Church on earth must be governed by the fact that Christ substitutes Himself in our place, and that our humanity with its own acts of worship is displaced by His, so that we appear before God not in our own name, not in our own significance, not in virtue of our own acts of confessions, contrition, worship, and thanksgiving, but solely in the name of Christ and solely in virtue of what He has done in our behalf and in our stead."

Therefore T. F. Torrance stressed that "for too long in Protestant, as well as in Roman theology, the full place of the Humanity of Christ has been neglected", and that "from end to end...dogmatic theology must be determined and shaped by the Humanity of the Son of God". It is this One Worshipper, this Representative Man for all men who presents our sonship before the Father. He has opened up a new and living way within the veil, and only
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through Him can we come to God above (Heb. 6:19, 4:16, 10:19-22). We participate in His worship through the Holy Spirit,

"Thus in our worship the Holy Spirit comes forth from God, uniting us to the response and obedience and faith and prayer of Jesus, and returns to God, raising us up in Jesus to participate in the worship of heaven and in the eternal communion of the Holy Trinity." 188

H. B. Swete noted that "the ancient collects of the Western Church remind us many times in our daily services that the whole fabric of Christian prayer rests on the heavenly intercession of our Lord". 189 Thus, "through the Holy Spirit we are made members of Christ and of His Body, and so share in His sanctified human nature and are nourished with the life of God residing in His flesh." 190

It is this important participation in the humanity of Christ, in His once-for-all sacrifice, in His continuous vicarious response, in His worship to the Father, which is central to genuine liturgy.

In his informative article studying the theological background of worship in seventeenth-century Scotland, J. B. Torrance has said that,

"The severe polarization between what Christ did for us then, once and for all, and what we must do now, in obedience, penitence and faith, can have the effect of eclipsing what Jesus Christ is doing now as the Leader of our worship in His Continuing Ministry of drawing men to Himself and uniting us with Himself in His communion with the Father." 191

To some extent, at least, is this not the position of Barth's theology? He too has emphasized the once-for-all that is now being revealed, and so concentrated upon that revelation so that our human response is stressed (eg. in the Eucharist) rather than the continuing response of Jesus Christ.

It is true that he tells us that Jesus Christ is still on His way from Jordon to Golgotha (which would include both God's word to man and man's
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response to God). But is this enough? In other words, we sense to some degree this same eclipse of the present man to Godward ministry of Christ's worship in Barth's theology.

In mentioning that the Westminster Confession gave formulation to the Reformers triplex munus, J. B. Torrance asked, "but what about the continuing threefold office of Christ?" Is this not precisely the question that has to be asked of Barth, who has only spelled out the prophetic office in his post-resurrection Christology? Again J. B. Torrance said,

"The seventeenth century certainly emphasised that Christ is the One King and Head of His Church - the Crown Rights of the Redeemer - against the papacy, Erastianism and divine right of kings. This has always been high doctrine in Scotland, not least in the later patronage controversies. Christ was likewise the One Prophet in the Church, whose voice is heard in the preaching of the Word and in the councils of the Church. But what about the Sole Priesthood of Christ?"

He stated that the Sole Priesthood of Christ is the heart of the worship life of the Church, asking if this had been understood and worked out, would there not have resulted a better balance within worship between preaching, prayer and praise, and further,

"Has it not constantly been the tendency of Scottish Presbyterians ever since to emphasise the prophetic ministry of Christ at the expense of the priestly?"

Are these not precisely the questions which must be asked of Barth's post-resurrection Christology?

d. The Risen Humanity of Christ in Calvin's Theology

Having raised these questions of Barth's post-resurrection Christology, we now move on to see the greater emphasis that Calvin gave to the continuing High Priestly ministry above. His emphasis in the Eucharist was also different, as it stressed participation in the risen humanity of Christ.
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rather than ethical response as did Barth. It is this attention to the "here-there", "new-old" eschatological tension in Calvin's theology which, unlike Barth, does justice to this aspect of eschatology. It was at this point that Chapter Five concluded, noting that,

"The crucial issue in Calvin's eschatology is the humanity of the risen Christ, and our actual participation in His humanity through Word and Sacrament." 196

We will give attention to his presentation of the risen Christ in the sessio ad dexteram and its significance to worship. Whereas Schleiermacher presented the triplex munus as Prophet, Priest and King; 197 Barth, as Priest, King and Prophet; Calvin presented them as Prophet, King and Priest. 198 Perhaps, therefore, Calvin's order lends itself best to emphasizing the post-resurrection priesthood of Jesus Christ. He clearly said, with obvious implications for worship,

"there is no access to God for us or for our prayers until the priest, purging away our defilements, sanctify us, and obtain for us that favour of which the impurity of our lives and hearts deprives us. Thus we see, that if the benefit and efficacy of Christ's priesthood is to reach us, the commencement must be with his death. Whence it follows, that he by whose aid we obtain favour, must be a perpetual intercessor. From this again arises... confidence in prayer...Christ now bears the office of priest." 199

Again he stressed that,

"he constantly appears as our advocate and intercessor in the presence of the Father; directs attention to his own righteousness, so as to turn it away from our sins; so reconciles him to us, as by his intercession to pave for us a way of access to his throne, presenting it to miserable sinners, to whom it would otherwise be an object of dread, as repleted with grace and mercy." 200

It was thus in His advent that He "opened the gate of heaven, and gave us familiar access to it", 201 so that ever since "the blessings which our
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heavenly Father bestows come to us through his intercession."\(^{202}\)

In many places in the *Institutes* and his commentary on Hebrews, Calvin called attention to Jesus Christ as the Sole Priest, and therefore as the Only true Minister or Leader in worship. His attack was against the Roman priesthood which placed men between the community and Christ. In its place he pointed to the priesthood of all believers in direct relation to and under the only High Priest Jesus Christ.\(^{203}\) The Catholic priesthood claimed to have succeeded the Aaronic priesthood, but Calvin saw it as doing injury to Christ's priesthood.\(^{204}\) He said they "cannot produce one iota of Scripture in support of their priesthood,"\(^{205}\) for "Christ is the only Pontiff and Priest of the New Testament: to him all priestly offices were transferred, and in him they closed and terminated."\(^{206}\) Thus the Roman priesthood robs Christ of his eternal priesthood.\(^{207}\)

In his Hebrews commentary, Calvin noted that we can all come boldly to the throne of God ourselves, not needing to go through human priests, stating that Catholicism had put the Gospel light out, for "the power is taken away from the priesthood of Christ as long as men hesitate and look anxiously for other mediators..."\(^{208}\) Not only did he say that the office of Christ has abolished the old priesthood,\(^{209}\) but went on to state that "the fruit of eternal priesthood is our salvation", whereas "those who adhere to the old priesthood never attain to salvation."\(^{210}\) Thus Christ alone is "the only and the perpetual priest",\(^{211}\) the only true Mediator,\(^{212}\) and it is He who continually intercedes for us.\(^{213}\) This is important for worship, for "all worship is faulty and impure unless Christ cleanses it by the
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sprinkling of His blood." In fact,

(1) "all fictitious worship, which we ourselves devise for the purpose of serving God, is not in the least degree acceptable to him, how pleasing soever it may be to us" for (2) "there is nothing which God more abhors than fictitious worship".  

Christ is the man who has been given to us, to be our Mediator, to be the One in whose name we pray, the One through whom we can approach the Father. Calvin said, "no one will find God unless the Man Christ is his way and his door." He put it this way,

"...since no man is worthy to come forward in his own name and appear in the presence of God, our heavenly Father, to relieve us at once from fear and shame, with which all must feel oppressed, has given us his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, to be our Advocate and Mediator, that under his guidance we may approach securely, confiding that with him for our Intercessor nothing which we ask in his name will be denied to us, as there is nothing which the Father can deny to him..."  

It is this sole intercession of Christ that Calvin repeatedly comes back to, saying that, "no man can derive the least benefit from any prayers without the intercession of Christ...all the intercessions thus used in the Church must have reference to that one intercession." Thus concerning Christ's intercession, "no prayer is agreeable to God which He as Mediator does not sanctify."  

Throughout his theology Calvin has emphasized the Christians union with Jesus Christ. Thus "when separated from him, we are nothing but dry, useless wood..." and have no benefit. Hence "it will never do to separate Christ from us, nor us from him..." T. F. Torrance has shown
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that it is this very union with Christ that is the substance of Calvin's theology. It is this fact which is so important in interpreting his thinking on worship. Christ's intercession gathers up our intercession, His prayers are presented with ours, His worship is ours. We pray in His name and He prays for us in our name. This same union is carried through into the very heart of worship, i.e. into the Eucharist. The Lord's Supper is where Christ the Head and the community His body are one. Involved is the "wondrous exchange", for "having become with us the Son of Man, he had made us with himself sons of God". He became flesh of our flesh and we might become flesh of His flesh. The growth in grace of communicants is through the Beneficia Christi, who as the whole Christ is present in the Lord's supper as our Living Bread, and "is the only food of our soul". This is the "mystery of the secret union of Christ with believers".

Thus Christ offers Himself to us at the Supper, and "we are quickened by the true partaking of him." Christ is not at a distance but is united with us. He is not removed "but exhibits himself openly for our participation. Nay, the very flesh in which he resides he makes vivifying to us, that by partaking of it we may feed for immortality," for "by this food believers are reared to eternal life." Thus "the flesh of Christ is like a rich and inexhaustible fountain, which transfuses into us the life flowing forth from the Godhead into itself. Now, who sees not that the communion of the flesh and blood of Christ is necessary to all who aspire to the heavenly life?" It is clear that here Calvin is speaking of the
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humanity of the risen Christ who is the Whole Christ present in the Eucharist to unite Himself to the communicants and the communicants to Himself to effect a change or preparation for the future life. This is the ontological participation or eschatological firstfruits that the merely ethical response interpretation in Earth's theology has left out. Calvin spoke of these benefits as effects, saying that they "could not reach us, did not Christ previously make himself ours."²³⁰ He stressed that "the whole Christ is offered to us in the Supper".²³¹ Again it is union with the risen Christ that concerned Calvin. This union is first experienced in baptism when ingrafting into His body the Church takes place.²³² Through the Supper Christians are "more and more united to him, until the union is completed in heaven."²³³ Also, Calvin, noted that "it is owing to the Spirit alone that we possess Christ wholly, and have him abiding in us,"²³⁴ saying that "the sacred agency of the Spirit is the bond of our union with Christ".²³⁵

It is in this context that he rejected as false any worship of the sacramental symbols. The signs point beyond to what is signified, and "Scripture itself, also, besides carefully narrating the ascension of Christ, by which he withdrew his bodily presence from our eye and company, that it might make us abandon all carnal thoughts of him, whenever it makes mention of him enjoins us to raise our minds upwards and seek him in heaven, seated at the right hand of the Father (Col. 3:2)." ²³⁶

Calvin's emphasis on the Sole Priesthood of Christ above together with the Whole Jesus Christ present in the Eucharist was a convincing answer to Roman theology. It replaced the humanity of men with the humanity of Christ, for it was the human Christ who was the Minister above in prayer, the Minister at the table of the Lord, and was the Head of the Church which
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was His body. In *Institutes* 4.18, Calvin showed how the mass destroyed
the Lord's Supper, for it is a priest sacrificing Christ to the Father,
whereas the Eucharist is the Father offering us Christ. Thus he considered
that "Satan never employed a more powerful engine to assail and storm the
kingdom of Christ."²³⁷ It was the real humanity of Christ that was at
stake, and so Calvin consistently pointed to Him as the only Mediator
between God and man in His sole intercession above and in His sole self-
presentation below. Both above and below it is our privilege through grace
to participate in His humanity and in doing so to really worship before the
Father.

e. The Roman Position as given in Vatican II²³⁸

In coming to this section we ask the question, does Reformed theology
need as certain a place for the continuing sole priesthood of the risen
Jesus Christ as Calvin presented in his day? In other words, is Roman
theology in just as much need of this witness today as it was in the six-
teenth century? To answer this question we turn to the Vatican II documents,
and although there is evidence to substantiate a welcome aggiornamento, we
shall note that the same sixteenth century central problem of usurping the
humanity of the risen Jesus Christ is still clearly present.

We submit that true worship has to do with man's true relationship to
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²³⁸ In this section we shall see that Catholic theology still speaks of
human mediation (even though related to Christ's) and that this greatly
detracts from the sole priesthood of the human Jesus. It is in this
context that O'Grady's critique of Barth's (given in Chapter 5) must
be only cautiously accepted. He questioned the role of the humanity of
Christ in Barth's atonement, and did so because as a Catholic he wants
to give room for a co-operation of man in reconciliation. This is
rooted in the role of Mary in Christ's birth, and is continued in the
priesthood of the Church. Whilst not accepting this over-emphasis on
the human role in Catholic theology, we still concur with O'Grady that
Barth's is an opposite over-emphasis. We submit that Calvin's position
lies between the two, as it was the human Christ who atoned and is now
the sole human mediator.
the risen Jesus Christ. It is that very relationship which is broken in
the Catholic system of human mediators stepping between man and God in
prayer and between God and man in the Eucharist. True worship to God is
participation in the worship of the man Jesus for us. Vatican II theology
says that Christ is the One Mediator and unique Way of Salvation, 239 that
He is the "sole Mediator between God and man", 240 is the "supreme and eternal
Priest", 241 and "is our sole Redeemer and Saviour". 242 However, that this
is not the same as Calvin's "Sole Priesthood of Christ" is quickly seen by
the many non-Calvin qualifications given. Thus, "the faithful must cling
to their bishops, as the church does to Christ, and Jesus Christ to the
Father, so that everything may harmonize in unity." 243 Here the bishops are
between the faithful and Christ. The Vatican Council put it that this is a
"sharing in the kingly priesthood of Christ," 244 as "partakers of the func-
tion of Christ the sole Mediator". 245 They also said that bishops are "taken
from among men and appointed their representatives before God in order to
offer gifts and sacrifices for sins." 246 And Vatican II speaks of priests
as an "imitation of the eternal priesthood", 247 as having a "share in the
mission and grace of the supreme priest." 248 Thus men "share in Christ's
hierarchical priesthood", 249 and this through a special title when conse-
created by God. 250

Priests make the bishop present at the gathering of the faithful, 251
and in the name of the bishop they exercise the office of Christ, leading
members through Christ and in the Spirit to God the Father. 252 As teachers
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they are free to enter the Holies in virtue of the blood of Christ, and they rule the community, actually "presiding in place of God over the flock." Vatican II states that "Christ conferred on the apostles and their successors the duty of teaching, sanctifying, and ruling in His name and power." Here human priests are said to share in Christ's priesthood, but in fact rob Him of His sole priesthood. The same can be said of His sole intercession for the Church, for those who also intercede include Mary, the angels, and the departed saints.

It is this emphasis upon the role of the Church, the corpus mysticum, the body of Christ prolonged or extended in history from the incarnation, the body to whom Christ has handed over authority, that is central to worship in Vatican II theology, as is best seen in their teaching on the mass. The basic presupposition of human co-operation they find in the virgin birth. Mary became the mother of God and acted salvically, and is thus honoured, and considered as bodily assumed to heaven, as its queen. The immaculate conception calls in question the real humanity of Christ, concentrating too much on His divinity. As T. F. Torrance has said, "When the Humanity of Christ is depreciated or whenever it is obscured by the sheer majesty of his Deity, then the need for some other human mediation creeps in..." Together with this is the emphasis that the Church is human, and Vatican II can speak of co-operating with Christ to upbuild His body until "the full measure of His manhood is achieved." Here it would seem is the divine Head and the human body which together make up Jesus Christ in the totus Christus sense. This is carried through into the mass which
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considers that the Lord's body is received "under elements consecrated at that very sacrifice."\(^{262}\) As T. F. Torrance has pointed out, this is Christ's presence coming only half way so that the worldly element is divinized or raised up by transubstantiation to meet it.\(^{263}\) However, Reformed theology stresses that it is the Whole Christ (divine-human) who comes in the Eucharist, the very God very man, and comes as such as a self-offering.\(^{264}\) It is the humanity of the risen Christ which is here called in question by Vatican II. Concentrating on the mass, we find that the emphasis is upon the mediation of the priests rather than upon the mediation of the risen High Priest Jesus Christ. It is a case of the priests offering the sacrifice rather than the self-offering of the risen Christ. Thus, "through the hands of priests and in the name of the whole church, the Lord's sacrifice is offered in the Eucharist in an unbloody and sacramental manner until He Himself returns."\(^{265}\) Thus, it is the Church which offers the divine Victim to God,\(^{266}\) rather than the coming of the risen Christ offering participation in His humanity Himself. With this emphasis upon the human role, it is important to note that Vatican II has stressed that this Eucharistic sacrifice is "the center and root of the whole priestly life,"\(^{267}\) for it is in it that the "priests fulfil their chief duty", and "in it the work of our redemption continues to be carried out".\(^{268}\) It is the "basis and center" of the Christian community,\(^{269}\) it is "the source and apex of the whole work of preaching the gospel", is "the very heartbeat of the congregation",\(^{270}\) and "contains the Church's entire spiritual wealth".\(^{271}\) In other words, here at the heart of worship the essential order is the
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priests mediation for the people before God, which is actualized in re-presenting the sacrifice of Christ, which he mediates before the Father and to the people. Here priestly men control the risen Christ instead of the risen Christ being sovereign Lord in His freedom and control over His body the Church. No one can accuse Earth of failing to stress this sovereign freedom of the risen Lord as the Christus Praesens. Much that he has written successfully answers the Catholic position here outlined.  

However, if Vatican II has shown anything, it has shown that inspite of granted and welcome evidences of aggiornamento, it has not changed at its center. Put in other words, the central issues are brought to a head in the priestly role in the mass. It is man's taking of the place that should be occupied by the human risen Christ that concerns us. Just as Christ is supposed to have a vicer in His place on earth in the Pope, so the salvic work is supposed to be continuing through the priests and their work below in the mass. Surely the most effective answer to this anthropocentric emphasis is to point to the continuing sole priesthood of Jesus Christ for us above which brings Him through the Holy Spirit to offer Himself as the Whole Christ in communion in the Eucharist? It is this risen human Jesus Christ who is the One Minister for us above, thus qualifying any need of sole intercession by other humans below, and is also the One Minister for us below, at the Lord's table, thus negating any need of mediation by priests. Vatican II theology does not do justice to the once-for-all finality of Hebrews, which removed the need of any human priestly system. Theirs is a christianized form of the Jewish cult. But today, there is only one human priest, not in temples of earth, but in the sanctuary above in the sessio ad dexteram. He is the centre of worship as the One True

---

272. See Chapter 5, Section 8 a on the once-for-all emphasis, also CD 4/2, 614-726; 4/3, 729-734, 836, etc.
Worshipper for us before the Father, interceding in our name as we pray
in His, coming to commune with us in Spirit at His Table as we partici-
pate in Him through the emblems. He, and He alone is central to worship,
for we not only worship through the One who is our only human mediator,
but worship Him also as He is God. We submit that the need for concen-
trating upon the risen humanity of Christ in His continuing sole mediation
above for us is just as necessary in our day as it was in that of Calvin.
The fact that the whole Jesus Christ is present with us is a welcome part
of the answer given by Barth, as is so much of what he had to say on the
Church as the congregatio, the priesthood of believers, as the real body
(as body, not ruler) of its sole Head, Jesus Christ and his stress on the
once-for-all realized atonement. However, having concentrated upon this God
to manward side of post-resurrection Christology, the vital man to Godward
side, which is so important to worship and to answering the theology of
Vatican II (as we have seen), is all but missing. Thus Calvin's presen-
tation does greater justice to this central issue than does Barth's.

It has been said that the Reformers restored the place occupied by the
humanity of Christ, and that Calvinists shattered the Roman priesthood
by teaching the book of Hebrews. It is this same emphasis on the humanity
of the risen Christ in his man to Godward intercession, and thus this
important aspect of the book of Hebrews that is needed in Barth's Dogmatics.
It is of interest that in an early letter to Thurneysen Barth wrote, "I
have still very little knowledge of the Letter to the Hebrews...for the
present I simply do not yet understand much of its essential meaning."276

It would be wrong to assume from this that he did not learn much about
the meaning of Hebrews in his later life, for references to the book are
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found throughout the *Dogmatics*. However, if as A. Ross said, "there is no book of the New Testament that stresses so strongly the true humanity of Our Lord as does this Epistle..." and if as T. W. Manson said, "Heb. 1-4 is concerned with proving the uniqueness and supremacy of Christ as against all other intermediaries", we are left wondering why this book was not given the central and determinative place in Barth's post-resurrection Christology which would have taken his stress on the bodily resurrection of Christ to its logical conclusion and have strengthened his otherwise strong attack against the Roman priesthood? In this Barth differed from Calvin, who "made it (i.e. Hebrews) determinative for the whole of his christology and eschatology." In his unpublished *Ethik* Barth said, "Prayer is in fact the actualizing, made possible here and now, of our eschatological reality." In an article in *Zwischen den Zeiten* he said of Christ, "The promise is fulfilled" is then understood to mean that what the promise promised is now here and is able to be appropriated, possessed and joyfully partaken of by at least Christians." What we would have liked to have seen in Barth's post-resurrection Christology in KD 4 is the development of these two eschatological insights, as participation in the risen humanity of Christ as the One Worshipper, offering our human response before the Father, and as participation in the risen humanity of Christ as the One Priest, offering His humanity to the community in the Eucharist, for an ontological appropriation of the eschatological εν παρθένη. In both the community is gathered up in the Godward movement which is worship. In 1916 Barth wrote "there is something greater in the Bible than religion and 'worship'" i.e. revelation. In KD 4 it is still revelation rather than
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worship which was his primary interest, but, in the end, is it not a christological understanding of worship which overthrows the very anthropocentric "religion" against which Barth consistently revolted throughout his life?

f. Conclusion

As we have seen, over-against the de-eschatologized anthropocentric thinking of Schleiermacher and Ritschl, Barth has not only restored to theology its proper Subject in Jesus Christ, but in doing so has re-established the integral importance of eschatology to theology. We have noted his development in the earlier period when his "timeless eschatology" was experiencing its theologia viatorum to become "christological eschatology." We have noted the important contribution of his one on-going parousia or munus propheticum which does justice to the "past-present-future" eschatological tension, thus overcoming the different one-sided emphasis of various other eschatological theses. But we have also seen that this very correction was itself one-sided because the man to Godward movement of the risen Jesus Christ was all but unmentioned, and hence the "here-there", "new-old" eschatological tension is all but missing. Although Barth criticized Calvin's eschatology we have seen that Calvin has done justice to this latter eschatological tension, and that in the light of Vatican II Barth has not given such a forceful answer to Roman theology as Calvin on the question of the sole saving priesthood of Christ. We have noted that it was the humanity of Jesus in time that was not given justice in Barth's "timeless eschatology" whereas it is the humanity of Jesus above time and into time that is not given justice in his "christological eschatology". We also noted that the earlier "eternity-time" dialectic became the later "reality-revelation" dialectic. With these observations we have followed Barth in collecting and presenting his ideas on eschatology, comparing his
thinking over-against the main strands in the debate on the Kingdom. From it all our concern has come to centre around the place of the humanity of Jesus in the theology of Karl Barth. In our conclusion we are left with the following questions. Should not our human response in the Eucharist be replaced by the human response of Jesus Christ in the *sessio ad dexteram*? Is there not room here for strengthening Barth's otherwise strong objectivity? Should not the Eucharist also be understood as participation in the humanity of Christ with ontological, and therefore eschatological απαρξή results? Should not equal space be given to the man to Godward intercessory worship of the human Christ as is given to the God to manward *parousia* revelation of the coming God? Was not Barth more interested in the coming God in continuing *parousia* revelation to man than he was in man's coming to God in continuing worship in the One Worshipper, Jesus Christ? Is not A. Ross's general comment (on book of Hebrews) applicable to Barth? - "Man needs a Revealer, but he needs far more, a Redeemer". Finally, is it possible to really have a genuine mediation by the man Jesus before His Father in Heaven, or such an "outer history" during his Bethlehem to Calvary life, with Barth's Trinity as three modes of being of the one God instead of three persons in the one Godhead? Could it not be said that this basic trinitarian presupposition lies behind the lack of justice given to the humanity of Jesus in both pre- and post-resurrection Christology in Barth's theology?

g. Postscript

With his characteristic openness to change or *theologia viatorum*, it is interesting to speculate whether the *sessio ad dexteram* christological movement would have been spelled out in KD 5. If the five volumes were

before us, and the _sessio ad dexteram_ were given equal space with the _munus propheticum_, then it would seem more logical to find the _munus propheticum_ in KD 5 on the Redeemer Holy Spirit, and the _sessio ad dexteram_ in KD 4 on the Reconciler Jesus Christ. In other words, it is KD 4 which spells out pre-resurrection atonement by Christ which could logically have been followed by the post-resurrection atonement ministry of Christ as the High Priest in the _sessio ad dexteram_. Also seeing KD 5 was to be on eschatology, and therefore on the _parousia_, and seeing it was to be about the Holy Spirit as Redeemer, it would seem that this would have been the logical place for the presentation of the Holy Spirit in the on-going _parousia_ (_munus propheticum_) revelation. It seems, to this writer, that a thorough presentation of the man to Godward ministry of the risen Jesus Christ would best have been given early in KD 4, to form the objective basis from which the God to manward side could have been spelled out.

All questions, critiques and ideas suggested here have sprung from a genuine appreciation of the tremendous contribution that Barth has made. As G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance wrote in the editors preface to the English CD 4/4,

"The Church Dogmatics has opened up for us the whole perspective of the theological understanding in such a way that by standing on Karl Barth's giant shoulders we can see excitingly far into what still needs to be done. It is by going forward into that promised land that we can best show our gratitude for him, and if there we prove for ourselves the immense enlightenment and fruitfulness of his fundamental thought for the further development of Christian theology, we will be able to assess his work and do honour to him in the way that he deserves." 284

That way forward, we submit, embraces the man to Godward movement of the humanity of Jesus Christ for us above and into us below. It concerns our

284. CD 4/4, vi
present ontological participation in that humanity so that post-resurrection Christology is not only a coming Christ in *parousia* revelation but also includes the facts that "no man cometh unto the Father but by me" (John 14:6), and "when He shall appear we shall be like Him" (1 John 3:2).
SECTION IV

APPENDIX AND BIBLIOGRAPHY
APPENDIX No. 1.

A BRIEF LOOK AT SOME ASPECTS OF THE DEBATE ON THE KINGDOM

With this study of the Kingdom, we come to what E. Brunner called "the central conception of the message of the New Testament", and to what J. Moltmann considered "the real heart of eschatology". The Greek word for Kingdom (ῦδικεία) has been variously interpreted as (a) reign of God, (b) realm over which He rules, and (c) a combination of both rule and realm. The time of the Kingdom's arrival is considered either as already come, in the process of coming or yet to come in the future. Around this "time question" centres discussion over the exact meaning of the Greek word ἀδικεία. The concensus of opinion considers the Kingdom as both having come and yet to come.

The parables of the Kingdom have been interpreted in the past as allegories (Origen), and as similitudes (A. Jülicher), but in recent study have been primarily related to the Sitz im Leben of Jesus (C. H. Dodd, J. Jeremias). There is also a difference between the "historical" and "theological" approach to the subject, with the historical emphases on a radical distinction between the Jesus of history (Historie) and the Christ of kerygma (Geschichte). There are differences concerning whether Jesus made use of apocalyptic as a man of his own century (A. Schweitzer), or whether it is only an accretion to the original logion of Jesus made by the primitive church to explain the delayed parousia. The latter view lends strength to the idea that apocalyptic is only the timebound disposable shall surrounding the timeless essential truth, necessitating "demythologizing" (R. Bultmann) - better called by non-advocates "de-coding" (J. Bright), or "de-literalizing" (W. A. Whitehouse), which simply means to "de-supernaturalize" (J. S. Stewart). This raises the question
of the Kingdom's relation to continuity (prophetic) or discontinuity (apocalyptic) with this world. With this comes the question as to whether the Kingdom is to be thought of as an age beyond history (O. Cullmann), above history (R. Bultmann), or in history (E. Brunner); whether the decisive event of the Kingdom has happened (G. W. H. Lampe) or if there are yet greater things to take place (D. Ritschl, C. K. Barrett); and finally, if the Kingdom is to be considered as "realized" (C. H. Dodd), "fulfilled" (E. C. Hoskyns), "fully inaugurated" (J. A. T. Robinson), or "in process of realization" (J. Jeremias, N. A. Dahl), "being realized" (J. Knox), "becoming" (G. Aulen), "Ever Coming" (B. Duhm) and thus yet to be realized (R. H. Fuller, G. S. Duncan, J. Moltmann).

1. E. Brunner, TM 1 2. J. Moltmann, TH 216
3. E. F. Scott, KM 95 - kingship, not realm, is prior; H. B. Swete, PK 163 - the Kingdom is not a "territory governed by God" but His "sovereignty". STL 161f - Kingdom not a territorial empire, but sway of Christ in the hearts of men. T. W. Mansen, MMJ 570f (Cf. 439) - earliest formulation of eschatology was not creation of a better world but we shall be with God "that and nothing else is the complete fulfilment of christian hope" (626, Cf. 637). The TOJ 116-141 - Kingdom is the sovereignty of God and not a social order, p. 135 - Kingdom is the reign of God. G. E. Ladd, JK 38, 118-144, 327; GK 13-23 - Kingdom is rule and not realm. J. Bright, KCG 18; C. K. Barrett, SJT 1955, 141 - Kingdom is reign and not realm. G. Dolman, WJ 94 - always "kingly rule" and never "kingdom". W. Mansen, SJT OF Vol. 2, 1953 - only the reign or rule of God is mentioned, never the realm (pp. 1-16). Often in petrisc literature it is the reign in exclusion of the realm that is emphasized (see W. G. H. Lampe, "Early/Patrician Eschatology", SJT OF No. 2, 1953, 17-35.
5. W. G. Kümmel, PF 91, 124, 153 - Kingdom as reign; pp. 28, 52 - as realm. J. Orr, HDB Vol. 2, 844-856 - "Kingdom of God, of Heaven"; p. 852 - Kingdom as rule; p. 851 - as realm or sphere (Cf. 852). A. M. Hunter, TF 39. Cf. Moffatt's Bible Translation - Kingdom (βασιλεία) as reign (Rom. 14:17, 1 Cor. 4:20), as realm (1 Cor. 6:19f, Ephes 5:5, 1 Cor. 15:50). S. D. F. Salmond, CDI 295 - Kingdom includes "royal authority" and "the realm over which He rules".
6. Kingdom come - C. H. Dodd, TPCK 7-156. Kingdom in process of being realized - N. A. Dahl, W. G. Kümmel, PF 19-83. Associated with the present coming of the Kingdom is the discussion on its imminence in the sense that it has not yet come. G. Aulén, FCC 168, 445 - Kingdom has not become but is becoming; J. Knox, CL 30 - Kingdom at hand but not cont./
6. cont.
come in the absolute sense; C. J. Cadoux, HMJ 353 - we are back where
the Jews were for the Kingdom is still near and still brings decision;
E. Duhm, ECGK 1-86 - the Kingdom is not come for it is always coming;
G. S. Duncan, JSM 256, speaks of the imminence of the Kingdom as not
immediate, of its establishment as still future (258); R. Otto, KGM
131-137 - Kingdom as future.

7. G. H. Dodd, TPK 36f, equates "\(\eta \theta i \kappa \sigma \nu\) with \(\phi \alpha \tau \sigma \nu\) (has come) and
A. M. Hunter, IP 42, with having "arrived"; Kümmler, FF 23ff, negates
this because the two Greek words do not come from the same Aramaic
(m'ta - to arrive). R. H. Lightfoot, however, interprets it as "has
come" (HMG 65, 107). C. E. B. Cranfield points out that it has a spatial
rather than a temporal connotation, and thus means "has come near". (GM
67f). V. Taylor also emphasizes that it means has drawn near, and not
come (GSM 167). Also J. M. Robinson, FHM 24. C. T. Craig indicates
that the perfect \(\eta \theta i \kappa \sigma \nu\) when used of time can only refer to the near
future (JBL Vol. 56, 1937, 20); J. Y. Campbell concludes that there is
no evidence for equating \(\eta \theta i \kappa \sigma \nu\) with "has come" (ExT Vol. 48, Nov.
1936, 91f). K. W. Clark considers a "realized eschatology" based upon
\(\eta \theta i \kappa \sigma \nu\) or \(\phi \alpha \tau \sigma \nu\) as meaning "has come" to be "unjustifiable" (JBL

Vol. 64, 1945, 241-254 - Kingdom had come and would come (252f). J. D.
Smart, IS 110 - Kingdom always both present and near. G. S. Duncan,
JSM 165 - Kingdom come, and future (258). J. Bright, KOG 216, 233-243;
C. E. B. Cranfield, GM 66 - Kingdom has come and is still to come because
Jesus has come and is to come again; E. Käsemann, "Das Problem des
historische Jesus", ZTHK 125-133, "Zukunft der Gottesherrchaft" and "die
Baasileia als sich auf Erden" (150f). C. K. Barrett, SJT Vol. 6, 1953,
136-155, 225-243 - Kingdom come near in secret, will come in power (231).
J. S. Stewart, LTJ 54 and MC 202, 293; K. E. Skydsgaard, SJT Vol. 4,
1951, 383-397; H. P. Owen, SJT Vol. 15, 1962, 369-383 - Kingdom come but
not fully come; O. Cullmann, SH 32-40, 166-185 - Heilsgeschichte holds
together past, present and future. ECC 42 - present Kingdom, future
reign. V. Taylor, GSM 134f, 385, 547 - realized eschatology and
unrealized eschatology. T. F. Glasson, SA 106f; A. T. Cadoux, TJ 45-47;
J. Orr, HDB 851; J. Knox, CL 29; R. Otto, KGM 123; E. von Dobschütz, EG
24ff; W. Manson, CVKG 57f (cf. 60, 155); SJT OP No. 2, 1953, 6f - there
is a "realized eschatology" and also an "eschatology of the unrealized"
(cf. p. 9 - "fulfilled" and "not fulfilled"). T. W. Manson, MJM 304f -
the consummated Kingdom is present as really as harvest is present in a
sown field - also pp. 461, 472, 596. R. S. Wallace, GM 56, 79; J.
Moffat, TG 41-84; G. Vos, TJKC 38-65; G. W. H. Lampe, SJT OP No. 2, 1953,
22f and W. A. Whitehouse, Ibid. 70f; H. Anderson, JCC 128-134; S. B.
Babbage, EQ Vol. 12, 1940, 64-66; F. F. Bruce, EQ Vol. 15, 1943, 265f;
Howard, EQ Vol. 38, 1966, 55f - both present and future because inextricably bound up with Christ.

10. A. Jülicher, DGJ vii-x. Included is the history of interpretation
(pp. 203-322) and the consideration of the authenticity (pp. 1-24),
essence (25-118), objective (118-148) and value (148-182) etc. of the
parables of Jesus.
12. 19th century Leben-Jesu Forschung was interested only in the historical
Jesus as seen throughout A. Schweitzer's NZW. The opposite extreme is
cont./
12. cont.
R. Bultmann's rejection of the "old quest" for a consuming interest in the Christ of kerygma (TNT, esp. Vol. 1, 33-183). Bultmann therefore radically separated the sayings of Jesus from the Pauline kerygma, because he considered them so divided by the turn of the ages (JP 196). This has implications for interpreting the "Son of Man" eg. whereas for W. Manson the Son of Man of the future parousia was identical with the Jesus of history (SJT OP Vol. 2, 1935, 11), for Bultmann the Jesus of history pointed forward to the Son of Man as another than Himself (TNT Vol. 1, 9). T. F. Torrance has convincingly shown that the New Testament witness is a complete witness, with no contradiction between the eschatology of the apostles and the eschatology of the synoptics, for "If the eschaton in Jesus Christ has really come into the present, then it must invade and shape the thought of the redeemed, so that the synoptic revelation of the kingdom attains its full fruition only through the Apostolic witness... What Jesus began to do and to teach in the flesh is continued and completed by Himself through the Spirit in the witness and work of the Apostolate" (EQ Vol. 25, 1953, 102).
G. R. Beasley-Murray traced the underlying unity of the various N. T. witnesses to Christ Himself (EQ Vol. 16, 1944, 202-218). This is also the position of J. E. Howard (EQ Vol. 38, 1966, 52-58, 68-75, 150-157). G. Cullmann has shown that although mention of the second advent is not frequent in the earliest Christian confessions, eschatology played more than a small part in them (ECC 42). J. S. Stewart finds no contradiction between these early kerygma and that of Jesus (FTP 15ff). H. F. Owen argued that the tenacious belief in the imminent return would hardly have been possible if not propounded by Jesus Himself (SJT Vol. 12, 1959, 171-192, esp. 171f). In talks to the Cambridge Theological Study Circle, H. E. Gillelebeuck defended the unity between the Gospel of Jesus and of Paul (EQ Vol. 14, 1942, 281-290).

13. A. Schweitzer, QHJ 368f; E. Duhm, ECKG - Duhm considered that Jesus "de-apocalypticised the expectation" (p. 73).


15. R. Bultmann, ThB 27-40; E. K. Good on "The Meaning of Demythologization" and Bultmann's reply on pp. 256-261. J. Bright, KOG 240; W. A. Whithouse, SJT OP No. 2, 1935, 77, 85; J. S. Stewart, FTP 26. Apocalyptic is considered as a form to convey the content - W. Hanson, JM 209 and R. Bultmann TNT Vol. 1, 22f; as a shell - J. W. Bowman, ICJ 148, 153; as not literal but used to give urgency - A. N. Wilder, EETJ 141, 21, 26; as accretions of the primitive church added to the sayings of Jesus - W. G. Kümmel, PP 95-104. On the other hand E. F. Scott warned that they are forms not to be treated as mere husks which can be thrown away (KGNT 116). There is, he argued, a distinction between the framework and message (KM 255), and there cannot be a process of discarding without sacrificing something of the essential message (KM 256). Knowingly exaggerating, D. Ritschl considered the demythologization of the Gospel to have caused the "remythologization" of the world (MH 183). A Nygren urged that our modern view of Christianity and not the New Testament needs to be demythologized (SJT Vol. 4, 1951, 363-375, esp. 372). More recently D. Ritschl, in opposition to Bultmann's demythologizing, has similarly affirmed the need to make the modern situation relevant to the biblical texts rather than the opposite (MH 61).

16. cont.

the eschatological apocalyptic view of the Kingdom: E. F. Scott (EM 102f) - Jesus' sayings concerning gradual coming of the Kingdom and its sudden coming to be taken together; S. D. F. Salmond, (CDI 297f) - "gradual growth" and "great catastrophe" - continuous inner development and a sudden outward event at the end; C. F. Bruce (EQ Vol. 15, 1943, 266) - "present hidden development of kingdom" and its "cataclysmic manifestation at the Second Advent"; H. H. Farmer, (WG 223); G. Aulén (PGC 68ff); S. Smalley (SJT 1964, 406-413); C. E. B. Cranfield (GM 402); C. K. Barrett (CJT 1953, 136-155); A. R. Ford (EQ Vol. 23, 1951, 30-39). G. E. Ladd supports the unity between the prophetic and apocalyptic, pointing to the artificial distinction of them into two different religions (as with S. Mowinckel, HTC) as underlying much of contemporary discussion (EQ Vol. 38, 1958, 75-85, esp. 81).


The following are some scholars who stress continuity: A. T. Cadoux (TJ 22-55); G. Gloege (DHC 195f); G. S. Duncan (JSM 185, Cf. 100).

Some thinkers who consider apocalyptic and prophetic to be mutually exclusive (with these can be included those interpreting apocalyptic to be but a form, shell, husk or framework etc. as noted in fn. 15): S. Mowinckel (HTC 267) considers efforts to unite these two to be a "retrograde" step in historical scholarship; G. Neville (AH 21-66, 95) distinguishes between prophetic and apocalyptic in favour of the former; M. Goguel also separated the two, dismissing apocalyptic (LVJ 554-557, Nb. 554, "si la pensée de Jesus sur le Royaume de Die a été nettement eschatologique, elle n'a pas été apocalyptique."

17. This classification could be misleading as there is an overlapping of thinking between them, eg. all consider, in different ways, that this post-resurrection time is the new aeon. The classification is therefore only limited to indicating the seemingly different emphases or ways of considering this new aeon, ie. the emphasis upon the future age of glory to follow this present age of grace (Cullmann) the present "Timeless" encounter from God as the constant inbreaking of the Eschaton (Bultmann) and the future age in the present in the sense that Christians live wholly in the new aeon and not just between the times (Brunner). O. Cullmann, CAT 144ff; R. Bultmann, HE 138-155; E. Brunner EH 146. (This is only one emphasis among others, for although Christians are altogether living in the new aeon and not just between the times (EH 146) so that in faith the future is already present (EH 59), this should be balanced with the dualism between possession and anticipation (EH 60) for the Kingdom cannot be established in this earthly world because incomparable with sin and death (EH 76).)

18. G. W. H. Lampe, (SJT OP No. 2, 1953, 21) - history's climax is in the past. O. Cullmann, (SJT 11 and CAT 145 - "devisive battle") also speaks of the decisive event as in the past, as does T. P. Torrance in speaking of the incarnation (EQ Vol. 25, 1953, 171), together with Christ's death and resurrection (Ibid. 226). J. K. Howard refers to the Kingdom in the first advent as the decisive event (EQ Vol. 38, 1966, 57). D. Ritschl (MH 11) - greatest things still to come. C. K. Barrett, (SJT Vol. 6, 1953) - although he spoke of final and decisive events as cont./
already happened as well as yet to happen (236), he referred to these future events as God having greater things to do (240) and thus of "unprecedented events to come" (47). This is also inspite of the fact that in another place he spoke of the first advent of Jesus as the "primary eschatological event (BUTE 364).

18. cont.

19. C. H. Dodd, TPQK 8, 146-156; E. C. Hoskyns, CS 27; J. A. T. Robinson, JHC 29f. The term "inaugurated eschatology" was used by W. A. Whitehouse in SJT CP No. 2, 1935, 76 where credit to Prof. Florovsky and Calvin are given for this idea. We find it used also by T. F. Glasson, SA 113f and by C. H. Finnock, EQ Vol. 37, 1965, 14. J. Jeremias, DGJ 194 - sich realisierenden Eschatologie. W. Manson also spoke of the "eschatology of the unrealised" together with "realized eschatology" (SJT CP No. 2, 1953, 7). Similarly V. Taylor, (GSM 134f, 385, 547), N. A. Dahl (BUTE 430) and also C. K. Barrett, (SJT Vol. 6, 1953, 384) speak of eschatology "in process of realization". J. K. Howard referred to it as "in part realized" and "in part still anticipated" (EQ Vol. 38, 1966, 52f). J. Knox, CL 29. G. Aulén, FCC 168. B. Duhm, ECKG (thesis of book). R. H. Fuller, MAJ 25f, 32 - "the kingdom of God has not yet come". G. S. Duncan, JSM 258f - Kingdom "shall be fully established in the future. J. Moltmann, TH 283 - the centre of the N.T. is the future of the risen Lord, with the future as a "new reality" (p. 279), events receive ultimate truth not from themselves but from their goal (108) and thus eschatology is not yet realized (107).
Based upon a page by page reading of the Church Dogmatics, the following record includes the number of pages in which there are explicit or implicit references to eschatology (realized, present and futuristic). In the break down into various aspects there is naturally an overlapping as in some cases several items appear on the same page. Also it is obvious that some pages have only a word, sentence or paragraph on eschatology, whereas others are wholly concerned with it. Also if the notation on eschatology begins near the end of a page and continues on to the next, then two pages are found in the table. Hence this does not pretend to be more than an attempt to illustrate the consistent place eschatology has throughout Barth's Dogmatics. It indicates that his entire theology is eschatologically oriented because it seeks to speak from the actualized reality in Jesus Christ who is the Eschaton already inserted in history with a teleological movement to ultimate universal revelation of this fact, for christological eschatology is, for Barth, the Eternal Son of God in His overflowing love or manward movement of self-revelation in this cosmos as the theatre of God.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CD 1/1</th>
<th>CD 1/2</th>
<th>CD 2/1</th>
<th>CD 2/2</th>
<th>CD 3/1</th>
<th>CD 3/2</th>
<th>CD 3/3</th>
<th>CD 4/1</th>
<th>CD 4/2</th>
<th>CD 4/3</th>
<th>CD 4/4</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eschatology</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingdom</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against Universalism</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Line 1 on "Eschatology in general" does not include the other specific aspects of eschatology listed in the other sections, except a few times with the 3rd line where objectively realized eschatology and its implications for universalism are both given credit for the same reference. However, the overwhelming majority of references on universalism are kept separate from this realized aspect of eschatology in the chart.

The total 2,806 references in 7946 pages of the CD is perhaps most fairly represented as at least a 1 in 5 average new or repeated references on eschatology throughout the Dogmatics.
APPENDIX No. 3

SOME WRITERS WHO REFER TO THE LAST JUDGMENT

G. Aulén, FCC 445.
S. B. Babbage, EQ Vol. 12, 1940, 64f, 67, 70, 72f.
C. K. Barrett, BNTE 364; SJT Vol. 6, 1953, 147, 150, 239, 243.
E. C. Blackman, BNTE 21.
J. W. Bowman, PRC 272.
H. J. Cadbury, BNTE 310, 314.
J. Calvin, CHE Vol. 3, 257f. See also T. F. Torrance, KC 112, 114, 135, 139, 145.
B. Duhm, ECKG 77f. Cf. 64.
J. Jeremias, PCJ 226f.
D. Lamont, EQ Vol. 6, 1935, 73, 351-363.
M. Luther, see T. F. Torrance, KC 11, 25f, 31, 35, 51, 114.
T. W. Manson, TCJ 265, 269-277; MMJ 409.
W. Manson, SJT CP No. 2, 6f 13, 15.
J. Martyr, DT 121.
L. Morris, BDJ 54-72.
G. F. D. Moule, BNTE 464-481.
J. Orr, HDB II, 854.
H. Riesenfield, BNTE 93.
S. D. F. Salmond, HDB I, 751.
E. G. Selwyn, BNTE 397-401.
A. Stewart, PJe 209-225.
H. B. Swete, STL 180, PCK 79, 205.
V. Taylor, GSM 522.
W. M. Taylor, POS 52f.
T. F. Torrance, RP 45, 59f. Cf. 64, 67; SJT Vol. 16, 1963, 114;
SJT Vol. 2, 1949, 312f; CAC Vol. 1, 119, 180, 278;
CAC Vol. 2, 12, 175.

See note on Barth, next page.
It is noted that Barth can also speak in terms of the future judgment, not only in CD 4/3 (719, 758, 891, 903f, 906, 920ff, 934, 936) but also as late as his final fragment in 1967 (CD 4/4, 9, 122). What we have attempted to do is to see these in the context of his reality-revelation dialectic which speaks of Jesus Christ as the only One who can be judged (3/1, 109), as the "Judge judged in our place" (4/1, 211-283) so that it was this One man for all men who returned in the glorious resurrection, inaugurating the parousia which is to reach its ultimate universal revelation in the coming advent when nothing new is to be added to what already is (4/3, 293), so that the future judgment would seem to be a revelation of the reality of the judgment received on the cross. It is fair to say (as far as we can determine) that this qualification of the final judgment, which leaves it open to question as a novum reality to come, is not evident in the writers cited above, which makes their consideration more acceptable than Barth's.

As G. C. Berkouwer noted, in Barth's theology Jesus Christ is the only one judged, the only one rejected, and this is a dangerous idea because it does not take seriously enough the nature of unbelief, it does not really relate election and faith (FJ 196-199). G. S. Hendry also questioned Barth's evident weakness concerning the final judgment at the consummation (GI 112f). Hendry speaks of Barth's overemphasis on the objective reality in Jesus Christ (Ibid. 130ff). He also questioned the role of the human Jesus in Barth's theology (Ibid. 128). This has been our critique, for as H. R. Mackintosh said, "He became High Priest (5:5), and His complete and perfect priest-hood is the outcome of his having been made like men in all things..." (PJC 11). If the real consubstantiality of the man (vere homo) Jesus had been given in Barth's theology, then this man as the criterion and not just as the content of salvation would have been possible. That He is only the content because humanitas instead of vere homo, leads into the heart of universalism, dismissing the need of future judgment. It follows that Barth's ontology is transcendent with no givenness to man in time, save for noetic revelation (see Appendix No. 4). With those already listed over the page, H. C. Thiessen, unlike Barth, was unmistakably clear on the final future judgment (ILST 453, see 441-468, especially 496-505).
If we have interpreted Barth correctly, then his concentration upon the reality in Jesus Christ above left only reflection of and response to this reality below. This once-for-all actualized reality in the cross was revealed first in the resurrection, is continuing to be manifested through the Holy Spirit and will ultimately be universally disclosed in the final advent. This reality-revelation dialectic would seem to the heart of his post-resurrection Christology in its interest in the munus propheticum. It is therefore within this context that we have endeavoured to understand and interpret all statements relative to the subjective realization of the Kingdom in history since the resurrection. Our concern is not against the important place that human response has to God's revelation and presence (and this includes its place in the Eucharist and Worship) but that this seemingly became the only emphasis of Barth. We consider that growth in grace, the work of sanctification, the life-time process of is an ontological reality in man as He is being changed to become ever more like His God. He becomes clothed with the righteousness of Christ through the indwelling and creating power of the Holy Spirit, which is a living daily reality so that true worship and therefore genuine Eucharistic communion can be experienced. Through prayer, Bible study, daily living, etc. the Christian can walk with God as Enoch did. This is the abiding in Christ and Christ abiding in the Christian spoken of in John 17. Thus in worship and Holy Communion it is the Holy Spirit as Christ's representative who comes to commune and change Christians in that living fellowship which brings the fruit of the Spirit into their lives (Gal. 5:22f). (Thus the sections on the indwelling Creator God in Chapter 5 and the self-offering of the Eucharistic Christ in Chapter 7 are two aspects of the Holy Spirit's communion with Christians.)

As far as we understand Barth, his repeated encounter relationship between God and man is a result of his reality-reflection (or response) dialectic which does not give proper place to the ontological change in man below. Having said this, however, it is of interest that apparently on the periphery, even Barth could speak of Christ dwelling in the Christian (CD 4/3, 596, Cf. 605) so that he is altered (4/3, 655) and can seemingly use the language of "appropriation" (4/3, 620, 635ff). On the other side of the question, which is in agreement with his normative position, is the fact that sanctification is described as direction (4/2, 523, Cf. 499-613), with the objective as the ontic and the subjective as the noetic (4/3, 215). In harmony with this is the following quote:

"When a man has faith and is baptised, then he knows (noetic) something that changes his life (ontic). This knowledge is reality, so that the baptised man does undergo an ontological (noetic) change within the once-for-all ontological condition created for all men by Jesus Christ." (TT 92)

All the above references from CD 4/3 (481-680), concern the "creative call" of Jesus Christ to awaken to an "active knowledge" and vocation. It would seem that the nearest to an ontological change in man below is this noetic change in the Christian who now knows that his life is hid with God in Christ, who now knows that His being has been changed above in Him.
CONCERNING BARTH'S PAROUSIA

Some writers have said that the resurrection is not the parousia (e.g. W. G. Kümmel, PP 147ff and H. P. Owen, SJT Vol. 12, 1959, 183) and thus to that extent keep them distinct according to the narrower traditional meaning of the parousia as the final advent. C. H. Dodd has spoken of the resurrection, ascension and second advent as inseparable parts of a single divine event (C. H. Dodd, APD 68). Other interpreters have included the incarnation, and the cross together with the resurrection, ascension and final advent as together forming one event (e.g. C. E. B. Cranfield, SJT Vol. 7, 1954, 288 and A. R. Ford, EQ Vol. 23, 1951, 32f). C. E. Ladd pointed out that to the Old Testament prophets the day of the Lord embraced the historical (past advent to us) and the eschatological (future advent to us) as two aspects of the one act of God (JK 63-71). Thus Jesus came in the resurrection, in the Holy Spirit, is coming in every day of the Church's history and will come in the final advent. To Jesus this was a process in which many elements flow together into a single image (J. Orr, HDB II, 854). Thus the Kingdom was manifested, is continually entering into the present order and will in the future replace it (G. W. H. Lampe, SJT CP No. 2, 22). Thus the Eschaton was accomplished and is to be expected again in a form where the veil of mystery is lifted, and in the meantime happens through the Holy Spirit by what may be called an "eschatological repetition" (W. A. Whitehouse, SJT OP No. 2, 71).

Whereas E. Evans noted that the New Testament uses the word parousia in relation to the first advent only in reference to the transfiguration (2 Pet. 1:16-18, EQ Vol. 26, 1954, 105) Barth used the term only in reference to the second advent beginning in the resurrection. Rather than Pentecost as the "beginning of the 'End'" (J. K. Howard, EQ Vol. 38, 1966, 73) for Barth the end on the cross began to be revealed in the resurrection. Rather than three events as parousia (a. humility, b. mystic, and c. manifest, G. R. Beasley-Murray, EQ Vol. 16, 1944, 213) the munus propheticum of Barth is one parousia in three moments.

Compared with Barth's parousia, there are both similarities and dissimilarities evident in these different references. No doubt there are many others that could be cited. We submit that, as far as we can determine, no other writer has developed the concept of the one on-going parousia in terms of the munus propheticum (resurrection, Holy Spirit, ultimate advent) rooted in the triplex munus and grounded in a reality-revelation framework as in Barth's Dogmatics.
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