



THE BIBLE
is our only infallible guide
TODAY
and every day

THE BIBLE TODAY

43rd Year

JUNE - SEPTEMBER, 1950

Vol. 43, No. 9

10¢ a copy

Published by SHELTON COLLEGE, New York City

50¢ a year

The National Bible Institute

becomes

SHELTON COLLEGE

A sound Christian liberal arts college in the heart of the world's largest metropolitan area. Curricula leading to the B.A., B.R.E., and Th.B. degrees.

See leading editorial, page 251.

THE BIBLE TODAY, published monthly from October to May, inclusive, and one issue from June to September, inclusive, by SHELTON COLLEGE, formerly the National Bible Institute, 340 West 55th Street, New York 19, N. Y. DON O. SHELTON, Founder, President and Editor, 1907-1941; J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., President and Editor. Entered (or reentered) as second-class matter, September 15, 1937, at the post office at New York, N. Y. under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Meanwhile, under emigrant wharves and crowded factories, and under Washington, and under scheming conclaves of men acute and unscrupulous, and under many newspaper presses, and beneath Wall Street, and under the poisonous alleys of great cities, I heard the black angels laugh.

Then came forward before the angel three other spirits, whom I heard the ten thousand times ten thousand call by names known on earth,—Adams and Jefferson and Webster. And they said to the angel: "We will go on earth and teach the diffusion of property. We will heal America by the self-respect of ownership." And the angels said: "Go. You will be efficient, but not sufficient."

Meanwhile, under emigrant wharves and crowded factories, and beneath Wall Street, and under the poisonous alleys of suffocated great cities, I heard yet the black angels laugh.

Then came, lastly, forward before the angel three other spirits, with garments white in the light; and I saw not their faces, but I heard the ten thousand times ten thousand call them by names known on earth,—Edwards and Dwight and Whitefield. And they said to the angel: "We will go on earth and teach the diffusion of conscientiousness. We will heal America by righteousness." Then the angel arose, and lifted up his far-gleaming hand to the heavens of heavens, and said: "Go. Not in the first three, but only in all four of these leaves from the tree of life is to be found the healing of the nations,—the diffusion of liberty, the diffusion of intelligence, the diffusion of property, the diffusion of conscientiousness. You will be more than very efficient, but not sufficient."

I listened, and under Plymouth Rock and the universities there was no sound; but under emigrant wharves and crowded factories, and under Wall Street, and in poisonous alleys of great

cities, I heard yet the black angels laugh; but, with the laughter, there came up now from beneath a clanking of chains.

Then I looked, and the whole firmament above the angel was as if it were one azure eye; and into it the ten thousand times ten thousand gazed; and I saw that they stood in one palm of a hand of Him into whose face they gazed, and that the soft axle of the world stood upon the finger of another palm, and that both palms were pierced. I saw the twelve spirits which had gone forth, and they joined hands with one another and with the twelve hours, and moved perpetually about the globe; and I heard the Voice of the Christ, after which there was no laughter; and it said, "Ye are efficient, but I am sufficient."

As our first request for prayer shall we not ask for such a revival to sweep America, that it may shake the world.

The promise of an outpouring of the Spirit "upon all flesh" stands in His Word (Joel 2:29).

"Sow to yourselves in righteousness; reap in mercy; break up your fallow ground: for it is time to seek the Lord till He come and rain righteousness upon you." (Hosea 10:12)

Prayer requests through 3,440 are repeated for the second printing. The Circle of Intercession is printed once in two months.

3,436—Miss Margaret Maass writes December 4th from Chungking Hills, "Pray that we may be able to travel to our appointed fields as soon as we finish our first section of language study."

Word comes from Margaret Maass that since the Communist occupation many of the missionaries found it necessary to leave the China field,

but the '49ers decided to stay. Pray that a "rich strike" of gold for the Master may result.

3,437—May I ask you to pray for my young unsaved sister who seems to be under conviction and afraid to go to Youth for Christ meetings. She goes with an unsaved boy.

—G.G., Minneapolis

3,438—May I ask you to pray for those high in authority and government in the Leeward Islands that they may seek wisdom from on High to direct affairs.

—Rev. G.H., B.W.I.

3,439—Pray for an aged woman living in a rooming house. She is a mental case needing our prayers. There are many old women like this one needing care and prayer, some the Lord's own but many are lost.

3,440—Pray for a young Christian Filipino minister and wife called to go with their two children into a difficult field. They are consecrated and willing but need prayer.

Philippine Islands

3,441—Pray for a spiritual, talented Christian young woman, that a path may be opened for her according to Ephesians 2:10.

—An interested friend, Pa.

3,442—Pray for Miss Hannah Campagna who, having served as a W.A.C. in the Pacific, hopes now to return as a missionary to the Philippines.

—E.P.B.

3,443—Pray for a great blessing on the summer school, opening July 3rd.

3,444—Pray for a pouring out of the power of the Holy Spirit upon Shelton College.

3,445—Pray for the homes of aged ministers and missionaries and for those who minister to their needs, and, too, for those who receive the ministrations. May the grace and patience of Christ be upon them.

3,446—Pray for the Body of Christ in these days.

3,447—*The World Wide Revival Prayer Movement* has issued a call for a Day of Prayer for Revival, July the fourth. Pray for the World.

Karl Barth's Theology

A Book Review by J. OLIVER BUSWELL, JR.

THE very latest thing from Karl Barth in English, this new book* is a translation of lectures delivered in Bonn during the summer of 1946. The foreword by Barth is dated Basel, February 1947. This is the book which all of us who endeavor to keep informed on the Barthian movement (and most of us fundamentalist teachers do keep informed on such subjects) should read and carefully analyze.

We are being told that our critical analysis of Barth's teachings is "out of date," that "the new Barth" is a different man, has changed, no longer teaches

* *Dogmatics in Outline*, by Karl Barth, Philosophical Library, 1950. 155 pp., \$3.50.

Barthianism as we knew it before the war. Here we have a series of recent lectures on the Apostles' Creed, following the outline of that ancient standard point by point, and touching upon all the great fundamentals of the Christian faith. This is "the new Barth," and we undershepherds owe it to the sheep of the flock that we keep ourselves posted. We must know the direction in which the Barthians are leading American "liberalism."

Is it true that Professor Karl Barth has changed? The answer is that if he had not changed, this in itself would have been the greatest of change.

Barth is always changing. My friend,

Professor Samuel Hamilton, wrote him some years ago in the interests of a graduate student. The inquiry had to do with certain apparent contradictions in Barth's commentary on Romans. Barth replied, "*Ja mein Herr Professor*, that is so, I do contradict myself; *so ist das Leben*. Life is that way." And he proceeded to point out a number of other contradictions in the same book! Changes and contradictions are characteristic of the Barthian literature from start to finish.

This being the case, the reader must expect that any generalizations given in this review are also subject to contradiction. It would be impossible to give any statement of Barth's views which could not be contradicted by quotations from what Barth says. I shall endeavor to the best of my ability to be fair and objective in the following critique, but the reader must understand that a description of the theology of Barth is like a description of the shape of a cloud driven and tossed by a turbulent wind with many cross currents.

THE TRINE GOD

To plunge into the center of the subject, it seems to me that the most outstanding heresy in this work is Barth's view of the Trinity. It is both Sabellian and Arian. Sabellianism is that doctrine, ancient and recurrent in church history, which regards the Trinity as a matter of the modes of existence of one personal being. According to Sabellianism there are not three Persons in the Godhead; there is but one Person, and He appears sometimes as the Father, sometimes as the Son, and sometimes as the Holy Spirit. Arianism is the ancient denial of the eternal co-equal deity of the Son. Arianism regards the Son of God as deriving his existence from the Father. Barthianism is both Sabellian and Arian in that, according to Barth, the three Persons of the Trinity are not Persons but modes of one person, and the second and third modes are produced by and from the first mode.

In the heading of Chapter VI, Barth says

The one God is by nature and in eternity the Father, the source of His Son and, in union with Him, the source of the Holy Spirit. (P. 42)

He is, in Himself by nature and in eternity, and for us in time, *the One in three ways of being*. . . person meant exactly what I have just been describing as 'way of being.' . . . God is not just in one way . . . (pp. 42f) God the Father — in these words we are speaking of God's way of being, as a source and origin of another divine way of being, of a second one which is distinct from the first and which is yet *His* way of being and so is identical with Him in His divinity. (P. 44)

The combination of Sabellianism and Arianism makes it possible for Barth to cling to the old words "the Son is not created." (P. 44) He says

He establishes Himself and through His own agency is God a second time. Established by Himself, not created by Himself—the Son is not created. . . . God the Father and God the Son are together the origin of the Holy Spirit . . . Begetter and Begotten are together the origin of the Holy Spirit, and so the origin of their unity. (P. 44)

THE HOLY SPIRIT

The personality of the Holy Spirit, existing so as to say "I" and "thou" in relation to the Father and the Son, is contrary to Barth's position. He criticizes seventeenth century and eighteenth century theology, along with Schleiermacher, for thinking that the Holy Spirit may be studied as a distinguishable subject. He says ". . . the third article [of the Apostles' Creed, namely 'I believe in the Holy Ghost'] is only the explication of the second." (P. 66) That is, the article on the Holy Spirit is only an explication of the article on the Son.

Denying the distinguishable personality of the Holy Spirit, the result is

almost bound to be Pantheism. *Les extremes se touchent!* Barth with his "Absolutely Other" view of God, says

The Holy Spirit is nothing else than a certain relation of the Word to man. (P. 138)

It is God's good will and resolve that His relationship to us should be comprehended in His being, in His begetting of the Son . . . Our calling is meant to be comprehended in this way of God's being as the Holy Spirit . . . (P. 45)

THE SON

With these weaknesses in Barth's doctrine of the Holy Spirit, it is not surprising that he falls into similar errors in his doctrine of the Son.

The world is not God's Son, is not 'begotten' of God; but it is *created*. But what God does as the Creator can in the Christian sense only be seen and understood as a reflection, as a shadowing forth of this inner divine relationship between God the Father and the Son. . . . this relationship exists between the work of creation and the relationship of Father and Son . . . By becoming man in Jesus Christ, the fact has also become plain and credible that God is the Creator of the world. We have no other alternative source of revelation. (P. 52)

Evidently the inspired declarations of Moses are not a "source of revelation" of the fact of creation. With regard to creation, Barth teaches, "God who alone is real and essential and free, is one; and heaven and earth, man and the universe are something else, and this something else is not God, though it exists through God." (P. 55) Evidently this something else which is the created world, is either nothing or is God, for God alone is real!

Barth repeatedly says that in the incarnation Christ "became a creature." (Pp. 53, 68, etc.)

. . . we cannot avoid saying that Jesus

Christ's Incarnation is an analogue of the creation. Once more God acts as the Creator but not now as Creator out of nothing; rather, God enters the field and creates within creation a new beginning. . . . (P. 97)

No well informed trinitarian would say that "Christ became a creature." In the incarnation Christ took to Himself a creaturely body and a creaturely nature. His two natures are distinct, though not divided. His human nature is creaturely, but *He*, the eternal Second Person of the Trinity, did not *become a creature*.

When Barth defends the Athanasian opposition to the *iota* (p. 85), he does so on Sabellian grounds, and Sabellianism generally leads to Pantheism.

His humanity is humanity indeed, the essence of all *humanitas*. . . . Jesus Christ is *the* man, and the measure, the determination, and limitation of all human beings. He is the decision as to what God's purpose and what God's goal is, not just for Him but for every man. (P. 89)

Barth makes a peculiar reference to "what is involved in the relationship between creation and the reality of existence on the one hand, and on the other hand the Church, redemption, God. . . ." He says, "This we can only learn from the relation between Jesus and Christ." (P. 66) He does not explain in the present volume what he means by the relation between Jesus and Christ. Perhaps his discussion of Romans 3:21,22 in his Commentary on Romans throws light upon this cryptic passage. He says

The faithfulness of God and Jesus the Christ confirm one another. The faithfulness of God is established when we meet the Christ in Jesus. . . . By the knowledge of Jesus Christ all human waiting is guaranteed, authorized, and established. . . . All human activity is a cry for forgiveness; and it is precisely this that is proclaimed by Jesus and that appears concretely in

Him. . . In Jesus we have discovered and recognized the truth that God is found everywhere . . . in Him we have found the standard by which all discovery of God and all being discovered by Him is made known as such; in Him we recognize that this finding and being found is the truth of the order of eternity. . . it is the Christ whom we have encountered in Jesus . . . His entering within the deepest darkness of human ambiguity [*Fragwürdigkeit*] and abiding within it is THE faithfulness. . . Jesus stands among sinners as a sinner [The German is even worse than this, "*Er stellt sich als Sunder zu den Sundern.*" "He places himself as a sinner to [beside] the sinners." The context shows that this denies the sinless life of Jesus in the flesh.] . . . He takes His place where God can be present only in questioning about Him . . . His greatest achievement is a negative achievement . . . *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* Nevertheless, precisely in this negation He is the fulfillment of every possibility of human progress, as the Prophets and the Law conceive of progress and evolution, because He sacrifices to the incomparably Greater and to the invisibly Other every claim . . . because there is no conceivable human possibility of which He did not rid Himself. Herein He is recognized as the Christ; for this reason God hath exalted Him . . . (Commentary on Romans, pp. 96f)

For every Bible believing Christian the reason why Jesus is the Christ involves His ontological, co-equal, co-eternal, consubstantial Deity. For Barth, the Christhood of Jesus is an achievement in negation, of a man "among sinners as a sinner."

THE OTHER

On God the Absolutely Other, Barth adopts the view of Thomas Aquinas. A Christian Father once rightly said that *Deus non est in genere*, 'God is

not a particular instance within a class.' (P. 32)

True, God is not one of a class "gods." But in the Thomistic sense adopted by Barth in this context, it is false to say that God is not "*in genere.*" The Great Westminster definition of God is thoroughly Scriptural. Genus: "*God is a Spirit.*" Differentia: "infinite, eternal and unchangeable in His being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth." God is one in a class "spirits." We are spirits created in His image. For Barth, however, God's being outside of all classification means that He is inconceivable. (Pp. 38, 39, 46, 59, 62, 63)

OMNIPOTENCE

On the subject of the omnipotence of God, Barth has an amazingly contradictory view, "God's power . . . is victoriously opposed to 'power itself.'" (P. 46)

. . . the man who calls 'the Almighty' God misses God in the most terrible way for 'the Almighty' is bad, as 'power in itself' is bad. 'The Almighty' means Chaos, Evil, the Devil. We could not better describe and define the Devil than by trying to think this idea of a self-based, free, sovereign ability. This intoxicating thought of power is chaos, the *tohu wabohu*, which God in His creation has left behind Him, which He rejected when He created heaven and earth. That is the *opposite* of God; . . . 'Power in itself' is *nihil* . . . is the end of all things. The power of God, real power, is opposed to 'power in itself.' . . . God is the essence of the possible; but 'power in itself' is an essence of the impossible. (P. 48) God's work . . . [is] the essence of all that is possible and real. (P. 49; see also p. 90)

The omnipotence of God and the grace of God . . . are one and the same thing. (P. 124) The grace of God and the omnipotence of God are identical. (P. 126) 'God's omnipotence is God's grace.' (P. 127)

The upshot of all this is simply a flat denial of omnipotence as the word is generally understood. God is gracious, God is loving, and, which is not to say the same thing, God is also omnipotent, according to the Bible.

DOCTRINE OF SIN AND THE FALL

Barth's theology has no room for an actual incident in chronological history in which man, previously holy and sinless, corrupted the holy character of God which God had imparted unto him. "Original sin" is variously defined. "Sin means to reject the grace of God as such . . . [all other sin is] petty and incidental and a mere application of this original sin." (P. 105) In regard to man, Barth says ". . . from the beginning it is narrated that he is unthankful to God, that he is a sinner." This "from the beginning" is a denial of the original sinlessness of man before the fall. ". . . to be in time and space must cause his [man's] destruction . . ." (P. 57)

Evil does not lie in the possibilities of the God-created creature. . . . Should it happen that the creature makes a different use of his freedom than the only possible one [*sic*], should he want to sin — that is, to 'sunder' himself from God and from himself — what else can happen than that, entered into contradiction to God's will, he is *bound* to fall by this disobedience, by the impossibility of this disobedience [*sic*] into this possibility not foreseen in creation? . . . There must now take place the fall into *nihil*. . . this whole realm that we term evil . . . is *not* God's creation, but rather what was excluded by God's creation. . . . And if there is a reality of evil, it can only be the reality of this excluded and repudiated thing, the reality behind God's back, which He passed over when He made the world and made it 'good.' . . . What is not good God did not make; it has no creaturely existence. (Pp. 56f)

Of course for every sober Bible believing Christian sin and evil are just as real as God and righteousness; and the only proof we need that sin was possible, is the fact that sin has come to pass by God's permission. Barth teaches, however, that

Being a man means being so placed before God as to have deserved His wrath. In this unity of God and man the man is bound to be this condemned and smitten person. The man Jesus in His unity with God is the figure of man smitten by God. . . . God's Son became man in order to let man be seen under God's wrath. (P. 106)

God is the one who becomes guilty here and reconciled. (P. 107)

Thus Jesus triumphs over the world, in which by treading it He has to suffer. (P. 112)

. . . God's Son takes to Himself that which must come to the creature existing in revolt, which wants to deliver itself from its creatureliness and itself be the Creator. . . . Man stands before God as a sinner, as a being who has sundered himself from God, who has rebelled against being what he may be. He rebels against grace; it is too little for him, he turns away from gratitude. . . . He puts himself where God cannot see him. (Pp. 116f)

It thus appears that according to Barth the essence of sin, the essence of rejecting divine grace, is the desire of the creature to cease to be a creature and to become the Creator. It scarcely needs to be pointed out that this is not the Biblical conception of sin. The unreality of sin is sharply brought out in the following:

Our future consists in our being shown that all was right and good in our existence and in this evil world-history and—miracle on miracle! —in the still more evil church history. . . . what is in the newspapers is not good. And yet some day it will be

made manifest that it was right, because Christ was in the center. (P. 134)

That which is not of God's grace and right cannot exist. (P. 135) . . . Hades in the Old Testament sense, is . . . where man continues to exist only as a non-being . . . (P. 118)

UNIVERSAL SALVATION

With this weak and flabby doctrine of sin, it is not surprising to find the doctrine of universal salvation running all through the book under discussion.

This creature man is, so far as the eye reaches, in rebellion against God, is Godless and nevertheless God's child. (P. 45) . . . God became man, in this one who stands for all others. (P. 69) . . . God's free grace . . . asks no questions about a man's attitude, but sovereignly pronounces upon man a 'nevertheless', by which he is upheld. Man is nothing but the object of the divine compassion . . . (P. 79, see also p. 91, lines 1-22)

At this point I should like, in passing, to answer a question which has been put to me several times during these weeks: 'Are you not aware that many are sitting in this class who are not Christians?' I have always laughed and said: 'That makes no difference to me.' (P. 93)

The Son of man *must* suffer and be delivered up and crucified, says the New Testament. In this Passion, the connexion becomes visible between infinite guilt and the reconciliation that necessarily ensues upon this guilt. (P. 106)

To be a man means to be so situated in God's presence as Jesus is, that is to be the Bearer of the wrath of God. . . . God is the One who becomes guilty here and reconciled. And so the limit becomes visible, *total help* over against *total guilt*. (P. 107)

. . . there is bestowed upon him [man] unconditional participation in the glory of God. (P. 153)

A FALLIBLE BIBLE

It is well known, of course, that for Barth the Bible as a printed book is not itself the Word of God, but it *contains* the Word of God. Whereas, for Bible believers, systematic theology or "Dogmatics," is based upon the Bible as the infallible Word of God; for Barth all that we have is "just a human and earthly dogmatics." (P. 10)

Dogmatics will always be able to fulfill its task only in accordance with the state of the Church at different times. . . .

Even dogmatics with the best knowledge and conscience can do no more than question after the better . . ." (P. 11)

There is no utterly necessary, no absolutely prescribed method of Christian dogmatics—that is, the road we have to take in detail is left to the best knowledge and conscience of the man engaged in this matter. (P. 14)

In calling the Holy Scripture the Word of God (and we so call it because it is so), we mean by it Holy Scripture as the witness of the prophets and the apostles to this one Word of God, to Jesus, the man out of Israel who is God's Christ, our Lord and King in eternity. And in confessing this, in venturing to call the Church's proclamation God's Word, we must be understood to mean the proclamation of Jesus Christ . . . (P. 17)

In other words, the Bible is the Word of God, not in its every word, but in so far as it presents, or contains the Word of God.

Barth's reference to "the first and second creation accounts" (P. 51) is clearly an acceptance of the documentary theory of the composition of the book of Genesis, a theory which denies the genuineness of the book as it stands. His denial of any "source of revelation" in regard to creation, other than the life of Christ incarnate (P. 52), is a

clear denial of the Genesis account of creation, as revelation.

In pages 61 to 64, Barth gives what he calls the "lapidary description of creation." He forces upon the Genesis account the absurd mythologies of the ancient world, which nowhere are taught in the book of Genesis itself.

The Bible is not a letter-box but the grand document of the revelation of God. (P. 85)

BARTH'S THEORY OF TIME

For years we have been saying that for Barth God is outside of this world of time and space, and that what is true in ordinary historical and geographical terms for man, is untrue for God or is in an entirely different order of truth. This new work of Barth's seems actually to be calculated to contradict our former interpretation. Over and over again he emphasizes the reality of time and space.

The Christian Church does not exist in Heaven, but on earth and in time. (P. 10)

The truth of Jesus Christ is also in the simplest sense a truth of fact. Its starting-point, the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, is a fact which occurred in space and time, as the New Testament describes it. (P. 25)

God Himself is not supra-historical, but historical. (P. 28)

In the Biblical God's name is named, not as philosophers do it, as the name of a timeless being, surpassing the world, alien and supreme, but as the name of the living, acting, working Subject who makes Himself known. The Bible tells us the story of God; it narrates His deeds and the history of this God in the Highest, as it takes place on earth in the human sphere. (P. 38)

The mystery of God, and thus also of Jesus Christ, is that He, this One, this Man, by His being One—not an idea, but One who is quite concrete at that time and place, a man who

bears a name and comes from a place, who like us all has a life history in time—not only exists for Himself, but is this One for all. (P. 90)

That the Word became flesh also means that it became temporal, historical. . . . God was not ashamed to exist in this accidental state. To the factors which determine our human time and human history belong, in virtue of the name Pontius Pilate, the life and Passion of Jesus as well. . . . Into this alien land God has come to us. (P. 109)

We must not transmute the Resurrection into a spiritual event. We must listen to it and let it tell us the story how there was an empty grave, that new life beyond death did become visible. (P. 123)

We may name this time which broke in with Jesus Christ's ascension into Heaven, 'the time of the Word' . . . It is the time in which the Church is united with Christ only by faith and by the Holy Spirit; it is the interim time between His earthly existence and His return in glory; it is the time of the great opportunity, of the task of the Church toward the world; it is the time of missions. As we said, it is the time of God's patience, in which He is waiting for the Church, and, with the Church, for the world. (P. 128)

What more could any believer in realistic creationism desire? But "The lady protests too loudly methinks." Along with these splendid proclamations of the chronological, historical, geographical reality of the truth of God, we have the following type of teaching:

But God is eternal. That does not mean that there is no time in Him, but it is a different time from ours; for fundamentally we never have present, and for us spaciality means apartness. God's time and space are free from the limitations in which alone time and space are thinkable for us. (P. 56)

Jesus Christ having come, all those past tenses, would answer to what we term the past. But how inappropriate it would be to say of that event that it was past. What Jesus suffered and did is certainly not past . . . Sin and death *did exist*, and the whole of world history, including that which ran its course *post Christum*, right down to our day, *existed*. All that is past in Christ; we can only think back on all that. (P. 129)

Since Jesus Christ exists as the person He was, obviously He is the beginning of a new, different time from that which we know, a time in which there is no fading away . . . Jesus Christ's yesterday is also His today and His tomorrow. . . . It has not the frightful fleetingness of our present. . . . it is also existent in time, although in another time than the one we know. . . . Death is timeless, nothingness is timeless. So we men are timeless when we are without God and without Christ. Then we have no time. (P. 130)

Perhaps this last sentence is the key to the confusion. Perhaps Barth has taken over all the ordinary vocabulary of time and space into his own realm, and left the ordinary John Doe and Timothy Smith, our neighbors whom we are seeking to win for Christ, out in the timeless cold. Vocabulary stealing is not an unknown art in our day.

And corresponding to this eternal existence of Christ there is also His becoming existent. What was, comes; what happened, will happen. (P. 130) What happened still happens, and as such will happen. The point from which the Christian community derives, with its confession of Jesus Christ, is the same point as that which it goes to meet. Its recollection is also its expectation. (P. 131) The Christian perfect [tense] is not an imperfect; but rightly understood perfect has the force of the future. (P. 132)

'Christ is born.' once again it is Advent. Christ's coming again is the coming of Him who was there. . . . So He will come. He will rend the Heavens and stand before us as the person He is, sitting at the right hand of the Father. . . . Him we are expecting. He is coming, and He will be manifest as the One whom we know already. It has all taken place [*sic.*]; the only thing wanting is that the covering be removed and all may see it. He has already accomplished it, and He has power to make it manifest. (P. 133)

Our future consists in our being shown that all was right and good in our existence . . . What is the future bringing? Not . . . a turning-point in history, but the revelation of that which is. It is the future, but the future of that which the Church remembers, of that which has already taken place once for all. (P. 134f) The Christian hope is the seed of eternal life. In Jesus Christ I am no longer at the point at which I can die; in Him our body is already in Heaven (Question 49, *Heidelberg Catechism*). (P. 155)

How strange! The Heidelberg Catechism says nothing of the kind. It reads Q. 49. What benefit do we receive from Christ's ascension into Heaven? Ans. That we have our flesh in Heaven, as a sure pledge that He, as the Head, will also take us, His members, up to Himself. . . .

. . . *dasz wir unser Fleisch im Himmel zu einem sichern Pfand haben, dasz Er, als das Haupt, uns, seine Gleider, auch zu sich werde hinauf nehmen.* . . . (Cf. Q. 35 on Virgin Birth)

The teaching of the Heidelberg Catechism is by no means "I am no longer at the point at which I can die" nor that, in the sense in which Barth implies, "our body is already in Heaven." On the contrary the teaching is that One who is of our flesh is in Heaven,

and therefore, though we die, we are confident of our future resurrection by His power.

In my judgment, the material above cited, and much more of the same nature, proves that there was a deliberate intention to answer critics who had pointed out that Barth made the incarnation non-historical. If this conjecture is correct, it must certainly be said that he has not succeeded in defending himself. He has only succeeded in making historical language a matter of ridiculous nonsense.

I know very well that some will say "Ah, but this is profound! You do not understand!" I reply that it is not at all profound; it is quite superficial. Our irresponsible generation loves to hear "learned" men say "The future lies in the past; the perfect tense refers to future events; our expectations are already accomplished in history. Black is white and white is black;" and all that kind of thing. Barth's handling of the vocabulary of chronology grows out of hopeless confusion which does not know the difference between yesterday and tomorrow.

DOCTRINE OF FAITH, REASON AND EVIDENCE

On the side of traditional apologetics, Barth says

The Logos became man. Church proclamation is language, and language not of an accidental, arbitrary, chaotic, and incomprehensible kind, but language which comes forward with the claim to be true and to uphold itself as the truth against the lie. Do not let us be forced from the clarity of this position. (P. 22)

Christian faith is not irrational, not anti-rational, not supra-rational, but rational in the proper sense. (P. 23)

In contrast with such flashes of sanity, when Barth begins to define the "proper sense" of "rational" confusion begins to intrude. Just after saying "The creed of Christian faith rests upon knowledge," he says that the periods

of church history when theologians separated *gnosis* and *pistis*, were "always unpropitious periods."

"*Pistis* rightly understood is *gnosis*; rightly understood the act of faith is also an act of knowledge. Faith means knowledge. . . . Knowledge of God is not a possibility which is open for discussion. God is the essence of all reality . . ." (P. 23)

Now, to ordinary people who speak plain language, if faith and knowledge are identical then the dictionary has been torn to shreds, ordinary usage has been completely disregarded. True, faith *includes*, and must in part be *based upon* some degree of knowledge, but this is not what Barth has said.

Think of the men in the Bible. They did not come to faith by reason of any kind of proof, but one day they were so placed that they might believe and then had to believe in spite of everything. (P. 20)

On the contrary, for Thomas, and for Saul of Tarsus, faith came precisely at the point where the evidence was for them sufficient and convincing.

ANOTHER FLASH OF SANITY

The truth of Jesus Christ is also in the simplest sense a truth of fact. Its starting-point, the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, is a fact which occurred in space and time, as the New Testament describes it. (P. 25)

But obscurity clouds over in the following words:

The truth of Jesus Christ is not one truth among others; it is *the* truth, the universal truth that creates all truth as truly as it is the truth of God, the *prima veritas* which is also the *ultima veritas*. (P. 26)

On the contrary Paul in the fifteenth chapter of I Corinthians uses the truth of the resurrection of Christ precisely as "one truth among others." From the fact of the resurrection of Christ he argues to a further truth, another truth, the resurrection of believers.

Flying blindly in the face of all the facts Barth says

Note well: in the whole Bible of the Old and New Testaments not the slightest attempt is ever made to *prove* God. This attempt has always been made only outside the Biblical view of God, and only where it has been forgotten with whom we have to do, when we speak of God. . . . In the Bible there is no such argumentation [as "the five famous proofs of God"]; the Bible speaks of God simply as of One who needs no proof. (Pp. 37f)

No proofs of God in Romans 1:19, 20! No proofs of God in the eighth and the nineteenth Psalms! No cosmological or teleological arguments in Job, chapters 38 to 41!

But on the contrary, the God of the Bible says, "Come, let us *reason* together" (Isaiah 1:18), and challenges men to examine empirical evidence, "Taste and see that the Lord is good." (Psalm 34:8)

But Barth declares

It is not the case that the truth about God the Creator is directly accessible to us . . . It is of God the Creator we have to speak and therefore of His work as the *Creation*, the making of Heaven and earth. If we take this concept seriously, it must be at once clear that we are not confronted by a realm which in any sense may be accessible to human view or even to human thought. (Pp. 50f)

How completely contrary to the teaching of the apostle Paul! According to him the knowable attributes of God are clearly seen and revealed, His invisible attributes, His eternal power and deity, are known, since the creation of the world, through the things which are created, so that those who hold this truth in an unrighteous manner, not liking to retain God in their knowledge, are guilty and without excuse. (See Romans 1:19f)

And yet Barth says "The world . . .

gives us no information about God as the Creator." (P. 52)

CHURCH AND STATE

For all the theological "double talk" evidenced above, Barth cannot be accused of insincerity. He has sacrificed much for his convictions against Nazism and Anti-Semitism, which he strongly denounces. (Pp. 76f)

His two small books "Church and State" and "The Church and the Political Problem of our Day," both published in 1939, give much more along this line.

There is a palpable grammatical error in his exegesis of the words "the Holy Catholic Church" in the Apostles' Creed. He says

Credo in Spiritum sanctum, but not *credo in ecclesiam*. I believe in the Holy Spirit but not in the Church. Rather, I believe in the Holy Spirit, and therefore also in the existence of the Church, of the congregation. (P. 142)

He construes *Spiritum sanctum* as governed by the verb and the preposition *credo in*, but (p. 141, last line) he construes *ecclesiam* as governed only by the verb without the preposition, a palpable error in syntax. Again he says *Credo ecclesiam* means that I believe that here, at this place, in this visible assembly, the work of the Holy Spirit takes place. . . . Consequently, there are in truth not many Churches but *one* Church in terms of this or that *concrete* one, which should recognize itself as the one Church and in all others as well. (P. 143)

Evidently each particular local congregation is to regard itself, and "all others as well" as the Holy Catholic Church.

Since, as I understand it, Barth has not gone along with the ecumenical World Church ecclesiastical machinery, it would be interesting to know just what he means, if indeed he has any precise meaning. Certainly the West-

(Continued, bottom of page 271)

Book Reviews

This, My Brother, by Argye M. Briggs. Grand Rapids, Michigan, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1950. 347 pp.

The book under review is the second novel from the pen of Mrs. Briggs. Her first publication of book-length fiction, *Root Out of Dry Ground*, won for her the Eerdmans prize.

In both of these books Mrs. Briggs has used for her setting the Texas oil and cattle country, a region with which she is thoroughly familiar and which imparts to her stories an excellent sense of authenticity. Her characters too are Texan in their occupations, their attitudes, and their use of the English language, means by which a verisimilitude is achieved even more marked than in her previous novel.

The author's purpose is expressed by the title. In fact, the title contains the double purpose of pointing up the relationship between the two characters Josh and Ran, brothers in the same family though far apart in essentials, and that of Josh and Evart, the white and the negro boy, who become brothers in Christ. This brotherhood is realized and acknowledged by the white Josh only after a long struggle.

Mrs. Briggs shows excellent technique in developing her characters. She avoids direct exposition, especially in her minor figures, and makes the reader realize the character as others speak of him or as he himself speaks or acts. Thus the reader gains a sense

of personal acquaintance. This skill is shown especially in the introduction and development of Ran and of the Colonel.

The action of the story has as its center the life of the character Josh from his youth as a lad in high school over a long period of years culminating with World War II and the marriage of his son. The portrayal of this action shows both the strength and weakness of the author. The opening scene, in which the Colonel forces Josh to ride the unbroken pony, gives an adequate and fine introduction both of characters and of events. The high point of the story, the utter despair and blackness of darkness in the midst of which Josh reaches groping hands of faith and finds the blessedness of sins forgiven, is managed with admirable mastery. This moving scene is the culmination of a chain of events, arousing the reader's expectation and satisfying it fully. Mrs. Briggs, however, arouses such expectation at other points in her story without rewarding the reader with a good culminating scene, (called in technical language the *scène à faire*). For example, one of her minor characters suffers a painful accident which requires him to be taken at once to the hospital in the nearby city, but a blinding snowstorm is in progress at the time. The car with the injured man in it starts out through the storm, but the author fails to "follow through"; we are not told that the car

(Continued from page 270)
minster Fathers gave a much more intelligible statement.

The visible Church which is also Catholic or universal under the Gospel . . . consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion together with their children . . . And particular churches . . . are

members thereof . . . (Westminster Confession, chapter 25, paragraphs 2, 4)

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we may well be thankful for this little volume, which, in my opinion, gives a fair picture of Karl Barth and his theology as of the present day. J.O.B., Jr.

ever arrived at the hospital. The only justification for the carefully laid scene and for the suspense is a sort of spiritual triumph for Josh. To fail to satisfy suspense in a novel is a decided flaw in technique. No author should create expectation for the reader unless he expects to satisfy it amply. In the great novelists this is a matter of the artistic conscience. That Mrs. Briggs is capable of creating a rousing scene as the culmination of such expectancy is fully evident in the account of the regeneration of Josh.

The tone of the story, showing the author's attitude toward the Christian life with its joys and sorrows, its frequent need for long patience and for faith in the midst of trial, is very good indeed. She avoids the pitfall, into which many Christian novelists have fallen, of representing faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as rewarded with material success. Mrs. Briggs reminds the reader, especially in her development of the character Evart, of the sufficiency of the spiritual reward.

It is encouraging to know that the Christian public is at last welcoming such realistic representations of life. Almost three centuries ago John Bunyan portrayed in *Pilgrim's Progress* the journey to the celestial city through trial and suffering, intermingled with the joy of Christian fellowship, without any of the sentimentality that has crept into Christian stories in late years. We need more of this honest, straightforward depicting of our pilgrim way. Such is *This, My Brother*, and such, we hope, will be many more Christian novels from the pen of Mrs. Briggs.

MARIAN J. DOWNEY

Are you praying for

SHELTON COLLEGE

in its new field of opportunity?

HELP WANTED

We are in need of clerical help in The Registrar's Office and in the Accounting Department. Applicants should state age, experience and salary required. Address replies to the Business Manager

SHELTON COLLEGE

340 W. 55th Street, New York 19, N. Y.

ARE YOU A COOK?

This school would like to interview an experienced cook. We serve from 175 to 200 persons per meal. Dietitian will plan and direct work. Address your reply to the Business Manager

SHELTON COLLEGE

340 W. 55th Street, New York 19, N. Y.

Is your copy of *The Bible Today* coming to the correct name and address? Please keep us posted.

The Old Church

[FIRST METHODIST PROTESTANT]
Denton Avenue :: Lynbrook, L. I.

We preach Christ Crucified,
Risen and Coming Again.

Sunday Services: 11 a.m. - 7:45 p.m.

Member of the Bible Protestant Conference and the American Council of Christian Churches.

WALTER S. PATRICK, Pastor

The Authoritative Message

By EDGAR VAN DEUSEN

A MESSAGE is authoritative when it is given or supervised by (a) one who *knows all the relative facts*, and (b) is *absolutely true* in stating them. In all matters concerning our moral and spiritual life and eternal destiny, manifestly but One person is all-knowing and whose word is absolute truth; "Known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world" (Acts 15:8), and "God is not a man, that he should lie" (Numbers 23:19). Those who recorded the Bible's messages are careful to have it clearly understood that they wrote simply as God's scribes: "Only the word that God puts in my mouth, that shall I speak" (Numbers 22:20, 35,38); "We speak not in words of man's wisdom, but which the Holy Spirit teaches" (I Corinthians 2:13). Never by man's will was a Divine message brought, but "men of God spoke being impelled by the Holy Spirit" (II Peter 1:21). Instead of self-exaltation, their first concern is "that in all things He might have the preeminence" (Colossians 1:18). The writers repeatedly refer their assertions to God's illuminating influence, and so speak with confident assurance. Lee writes, "No honest and merely human historian ever dared to write thus." And Clarke says, "Neither Koran nor Zendavesta utter claims like these, that profess to proceed out of the mouth of the Most High." Were these claims untrue, the Book making them would have

long ago perished, instead of being the world's most morally uplifting and purifying one.

Briefly, the Bible reveals, by statements and examples, God's holy, just and loving nature; it shows clearly His earnest desire for our affection in return; it makes plain what we must do to come into the endless fellowship and felicity with Himself, which He has most mercifully provided and promised to those who truly seek and follow His good will. In such a message there are naturally self-identifying marks of its divine source and consequent authority. Among these divinely supernatural "hall-marks" are —

(1) The Bible's unique unity. It is composed of sixty-six separate writings on the many different facts and features of human life, by approximately forty different penmen of diverse background, training and experience—peasant, fisherman, shepherd, statesman, historian, scholar—writing under widely different circumstances in different regions and at different times during some 1600 years, yet one dominant theme binds all together—God ruling righteously yet even patiently with sinning humanity, striving to win their love and loyalty, providing and showing the way to eternal life for all who will trust and obey their Lord and Redeemer,—in short, man's spiritual need and God's provision for it. Evidently one controlling Mind guided the composition of these