

- **An Ambivalent Disciple: Barth's Use of Calvin in the Göttingen Dogmatics¹**
- **Un disciple ambivalent : comment Barth utilise Calvin dans la dogmatique de Göttingen (1924–1925)**
- **Ein zwiespältiger Jünger: Barths Verwendung von Calvin in der Göttinger Dogmatik (1924–25)**
S. W. Chung, Oxford

RÉSUMÉ

La relation théologique de Karl Barth avec Jean Calvin est demeurée trop longtemps ignorée du monde académique, sans raison légitime. Considérant que Barth a affirmé à plusieurs reprises sa lourde dette à l'égard de la théologie de Calvin, il est essentiel de prendre en compte la relation de Barth à Calvin afin de comprendre correctement le caractère de la théologie de Barth. La Dogmatique de Göttingen constituait, à l'origine, le contenu des premiers cours de dogmatique donnés à l'université par Barth en 1924–1925. Elle montre que Barth a fait un usage très attentif des arguments théologiques de Calvin pour construire ses propres positions

théologiques. Barth admirait Calvin tout en s'opposant à lui. Par certains côtés, Barth a développé d'une manière créative les apports théologiques de Calvin. Mais, sous d'autres aspects, il a critiqué et rejeté sans hésiter ses arguments. Ainsi, sa manière d'utiliser la sagesse théologique de Calvin peut être caractérisée comme étant à la fois élogieuse et critique, voire hostile. Dans ce sens, Barth peut être considéré comme ayant une attitude ambivalente vis-à-vis de Calvin. La raison de cette ambivalence tient au fait que Barth n'avait aucun désir de reproduire les idées de Calvin et qu'il avait ses propres préoccupations et objectifs, lesquels étaient conditionnés par ses présupposés philosophiques et théologiques.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Karl Barths theologische Beziehung zu Johannes Calvin ist von der Forschung viel zu lange ignoriert worden, noch dazu ohne ersichtlichen Grund. Berücksichtigt man, daß Barth den starken Einfluß von Calvins Theologie wiederholt bekräftigt hat, so scheint es geboten, seine Beziehung zu Calvin zu untersuchen, um so das Wesen von Barths Theologie besser verstehen zu können. Die Göttinger Dogmatik, die auf Barths erste Universitätsvorlesungen in den Jahren 1924–25 zurückgeht, zeigt, daß Barth Calvins theologische Argumentation auf sorgsame Weise zur Entwicklung seiner eigenen theologischen Positionen

herangezogen hat. Barth war ein Bewunderer und doch auch zugleich ein Kritiker Calvins. Er hat manche seiner theologischen Einsichten auf kreative, im Grunde aber bejahende Weise weiterentwickelt. Andererseits hat sich Barth aber nie davor gescheut, Calvins Positionen zu kritisieren oder zurückzuweisen. Sein Umgang mit Calvins theologischen Einsichten ist einerseits anerkennend, doch zugleich auch kritisch und zuweilen gar ablehnend. Barths Einstellung zu Calvin ist also gespalten. Der Grund für diese Ambivalenz liegt darin, daß er keineswegs darum bemüht war, Calvins Gedanken zu läutern, sondern vielmehr

seine eigenen, von seinen
philosophischen und theologischen

Voraussetzungen bestimmten, Anliegen
verfolgte.

1. Introduction

Karl Barth's *Göttingen Dogmatics* is a product of his first attempt to articulate his new vision of Christian dogmatics after his break with liberalism, and it was based on his lecture course on 'Instruction in the Christian Religion' titled after John Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion* in the University of Göttingen in 1924/25. These Göttingen lectures on dogmatics were one of the three cycles of his whole lectures on dogmatics delivered in Göttingen and Münster (1924/6), Münster (1926/8), and Bonn and Basle (1931–61) respectively.² Ever since his inauguration as the honorary professor of Reformed Dogmatics in the University of Göttingen in 1921, Barth had been concentrating his energy on studying Calvin's theology, other Reformers' theology and Reformed theology embodied in Reformed catechisms and confessions including the Geneva Catechism and the Heidelberg Catechism.³ For example, in his letter of January 22, 1922 to Edward Thurneysen, Barth talks about the progress of his study of Calvin and the Reformation:

What do I do? I study. Chiefly the Reformation and everything connected with it. A voluminous card-index is coming into being in which everything of importance finds its place. The Calvin lecture for the summer gives me considerable trouble.⁴

Thus, it is arguable that the *Göttingen Dogmatics* demonstrates the consequences of his careful study of Reformed theology as well as his manner of incorporation and appropriation of the Reformers' theology including Calvin's.

In these lectures, Barth presents his own view of the prolegomena to dogmatics, addressing the doctrine of the Word of God as revelation (Chapter 1), Scripture (Chapter 2) and preaching (Chapter 3).⁵ In addition, he provides an articulation of his understanding of the doctrinal sub-

stance of theology proper, dealing with the doctrine of God (Chapter 4) and the doctrine of humanity (Chapter 5). In his preparation for these lectures Barth obtained great assistance from Heinrich Heppe's *Reformed Dogmatics*⁶ and H. Schmid's Lutheran dogmatics.⁷ The lectures also display his new discovery of the importance and relevance of both the Reformation theology and the Protestant orthodox theology for his work of establishing a new foundation for the future Christian Reformed dogmatics:

After much head shaking and astonishment, I agree with orthodoxy on almost all points and hear myself lecturing about things that I would never have dreamed could really be true when I was a student or when I was pastor in Safenwil. I am excitedly waiting how the whole will look to me when I can get some distance from it after it is finished.⁸

One of the most significant contributions, however, of the *Göttingen Dogmatics* is that it provides one with an excellent picture of Barth's manner in using Calvin's theology for the development of his own dogmatic arguments and Calvin's role in Barth's theological and dogmatic formulation and elaboration. Ever since his starting on the writing of *Romans II* (1920) Barth had studied seriously and carefully Calvin's theology by reading his *Institutes*, commentaries, catechism and confession.⁹ As a result of this study, he gave a lecture course on Calvin's life, reforming work and theological thought in Göttingen in 1922.¹⁰ Barth's knowledge of Calvin's theology obtained in the process of his study of and lecture on Calvin made a great impact on these first lectures on dogmatics. It is not difficult, therefore, to infer that the *Göttingen Dogmatics* demonstrates Barth's view of Calvin's theological ideas and reforming vision together with his manner of appropriation and incorporation of

them for his own dogmatic reflection. This paper aims to investigate such a theme in detail by focusing on Barth's specific mentions of Calvin's name and citations of Calvin's theological arguments in the *Göttingen Dogmatics*. In the process we would make a contribution to the issue of Calvin's crucial and indispensable role in the development of Barth's new theology.

Numerous scholars, primarily German and Scandinavian Lutherans, have concentrated their energy on examining the theological relationship of Martin Luther and Karl Barth.¹¹ As a result, the character of their relationship seems to be widely understood. Furthermore, many important scholarly works on the relationship between Karl Barth and Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1831) have been produced.¹² However, there is no comprehensive work dealing with the theological relationship between Calvin and Barth other than a few monographs and articles on several specific topics.¹³ Moreover, there has been no scholarly work that deals with Calvin's impact and influence on the theological beginning of Barth, the origin of his theological break with liberalism and the subsequent theological development of his dogmatic thinking.

For example, in addressing the issue of Barth's theological beginnings¹⁴, Eberhard Jüngel never mentions Calvin's significant role in Barth's determination to radically break with liberal theology and his stringent endeavor to establish a new model for Reformed theology. He writes as if Calvin's role was not worth mentioning. Furthermore, it is regrettable that even Bruce L. McCormack does not see Calvin's foundational importance in Barth's theological beginning and development in his, otherwise considerably insightful work, *Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology*. He only attributes a negligible and subsidiary role to Calvin in the genetic development of Barth's theology.¹⁵ Thomas F. Torrance is no exception. Although elsewhere he acknowledges Calvin's influence, in his book, *Karl Barth: An Introduction to his Early Theology 1910–1931*,¹⁶ he fails to

examine deeply the significance of Calvin's role in Barth's theological development despite referring to the name of Calvin in several places along with other figures who made an impact upon Barth. Hans Urs von Balthasar's book reveals the same tendency in taking no account of Calvin's definitely critical role in the genesis and development of Barth's new theology.¹⁷

Barth's relationship to Calvin and Calvin's role in Barth's theology have been neglected and ignored for a long time without any legitimate reason. It is irrefutable that Barth held Calvin and his theology in high regard, and Calvin was one of the most frequent dialogue partners of Barth in his theological formulation and elaboration throughout his entire theological career from the early period of the 1910s—alone with a deep feeling of frustration for what he saw as Calvin's failures. It is true that Barth lived with Calvin's theology and paid the closest attention to Calvin for the entirety of his life. Hence, for a correct and deep understanding of Barth's theological thought, a comprehension of his relationship and indebtedness to Calvin and of Calvin's crucial role in Barth's theology is truly essential and fundamental. Barth's theological relationship with Calvin deserves much scholarly interest and attention and this paper attempts to fill the gap. It is high time that we should pay a markedly deserved attention to Calvin's prominent role in Barth's theology. In this sense, the major concern of this paper lies in endeavoring to answer the question as to how Barth used Calvin's theological arguments for his own purpose of pursuing a new paradigm of Reformed theology in the modern context of the 20th century. Through examining and investigating Calvin's role in Barth's *Göttingen Dogmatics*, a considerable light should be shed upon Barth's relationship to Calvin.

2. Theological analysis of Barth's use of Calvin

It is a significant feature of Barth's use of Calvin that he mentions the name of

Calvin along with the great theologians of the past such as Augustine and Thomas Aquinas:

We are a generation that has to learn again, sometimes even by name, what are the presuppositions that a Thomas, an Augustine before him, and a **Calvin** after him could quietly take for granted.¹⁸

It may be feasible that this statement demonstrates a lucid example of Barth's regarding Calvin as one of the most important representatives of classical Protestant theology on the same level with Thomas Aquinas as the doctor of the Roman Catholic church as well as Augustine of Hippo as the founder of the theology of the whole Western and Latin church. One can also point out that Barth believed that he and his students should learn Calvin's theological presuppositions in order to establish his and their own theological assumptions and substantial arguments.

Barth mentions the name of Calvin to emphasize his and his students' different situation from Calvin's: 'I repeat, we are not Thomas and Calvin. We have to relearn the most rudimentary presuppositions that were needed to answer the question (speaking about God). We can take only the smallest steps.'¹⁹ Exploring the dangers and questions in writing dogmatics, Barth seeks to put a great stress on the difficulties that each theological generation must confront when they embark on the task of dogmatic reflection. This implies that for Barth the difficulty of the task of dogmatic elaboration lies in the fact that every attempt at a new dogmatics for a new generation of people must begin with a creative starting point and a new foundation rather than a re-pristination of an old work. Hence, every theological beginner should learn her predecessors' presuppositions including Calvin's but he must not repeat and reproduce them slavishly because his situation and theological context are different from theirs.

Accepting the modern attempts to define dogmatics as a science, Barth defines 'dogmatics' as 'scientific reflection on the

Word of God'²⁰ but criticizes modern definitions as invalid since 'all those other definitions speak more or less expressly of faith, religion, or the religious consciousness, sometimes with an explicit limitation to present-day faith'²¹ not of the Word of God. In saying this, Barth shows evidently his antipathy to the overall approach of modern theology to dogmatics from the perspective of an individual human subject rather than the objective Word of God and reality of God's revelation. He appeals to Calvin to validate his definition of dogmatics:

The tradition behind them does not date only from Schleiermacher. It goes back by way of pietism to Protestant orthodoxy. Not to Zwingli and **Calvin**, one must say, in spite of the bad impression that might be made by a first glimpse of titles like *Commentary on True and False Religion* or *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. We have only to read the first pages of these books to be convinced that we do not have here a theology of religious consciousness. . . . Calvin, too, will link the knowledge of God directly to self-knowledge only in so far as insight into our poverty, nakedness, and ruin through the fall compel us to ask after God. To this extent, but only to this extent, can human awareness of God be the object of theology for **Calvin**.²²

It is noteworthy here that in the very beginning of his dogmatic reflection Barth is guided by Calvin's fundamental idea of the correlation of the knowledge of God and ourselves. This means that Barth completed his break with the anthropological starting point of the liberal school of Schleiermacher and Herrmann and began to endeavor to establish a new theocentric starting point and foundation for dogmatics through the help of the Reformers' theology including Calvin's. For him, the fact that God has spoken (*Deus dixit*) should be the only adequate foundation for and proper object of the entire theology and dogmatic reflection. Besides, the above passage demonstrates another critical point in terms of Barth's view of the relationship between the

Reformers including Calvin and later Protestant orthodoxy. Barth sees here Protestant orthodoxy's deviation from the Reformers' original concern in that Protestant orthodoxy was not strictly faithful to their essential insight into the appropriate and unique object of dogmatics, that is, the Word of God. By implication, Barth acknowledges the possibilities of later orthodoxy's departure from and betrayal against the fundamental principles of dogmatics that the Reformers espoused. It is at this point that Barth's appreciative acknowledgment of a normative role of Calvin's theological ideas within his dogmatic formulation stands out.

And yet, however normative and helpful Calvin's theological insights may be, Barth does not forget the crucial fact that he and his students are not living in the same classical age of theology, that is, they are living in the modern age after the Enlightenment and Schleiermacherian anthropocentric revolution in theology. Thus, it implies that Calvin's theology might have some limitations and inadequacies that cannot be applied directly to the modern age. Discussing the necessity of 'prolegomena' to modern dogmatics, Barth states, 'Melancthon, Zwingli, and Calvin acted similarly. They were so sure of their cause that they hardly thought it worth the effort to devote more than a few pages to the concept and method of their science.'²³ This statement implies that since Calvin lived in a different age when there was no desperate need for dogmatic prolegomena, Calvin might not provide one with any valuable example and framework for his articulation of modern prolegomena to dogmatics. However, it must be pointed out that Barth has no wish to attack Calvin for his scanty treatment of preliminary discussion of the concept, task and method of dogmatics because he understands well the historical and theological situation which made Calvin and other Reformers have so little interest in and concern with so-called prolegomena to theology. Rather, he criticizes the post-Reformation orthodoxy and Schleiermacher for their too hasty sur-

render to modern science's demand of an apologetic discussion of presuppositions of their dogmatic constructions:

To the extent that theologians increasingly lost sight of their theme and became unsure of their cause, beginning the tragic retreat which in the theology of Schleiermacher ended with total capitulation, there flourished introductions, prolegomena, debates about scripture, inspiration, revelation, miracles, religion, and reason, and apologetic efforts to establish and justify the discipline and its theme.²⁴

Nevertheless, Barth acknowledges the necessity of a prolegomena for his own dogmatics because his work is inevitably situated to the modern age. 'This is a situation that no one can escape. I myself neither can nor wish to do so. We can none of us simply reverse the change that came about in Protestant theology around 1600 and act like a Thomas or a Calvin. . . . This is my view.'²⁵ Such a statement demonstrates that Barth has no wish to simply return to the pre-modern classical theology of the Reformers although he feels free to gain help from and consult them for his task of reformulation of a new Reformed dogmatics. On account of Barth's firm conviction of the importance, value, and relevance of the classical dogmatics including Calvin's *Institutes*, he encourages his students to begin their study of dogmatics with classical writers:

As regards your private study of dogmatics, I cannot advise you to begin with modern writers. Even though you may later decide to go along with the great Schleiermacherian revolution which characterizes almost all modern dogmatics, my urgent recommendation is that you should know what you are doing when you take this course, having first learned and considered the unreconstructed dogmatics of the older writers, for example, the medieval dogmatics of Bonaventura, the reformation dogmatics of Melancthon, Zwingli, and **Calvin**, and the dogmatics of orthodoxy as collected by Schweizer or Heppe in the case of the Reformed, Hase or Heinrich Schmid in the case of the Lutherans.²⁶

One of the most prominent features of Barth's *Göttingen Dogmatics* is that it sees 'preaching as the starting point and goal of dogmatics'. This means that for Barth dogmatics should serve the ministry of the proclamation of the Word of God in the Church. To legitimate his conviction about the equation between the Word of God and preaching, Barth appeals to the Reformed fathers including Zwingli, Calvin and Bullinger:

On the contrary, the Reformation orientation which took precisely this direction the most sharply, the church of Zwingli and **Calvin**, maintained this equation loudly and definitely from the very outset. The preaching of God's Word is God's Word.²⁷

Once again, this statement demonstrates that Calvin is one of the most important theological authorities to whom Barth appeals for the legitimation and validation of his dogmatic argument. It also implies that Barth began to appreciate refreshingly the significance of the Reformation theology for his task to establish and articulate a modern Reformed dogmatic theology. Furthermore, it may be pointed out that it is indeed the case that the Reformed fathers including Calvin take the central place in Barth's dogmatic reflection and theological construction at this stage of his theological development. In fact, this initial attitude and relationship of Barth's to the Reformed fathers in general and Calvin's theology in particular is not to change considerably but to continue to play a crucial role as a foundational asset and resource in the future work of dogmatic elaboration as his later attempts at reformulation of dogmatics including *Christliche Dogmatik in Entwurf* as well as *Kirchliche Dogmatik* illustrate indisputably. Barth's emphasis on preaching as the basis and goal of dogmatics is to determine the direction which he will take in reconstruction of a modern Reformed dogmatics crystallizing in the *Church Dogmatics*.

It may be relevant to stress that in spite of his high regard and deep respect for Calvin's theological thought, Barth is

not reluctant, if necessary, to go beyond Calvin. One excellent example might be his understanding and application of the notion of 'preaching':

But the question then arises: Why specifically is the church's preaching God's Word? Might not other human voices proclaim this Word too, and do they not do so by common experience? Does not God speak through nature too, through history, through Handel's Largo and all kinds of good art? And can we say that God does not speak directly to people today? No, we cannot, is the obvious answer. As **Calvin** says, God is not tied to such aids or such inferior means. . . . As we have already said, nothing stands in the way of taking the idea of preaching broadly, more broadly than Bullinger and **Calvin** did. The general breakup of the Christian body simply compels us to do so today.²⁸

One can infer from the passage that Barth feels free to develop his own dogmatic argument even though he wishes to remain faithful to the original and profound insights of Calvin as staunchly as possible. In terms of theological principles, Barth intends to be faithful to the Reformers' deep and valuable thought, and in practical construction of his dogmatic system, he seeks to advance further their insights in a manner corresponding to his own characteristic theology. Thus, he attributes the reason for his going beyond Calvin in his reinterpretation of the idea of 'preaching' to 'the general breakup of the Christian body' in his day. On the basis of the above discussion, one can suggest that Barth's attitude and relationship to Calvin may be characterised by both reverential dependence and insightful critique, not by a slavish repetition and repristination without any significant endeavour for critical engagement.

Addressing the relationship between the fact of *Deus dixit* (God speaks) and Scripture as understood in the Reformed church in contrast to the Lutheran church in the sixteenth century, Barth makes a considerably appreciative comment on

Calvin's view of and attitude to Scripture:

To a degree and with an intensity that are almost intolerable to us today, people had to speak again about God in the light of this historical datum as though it could be done and had never been attempted before. Read some of the sermons of **Calvin** with this in mind. How this man is grasped and stilled and claimed . . . in the first instance simply by the authority of the biblical books, which year by year he never tired of expounding systematically down to the very last verse! How this man, moving always along the uncrossable wall of this authority, copying down what he finds copied there, as if the living words of God were heard there (as he himself says in the *Institutes*), becomes himself wholly voice and speech and persuasion, and can never exhaust or empty himself, as though nothing were more self-evident than this torrential talk about God in spite of all the objections which might be urged against it, and which himself knew well enough! Why was this? In the first instance we can find no other reason than this: Because he heard Moses, Jeremiah, and Paul speak about God, because he heard there the trumpet that summoned him to battle.²⁹

This lengthy statement shows convincingly that Barth is knowledgeable about Calvin's reverential attitude to Scripture, besides endorsing Calvin's way of theologizing, which is totally dependent on the conviction of the authority of Scripture as the Word of God. As Calvin heard God's command and permission to preach the Word of God and to speak about God in and through the Bible, Barth wants to proclaim the Word of God testified by Scripture in obedience to God's demand. Barth views the task of dogmatics as a service to this ministry of the proclamation of the Word of God. For this reason, he intends to maintain a high view of Scripture as a witness of the Word of God, that is, revelation. It is important, however, to point out that Barth retains a nuanced distinction between direct revelation (the original Word of God) and indirect revelation (Scripture). For this

reason, it is arguable that Barth's view of Scripture has a different dimension from Calvin's. As Barth himself states, 'most forceful of all is Calvin, who finds the supreme proof of Scripture in the fact that God speaks in it personally.'³⁰ In other words, while Calvin appears to identify Scripture as the Word of God and revelation itself, Barth tries to maintain the Reformed and Lutheran consensus (from his perspective) which makes a distinction 'between the inner Word to the apostles and the outer Word of the apostles.'³¹ For Barth, 'Scripture does indeed bear witness to revelation, but it is not revelation itself.'³² Thus, it is plausible that while Calvin exerts an indelible impact upon Barth's theological argument for the authority and indispensability of Scripture for the task of dogmatics, Barth makes a critical use of Calvin's deep insights for the confirmation and validation of his own arguments. Though not accepting Calvin's view of Scripture as the Word of God itself he rather presents his peculiar view of Scripture as the human witness to revelation.

Another pressing issue worthy to be discussed in terms of Barth's theological use and incorporation of Calvin's doctrine of Scripture is that Barth seems to accept Calvin's stress upon the secret testimony of the Holy Spirit:

Such a 'we are' without experience is what **Calvin** likes to recall and appeal to in this connection: the secret testimony of the Holy Spirit by which the witness of Scripture becomes God's self-witness to us . . . Yet the very reference to the Holy Spirit, that is, to God himself in the present, in the church, and in us, is also a reminder that we have here something neither to be experienced nor to be thought not to be asserted, that God himself bears witness to himself. That he does so, not the heart, is what makes a theologian.³³

One may infer from this statement that Barth intends to legitimate and justify his theological thought by appealing to Calvin's insightful idea, and this shows the Calvinian character of Barth's theology. Nevertheless, one can notice that

Barth's basic attitude to Scripture is different from Calvin's in that Barth shows his conviction about Scripture as the witness to the Word of God by employing the actualistic and dynamic term 'becomes'. In other words, for Barth Scripture is originally not God's own self-witness to humanity but fallible human witness to revelation, and it 'becomes' the Word of God by the secret witness of the Holy Spirit. Thus, for Barth Scripture cannot convey the Word of God in a substantial and essential manner, but in a dialectical and paradoxical manner. There is no necessary and inherent relationship between revelation and Scripture. The relationship between the Word of God and Scripture is contingent, depending upon the Holy Spirit's sovereign work to make Scripture become the Word of God. In contrast to Barth's conviction, what is striking is that Calvin believed that Scripture can convey the Word of God in a substantial and essential manner and he used the notion of the secret and inner testimony of the Holy Spirit to explain the process in which human beings come to be assured and convinced of the already established fact that Scripture carries the Word of God inherently and essentially.³⁴ Accordingly, even though it is the case that Barth positively appreciates³⁵ and uses Calvin's theological notion of the secret testimony of the Holy Spirit, one should remember that he employs the idea in a different context, especially in accordance with his dialectical and actualistic assumptions. This seems to demonstrate that Barth's theology possesses a peculiar dimension fundamentally different from Calvin's.

Discussing the question of humanity in paragraph 4, chapter 1, Barth contends that the question of humanity should be resolved in the context of humanity's relation to God, and criticizes modern theology's failure to understand this truth. 'Modern theology cannot press on with a good conscience to the statement of Pascal that we could not seek God if we had not already found him.'³⁶ For Barth, Calvin gives a good example to understand humanity's place and significance in rela-

tion to God in that Calvin's Geneva Catechism begins with an affirmation that 'the end of human life' is 'to share His good things, to be His image, to learn to know and serve Him that He may be glorified in us.'³⁷ It is undeniable that Barth's reference to Calvin's Geneva Catechism is a further example of Barth's appreciative reception and positive endorsement of Calvin's theological insight.

Addressing the issue of 'God as the subject of revelation' Barth criticizes sharply the significant role which natural theology had played in Protestant theology from the end of the sixteenth century:

The older Reformed theology in particular attached high importance to this preliminary structure. According to A. Schweizer one might even see in it one of the most valuable features of Reformed theology. It was given a place of honor in the 19th century both in the first part of Schleiermacher's *Christian Faith* and in Schweizer's own *Glaubenslehre*. For my part, although I am Reformed, I want no part of it.³⁸

The salient point here is that Barth acknowledges quite affirmatively his being a Reformed theologian as an undeniable fact. Despite that, he does not endorse the old Reformed theology's advocacy of natural theology and revelation. This demonstrates Barth's spirit of freedom in doing theology by retaining both positive and critical relationship to the old Reformed theological tradition. It is also significant to point out that he bases his antithetical argument to natural theology, which had been advocated by both the old Reformed orthodoxy and modern liberal theology, upon Calvin's theological argument:

Calvin at the end of the discussion in the first chapters of the *Institutes* was perspicacious enough to raise the whole question again, to oppose the Christian knowledge of God dialectically to natural knowledge, and to proceed as though there were only the former.³⁹

However, it should not be overlooked that Barth's interpretation of Calvin's ar-

gument on the natural knowledge of God might be misleading in that he seems to overimpose his own theological presuppositions and interpretative grid upon Calvin's ideas, and consequently misinterpret them. Unlike Barth, Calvin never denied the existence and the limited validity of human natural knowledge of God. For Calvin the problem lies not in nature itself as the theatre of God's glory but in the noetic effect of sin on human mind. Whether Barth's interpretation of Calvin's thought on natural theology is correct or not, it may be irrefutable that Barth appeals to Calvin in order to make his crucial and central arguments valid, viable and legitimate. Thus, it may be concluded that Calvin's role in Barth's theological construction might be more or less formative, determinative and constitutive rather than simply confirmatory and instrumental in many areas of doctrines.

Defending the validity and justifiability of his treatment of the doctrine of the Trinity within dogmatic prolegomena in contrast to its traditional place within the context of the doctrine of God, Barth criticizes Schleiermacher for his negligent attitude to the doctrine of the Trinity and appeals again to Calvin's strong valuation of it:

Again, it does not have any natural force, or at the most only decorative force, when after the manner of Schleiermacher it is put right at the end of dogmatics.⁴⁰ Is it not a remarkable thing that the doctrine of the Trinity was so basic for **Calvin** that he even had Servetus burned for obstinately deleting it, and yet one would never suspect his urgent interest in it from the position he gave it in his train of thought in the *Institutes*.⁴¹

It is arguable from the statement that Barth's indebtedness to Calvin's theological argument is so heavy and foundational that Calvin could be regarded as one of the most influential figures in Barth's theological construction and development. In terms of almost all doctrines including the doctrine of the Trinity, Barth seeks the argumentative

support from Calvin. However, in view of Barth's interpretation of the place of the doctrine of the Trinity in Calvin's *Institutes*, it must be remembered that Calvin does not address it within the exact context of dogmatic prolegomena, but rather treats it in the process of discussing the knowledge of God the Creator, that is, within the context of the doctrine of God. Hence it is arguable that the old Reformed orthodoxy's treatment of the doctrine of the Trinity in the context of the doctrine of God seems faithful to Calvin's original intention and concern, but Barth's treatment of it in the context of dogmatic prolegomena seems to be departing from Calvin's foundational insight.

Within the context of his discussion of 'the Reality of the Incarnation', Barth addresses the theme of the identity and similarity between the Old Testament and the New Testament, appealing to Calvin's fundamental and profound insight:

What is true, for all the reservations that we may think necessary in detail, is what **Calvin** says about the matter in *Inst.* II, 10–11, which I simply ask you to read so that you will be persuaded that I am not just presenting a private view here.⁴² Read **Calvin**, who tells us that the distinction between earlier and later is a distinction in the historical administration of revelation, of the covenant between God and us, but not a distinction in its substance. The nerve of the statement that Christ has come in the flesh does not lie in the little word 'has', in the chronological perfect, but in the words 'come in the flesh.' This is the fulfillment for which the fathers waited, but with the 'has' the waiting did not stop; it truly began at that point.⁴³

The above passage gives clear evidence that Barth accepts Calvin's argument for the similarity and the ultimate unity of the two Testaments. For Barth, the Old Testament is a witness to Jesus Christ in expectation for his coming to the world as the Mediator and Incarnate God, the New Testament being similarly a witness to Jesus Christ in remembrance and cele-

bration of the fulfillment of the expectation of the people of God for the coming of Jesus Christ. In this sense, there is a fundamental and essential unity and identity rather than a mutual contrast and opposition between the two Testaments. Barth regards Calvin's insight into this fact as one of the most crucial theological contributions that Calvin made in the sixteenth century. It is noteworthy, however, that Barth advanced Calvin's foundational insight into and concern with the unity of God's covenants into a distinctly innovative and creative doctrine of the priority of the Gospel and grace over the law and command in his small pamphlet *Gospel and Law* as well as the *Church Dogmatics*, criticising both Luther's and Calvin's arguments on this point from his peculiar dogmatic perspective. In this connection, it is arguable that Barth's basic attitude to Calvin's theological thought can be characterized as both passionately appreciative and unhesitatingly critical. One can also point out that even when Barth endorses Calvin's theological arguments, so far from repeating or repristinating them slavishly, he develops and advances them further in an innovative and creative way in accordance with his own peculiar theological and philosophical presuppositions and beliefs. In this sense, Barth can be classified as a progressive Calvinian rather than a conservative Calvinist theologian.

Addressing the relationship between incarnation and revelation, Barth argues that 'in its humiliation as in its exaltation, the humanity of Christ, in contrast, is in a specific, prescribed place, for it remains finite, and the finite is not capable of the infinite.'⁴⁴ In arguing for the finite character of Christ's humanity, Barth raises a critical question about the Lutheran view of the humanity of Christ, which attributes the divine attribute of ubiquity to Christ's humanity on the basis of the belief that Christ's divinity and humanity can be appropriated and communicated to each other and thus be regarded as mingled in a way. As a Reformed theologian, Barth does not hold

to the Lutheran view but appeals to Calvin's contention for the legitimation of his own position. He cites appreciatively Calvin's following argument:

Wonderfully God's Son descended from heaven, yet without leaving heaven. Wonderfully he willed to be born in the virgin's womb, to go about the earth . . . , yet he continuously filled the world even as he had done from the beginning.⁴⁵

It must be emphasized that the Lutheran theologians called this Reformed understanding of Christ's humanity as *extra Calvinisticum* in that the Reformed argue that outside (*extra*) Christ's flesh, the divine Logos is out there as omnipresent God. Since the Lutherans believed in the communication of the attributes (*communicatio idiomatum*) between Christ's humanity and divinity, they could not accept the Reformed denial of the omnipresence of Christ's humanity. Barth makes it clear that he is on the side of the Reformed argument, saying that 'the Lutherans, however, heard in all this only the word "outside" (*extra*), and they thus termed this doctrine the Calvinistic *extra*. I have three reasons for fully accepting this Calvinistic *extra*.'⁴⁶ It must not be overlooked that it is significant for Barth to accept the Reformed position of Christ's humanity at this stage because it is closely related to his interpretation of the importance and meaning of the sacraments, especially the Lord's supper. It is arguable thus that during this period of Göttingen, Barth agreed with the Reformed understanding of the sacraments⁴⁷ which was epitomized and systematized by Calvin more than anyone else. Furthermore, by agreeing with *extra Calvinisticum*, Barth leaves no doubt that he endeavors to inherit the valid arguments of Reformed theological tradition and he would take an opposite position against the Lutheran position even though he regards Luther as one of the most important teachers and dialogue partners in his theological elaboration. For this reason, Barth could argue that 'we understand Calvin, for example, very badly if we do not see what a wholly

co-decisive role the sacraments played in his theology, especially the Lord's Supper.⁴⁸

Discussing the subjective possibility of revelation, Barth puts a great stress on the essentiality of human response of faith and the close correlation between faith and obedience. Once again, Barth appeals to Calvin's theological wisdom for the support of his own argument:

In his 1545 Catechism **Calvin** could even distinguish four categories for what must take place on our part (naturally as the work of the Holy Spirit): faith, obedience, prayer, and thanksgiving. Yet only two persist: faith and obedience. This pair is so universal and distinctive that Reformed dogmatics cannot possibly fail to assert them.⁴⁹

Barth claims here that when the revelation of God centered on the Incarnation of Jesus Christ comes to humanity as an event of God's encounter with humanity, it generates humanity's hearing of the Word of God, which is expressed by humanity's faith and obedience. In this connection, Barth evaluates highly Calvin's emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Christians. For Barth, when the revelation of God occurs in a genuine sense, Christ dwells in humanity as the Holy Spirit:

Calvin formulated the problem when he said 'as long as Christ remains outside of us, and we are separated from him, all that he has suffered and done for the salvation of the human race remains useless and of no value for us. Therefore, to share with us what he had received from the Father, he had to become ours and to dwell within us.' Or again, 'the Word of God is like the sun, shining on all those to whom it is proclaimed, but with no effect among the blind. Now, all of us are blind by nature in this respect. Accordingly, it cannot penetrate into our minds unless the Spirit, as the inner teacher, through his illumination makes entry for it.'⁵⁰

It is here that Barth advances further Calvin's stress on and insight into the role

of the Holy Spirit in the Christian understanding of divine revelation and establishes a Christian epistemology based on the theme of the permanent priority of the work of the Holy Spirit over human response of faith and obedience. It is also important to notice that Barth develops Calvin's ethical theme of faith and obedience into a noetic and epistemological theme in relation to the reality and possibility of God's revelation.

Discussing the inevitability of philosophical influence upon our understanding of Scripture and theological reflection in relation to the theme of Christian freedom, Barth argues that Calvin also had his own philosophy:

Luther and **Calvin** had their philosophy. So far as I can see they were both Platonists, although of different schools. And to none of us in our understanding of scripture is it a matter of indifference where we come from in this sense or what presuppositions we bring with us. In one sense this is decisive, namely, for our fixing of the thoughts of scripture, of what is meant, or supposed to be said, with what is said in the text . . . It is true that we all seek our dogmas in the Bible and find them as seems best to ourselves.⁵¹

By saying this Barth expresses his fundamental conviction about the provisional character and limitation of human work of theological formulation and biblical interpretation. This seems one of the most prominent strengths of Barth's theological mind-set. On the basis of such a conviction he could retain a critical and free relationship to his theological predecessors and fathers including Calvin. For this reason, Barth could state as follows:

What will protect us is a bit of the Apostle's Creed, a bit of Luther or **Calvin**, viewed not as thinkers or heroes but as authorities by which to orient ourselves. Free thinking with the help of authorities—this is the way. I am aware of the relativity of this formula, but we are now talking only about the relative conditions. Freedom and authority are not mutually exclusive once

one considers both are totalities operating on different levels.⁵²

This statement demonstrates that Barth celebrates and cherishes the spirit of freedom as one of the most central principles in his theological elaboration. This means that Barth believes that except Scripture and the inner testimony of the Holy Spirit, there can never be absolute authorities to which Christian theologians should submit themselves and for which they surrender their freedom of thought. For Barth, 'Christian freedom, we hope, is a demand that must be made unconditionally.'⁵³ This attitude should be applied to Calvin as well. Although Barth respects Calvin and the profundity and greatness of his theological thought, Calvin may not be the absolute standard and criterion against which Barth's theological arguments must be judged and evaluated. Rather, for Barth, even Calvin's theology should be judged by the authority of Scripture and the result of its faithful exegesis. In fact, it is the case that this attitude and relationship of Barth's to Calvin must be regarded as utterly faithful to Calvin's foundational wisdom embodied and crystallized by the well-known Reformed slogan '*semper reformanda*' (always reforming), which has been overtly neglected and dismissed by some factions within the Reformed theological camp, especially by certain extreme groups of the so-called orthodox Calvinism.

Discussing the dogmatic norm in the Reformed dogmatic theology, Barth presents five decisive marks of the Reformed school, which he intends to accept and follow in his own dogmatics:

1. Formalism in the teaching on principles; the Word vouches for the content, not vice versa; 2. in the understanding of the relation to God, emphasis on the thought of God; our salvation is enclosed in the glorifying of God, not vice, versa; 3. in the thought of God, stress on God's subjectivity, freedom, and majesty; 4. in the concept of the objective possibility of revelation, a strictly dialectical christology; 5. in the concept of the subjective possibility of revelation, an equal presence of both the religious

and the ethical elements, of both faith and obedience.⁵⁴

Barth's choice of these five features as the determinative marks of the Reformed school appears to show not only the plausible principles of the Reformed dogmatics but also his own peculiar interpretation and understanding of the Reformed theology and the dogmatic visions and goals that he wants to accomplish through his work. For example, one can raise a serious question as to whether the Reformed Christology can be truthfully characterized as 'strictly dialectical'. It seems that the modern notion 'dialectical' may not be attributed to the traditional Christology of the Reformed theology. Rather, it could characterize Barth's own version of Christological reformulation which will be materialized in the *Church Dogmatics*.

Nevertheless, Barth appeals to Calvin for the legitimation of his position as follows:

I hope that you will bear me witness that in some degree even here in the Prolegomena I have respected what I regard as the valid rules of my own school. By studying the symbols or the Reformed confessions or **Calvin's Institutes** you may make sure for yourselves that these do in fact have to be the main rules of a Christian, Reformed dogmatics.⁵⁵

This statement demonstrates one of the most important facts in Barth's relationship to Calvin, namely that it is through reading Calvin that Barth came to be a member of the Reformed school and he learned foundational wisdom and principles necessary for being a Christian Reformed dogmatic theologian. Thus, it is undeniable that Calvin's impact upon Barth's theological growth and development is determinative and constitutive. However, as we have discussed so far, it must be remembered that Barth's use of Calvin's theological argument cannot be identified as an effort of servile and slavish repetition and repristination, but rather as an endeavor of critical appropriation and incorporation, which

includes various procedures of argumentative advancement, substantial innovation, creative reapplication and critical readjustment to his own characteristic Reformed theology.

In this connection, it may be helpful to cite the following statement of Barth's:

It is one thing to quote a document like the Nicene Creed as a contemporary source and quite another to read and understand it as an authority. Dogmatists do the latter. They have a right and even a duty to do so. Do not expect that I will here present and expound **Calvin**. When I let **Calvin** speak, I let him do so in my own train of thought, certainly with as much regard as possible for the historical meaning of his words, but only in order to achieve the elucidation of a matter which a quotation from **Calvin** can give at this particular moment.⁵⁶

One may construe from this statement that in the elaboration and articulation of his own dogmatic vision and arguments, Barth has no intention of slavishly expounding Calvin's theological contentions and imposing them upon his readers, but rather of using them for the elucidation and illumination of his own position. This is Barth's conclusive answer to the question as to how he utilises Calvin in the construction of his dogmatic system. It is indeed the case that Barth learns many valuable and crucial insights from Calvin's theological work, and the latter's theology makes a constitutive and formative impact upon the former's dogmatic work. On the other hand, it must be remembered that Barth makes use of Calvin for his own particular purpose and goal, which are to consolidate the whole wisdom of the past masters and to remold it into a dogmatic system suited for his peculiar philosophical and theological assumptions. Why does he do so? There may be many reasons for him to do so. And yet, one of the most conspicuous reasons may be the fact that Barth is keenly conscious of his and the church's living in an age of theological crisis after the failure of the project of the Enlightenment and modern liberal theology. For this very reason, he

wishes to establish a new theology solidly founded upon the Word of God witnessed by Scripture. In an effort to do this, Barth endeavoured to obtain numerous helpful insights from Calvin's theology. Nonetheless, Barth came to hold an ambivalent attitude and relationship to Calvin because Barth also discerns many naïve assumptions and beliefs operating in Calvin's thought, which are not compatible with his own philosophical presuppositions and convictions.

Addressing the problem of God's knowability and conceivability, Barth reflects upon Calvin's Geneva Catechism of 1545, which accepts the knowability of God as an established fact following the medieval dogmatists' argument:

With various reservations they accepted God's knowability. For them knowing God was humanity's most central matter. We recall the introduction to the Geneva Catechism of 1545: The chief end of human life is that we should know God, by whom we were created.⁵⁷

The above statement reveals that Barth is convinced of the possibility of human knowledge of God and this belief of Barth's is truly consistent with Calvin's thought. In this connection, it is of the utmost importance to remember that the doctrine of the knowledge of God was vital to both theologians, with the latter being heavily indebted to the former for his reformulation of the doctrine of the knowledge of God.⁵⁸ The above statement may be regarded as an outstanding example of this indebtedness.

Another important and unforgettable theme in the area of the doctrine of God is the election of Grace (das *Gnadenwahl*). First of all, it should be pointed out that Barth accepts the traditional Reformed orthodoxy's treatment of the doctrine of election within the sphere of the doctrine of God rather than in the realm of the doctrine of salvation of which Calvin shows an excellent example in his last edition of 1559 *Institutes*. It is arguable that Barth's discussion of the doctrine of election within the context of the doctrine

of God anticipates Barth's antipathy to Calvin's doctrine of double predestination, which will be made clear in his *Church Dogmatics*.

Nevertheless, in the *Göttingen Dogmatics* Barth begins his discussion of the doctrine of election with an affirmation of Calvin's theological axiom in regard to the relationship of God's election and human faith:

We can still only turn up our noses at the helplessness of such a confession, yet we have to admit that where there is faith this is the only relevant answer that we can give to the question why one believes. God wills it. He willed our faith and awakened it.⁵⁹

This statement demonstrates that during this period of Göttingen Barth accepted Calvin's theological insight into and stress upon the ultimate priority of the sovereignty of God over human faith and religious life. However, this appreciative attitude to Calvin disappears when he begins to address 'the shadow side of election: reprobation.'⁶⁰ Barth criticises the Reformed orthodoxy's tendency to focus on the question as to who are the certain reprobate people in addressing and discussing the doctrine of predestination.⁶¹ For Barth, one can also find this tendency in Calvin, who nevertheless was more cautious in his presentation and teaching of the harsh ramifications of the doctrine:

The 'certain people,' the perversion of the doctrine of predestination into a doctrine of predestined individuals, was the Trojan horse which was finally set up in the holy place in Ilium. If in truly classical proponents of the doctrine (e.g. **Calvin**) it appears only as an occasional logical deduction, this becomes increasingly central in those who followed, and with its crass mythological arbitrariness it quickly made the whole doctrine unbelievable and untenable even for its most zealous champions.⁶²

Although Barth is reluctant to criticize directly what he sees as Calvin's failure and error, Barth acknowledges here that Calvin may be regarded as an originator

of the Reformed orthodoxy's deplorable practice of rigid logical deduction about certain reprobate individuals. One can detect here the incipient seeds of Barth's serious challenge against Calvin and the whole Reformed theological tradition in terms of the doctrine of election and predestination. Barth is herewith showing manifestly the seeds of his anticipatory revolt against the traditional method and approach to treat the doctrine of election. He assigns Calvin to a group of supralapsarians⁶³ and this seems to signify that Barth retains his supralapsarian position throughout his theological career in spite of his trenchant critique of Calvin's doctrine of double predestination, which includes God's eternal decree of both election of some people and abandonment of others before the foundation of the world. This means that Barth wants to endorse and follow Calvin's supralapsarian insight as legitimate and valid. Nonetheless, it is questionable that Calvin is a supralapsarian in relation to the doctrine of election. In fact, he had no knowledge about the dispute between the Supralapsarians and the Infralapsarians, and it seems that his position might be closer to that of Infralapsarians.⁶⁴ In this connection, one can suggest that Barth sees his own face and image rather than Calvin's in the mirror of Calvin's text.

For Barth, one of the most important insights of Calvin's in relation to the doctrine of election may be the fact that Calvin seeks the believers' assurance of faith and election only in the face of Jesus Christ rather than their own grounds of religious experience and psychological condition as some later Reformed theologians did:

Calvin in particular had only one answer: We shall not find assurance of election in ourselves, nor even in God the Father if we think of him apart from the Son. Christ, then, is the mirror in which we must contemplate our election, and may do so without self-deception. I know of no other reply to the question about certainty of God. This is first God's own certainty, and as ours it is to be sought in God's revealed,

written, and preached Word whose content is Christ. But with this answer Calvin and his followers were not merely setting forth the nature or source of their assurance of God but also the nature and source of their assurance of election, salvation, and faith.⁶⁵

As a christocentric theologian, Barth might have been strongly attracted to Calvin's penetrating insight into the importance of the role of Jesus Christ as the ultimate foundation of our assurance of faith and election. Barth's later elaboration and articulation of his own doctrine of election of grace in his *Church Dogmatics* demonstrates his stringent effort to recapture Calvin's christocentric insight and advance it radically into a more accessible form of Christian doctrine from the actualistic and dialectical perspective. In this connection, one may argue that Calvin's impact upon Barth in relation to the doctrine of election might be more than simply confirmatory and instrumental. Even though Barth is skeptical about and opposed to Calvin's project of retrieving and reemphasizing Augustine's doctrine of double predestination in terms of God's double actions of election and reprobation of certain people in the pre-temporal world, Barth does not ignore Calvin's crucial and valuable insights into the christocentric ground of our assurance of election and faith but recaptures them into a highly innovative and challenging reconstruction of the doctrine. This is a remarkable example of Barth's spirit of freedom in doing theology.

Conclusion

On the basis of the above discussion one may draw several important conclusions about Barth's use of Calvin in his *Göttingen Dogmatics*. First of all, as the initial attempt to lecture on dogmatics, the *Göttingen Dogmatics* is most helpful for one to observe the trajectory of Barth's dogmatic thinking and reflection. It is also important to note that in Barth's theological reflection and thought Calvin's role

appears to be constitutive and formative in several crucial areas of discussion including the doctrine of the Word of God, the relationship of the Word and preaching, the authority of Scripture and the role of the Holy Spirit in revelation, the unity of the Old Testament and the New Testament, the christocentric nature of our assurance of election, and so on. However, it is also the case that Barth wishes to go beyond Calvin's theological arguments in several areas where he finds Calvin's anachronistic arguments to be incompatible with his own characteristic theological assumptions and beliefs.

Second, Barth does not simply expound and repeat Calvin's argument in a slavish manner in the *Göttingen Dogmatics*. Rather, he allows Calvin to speak in order to elucidate and explain his own theological and dogmatic arguments more effectively and persuasively. However, it does not mean that Calvin's role in Barth's argumentative endeavor is simply confirmatory and supportive. Although it is the case that Barth uses Calvin's argument and insight to verify and validate his own position in several important instances, it is also undeniably true that by reading and studying Calvin, Barth has obtained crucial wisdom and valuable intellectual assets both constitutive and formative for his peculiar attempt at reformulation and reconstruction of a new Christian Reformed dogmatics.

Third, it must be remembered that Barth's appropriation and interpretation of Calvin's theological thought is always checked and controlled by his own peculiar theological impulse and beliefs. He finds many of Calvin's arguments and assumptions not to be compatible with his theological and philosophical presuppositions and thus is inclined to dismiss and misinterpret Calvin's original theological intention and insight. Moreover, he sometimes misconstrues and misapplies Calvin's contentions and views to the degree that even when he uses the same language as Calvin's, his meaning is considerably different from Calvin's because he uses similar language in a very different context. Bruce McCormack appears to

agree with this point in stating, 'Barth displayed a marked tendency throughout his life to use borrowed categories in a way that was entirely peculiar to himself (and which often contradicted the intentions of those who originally coined them).'⁶⁶ Thus, one may conclude that his relationship to Calvin can be characterised as ambivalent although his ambivalence has justifiable reasons and grounds from his own perspective.

Notes

- 1 Karl Barth, 'Unterricht in der christlichen Religion', i. Prolegomena, 1924, ed. Hannelotte Reiffen (Zurich: 1985). ET *The Göttingen Dogmatics: Instruction in the Christian Religion*, vol. I, trans. Geoffrey Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1991); idem, 'Unterricht in der christlichen Religion', ii. Die Lehre von Gott/Die Lehre vom Menschen, 1924/5, ed. Hinrich Stoevesandt (Zurich: TVZ, 1990). ET *The Göttingen Dogmatics*, vol. I (contains the first third of the German edition).
- 2 Barth's Münster lectures were published in 1927 under the title *Die Christliche Dogmatik im Entwurf, I. Die Lehre vom Worte Gottes, Prolegomena zur Christlichen Dogmatik* and Bonn and Basle lectures were published as *Die Kirchliche Dogmatik (Church Dogmatics)*.
- 3 Matthias Freudenberg has recently published a significant work on Barth's engagement with Reformed theology in the Göttingen period. See, *Karl Barth und die reformierte Theologie: Die Auseinandersetzung mit Calvin, Zwingli, und den reformierten Bekenntnisschriften während seiner Göttinger Lehrtätigkeit* (Neukirchen, 1997). But he is concerned with Barth's Calvin lectures alone without analysing Barth's use of Calvin in the Göttingen Dogmatics.
- 4 *Revolutionary Theology in the Making: Barth-Thurneysen Correspondence, 1914–1925*, trans. James E. Smart (London: The Epworth Press, 1964), p. 81.
- 5 This theme of the threefold form of the Word of God is discussed extensively in Church Dogmatics I/1&2.
- 6 Heinrich Heppe, *Die Dogmatik der evangelisch-reformierten Kirche*, rev. and ed. E. Bizer (2nd ed. Neukirchen, 1958); ET

Reformed Dogmatics (repr. Grand Rapids, 1978).

- 7 *Die Dogmatik der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*, ed. H. Schmid (4th ed. Frankfurt a.M./Erlangen, 1858); ET *The Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church* (Philadelphia, 1899).
- 8 Edward Thurneysen (ed.), *Karl Barth-Edward Thurneysen: Briefwechsel, II. 1921–1930* (Zurich: TVZ, 1974), pp. 328–9.
- 9 This does not mean that Barth did not study Calvin before 1918. In fact, Barth began to read Calvin from the period of his theological study in Bern in 1904–5 through participating in his father's lectures on the Reformation. Ever since his interest in Calvin had not decreased but increased gradually and considerably.
- 10 Karl Barth, *Die Theologie Calvins*, 1922, ed. Hans Scholl (Zurich: TVZ, 1993); ET *The Theology of John Calvin*, trans. G. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995).
- 11 H. Engler, 'Das Lutherverständnis Karl Barths' (Doctoral Dissertation: Tübingen, 1946); H. Diem, *Karl Barths Kritik am deutschen Luthertum* (1947); K. G. Steck, 'Zwischen Luther und Karl Barth: Stimme der Gemeinde zum kirchlichen Leben und zur Politik', in *Wirtschaft und Kultur* 18, May (1996); Hans Otto Tiefel, 'The Ethics of Gospel and Law: Aspects of Barth-Luther Debate', (Ph.D. Thesis: Yale University, 1968); W. Hölle, 'Die Theologie des frühen Karl Barth in ihrem Verhältnis zu der Theologie Martin Luthers', (Doctoral Dissertation: Bochum, 1969); B. Klappert, *Promissio und Bund: Gesetz und Evangelium bei Luther und Barth*, FS 34 (1976); idem, 'Erwägungen zum Thema: Gesetz und Evangelium bei Luther und Karl Barth', *Theologische Beiträge* 7 (1976), pp. 140–57; A. Siemens, 'Karl Barth der Vollender der lutherischen Reformation? Eine notwendige Replik zu B. Klappert', *Theologische Beiträge* 8 (1977), pp. 31–35; W. Joest, 'Karl Barth und das lutherische Verständnis von Gesetz und Evangelium: Gedanken und Fragen zur Wiederaufnahme einer stehengebliebenen Diskussion', *KuD* 24 (1978), pp. 86–103; A. Peters, 'Karl Barth gegen Luther?', in his *Rechenschaft des Glaubens: Aufsätze* (1984), pp. 92–129; idem, 'Karl Barth und Martin Luther', *Luther* 57 (1986), pp. 113–9; E. Jüngel, 'Evangelium und Gesetz; Zugleich zum Verhältnis von Dogmatik

- und Ethik', in his *Barth-Studien* (1982), pp. 180–209; O. Bayer, 'atliche Theologie des Kreuzes? Barmen zwischen Barth und Luther', *EK* 17 (1984), pp. 367–70; F. W. Marquardt, 'Martin Luther und Karl Barth', in *Tyrannos, Beliner Theologische Zeitschrift* 1 (1984), pp. 175–96; Gerhard Ebeling, 'Karl Barth's Ringen mit Luther', in his *Luther Studien* III (Zurich, 1985); idem, 'über die Reformation hinaus? Zur Luther-Kritik Karl Barths', *ZThK* 83 (1986), pp. 33–75; Rainer, 'Gesetz und Evangelium: Ein lutherisches Sonderthema?', *Catholica* 41 (1987), pp. 30–41; *Luther und Barth*, ed., Karl Hauschildt (Erlangen: Martin Luther Verlag, 1989). It is worthy to note that these German and English works on the relationship between Luther and Barth primarily focus on the theme of law and gospel.
- 12 Darryl Ward, 'The Doctrine of Election in the theologies of Friedrich Schleiermacher and Karl Barth' (Ph.D. Thesis: the University of Chicago, 1989); Dietmar Lutz, *Homo viator: Karl Barths Ringen mit Schleiermacher* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1988); *Barth and Schleiermacher: beyond the impasse?*, ed., J. O. Duke & R. F. Streetman (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988).
- 13 Horton Davies, *The Vigilant God: Providence in the Thought of Augustine, Aquinas, Calvin and Barth* (N.Y.: Peter Lang, 1992); Eric Dean, 'Relation between Scripture and Tradition: Theoretical Statements by Calvin and Barth', *Encounter* 23 (1962), pp. 277–91; Walter Kreck, 'Johannes Calvin und Karl Barth', in *Kirche Konfession Ökumene*. FS. W. Niesel zum 70. Geburtstag (1973), pp. 77–84.
- 14 Eberhard Jüngel, 'Barth's Theological Beginnings' in *Karl Barth: A Theological Legacy*, trans Garrett E. Parl (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1986), pp. 53–104.
- 15 Bruce L. McCormack, *Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995). Dealing with the Safenwil period from July 1911 to September 1921, McCormack mentions Calvin only twice! See pp. 78–290 (almost the half of the whole book). Even in his discussion of the *Göttingen Dogmatics* he does not acknowledge Calvin's crucial role in Barth's theological development. See pp. 327–74.
- 16 Thomas F. Torrance, *Karl Barth: An Introduction to his Early Theology*, 1910–31 (London, 1962).
- 17 Hans Urs von Balthasar, *The Theology of Karl Barth*, trans. E. T. Oakes (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1992).
- 18 Karl Barth, *Göttingen Dogmatics*, op cit., p. 4.
- 19 Ibid., pp. 6–7.
- 20 Ibid., p. 8.
- 21 Ibid., p. 9.
- 22 Ibid., p. 9.
- 23 Ibid., p. 19.
- 24 Ibid.
- 25 Ibid.
- 26 Ibid., pp. 21–2. It is worthy to note that Barth omits Luther in this list of classical dogmaticians. It seems because Barth saw him as an irregular dogmatician. See Gerhard Ebeling, 'Karl Barths Ringen mit Luther', in his *Luther Studien* III (Zurich: TVZ, 1985), p. 448.
- 27 Karl Barth, *Göttingen Dogmatics*, op cit., p. 32.
- 28 Ibid., p. 33.
- 29 Ibid., pp. 54–5.
- 30 Ibid., p. 57.
- 31 Ibid.
- 32 Ibid., p. 202.
- 33 Ibid., p. 68.
- 34 On Barth's view of Scripture, see Klaas Runia, *Karl Barth's Doctrine of Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962).
- 35 Barth states, 'Calvin brilliantly states what I have in mind when he says that the same Spirit who has spoken through the mouths of the prophets must find entry into our hearts and persuade us that they rendered faithfully what they had been told to say by God.' Ibid., p. 225.
- 36 Ibid., p. 83.
- 37 Ibid., pp. 83–4.
- 38 Ibid., p. 91.
- 39 Ibid., p. 92.
- 40 Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Christian Faith*, ed. H. R. Mackintosh & J. S. Stewart (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1948), paras. 170–72.
- 41 Karl Barth, *Göttingen Dogmatics*, op cit., p. 96. See *Institutes*, I.13.
- 42 Ibid., p. 147.
- 43 Ibid., p. 148.
- 44 Ibid., p. 159.
- 45 Ibid.; the citation is from John Calvin, *Institutes*, II, 13, 4.
- 46 Ibid.
- 47 In the later period of his theological development, Barth abandons his endorsement of the Reformed understanding of the sacraments and denied baptism the status of sacrament.

- 48 Ibid., p. 169.
- 49 Ibid., p. 172.
- 50 Ibid., p. 191; citations from *Institutes*, III, 1,1; III, 2, 34.
- 51 Ibid., p. 259.
- 52 Ibid., p. 260.
- 53 Ibid.
- 54 Ibid., p. 294
- 55 Ibid.
- 56 Ibid.
- 57 Ibid., p. 351.
- 58 The classical discussion on Calvin's doctrine of the knowledge of God is Benjamin B. Warfield, 'Calvin's Doctrine of the Knowledge of God', in *Calvin and Calvinism* (N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1931) and also see Kenneth S. Kantzer, 'John Calvin's Theory of the Knowledge of God and the Word of God' (Ph.D. dissertation: Harvard University, 1950). On Barth's view, see Peter J. A. Cook, 'The Knowledge of God in the Theology of Karl Barth' (Ph.D. Thesis: The Queen's University of Belfast, 1981); John C. Lyden, 'Karl Barth's View on the Knowledge of God and its relation to the Philosophical Epistemology of Immanuel Kant' (Ph.D. Thesis: The University of Chicago, Divinity School, 1989); Sebastian A. Matczak, *Karl Barth on God: The Knowledge of Divine Existence* (N.Y.: St. Paul Publications, 1962); Eugene F. Rogers, *Thomas Aquinas*

- nas and Karl Barth: Sacred Doctrine and Natural Knowledge of God* (Notre Dame, Ind: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995); Ned Wisnefske, *Our Natural Knowledge of God: A Prospect for Natural Theology after Kant and Barth* (N.Y.: Peter Lang, 1990); Henri Bouillard, *The Knowledge of God*, trans. Samuel Femiano (N.Y.: Herder & Herder, 1968).
- 59 Ibid., p. 451. Barth refers to Calvin's *Institutes* III, 23, 2.
- 60 Ibid.
- 61 Of course, one can raise a serious question as to whether Barth gives here an invalid caricature of the Reformed orthodoxy.
- 62 Ibid., p. 455. Barth refers to Calvin's *Institutes* III, 21–24.
- 63 Ibid., p. 467.
- 64 Cf. Fred Klooster, *Calvin's Doctrine of Predestination* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Calvin Theological Seminary, 1961).
- 65 Karl Barth, *Göttingen Dogmatics*, op cit., p. 470. Barth refers to Calvin's *Institutes* III, 24, 5.
- 66 Bruce L. McCormack, *Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology*, op cit., p. 217. George Hunsinger calls this practice of Barth's as 'the procedure of assimilating' in his *How to Read Karl Barth: The Shape of His Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), pp. 61–3.

Of Related Interest

Calvin and English Calvinism

R.T. Kendall

The author demonstrates that the English 'Puritans', which he calls 'experimental predestinarians', were followers of John Calvin's successor in Geneva, Theodore Beza, and not of Calvin himself. Dr Kendall maintains that what became known as English Calvinism was largely the thought of Beza not Calvin.

His book is an important clarification of Calvin's position in relation to those who have been regarded as his followers.

'Dr Kendall's exciting study . . . is a major step forward in the reappraisal of Puritanism . . . no student in the Puritan field can excuse himself from reckoning with this important contribution.'—Dr J.I. Packer

0-85364-827-1 / pb / 229 × 145mm / £19.99



Paternoster Press

PO Box 300 Carlisle Cumbria CA3 0QS UK