

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

KARL BARTH AND THE PROTESTANT REVIVAL.

BY THE REV. R. BIRCH HOYLE, Author of "The Teaching of Karl Barth."

"PROTESTANTISM has only about fifty years of life left to it," said a Catholic Tutor at Münster, Westphalia, to Karl Barth once. "You may be deceived," was the reply; "the providence of God will still rule." If we may judge by the rapid extension of Barth's influence over Europe, reaching to America and even India, there seems good warrant for Count Keyserling's statement, "Barth has saved Protestantism on the Continent." Professor Adolph Keller, of Geneva, when making a tour of the Evangelical Churches in the Baltic lands, reported:

"Protestantism is undergoing a kind of revival, which may not only be due to the hardship of the time, but also to the deepening influence of the theology of Karl Barth which is sweeping all over the countries."¹

Barth's name occurs frequently now in British theological literature. Canon Kenneth Mozley recently paid tribute to the growing influence of Barth.

"Germany has a way of producing theologians who evoke passionate enthusiasm and equally passionate dissent. . . . These are early days for any estimate of the theology of Karl Barth likely to stand the test of time, especially as Barth may have still much to say. But this is quite clear: Barth's doctrine of Christ is first of all a doctrine of Christ the Redeemer."²

Dr. Cave, of Cheshunt College, Cambridge, in his latest book, *The Doctrines of the Christian Faith*, writes:

"It says much for the violence of the reaction against pre-war theology that a book as extreme as Barth's *Commentary on Romans (Der Römerbrief)* should have so greatly influenced many of the younger men in German-speaking Protestantism" (p. 20).

Dr. A. E. Garvie admits that "one of the most popular theological movements on the Continent is the Barthian. Of it I can say that the more I learn of it the less I like it."³ But a reviewer in *The Guardian* goes so far as to say that "the man and the movement have done more, perhaps, to set a new orientation to German religious thought than anything that has happened there since Goethe, perhaps, even since Luther."⁴ Even in India the influence is being marked among the Christian tutors. Dr. Bridge, of St. Paul's College, Calcutta, thinks that Barth's teaching is needed, for

"so much of Indian religious thought is coloured by an over-emphasis on the immanence of God, that a presentation of the attribute of transcendence will correct the exaggeration of Indian mystics."

¹ *British Weekly*, November 14, 1929.

² *Mysterium Christi*, p. 184.

³ *The Christian Ideal*, p. 465.

⁴ August 8, 1930.

The theologians are the first to feel the force of the new breeze : it is to be hoped that it may blow through our Churches as a "breath from the Lord." In the past British Protestantism gained much from the Continent. We need only think of the influence of Luther and Bucer on the Anglican Reformation in the sixteenth century : of Moravianism, in its action and reaction thereto on John Wesley in the seventeenth century, the warm impulses from Monod and Alexander Vinet on the leaders of the Evangelical movement a century ago, not to mention the deep impress of Calvin, through John Knox, upon Scotland and New England. The "new-Calvinism" Barth teaches bids fair to exercise an influence in this century as forceful as any of those eminent predecessors. For, as St. Augustine wrote, the Christian Church is always tempted to "crumble back again into the world" which it professes to have renounced by its baptismal vow, and she is set to be the perpetual protest against "worldliness," the secularism which to-day is the rival, if not the foe of spiritual evangelicalism. She has ever to protest against "things as they are," even as Jesus opposed Judaism, Paul Pharisaism, John "the world that lieth in the Evil one," Luther against Romanism, and the Evangelicals against the moderatism and indifferentism of the past century and a half.

At bottom, the movement which bears, against his desire, the name of Barth is a protest against modern Protestant theology since Schleiermacher, which, in Barth's phrase, "has transformed theology into anthropology." This a product of the Cartesian philosophy which turned man's attention to his inward life and has made "the proper study of mankind, man" instead of God. The centre has been shifted from the authority of God speaking in and through His Word : man is made the measure of all things in heaven and earth, until we hear men like C. E. M. Joad and Bertrand Russell saying, as did Feuerbach two generations ago, that God is a mere projection of man's fancies. As a consequence men have lost a sense of the presence of God : the sense of sin has been weakened : man has made himself as God, with all the misery of the war as gruesome commentary on "the divinity of man." Barth has analysed and traced the declension of Protestantism during the past century. At the Reformation the position held was that through the Word of God speaking in Scripture, aided by the inner witness of the Holy Spirit, believers heard *God* speaking. Later

"people began to surround the witness of the Holy Spirit with other reasons for belief in order to support a proof in which they no longer had perfect trust. . . . When historical criticism began objecting to the antiquity, the genuineness, the historical reliability of Biblical literature . . . we lost the wonder of *God* ; the great misery of Protestantism began. Doctrine, parted from its life-giving source, hardened into Orthodoxy : Christian experience, confusing itself with this source, took refuge in Pietism, truth shrivelled into the moral and sentimental maxims of the Enlightenment ; and, finally, Christian experience was reduced by Schleiermacher and his

successors to the hypothesis of being the highest expression of a religious instinct common to all men.”¹

And the recent studies in psychology have sought to trace religion to primal instincts derived from man's animal ancestry, and not from the creative breath and speech of God making him “a living soul.”

Before we attempt to present the principles from which Barth develops his teaching, a few words about the man himself and his works should be said. Born in 1886, the son of a theological Professor at Basle and having two brothers Professors, Barth passed through the Universities at Berne, Berlin, Tübingen and Marburg. At Marburg he sat under Natorp and Cohen, Neo-Kantians, and his thinking bears marks of the Kantian philosophy: he was strongly influenced by Wilhelm Herrmann in dogmatics. After graduating, for a year or two he assisted Martin Rade on the “Liberal” theology's paper, *Die Christliche Welt*; at 23 he entered the ministry of the Reform Church and at Safenwil, in Switzerland, from 1911 he was Pastor of a Church in the industrial area. Imbued with Socialistic notions, and a strong pacifist as regards war, he sought the “coming of God's Kingdom” in association with the Christian Socialist movement under the leadership of H. Kutter in Basle and of Ragaz. Soon he found that the theology he had learned under Herrmann gave him no message wherewith to face the fatalism and unbelief rife near the battlefields. He says:

“I sought to find my way between the problem of human life on the one hand and the content of the Bible on the other. As a minister I wanted to speak to the people in the infinite contradiction of their life, but to speak on the no less infinite message of the Bible, which was as much of a riddle as life.”

And as Luther found in St. Paul's Epistles the message for his day, so Barth found in Romans, with its great opening chapters putting man “in the dock” before a righteous God, the message for war and post-war conditions. “What at first,” he says, “was to be only an essay to help me to know my own mind grew into ‘my theology,’ or let us rather say ‘Theology of Correction.’”² Soon Barth was called to speak at religious conferences and gatherings of ministers: he spoke with a force and flame that kindled enthusiasm everywhere, and in 1921 he was placed in the Professor's Chair at Göttingen: then translated to the Reformed Church's Chair of Theology at Münster in Westphalia, and since 1929 Barth has occupied the Chair at Bonn and drawn to his classes hundreds of youths from all over Europe.

His book on Romans gave him a Continental reputation. It was first published in 1918, it has run through several editions, and its effect, as a Roman Catholic writer put it, was “as a bomb falling on a playground.” It was attacked by historians of eminence, Harnack and Jülicher: by theologians, as Wobbermin: by “liberals” such as Rade and Bultmann (the latter is now with

¹ *Word of God and Word of Man*, Engl. tr., p. 245 f.

² *ib.*, p. 103.

Barth): by Fundamentalists, Lutheran, Pietists and Roman Catholics alike. Since then other works have come from his fluent pen: two collections of Essays and Addresses, one of which, under the title *The Word of God and The Word of Man*, has been put into "American"-English: the other, *Die Theologie und Die Kirche*, gives us Barth's views of theologians, preachers and Church systems: two commentaries, in addition to his Romans, one of them on 1 Corinthians xv, on (in English) "The Resurrection of the Dead," the other on Philippians (*Erklärung des Philipperbriefes*); some sermons and many articles in the paper of the Movement, *Zwischen den Zeiten* (Between the Ages), and lastly, his *Dogmatik I*; *Die Lehre vom Worte Gottes*, issued in 1927. It is a misfortune that only two of his works have been rendered into English, one, *The Word of God*, just mentioned, another, *The Christian Life* on Romans xii. 1 f., which hardly conveys the strength of Barth's message. Perhaps mention may be made of the present writer's book, *The Teaching of Karl Barth, An Exposition*, which has had a kindly reception (S.C.M., 7s. 6d. net). It is a crying shame that the *Römerbrief*, which first gave Barth's name such prominence abroad, has not been put into an English dress: would that some publisher would do the whole religious world and especially Evangelical Christianity this service!

Dr. Cave has well described the book and its contents.

"Few modern books are so deeply moving as Barth's book on Romans. . . . It is an amazing book—500 closely-packed pages of violent paradox. . . . Barth had looked to the rise of Christian democracy to secure for the world peace and progress. The war showed him how vain was this hope: he lost all trust in man's thoughts and plans. No lasting good can come from any of man's activities. If we are to be saved it must be by God's act alone. The only light we have is given us by Christ's death. . . . Religion cannot help men, for that, too, is human. The one liberating word which 'religion' can never find is this: God sent His own Son. And since God sent His own Son because of sin, this liberating word is (to quote Barth) to be described only in strong negations, to be preached only as a paradox, to be apprehended only as the 'absurd' which, as such, is the 'credible,' for it is the Divine reaction against sin. The offence, the vexation which it causes us is the reflexion of the offence, the vexation which we men are to God."¹

And Dr. R. S. Franks, of Bristol, has succinctly put its main theme thus:

"According to Barth, Christ is simply the point where the Infinite world breaks across into the world of the finite, and the Cross is just the moment in Divine revelation through Christ when the condemnation of all things finite is pronounced. Hence Faith is avowing the Divine No and awaiting the Divine Yes."

Since the Professor exchanged the Genevan gown for the professor's robes, the language of paradox, flaming rhetoric and Carlylean thunder has undergone some change. He speaks in terms of scholastic erudition—he is well-versed in the Medieval Schoolmen, as becomes one working alongside of Roman Catholics

¹ *op. cit.*, p. 19 f.; citing *Römbf.*, p. 259.

trained in St. Thomas Aquinas—but at times the volcanic fire bursts out in flame. It is difficult to summarize his teaching because, as a “Theology of Correction” it is a kind of marginal comment on theories some knowledge of which is presupposed by the reader. All current psychological theories of religion, such as Otto’s on the “Numinöse” and Freud’s and Jung’s; all modern historical research on the Gospel narratives, and on the history of Christian doctrines, as given by Harnack, Ritschl (A.) and Troeltsch, are grist to his mill, and his keen analytical powers are turned on the practices as well as the ideas prevailing in the various religious circles of German Protestantism and Roman Catholicism. And to present adequately Barth’s doctrines demands also some knowledge of the social, political and economic conditions amidst which he labours. As Professor Niebergall rightly said, “Many volumes would be required to deal with his criticisms,” so far flung is his line of attack. Within our limits perhaps the most useful course to take is to present his central principle and from that to work out to his message to Protestantism to-day.

In the Preface to Romans he wrote :

“If I have a ‘system’ it consists in that I hold steadfastly in sight what Soeren Kierkegaard called ‘The infinitively qualitative difference of time and eternity’: in its negative and positive significance. ‘God is in heaven and thou on earth.’ The relation of *this* God to *this* man and *vice versa* is for me the theme of the Bible and the sum of philosophy in one. Philosophers call this crisis of human knowing, the Origin or Source (Ger. Ursprung).”

Enfolded there, as *in nuce*, lies the heart of Barth’s theology. If we unfold those theses we see in “the infinitively qualitative difference of time and eternity” the profound problems of the relation of time to what is *not* time, but precedes and follows time, eternity; which, since Einstein taught, has become a problem taxing our ablest minds to the utmost. Put in St. Paul’s words, “The things which are seen are temporal,” and so, changing, passing, “under condemnation” of God and doomed to extinction. But “the things which are not seen are eternal”: abiding, unchanging, partaking in God’s endless life. The eternal *negates* the temporal. And put in spatial terms, we have the difference between the transcendental and the immanent.

Here Barth attacks current modes of thought which view the temporal as a preliminary stage ascending to the eternal. Such a view is thinking in terms of quantity: the temporal as a lesser amount of which the eternal is the total sum, the temporal being a fragment, a fraction continuous with the eternal. Such a view is in line with the evolutionary idea in biology and the idea held in sociology where the final stage of things issues automatically in fulness of life in the individual and the Kingdom of God in society. In such a view the eternal is already in time: the divine is inherent in man: man being “but little lower than God,” God a little higher than man, immanent in man. Not so, says Barth. Time is not continuous with eternity: time, on earth, is “the broken arc,”

eternity, "in the heaven the perfect round" is not true, for no prolongation of the line will ever round to a circle.

Then the natures of God and man are "infinitely different" in "quality." God is in heaven, nothing qualifies, circumscribes or limits Him: man, on earth, is "cribbed, cabined and confined" in an environment he did not make, and can only slightly modify. He is finite, and, according to the axiom of the Reformed Church theology in which Barth was reared, "the finite has no capacity for the infinite." In terms of ethical quality the difference that exists between God and man is that between the Holy and the sinful, the Creator and the creature, the Sovereign and the subject. It is more than a difference in abstract quality; it is a difference in personality. God is not an abstraction, an *idea* which man can form by generalizing; that indeed would make God man's creation, as Feuerbach and B. Russell assert. And the ethical judgment follows that the only virtue man can have before God is unflinching obedience, "to do His will." Disobedience is flat rebellion, sin, and sin has affected man and all creatures on earth "at the very core of their being": it is Kant's "*radikal Böse*."

When Barth says this "infinite difference is the theme of the Bible and philosophy in one," he indicates the two lines along which man comes to realize his finitude. From philosophy man learns that he is an "I" over against a "Not-I" in nature and creatures beneath himself. He throws the mantle of thought over Nature and interprets it in terms of his own thought, much as Sir J. Jeans finds Nature's Maker to be a mathematician. But in nature man can never find God: *finitum non capax infiniti*. Even Nature may be only a "projection of man over things about him": according to Kant we never know "the thing in itself."

On the other line, through the Bible, a Voice speaks to man, "the Word of God speaking," as Barth says, and only as man hears that voice does he come to perfect personal responsibility. The Divine "Thou" addresses man's "I" and puts man "in Crisis." "In conscience God enters time," says Barth, but speaking and requiring assent and response. This is "the one theme of the Bible" to Barth, and in the *Dogmatik* he adds that this relation between *this* God addressing man and *this* man so taken in claim should be the one theme of Christian preaching. Here we are at the *source*, the primal origin. It starts with God, not with man, and the gravamen of Barth's polemic against present-day theologians is that they start with man to try to reach God. There is no way up, says Barth, only the way down from God to man: and this makes the relation between God and man. The relation is that of the Creator to the creature, of Sovereign to subject, and the latter lives in utter dependence on his Maker: "in Him we live, move, and have our being." Though God and man come into relation there is no infringement of the Divine Sovereignty. God conditions man, but though He relativates Himself, He never parts with His sovereignty. Man can never acquire a claim upon God or arrange terms of accommodation with Him, for God's

sovereignty would thereby be encroached upon. And even when man resents that sovereignty and disobeys, that Sovereign claim still persists : with doom, for God is " The Determiner of Destiny."

So from philosophy man learns that he is more than a bit of nature : he can never be at home there : nor in human society either, for it is ever in flux and he with it. As Barth said :

" Man is found in this world in prison. His creatureliness is a fetter : his sin a liability : his death is his fate. His world is a shapeless chaos, moving to and fro, of natural, psychical and some other forces. His life is an illusion ; this is his condition."

And from God's Word man finds that " God stands to man in contradiction as the *impossible* to the possible, as *death* is contrary to life, as *eternity* over against time."¹ God is the " Everlasting No " to man in *this* world ; but the No in which is concealed His Yes. And the Yes is seen only at the in-breaking of the Eternal world into time at the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.

" In Jesus Christ," he says, " two worlds meet and diverge. The first is the world we know, the world created by God—and ' fallen ' : the world of the flesh needing salvation, ' our world.' This world is cut into by another world, the unknown world, the world of the Father's original creation and of final salvation. The point of intersection of these two worlds is Jesus of Nazareth, the Jesus of history. In Him a vertical line falls plumb on the horizontal line of history. The resurrection of Christ manifests this ' new world,' the world of the Holy Spirit, which here touches this world at a tangent : touches but not entering. In Christ, the Word of the Creator marks the confines of history, its limits, and at the Resurrection is where God reveals Himself—whilst remaining concealed !"²

This revelation puts man " in Crisis." God becomes more than an object to contemplate : He is a demand which man has to concede or reject, and thus it is a turning-point, where life takes new direction ; it requires a decision, after which " life is never the same again " ; it is destiny, election or reprobation ; " there is a great gulph fixed."

Barth's strength is put forth to develop realistically the contradiction between God and man, and between man as he is and as he knows he was meant to be. Man is " in the depths " and cannot get out : he can cry to be rescued " de profundis," but no man, not even a human Jesus can rescue him : only God can do that. And God in the Logos, the God-man, has done that already at the Cross. There the contradiction is sovereignly overcome and the apprehension of that fact and truth is vouchsafed to man through God's outpouring of the Holy Spirit, Who is the subjective " efficient " within man, revealing the " meaning " of the objective revelation seen in the Incarnation of the Son of God. The human Jesus, " of the seed of David after the flesh, is declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead."³ He is the " bridge from eternity to time " ; God revealing His condemnation of sin, and God in wondrous grace restoring " fallen " man to fellowship with Himself.

¹ *Römbf.*, p. 12 f.

² *ib.*, p. 5 f.

³ Rom. i. 4 f.

The "work is all Divine"; man can only receive it, and only hears of it through the Word of God.

We need not stay to show how in this unfolding of Barth's central idea there is implicit the recognition of the Chalcedonian formula of the Two Natures—"that glorious paradox," as he calls it: the "plan of salvation," as Reformers described it: and the acknowledgment of the Personality of God the Holy Ghost, as Evangelicals delight to own and confess. Nor need we attempt to explain the difficulties inherent in paradox and in the dialectical method of thinking involved when things in relation and antithesis have to be resolved. A fellow-worker of Barth's, E. Brunner, of Zürich, has expounded lucidly the "Theology of Crisis" in a book now Englished, under that title (Scribners), and perhaps for dialectic the reader may be referred to the Chapter XIII in *The Teaching of Karl Barth*. We must confine ourselves to Barth's exposition of the principles of the Reformation. He has brought the great watchwords of the Reformation, Luther's Justification by Faith, Calvin's The Absolute Sovereignty of God, The Word of God as source and standard of Christian Preaching and Theology, into current coin again and focussed attention on the realities these slogans indicate.

The *Dogmatik I* is completely devoted to expounding the place of The Word of God as fountain-head of all Dogmatics. The Word of God comes to us in three forms, in all of which the Speaker is God. Starting from the preacher's office and function Barth shows how that "Word" contained in preaching is the third stage at which it comes to the hearer. The one thing that makes a Church is "God speaking": nothing else, not sacraments, social meetings, nor groups of persons like-minded in ideas. The preacher's word has been mediated to him through the Church as custodian of the written Word of God contained in the Bible. But the written record, in broken human speech, goes back to the final, first stage, God's immediate revelation to prophets and Apostles. The primal revelation was not immanent in prophets and Apostles; the "Word" has "to come"; it is not of this earthly sphere, or history: it is trans-history, coming into history and qualifying history, but not losing its transcendent force.

On the relation of this spoken Word of God's—*Deus dixit*—to the written word, Scripture, Barth says, "That Revelation produces the testimony of Scripture and in Scripture speaks for itself; this makes the Scripture to be the Word of God." Elsewhere he puts it: "The Word of God appears even to-day in the Bible and apart from this event, viz. His speaking, it (the Bible) is not the Word of God but one book as other books." And again: "Scripture is the Word of God so far as it witnesses to revelation."¹ He allows the "lower" and "higher" criticisms to do their proper work in fixing the best texts and allowing for the human element in writing and transmitting the "revelation" into human words: theology begins when they have done, and there remains God's

¹ *Dg.*, pp. 45, 63, 134.

Word, challenging men and calling them to the eternal world and also creating them new creatures in Christ. Barth stands there with Luther who said in 1522: John's Gospel and 1st Epistle, Paul's Epistles, and 1st Peter, these are

"the books which show Christ to thee and teach all that it is necessary and blessed for thee to know, even if thou sawest not nor heard any other book or teaching. . . . The Epistle of St. James is a right strawy Epistle, for it is not of an evangelical sort."¹

We saw earlier how Barth challenged the theologians for taking "man as the measure of things," including revelation. Since Schleiermacher's *Glaubenslehre*, which took as its starting-point for theology, "the states of soul of the pious Christian when feeling his absolute dependence on God," Barth holds that the wrong way has been taken. Man again has been put as the object of his reflection. As an orthodox theologian of the Erlangen school put it, "I myself as a Christian am to myself, as a theologian, the supreme object of theological science." Even Seeberg, in his *Christian Dogmatics*, says the object to be seen is "the subjective setting of the will experienced in Christian faith" (p. 227). This is akin to the pietism which is measuring its salvation by its gusts of inner feeling with but little reference to the August Being who may have evoked such emotion. Thus Barth sets himself against any search in *man* for the ground of theology: not even faith is a "ground" for religion. And the modern psychology of religion has given us much psychology but desperately little of God. Barth says the mode of procedure is to start with the Word of God, and not with the faith, the inner states of consciousness of man when in religious relation. Faith is not man's doing initially: "It is the gift of God, as the living presence of the Holy Ghost in man."² God never becomes an "object" for the religious consciousness: he is, and ever remains, the Subject, "the First Person Speaking," and man is always God's object addressed and knows nothing of God till God has spoken. To stay at man's end of the matter is to have our feet on sand ever shifting: to be in the relative and the uncertain: faith is grounded in God, "The Rock of Ages." To put faith first and the Word second, is, says Barth, "falsification upon falsification on the whole line and at all points. Dogmatics is not an hour-glass which can be reversed and run on just the same."³ Instead of starting with God's Word modern theologians begin with generalizing on religion generally, "the science of religion" it is called, and the voice of God is drowned; theology has become "anthropocentric" and thereby, as Schaefer says, "there has been belittlement of God. Little man has cast upon God his own shadow."

Towards Roman Catholicism Barth directs his criticism, and his positive views about the Reformation can be best seen in an Essay on "Roman Catholicism as a Problem for the Protestant Church."⁴

¹ *Pref. to New Test.*

² *Dg.*, p. 89.

³ *Dg.*, p. 87.

⁴ In *Theologie und Kirche*, p. 329 *et seq.*

This is not violent assault on the Roman views : Barth recognizes much of God's working in that Church, but lays his finger on weak spots. To the contention of Romanists that Protestantism is but a negative, a protest, Barth rejoins that the Reformation was not a revolution but a restoration, for the Church is "the place where God's Word has place and is received and is served by men : the fellowship is made on the basis of God's call heard." Romanists, on the other hand, regard the Church as "theirs, not God's" : "man's" presence makes the Church, the priesthood is the "visible" making known and impartation of grace : man secures an *opus operatum*, man secures reconciliation through the priest, and the Pontifex Romanus is nothing more nor less than Christ on earth. Here again, as in theology, man has thrust himself in the place of God. Genuine Protestantism, says Barth, is

"a restoration of the absolute individuality of the person, of the absolute non-repeatability of the work of the Lord ; restoration of the absolute irreversibility of the relation of the Word and flesh : subject and predicate ; restoration of the correlation of the Divine reality of revelation to the equally Divine reality of faith. So it is affirmation not negation, strengthening and sharpening, not weakening or removing of the thought of mediation, of the idea of service ; restoration of the understanding that the Church is *God's house*."

"Protestantism holds that 'God's presence is not shut up in a sacramental-house' ; He is present as grace in the shoemaker's shop, the factory, laboratory and mine." "Protestantism signifies the restoration of God's authority in contrast with that of the Church, and thereby the restoration of freedom of conscience," but that conscience is "under law unto God."

"The Reformation has restored the Church as the Church of The Word. Word is the revelation and self-impartation of another Person to us, meeting us, and if this Person is God's Person it is the expression of His Sovereignty—not of His might, but of His Sovereignty over us. Might would treat us as things, not as persons. If God meets me in His Word this denotes that He seeks me, rules me through His command and through His promise, and that I have to believe and obey Him. If God meets us in and through His Word, we know ourselves as sinners before God. Word of God means God's judgment. If God is sovereign then man is His servant—in the concrete, a fallible, unfaithful and disloyal servant, to the very core of our being."

"The Church as we view it is the restoration of the Church as the Church of sinners. The Word of God that secures and constitutes the relation between Him and us, is essentially, actually, Word of grace. This is the place of reconciliation. Jesus receives sinners. He names them 'His own' : He tells us that we are all 'right' to Him : this is our justification. And He takes us in claim, our faith and obedience : this is our sanctification. And both without our 'doing,' without a preceding or succeeding 'Merit.'"

"The Reformation was the restoration of the Church as the

Church of the mercy of God. We miss this in the Roman Church, viz., that we live in the Church of God's mercy (lit., warmheartedness), and altogether and utterly and in no wise live we by anything else."

Such are some of the points in that brilliant address. Barth has a message, and a ring that is sore needed to-day. Here sounds the trumpet-note of a herald announcing glad tidings, for he has heard a Word of the Lord, though he modestly disclaims such an exalted office. Here we feel the presence of a messenger with just the word to man in the infinite contradiction of his existence in Europe; yea, anywhere in the world to-day. "God has spoken in His holiness: I will exult." Well may Protestantism in these isles welcome this voice from German Switzerland with the old cries, *Gratia Dei sola, fidei sola, soli gloria Dei.*

POEMS OF LIFE. By Rev. T. H. Collinson, M.A. London: The C. W. Daniel Company, Ltd. 7s. 6d. net.

Mr. Collinson has brought out four volumes of poems. He has now to be congratulated upon a fifth and single volume, consisting of choice selections from his earlier books, although they are mostly and hitherto unpublished poems, interpreting Nature and Religion. The collection is divided into four parts—Poems of Youth, A Student's Love Songs, Lakeland Poems, and Poems of Nature and Life. Of course, it goes without saying that there are poems *and* poems. Mr. Collinson, however, is no mere versifier, but one of those poets who are born and not made. There is indeed ample proof of this in the book itself.

THE CHILD'S RELIGION. By Pierre Bovet, Directeur de l'Institut Jean Jacques Rousseau. Translated by George H. Green, M.A., Ph.D., B.Sc. London: J. M. Dent & Co., Ltd. 6s. net.

The author of this treatise, M. Pierre Bovet, is Professor of Education in the University of Geneva, and is, consequently, an expert in the realm of pedagogy, and the translations of several works from his pen have already established his reputation, so that he can rely upon any further contribution to the study of education being well received. He is virtually in agreement with William James, believing that there is no specific "religious instinct," but that the beginnings of religious behaviour and of a religious attitude must be sought in the behaviour and attitude of the child to its parents. This study is a work of the first importance for all persons who are in any way connected with the training of the young.

S. R. C.