
Subject: Karl Barth

Posted by [william](#) on Thu, 23 Mar 2006 20:25:35 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

After taking the quiz http://quizfarm.com/test.php?q_id=44116 and scoring 100% with Karl Barth I thought I might examine why.

With any neo-orthodox theologian you have to read volumes to actually see the areas where they err from orthodoxy. I found a site that contained some of the major teachings of this theologian and can see that there are many areas of agreement which would account for my score!

Here are some quotes from the site:

Quote:Barth became known as a radical critic both of the prevailing liberal theology and of the social order. Liberal theology, Barth believed, had accommodated Christianity to modern culture.

Ok, he was a radical critic of modernism... so am I. We see the trend in our day (Barth did most of his main work from the 1920's to 1950's) with most institutional systems departing further and further from historical Christianity--on every level. I know we tend to pick on the denominational systems but charismatics are even more guilty in their quest for the subjective experience regardless of the Scriptural-ness of such an experience.

Quote:In his famous commentary Epistle to the Romans (1919; trans. 1933), Barth stressed the discontinuity between the Christian message and the world. He rejected the typical liberal points of contact between God and humanity in feeling or consciousness or rationality, as well as Catholic tendencies to trust in the church or spirituality.

In our day we have those who are unabashedly evangelistic (to be commended) but lack a fundamental base for the purpose of training those converts in the knowledge of the Holy. Then we have the "Word" churches who grow fat on the teaching of the Word (or worse, the latest teachings derived from pop-psychology).

To be fair there is an attempt with some of the modern churches to focus on church growth (evangelistic?) but they do it at the expense of the principles taught to us in the Word of God --which to my mind is worse than doing nothing. (I know, better to be either hot or cold rather than lukewarm--but I'm considering the deception factor here.)

Quote:The principal emphasis in Barth's work, known as neo-orthodoxy and crisis theology, is on the sinfulness of humanity, God's absolute transcendence, and the human inability to know God except through revelation.

I certainly agree with the sinfulness of humanity and God's absolute transcendence and the

absolute necessity of revelation (read propitiation) for the twain to meet.

Quote:His objective was to lead theology away from the influence of modern religious philosophy back to the principles of the Reformation and the prophetic teachings of the Bible.

No problem with this, to the degree that the reformation teachings were a reflection of the Scriptures.

Quote:He regarded the Bible, however, not as the actual revelation of God but as only the record of that revelation. For Barth, God's sole revelation of himself is in Jesus Christ

I'm not sure I understand the difference here... perhaps he isn't convinced that the Bible is verbally inspired (God-Breathed). Men recording the revelation without the benefit of being verbally inspired?

Quote:Some argue that he was too negative in his estimate of mankind and its reasoning powers and too narrow in limiting revelation to the biblical tradition, thus excluding the non-Christian religions.

I confess that I'm pretty negative toward mankind and do think that it is a Biblical truth that non-Christian religions don't have a chance in escaping the judgment to come. Jesus is the ONLY WAY.

For those interested in reading the complete article instead of just the highlights you can see it here: <http://www.island-of-freedom.com/BARTH.HTM>

William
