

Dr. Roger Green, Reformation to the Present, Lecture 19, 19th and 20th Century Protestantism Focusing on Karl Barth

© 2024 Roger Green and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Roger Green in his course on Church History, Reformation to the Present. This is session 19, Roman Catholicism in the 19th and 20th century Protestantism, Focusing on Karl Barth.

Okay, well, let's, let's, this is lecture number 9, the Theology of Roman Catholicism in the 19th century.

We gave some introduction, tried to kind of set up, you know, how, what the broader culture was doing, what the broader culture was like and how it impacted the church, the Roman Catholic Church. So, and then the next thing we did, just kind of reminder, but we then moved on to the papacy of the 19th century, and we reminded ourselves there were two popes, Pope Pius IX on our left and Pope Leo XIII on our right. And the thing we mentioned about the two popes, remember, is Pope Pius IX closed the curtains on the window of the world.

He really isolated the church from the broader culture, the broader world. He was so suspicious of that world and of that world's kind of attack upon Christendom that he wanted to create a true Catholic faith apart from that world. And so you, that was the work of Pius IX, and he was pretty successful with it.

Remember that the movement is called Ultramontanism, which we mentioned. I've got that on the PowerPoint, but, and then Leo XIII, we said, he was the pope who stood before the same window and took the curtains and opened the curtains and let the church face the world and the problems of the world and be meaningful to the, to the world and so forth. So, you had, you couldn't have had two more, more different people as popes.

Quite a contrast in terms of how they felt the Roman Catholic Church should respond to the broader culture and that broader world. So we talked about, talked about them. And then we mentioned three, and we're going to get to three major Romans. We haven't finished with Leo XIII, so that's right.

The last thing we said about Leo XIII, we were talking about his accomplishments and how important he was. But the last thing we said about him was that we did mention *Rerum Novarum*. I think, didn't we? Do you have *Rerum Novarum* in the notes? This was his great encyclical. This was, in a sense, the greatest accomplishment of Leo XIII in the ninth, during his papacy.

And this was his encyclical, New Things or a New Order of Things. And now that's about it. As far as I know, I think we mentioned it, but we didn't talk any more about it. I think that's true.

So, *Rerum Novarum* is one of the most important writings of the 19th century in the church. So, we want to mention that. So, let me mention three things about the encyclical that show you where the church is going to stand on these cultural kinds of issues.

Number one, he stood, the encyclical stands with the laborers. He also says that laborers should receive just a reward. So it's taking a stand with the working class.

It's taking a stand with the people who labor, with the people who work. Remember we mentioned how difficult those working conditions were in these industrial cities in the West? So that's number one.

So, okay. Number two, *Rerum Novarum*, supports social legislation. Any social legislation that can help people in terms of working hours, working conditions and so forth.

Rerum Novarum, this great encyclical, supports that social legislation. All right. So that tells you that the church is concerned about the very conditions of life for people.

The church is not going to close the curtains and ignore that people are working long hours for low wages in very terrible circumstances. We're going to open the curtains, face that situation, and stand by the side of the working class and the side of the day laborers. So that's number two, approving social legislation.

Number three, which was very controversial now, I mean, we don't think of it as controversial, but at that time, it was controversial, and that is the support of trade unionism, support of unionizing the workers so that there can be strength in the numbers and so forth. Now, people went to battle in the late 19th century or early 20th century over whether there should be trade unions or not. People died in the streets of Europe of New York, Boston, and so forth, trying to unionize themselves.

But it's an approval in a sense of trade unionism. So, the basic thing about *Rerum Novarum* is that *Rerum Novarum* stands, *Rerum Novarum* says, the Roman Catholic Church is going to stand by the side of the working classes. Now, that's a major shift for the church because the church had been seen as standing by the side of the upper classes.

The church had been seen as someone who kind of baptized the life of the wealthy and the privileged. And certainly, that's why the French Revolution partly came for that reason because people in the revolution, when they thought about the Catholic Church, they thought about the Catholic Church as kind of standing in the place of the wealthy, by the wealthy, and ignoring the common people. Now, in the 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th century, the church says we are standing by the side of the workers.

This was very, very, very important, and it really was major. So, *Rerum Novarum*, one of the most important documents of this time. First of all, do you have any questions about the two papacies? Leo XIII or Pius IX? I know we've been away for a while so it's hard to kind of get back into thinking about this stuff.

Okay, that leads us to three major Roman Catholic doctrines that were during this time. Not quite during this time. As you can see, one of them is going to be a little outside of this time, but it's a natural place to talk about it.

Okay, so let's talk about those three major Catholic doctrines that kind of defined the Roman Catholic Church during this time. Okay, the first one is the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, pronounced in 1854 by Pius IX. Okay, so there are a few things I want to say about this: the Immaculate Conception of Mary.

But the first thing is, as a Protestant, maybe speaking mostly to Protestants here, please don't confuse this with the Virgin Birth. This is not a synonym for the Virgin Birth. They are two distinct doctrines, and often, I hear people who are talking about the Virgin Birth referring to it as the Immaculate Conception.

This has nothing to do with the Virgin Birth. So we want to take note of that. We want to clarify that.

Okay, so what is this doctrine? Let me read it to you, and then I'll get back to it. This is how the papal letter, the papal bull, read. From the very first moment of her conception, the Blessed Virgin Mary was, by the singular grace and privilege of Almighty God and in view of the merits of Jesus Christ, Savior of mankind, kept free from all stain of original sin.

Okay, so what is the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception? The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is at the moment of conception. Now, Mary's mother was not a virgin conceiving Mary. Mary's mother had intercourse, and at the moment of conception, Mary was kept free from original sin.

She was preserved from her original sin. And as a matter of fact, she remained sinless for her entire life. Okay, now the reason for the Immaculate Conception doctrine was, in a sense, two-fold.

One reason was that, again, the interest of Pius IX was to bring allegiance to the Roman Catholic Church and to the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church. And if you center that allegiance around a figure like Mary, who was seen as someone immaculately conceived, remained a perpetual virgin and so forth, a sinless person her whole life, if you focus that allegiance around a figure like Mary, that's going to draw in the faithful. That's going to help to accomplish what Pius IX set out to accomplish: close the curtains on the world, draw in the faithful into the life of the Catholic Church, and so forth.

But it also had a second; he was interested in it for a second reason, and that is because Christ, because Christology, Christ, the nature of Christ, and the teachings of Christ were under such attack in the 19th century, this helped to affirm the nature of Christ. Now, we can say there's no original sin that was passed down to Christ. Because Mary was a virgin when she bore Jesus, so there's no original sin.

And Mary herself doesn't have original sin. So there's no original sin to be passed down to Christ. So, in a sense, it kind of preserves Christ as fully divine, preserves his full divinity in the face of 19th-century attempts to deny his divinity and to make him just a human being.

So, it's a doctrine that comes at a very important time for the Roman Catholic Church, both for the church itself and for entering the argument about who Jesus was. Another thing we should mention about the doctrine itself is that Mary not only did not inherit original sin, but also there was an innocence conferred upon her, a justice conferred upon her, and a sanctity conferred upon her at the same time. So, she is innocent, she is living a justified life, and she is sanctified at the same time, which means that she remained perpetually without sin in her life.

Now, the church was quick to add to the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception Church was quick to add. Did this preserve her from sorrow, sickness, and even death? And the answer to that was no. The fact that she is living a perpetually divine life is, in a sense, a perpetually sanctified life, but she's not preserved from sickness, sorrow, or death. So, she is a human being, and she suffered a great deal, and she even died.

Okay, now where did the doctrine come from, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception? Where is it? Well, it's not in the Bible. So there were Roman Catholics who were worried about the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception being proclaimed because they said this was going to divide us Roman Catholics from Protestants. Because the Protestant would want to say, where do you find that in the Bible? Now, the Roman Catholic answer to that is that we believe doctrines are formed from the Bible and tradition.

There was a tradition in the early church of seeing Mary as the New Eve. So, with Eve, sin came into the world. With Mary, through her Immaculate Conception and her sinless life, bearing a sinless Lord, that problem of sin in the world was taken care of.

So, in the early church, there was already a discussion of Mary as the New Eve. So there's already talk about her in terms of what she can, kind of an example she can be for the church. A New Eve, an Eve before the fall.

So, you have Mary as a representative of that. Now, having said that people like Augustine, who got into this mix and into the discussion, as you would guess, but people like Augustine really did doubt that she was preserved from original sin. He felt that she lived a sinless life, but he really wondered if she was preserved from her original sin.

So, there was already discussion about that. Was she preserved from her original sin? Now, by the time you get to the 19th century, the doctrine says she was preserved from original sin and also remained sinless. By the time you get to the medieval church, the medieval church is celebrating a feast about the conception of Mary.

So, already in the 13th century, 14th century, and 15th century, they're talking about a feast of the conception of Mary. They're starting to think about the Immaculate Conception of Mary. It finally became doctrine in 1854.

So, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of Mary was a very, very important doctrine for the church and very important doctrine in a sense for preserving who Christ was in light of all the Christological debates that were going on and the biblical criticism that were taking place over the nature of Jesus. So, questions about that, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception? Are we clear about, and we're clear, that it is not a synonym for the virgin birth of Jesus? So, we don't want to confuse those two things.

Okay. Now, if you look at the next doctrine, the doctrine of the Assumption of Mary, this date is correct in your syllabus and correct here in the PowerPoint. This date is 1950.

So why am I doing this to you? Why am I having you jump from the 19th century to the 20th century here? Well, somewhere along the way, I need to talk about this doctrine, and I decided to do it here. As long as we're talking about the Roman Catholic Church and Mary, this seems to be the natural place to do it. But it is a 1950 doctrine.

It's not an 1850 doctrine. In other words, this is correct. So, let's fast forward and just talk about it here as long as we're talking about Mary and then talk about the Assumption of Mary.

Here's what the doctrine proclaims. Mary, Immaculate conceived by God and ever virgin, when the course of her earthly life had been finished, had been taken up in body and soul to heavenly glory. Okay.

So that's the doctrine of the Assumption of Mary that when she died when Mary died, she was taken body and soul up into heaven at the point, at the moment of her death. So, of course, no purgatory for Mary. She was taken right into the presence of God.

There is the Church of the Dormition in Jerusalem. The Church of the Dormition is an interesting church. And the Church of the Dormition is the church on the site where Mary was believed to be taken up into heaven.

So you go to Jerusalem, you go to the Church of the Dormition, and you'll see the site. There's the site of Mary being taken up to heaven. So, it is a very interesting church.

Ted could tell us about that Church of the Dormition. But a fascinating church. But the Assumption of Mary into heaven.

Okay. Now, that's the first doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. The second doctrine is the Assumption.

Now, before I get to the third doctrine, I just want to talk about Mary in general for just a minute. You would be amazed at how much Mary is being talked about in religion these days—a lot.

And I've just got some examples here. There's a book by, well, two books that came out pretty recently. One is called *Mary Through the Centuries*, and the other is called *In Search of Mary*.

It's very interesting, though. These books were in *Time* magazine. They were reviewed in *Time* magazine.

So, it's not like this came from some religious magazine that's reviewing books about Mary or some Catholic magazine. This is *Time* magazine. You can see the second half there.

And then another book, another cover story in *Time* magazine. *Handmaiden or Feminist*. What about more and more people around the world worshiping Mary?

It's led to a holy struggle over what she really stands for. So, a long article of Mary. There's an icon of Mary, the mother of God.

I mean, what is happening with Mary is unbelievable. Not just in the Catholic church but also in the more popular culture. There was an article a few years ago about pilgrims from Ethiopia.

And here's what it said. And you can see, I know there's just a small class here, but you can see Ethiopians. And there's a woman here carrying a big rock on her head and easing earthly burdens.

A pilgrim dances in her prayers to Mary. But let me just read one paragraph. Faith that Moves Mountains.

A Christmastime Lesson in Piety for a Stranger in Aksum. But let me just read one little paragraph here. This is the Faith that Moves Mountains.

At Christmastime in Aksum, the ancient home of the Queen of Sheba, reported sanctuary of the Ark of the Covenant and heart of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church, such devotion to Mary is commonplace. Nothing has ever succeeded in crushing the simple rituals of piety that have been practiced here since the 4th century. Not the communist ideology that ruled Ethiopia for much of the past two decades.

Not the cynicism of the modern age. Not the latest plagues of civil war, famine, poverty, or AIDS. Once a year, there is this feast of the Virgin by the Julian calendar.

Pilgrims flock to the tens of thousands to the Cathedral of St. Mary of Zion, the holiest of holy churches in their faith. The continual chants of Mariam, Mariam, Mariam bear witness to the high esteem, higher even than that accorded Jesus, in which Ethiopia's Christians hold the mother of the Savior. So, we talk about Mary in the church, whether it's the Roman Catholic Church or the Ethiopian Orthodox Church.

Once you get to the place where you hold Mary to such an esteem, now quote, higher even than that accorded Jesus, then you are, boy, where are you then theologically? Where are you doctrinally? Where are you biblically? So, there is kind of a fine line here in terms of Mary. My bottom line to all of this is that Roman Catholics have made too much of Mary, I think. I do not believe in the Immaculate Conception of Mary.

I don't believe in the Assumption of Mary into Heaven. I don't read those things in the Bible. I don't see those things in the Bible.

I think Roman Catholics have made too much of Mary, and also, I think they've taken her out of her Jewish context, a context in which marriage and bearing children and family was a privileged thing. They've made her almost a Gnostic figure in a sense, rather than a figure living in that wonderful robust Jewish culture and bearing the Lord and bearing other children and so forth and loving Joseph. So I think that the Roman Catholic Church has made too much of Mary.

But the other side of the story is Protestants have made too little of Mary. A good example of this is, when's the last time you've heard a sermon on Mary in your church? If you're Protestants. I don't know what your background is.

We'll find out maybe the last day. But when was the last time you heard a good sermon about Mary? There are a lot of texts in the New Testament about Mary through the Gospels and right at the beginning of Acts. So there's a lot that we Protestants should be saying about Mary.

And we don't have to worry about; I think Protestants are worried about falling over into a kind of Catholic veneration of Mary. I don't think we need to worry about that. We just need to be faithful to the biblical text and preach about Mary when Mary comes into the text.

So, have some of you heard good sermons about Mary? Or has it been a while? Or have you had Bible studies about Mary? Or has that been a while? I don't know. So here's a challenge. Think about Mary.

She's very important in the Scriptures. Roman Catholics have made too much of her. We have made too little of her.

That's my feeling, anyway. Okay, let's go to doctrine number three. And let's go back now to the 19th century.

So, doctrine number three was the 19th century. And that is the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope. Okay, the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope.

Now, Protestants also have this a bit wrong. So we want to be careful about this. The Pope is infallible when he speaks on matters ex cathedra.

When the Pope speaks on matters ex cathedra, which literally means from his chair, what is a cathedral? What is considered to be a cathedral? A cathedral is where the bishop's chair is. So you call it a cathedral for that reason.

When the Pope speaks from his chair ex cathedra on some doctrinal matter, then the Pope is speaking infallibly. That's the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope. Now Protestants don't understand this.

Protestants think every time the Pope says something, he's infallible. He's speaking infallibly. He's not speaking infallibly.

They don't understand this. But only when he speaks ex-cathedra. So technically, since this doctrine was proclaimed in 1870, the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope at the First Vatican Council, technically, there's only been one doctrine proclaimed since then.

And that's the doctrine of the Assumption of Mary. So it's not, though; every time the Pope speaks, he's speaking ex-cathedra. So, we need to kind of remember that.

Now, the doctrine itself was argued. There are two kinds of theological points from which the doctrine was argued. And still is argued.

So, let me give those two theological points. The first point is that the Holy Spirit dwells in the Church, in the body of Christ. So the Holy Spirit is in the Church.

So isn't it to be expected that the shepherd of the Church would teach the right doctrine? So, the Holy Spirit is within the Church, moving the Church, moving the Church along. And the Roman Catholic Church argues that wouldn't you expect that the great shepherd of the Church, the Pope, would be charged with the responsibility of, you know, kind of a divine message? So, there's a very positive view of this whole thing. What should we say? Okay. The second reason, however, is a pastoral reason, that eternal punishment is going to come to people who disobey the gospel.

If you disobey the gospel, if you live in mortal sin, remember we talked about mortal sin practically on the first day of the course. If you disobey the gospel, if you live in mortal sin, eternal punishment is going to come your way. So, isn't it providential that the great pastor of the flock, the great shepherd of the sheep, would want to keep that from happening? So, the way he can keep that from happening is to present the gospel correctly so that people have a clear understanding of the gospel and do not fall into mortal sin and go to hell and so forth. So there's this kind of positive movement that the shepherd of the flock is there to bear witness to the Holy Spirit and preach correct doctrine.

There's also this kind of negative view. You want to pastorally be concerned for people who are going to go to hell if they live in mortal sin. So now, in this case, the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope, in this case, the Roman Catholic Church, claims a biblical warrant for this.

So, I'm going to mention just one text, and I'd like you to jot it down. You can look at it. I'm going to take time to read it, but you can look at it when you get a chance.

So, it's Matthew 16. You jot that down and then read the text. You probably don't have your Bible with you, but Matthew 16 begins at verse 13 and goes down to 20.

So, Matthew 16, 13 through 20. And if you've got your Bibles on a laptop and you can look up the text real quick on the laptop, or if you've got a Bible with you, I'll wait till you do that so we can read this. This is a matter of difference of interpretation between the Roman Catholic Church and the Protestant Church for sure.

But let me read the text first. It's Peter's confession of faith. Now, when Jesus came into the district of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, who do men say that the Son of Man is? They said some say John the Baptist, others say Elijah, and others Jeremiah or one of the prophets.

He said to them, but who do you say that I am? Peter replied, you are the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered him, blessed are you, Simon Bar-Jonah, for flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father who is in heaven. And I tell you, you are Peter, and on this rock, I will build my church, and the powers of death shall not prevail against it.

I will give you the keys to the kingdom of heaven. Whatsoever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven. Whatsoever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.

Then, he strictly charged the disciples to tell no one that he was the Christ. Now, the whole issue centers around verse 18. I tell you, you are Peter; on this rock, I will build my church.

The powers of death shall not prevail against it. Okay, so verse 18, as far as the Roman Catholic Church is concerned, this is a verse which talks about the papacy. You are Peter, you're the first pope, upon that rock, upon you, Peter, upon that, you as the rock, I'm going to build my church.

So, Peter was the first pope, and now Pope Francis is, and every pope is in between. So, the Roman Catholic Church reads this and says this is a biblical warrant for the papacy. Okay, Protestants don't see it that way, however.

Protestants, when they read this text, say, in verse 18, I tell you, you are Peter, on this rock, I will build my church, and the rock upon which the church is built is the confession that Peter just made. You are the Christ, the son of the living God. And it's on the confession that the church, that's the rock upon which the church stands and upon which the church is built, upon the confession of faith.

So, he's saying you are Peter, but because he's called Peter the rock, he makes a play on words in a sense. But when he says, on this rock, I will build my church, he doesn't

mean a person or the papacy; he means the profession of faith. I'm going to build my church upon that great profession of faith.

You are the Christ, the son of the living God. So Catholics and Protestants are not going to see eye-tie on this biblical text. They are not going to interpret this biblical text the same.

But certainly, Roman Catholics understand, when they read this text, they understand that it has to do with the papacy. Okay, I just should say a couple of things, kind of in conclusion about this. When the Pope speaks ex-cathedra, when the Pope speaks in this way, it would be wrong if we thought that the Pope was just speaking his own mind when he pronounced, for example, the Assumption of Mary.

It would be wrong if we thought that this is kind of a lone ranger. He believes in the Assumption of Mary, so he's going to come out and speak his mind about this. All you Roman Catholics have to believe from now on in the Assumption of Mary.

That would be wrong to do that. What the Pope is doing when he speaks ex-cathedra is he's expressing the general belief of the church. He's expressing what the church generally teaches.

Now, there were Catholics who were fearful of the Assumption of Mary doctrine because, again, they said this was going to separate us even further from Protestants. But in any case, the Pope is not going to say anything ex-cathedra that generally the Roman Catholic Church doesn't teach by its own tradition. So we can't see this doctrine as, well, the Pope is a lone ranger. He can say whatever he pleases to say.

That wouldn't be true, and that wouldn't be fair to say that about when he speaks ex-cathedra, okay? The other thing we want to say, too, is that one way in which Protestantism has opposed this doctrine, the infallibility of the Pope, is to talk about the infallibility of the Bible. That the Bible is infallible, not a person. Now, we'll talk a little more about the infallibility of the Bible in future lectures, but okay, so three doctrines.

Now, we've skipped from the 19th century to the 20th century and back to the 19th century, but I hope you see the reason why we did that. But three doctrines that helped to shape Roman Catholicism as we know it today. So, are there any discussions about that or any questions about those three doctrines, as you think through those doctrines and how you believe them or don't believe them or would argue against them or whatever? Are you doing okay? Okay, the whole lecture is on Roman Catholicism in the 19th century.

So before we leave it, is there anything that needs to be said, or is there any clarification about Roman Catholicism in the 19th century? So, we tried to see what is happening in the Roman Catholic Church during this time. So, we tried to move back and forth between Protestantism, Roman Catholicism, and so forth. We're going to come back to Protestantism.

So, okay, take five seconds. Let me get the next lecture up here. Take a five-second break.

Did you use your time well and wisely while I was gone during this hour? Were you studying during this hour on Friday and Monday? Everybody studying and writing papers? Okay, studying? Yes, okay, bless your hearts. I'm not asking for a raise of hands here. But I hope it was good; I hope you use your time wisely.

Oh, I need to change this, and then we'll journey on here. Okay, whoops, whoops, no, here we go. What am I? Here we go.

Okay, we're going to journey on. We're now going to push from the 19th century, and we're going to push into the 20th century. So, okay, this is, you've got you, this is the theology of Karl Barth.

And the first thing I'm going to do is do a biographical sketch. Then, we want to see some of Barth's theology and why he was so important. Now, remember we said there are about, I don't know, four or five people in the course that we give a kind of biography of.

Because they're so important, and they shaped theology. They were such shapers of the theological tradition that you can't ignore them. So, we did that with Calvin, we did it with Schleiermacher, and I'm going to do that with Karl Barth as well.

And by the way, it's Barth and not Barth, okay? So, if you want to ask questions about Barth with a hard T, that's a good thing. So, you've got his dates there, 1886 to 1968. So first, I'm going to give his background and then get into his theology.

So, okay, well, first of all, he's not German as many people think he is, but Barth was born in Bern, Switzerland. That is the place of his birth in 1886. This will be the fact that he was born as a Swiss citizen, born in Switzerland.

That fact is going to be very important later in his life. In fact, it's probably going to save his life later on, but he was born in Switzerland and is a Swiss citizen. So that becomes very, very important.

Okay, now, what Barth does is he goes to various German universities. And we said this with Calvin. We say it now with Barth.

He studied at various German universities. But you go to the university to study with the professor. So, all these universities, he moved around from university to university because he wanted to study certain things with certain professors.

That's how you did it in that world. That's not how we do it now. Next Monday's a GE day.

We get people coming on campus and looking at Gordon and all kinds of aspects of Gordon and things they would like about Gordon. But in that world, you go to the university specifically to study with a professor. And he moved around from university to university to university.

After his university training, he decided that he would like to become a minister. He wanted to enter into pastoral ministry. And so, Karl Barth entered into a pastoral ministry first in Geneva.

So, he was a minister there for three years in Geneva. And then he went to a little town, and I've got people who, a friend of mine who lived in Switzerland for many years, Safenwil. So if you want a pronunciation of this little town, Safenwil.

He was a pastor in Safenwil, Switzerland. And he was a pastor there from 1911 to 1921. So he was a pastor in Safenwil for ten years.

Okay, and as far as he knew then, he thought probably that he was going to be a pastor for his entire life. He probably thought, this is going to be my life. Now notice the years, though, from 1911 to 1921.

That is very, very important. Now, moving away from Safenwil, between 1914 and 1918, there was a war being fought, the First World War. This is the most excruciating, most terrible event with which the 20th century began.

And so, he lived through that war. Living through the war called into question his own theological training. It really challenged his own theological training.

Because he had been trained in classical Protestant liberalism, so all the university training that he had had would be in the kind of classical Protestant liberalism that we talked about a couple of lectures ago. In the kind of the theology of people like Friedrich Schleiermacher.

And that classical Protestant liberalism seemed to put blinders on to the realities of the world in which we live. It seemed to not take sin very seriously. It didn't take evil very seriously.

Jesus became a good moral person for them. You just kind of follow Jesus. And so, all of that training of Karl Barth, all that kind of liberalism in which he had been trained, now are called into question because of this most horrible event that we are facing now.

And so, what Karl Barth found was he couldn't reconcile the way he had been trained. He couldn't reconcile his own theological training with the realities of the world in which he lived. And so in 1919, now notice he's still a pastor.

But in 1919, he came to grips with the Book of Romans. He decided that as a pastor, he was going to teach and write about the Book of Romans. And so, in 1919, he wrote a commentary on Romans.

And by writing that commentary on Romans and preaching from Romans, he was called into question the theology under which he'd been trained. Because he found out it wasn't really a biblical theology. It had no biblical foundation to it.

So, a long story short is about the 1919 commentary on Romans. And what was one of the first commentaries that Calvin wrote? It was his commentary on Romans. When Wesley felt his heart strangely warmed, what was he hearing? He was hearing all about Romans, Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans.

So now we have the same thing happening with Barth. So, there's something about Romans and reading Romans seriously that, I don't know, could change your life, I guess. So go and do likewise.

So read Romans and take it seriously. So, in 1919, he wrote his commentary in the Book of Romans. Now, I think he thought that the commentary would be shared with some of his pastor friends, and that would be the end of it.

I've talked to my pastor friends in the local towns, and we'll talk about this commentary, and we'll discuss Romans. I think he thought that was going to be the end of it. What happened is that it became an explosion in the German-speaking world.

His commentary on Romans became a major event in the German-speaking world because it was written in German. So, people really became really enamored, in a sense, with this book because this book emphasized, we'll see later, and we'll mention later, but this book emphasized, emphasized, emphasized, emphasized, that there is a discontinuity between God and us because of our sinfulness and our rebellion against God. And in his own life, do you need any further evidence of this? Do you need any further evidence of this than what we've just struggled through four years of terrible, terrible, awful war, that there's a discontinuity between the pure

God and the righteous God and sinful human beings? And so, the commentary really became explosive.

I can't underscore what a major event this commentary was on the theological world of his day. Then, it starts to get translated, and so forth. Okay.

What happened in 1921? Another thing about his life and his biography, what happened in 1921, is that Karl Barth left his pastoral ministry and went into university teaching. And there he will be for the rest of his life. So he became a teacher at many different universities, but the one that we are concerned about, I guess, is that he became a teacher at the university in Bonn, Germany.

So, he crosses the border and he goes into Bonn. He went there in 1930. He went to Bonn, Germany, in 1930 and became a university professor of theology there.

All right. And I think he thought probably that's where he's going to spend the rest of his life, at Bonn, Germany. Okay.

However, he couldn't have foreseen an event that happened in 1933 when Hitler came to power and when the Nazis came to power in 1933. Now, this becomes a turning point in Karl Barth's life and will affect him deeply. Now, we're going to show a two-day video on Dietrich Bonhoeffer when we get to Bonhoeffer and start talking about Bonhoeffer because Bonhoeffer was a student of Karl Barth.

We're going to show a two-day video of that, and I like the video because it kind of places Bonhoeffer and would place Barth in that context, in that kind of cultural-political context. But Hitler came to power in 1933 in Germany. Okay.

Now, what we want to take note of is four things that will affect Barth after Hitler comes to power. So, Hitler comes to power. The church struggle begins.

So, there are four things that we want to notice. Okay. Point number one, which is very important, is that he's a Swiss citizen.

He's not a German citizen. So as a Swiss citizen, even under the Nazis, as a Swiss citizen, he enjoys liberties and freedoms, especially freedom of speech, that the Germans did not enjoy, that the Germans didn't have. So that's number one as a Swiss citizen.

There are certain liberties he has. All right. So, you want to take notice of that.

That's going to be important for everything we talk about. Okay. All right.

Number two, the second thing that's very important for Barth. When the Nazis came to power, Barth's political theory was kind of almost a two-kingdom theory. His political theory was to remain neutral to all governmental powers.

In other words, somehow, God providentially, just like he did with the emperor in Rome, God providentially has set up this power, but I'm going to remain neutral about this. I'm not going to have anything to say. This is a matter of secular politics.

I'm in the business of religion and theology. So whatever happens, happens. That was his original kind of view of Hitler and the Nazis.

So, okay. Now later on, however, as Hitler grew in power and as the Nazis grew in power, he felt he could not hold that position any longer. He felt I couldn't hold a position of neutrality anymore.

Now, partly the reason for that is the same reason that Dietrich Bonhoeffer and one of his students would later have, and that is the Nazis; they demonstrate by their actions that God has not put them in that place of leadership so that Hitler is really an un-leader. He's not a leader. He's an un-leader or a non-leader, and the Nazi party has demonstrated that God did not put them into power, but they came into power by an abuse of power and authority and so forth.

So that's the second thing about Barth. While his original political theory was one of neutrality, as the Nazis come into power and as Hitler comes into power, he knows he can't remain neutral anymore. So, we want to take note of that.

A third thing about Barth that we want to take note of is that 1934 he was instrumental in writing a decree, a declaration in 1934. This was called the Barman Declaration. I'll bring it into class and read some sections of it, maybe on Friday, if I think of it.

This was called the Barman Declaration. This was a declaration of what was called the Confessing Church, and just long story short, the Confessing Church was the underground church. The Lutheran Church in Germany had been Nazified, been taken over by the Nazis.

If you were a Lutheran pastor, you had to swear allegiance to Hitler. So, the Lutheran Church had been co-opted. There was starting to be formed an underground church, and it called itself the Confessing Church.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer would be very much part of that Confessing Church as a teacher at their seminaries. So, the Confessing Church, this group of pastors who refused to swear allegiance to Hitler, formed their own confession of faith. The Barman Declaration is kind of like a line in the sand.

Whose side are you going to be on? Are you going to be on the side of God in Christ and the ministry of the pure gospel, or are you going to be on the side of Hitler? What side are you going to be on? So, the Barman Declaration in 1934 became very important, and he is the chief author because he's still living there. Okay, so that's number three. Okay, number four.

Dietrich Karl Barth gets to a place in his life where he refuses to swear an oath of allegiance to Hitler. Hitler demanded that all people swear an oath of allegiance to him, and that included people in the church, and that included professors in universities. Here, he was teaching at Bonn, and he had to swear an oath of allegiance to Hitler.

And Karl Barth decided that I could not do this. Now, if he had been a German, he might have been arrested and ended up in a concentration camp. The only thing that saved him was that he was a Swiss citizen.

So, he was sent back home. He was sent back out of the country. That's what saved his life; he was born in Switzerland and not in Germany.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer lost his life, as we'll see when we talk about Bonhoeffer, but Karl Barth's life was preserved. Now, the question is, so those are the four things under Nazi Germany, and then he goes home. Now, the question is, what did he do when he went home? What happened to him after he left and went home? Okay.

Whoops, sorry. When he goes home, he becomes a professor at Basel University. And that was, let's see, I've got the date here.

That was, let me see, that would have been about 34, 35 or so, he goes home. And then he was a professor at Basel University until he died in 1968. And by the way, it's Basel and not Basil, okay? So it's Barth, not Barth.

It's Basel, not Basil, just in case you want the correct pronunciation for these places. But he goes home and teaches at Basel University. Okay, what happens when he goes to teach at Basel University is that he becomes what we call a public theologian today.

Now, we didn't use that terminology then, but he became a public theologian. He becomes an international public theologian, an international person of international reputation as a theologian. A good example of that is on the cover.

Here it is, Time Magazine. Now, there again, not a religious journal, but Time Magazine put him on their cover and talked about theologian Karl Barth, and their

whole inside story was about Karl Barth. So, it's interesting that the public acknowledged him and acknowledged him as a theologian in this way.

Now, notice the picture in Time Magazine because there's Karl Barth and notice behind him. What do you see there behind him? You see the empty tomb of the resurrected Lord. There's a sense in which liberal Protestantism had closed up that tomb because they didn't believe in a resurrected Lord.

They believed in Jesus, a good man. But what you see behind Barth, I thought this was very ingenious of Time Magazine in terms of what they were going to put on the cover. I thought it was pretty ingenious that they put the empty tomb on the cover of that.

But that is how Barth was recognized. And then what he does, of course, because he had been writing, writing, writing, what he does is he begins writing. In 1932, he began this in Germany, but then he really settled in on it when he got back to Switzerland.

He begins writing the Church Dogmatics. Now, let me just say something about the Church Dogmatics. The original title for this book he was going to call Christian Dogmatics.

But he decided, no, I want this dogmatics to be a dogmatics for the body of Christ. I want this to be for the church. So, I'm going to change the title.

I'm going to talk about Church Dogmatics. All right, now, why is he doing that? He's doing that because he's a good Protestant. And what's the Protestant approach to theology? Is the Protestant approach to theology Depositum Fide? Remember Depositum Fide? Does anybody remember Depositum Fide from about our second day in class? What is depositum fide? Does that come to mind at all? Depositum Fide? Remember that's the Roman Catholic treasure chest, and you put the doctrines in the treasury, and doctrine is like a treasure chest that you've got Depositum Fide.

But the Protestant way is to reinterpret theology for every generation, to re-understand all of theology for every generation. That's the Protestant way. So that was the way of Luther.

That was the way of Calvin. That was the way of Schleiermacher. Now, we may not necessarily agree with the conclusion Schleiermacher came to, but he wanted to re-understand Protestant theology.

Well, Karl Barth comes along. And by the way, one of the titles that was given to Barth, people called him the Second Augustine. And that's not a bad title for Barth

because he produced so much like Augustine did in the 4th century and Barth did in the 20th century.

So, he spends his whole time re-understanding the Christian faith in this church's dogmatics. The night he died, in 1968, he was still writing the church dogmatics. He was on eschatology, so he was almost there but still writing the church dogmatics.

And by his own wife's talking about his death, when she walked in to see him because he didn't come out for coffee when she walked in to see him, he always had, by the way, he had two pictures on his wall, on his study. He had a picture of John Calvin, and he had a picture of Mozart because he was a lover of Mozart. And when his wife would go in in the morning to take him a coffee, she would turn on Mozart because he listened to Mozart.

He was actually a scholar of Mozart. He knew Mozart well and knew the work of Mozart. But anyway, she walked in, and he had died that night.

He had stayed up late at night, still writing in longhand, of course, still writing the church dogmatics, and then he died still writing. But church dogmatics became his major thing in life. Now, this is pretty big.

Let me just give you an indication. Maybe I'll bring in just by way of illustration, but in my PhD program, we had to do Barth's Doctrine of Reconciliation for a course. The Doctrine of Reconciliation is two volumes of dogmatics.

Each volume is about 900 pages. So, the one doctrine is about 1,800 pages or so. That's a lot of writing on one doctrine, wouldn't you say? So the church dogmatics became the great kind of classic, no doubt about that.

So what happened with Barth was that he became the great theologian of the 20th century. In a sense, when we get to his theology, we'll see this. In a sense, what he did was he pushed back the tide of Protestant liberalism.

Protestant liberalism would have gotten a much firmer hold in the 20th century if it hadn't been for Karl Barth. However, Karl Barth stands up to Protestant liberalism, and he pushes it back because he doesn't think that Protestant liberalism is the best expression of Christian theology. So, his theology then becomes very important for developing Protestant theology for the 20th and 21st centuries.

So, we'll pick that up on Friday. Have a good day.

This is Dr. Roger Green in his course on Church History, Reformation to the Present. This is session 19, Roman Catholicism in the 19th and 20th century Protestantism,

Focusing on Karl Barth.