

Introduction

Redemption, Pneumatology, and the Christian Life in Karl Barth

In the mid-1950s, Barth explained to his students the importance of pneumatology as follows:

Today I would speak more of the Holy Spirit. Perhaps I was too cautious. You students should not make that mistake in your polemical writings . . . ! A good theology can be based on any of the three articles of the Creed. You could base it on the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit . . . I personally think that a theology of the Spirit might be all right after AD 2000, but now we are still too close to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.¹

The above quotation not only shows that Barth underlined the significance of pneumatology, but also proposed it as a future possibility for Christian theology. Moreover, one may hardly miss that Barth regarded a Spirit theology as a constructive project through which other theological topics can be assessed and rearranged. These remarks may immediately provoke scholarly skepticism, because Barth's pneumatology has often been regarded as one of his most undeveloped doctrines. At least since the 1920s, when Barth attracted both scholarly and public attention after the publication of *The Epistle to the Romans*, he had come under severe criticism for leaving little room for reflection on the

1. Karl Barth, *Karl Barth's Table Talk*, ed. John D. Godsey (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1963), 27–28.

Spirit in theology.² In this sense, for example, Jenson claims that “long stretches of Barth’s thinking seem rather binitarian than trinitarian.”³

In contrast, I propose, Barth’s seemingly underdeveloped pneumatology mirrors his highly sophisticated, but very suggestive, reflection upon the Spirit against the backdrop of his intellectual, religious, political, and social context. In this respect, this study can be characterized as a constructive approach to Barth’s pneumatology. It will excavate the deeper logic of Barth’s Spirit theology by appropriating his reaction to previous centuries’ thinkers, and by unearthing pneumatological themes in his other doctrines. Moreover, and more importantly, I will deeply engage with Barth’s incomplete doctrine of redemption to find a more proper and comprehensive setting for conceiving of the Spirit’s *ad intra* and *ad extra* act. To do justice to the scope and depth of Barth’s discussion of the Spirit’s redemptive work, my study approaches this much-debated topic by developing my own methodologies and organizing the structure of my argument in a deliberate and specific way. Before moving on to expounding these crucial issues, I will briefly demonstrate the ways in which modern scholars have critically evaluated Barth’s so-called underdeveloped pneumatology. This review will help to identify the core problems that have plagued Barth scholarship and offer guidance in undertaking our own research on this topic.

MODERN RECEPTIONS OF BARTH’S PNEUMATOLOGY: A TYPOLOGY

Those who are familiar with Barth would acknowledge that his pneumatology is one of the most extensive descriptions of the Spirit in Christian history.⁴ However, critics have argued that his christocentric approach eclipses actual reflection on the person and work of the Spirit. Furthermore, his unfinished magisterial *Church Dogmatics* (hereafter *CD*) and the absence of the final volume on pneumatology trigger the question as to whether he had something new to

2. In order to meet this criticism, Barth delivered a lecture on the Spirit in 1929, and this lecture was published under the title of *The Holy Ghost and the Christian Life*. Despite this lecture his critics have constantly argued that Barth did not pay enough attention to the work of the Holy Spirit while underlining the work of Christ. See Karl Barth, *The Holy Ghost and the Christian Life*, trans. R. Hoyle (London: Frederick Muller, 1938). Hereafter *HC*.

3. Robert W. Jenson, “You Wonder Where the Spirit Went,” *Pro Ecclesia* 2 (1993): 296.

4. According to Rogers, Barth wrote more than 2100 pages with “Spirit” in boldface theses in his dogmatics and published more than one book with “Spirit” in the title. See Eugene F. Rogers Jr., “The Eclipse of the Spirit in Karl Barth,” in *Conversing with Barth*, ed. John C. McDowell and Mike Higton (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2004), 173.

say about the Spirit.⁵ In order to investigate these matters in detail, I submit here a fourfold typology of modern critical appropriations of Barth's Spirit theology.

1. DANGERS OF MODALISM AND EVAPORATION OF THE SPIRIT'S
PERSONALITY

One of the most common and severe charges against Barth is that of a modalistic tendency in his doctrine of the Trinity.⁶ Barth resisted using the term “person,” because this term might have implications of modern individualistic, psychological, and idealistic views of personhood. Instead, he opted for the German term *Seinweise*, which was translated as “mode of being” in English.⁷ When “person” was replaced by “mode of being,” it was inevitable that God would be understood as one personal Subject who exists in three modes of revelation—the Revealer as the Father, the revelation as the Son, and the revealedness as the Spirit. Many critics, however, have found that, because the role of revealedness is to unite the Revealer and the revelation, the bond between the two is already implied in their eternal loving relationship as the Father and the Son. In Barth's theology, therefore, the Spirit is superfluous in the Godhead, or, at the very best, can be understood in an impersonal way.⁸

5. Barth's *CD V* (the volume on the Spirit, redemption, and eschatology) was never written, and his volume on reconciliation (*IV*) also remained incomplete. Some critics even speculate that the absence of a volume devoted to eschatology and pneumatology is perhaps a matter of his undeveloped thought on these theological topics. See Colin E. Gunton, *Becoming and Being: The Doctrine of God in Charles Hartshorne and Karl Barth* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), 163; Robert W. Jenson, *God after God: The God of the Past and the God of the Future as Seen in the Work of Karl Barth* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010), 173.

6. See Catherine Mowry LaCugna, *God for Us: The Trinity and Christian Life* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991), 252; Alan J. Torrance, “Trinity,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Karl Barth*, ed. J. B. Webster (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 81; Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Systematic Theology, Vol 1*, trans. Geoffrey William Bromiley (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991), 296; Jürgen Moltmann, *The Trinity and the Kingdom of God: The Doctrine of God*, trans. M. Kohl (London: SCM, 1981), 139, 143; Walter Kasper, *Jesus the Christ*, new paperback ed. (London: Burns & Oates, 1977), 184; Karl Rahner, *The Trinity*, trans. Joseph Donceel (New York: Crossroad, 1997), 109–11.

7. The translators and editors of *CD I/1* confess their difficulty in choosing a proper English word for *Seinweise*. Barth himself preferred “the way of being” to “the mode of being” to avoid any hint of modalism, but they contended that “mode of being” would be a better word to refer back to the Cappadocian *τρόπος ὑπάρξεως* and the *modus entis* of Protestant orthodoxy. Therefore, *Seinweise* was translated into “mode of being.” See, Karl Barth, *CD I/1*

8. Eugene F. Rogers Jr., *After the Spirit: A Constructive Pneumatology from Resources Outside the West* (London: SCM, 2006), 22, 32. See also *CD I/1*, 469.

2. PNEUMATOLOGY'S SUBORDINATION TO CHRISTOLOGY AND LACK OF ESCHATOLOGICAL INSIGHTS

Many critics argue that Barth often confused the role of the Spirit with that of Christ and thus subordinated the Spirit's work in history under Christ's reconciliation in eternity. In Barth's theology, the Spirit's main work is to make it possible for humanity to recognize and to receive Christ's universal reconciliation. In my view, Barth was right when he emphasized the Spirit's *noetic* function, because this epistemological understanding has a deep root in the biblical and the Christian traditions. Moreover, Barth's opposition to the Enlightenment's optimism about human epistemological capacity influences his conception of the Spirit as the sole legitimate source of theological knowledge. However, critics claim that the Spirit's *noetic* function risks being understood as a noetic "addendum" to what Christ already achieved ontically.⁹ Additionally, despite Barth's pioneering attempt to revive eschatology in modern theology,¹⁰ some scholars charge that Barth confines the Spirit's main role to actualizing what has already happened in Christ rather than opening a new future in history.¹¹ Thus in Barth's theology the Spirit's subordination to Christ is arguably connected to Barth's lack of eschatological insights.

3. NO ROOM FOR HUMAN AUTONOMY AND FAITH

Although Barth has been criticized because of his insufficient reflection on the distinctive role of the Spirit, critics also claim that he so emphasized the Spirit's transcendence that there remains little room for human freedom and faith.¹² Barth's opposition to liberal Protestantism, Catholicism, and Christian

9. See Rowan Williams, "Word and Spirit," in *On Christian Theology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), 115; Sarah Coakley, "Why Three? Some Further Reflections on the Origin of the Doctrine of the Trinity," in *The Making and Remaking of Christian Doctrine: Essays in Honour of Maurice Wiles*, ed. Sarah Coakley and David A. Paulin (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993), 33; Michael Welker, *God the Spirit*, trans. John F. Hoffmeyer (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), 44, n. 91; Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Jesus—God and Man*, trans. Lewis L. Wilkins and Duane A. Priebe (London: SCM, 1968), 170.

10. For example, Pannenberg argued that the Spirit was an eschatological reality for primitive Christianity, and this eschatological character of pneumatology had recently been rediscovered by Barth. Wolfhart Pannenberg, *The Apostles' Creed in the Light of Today's Questions*, trans. Margaret Kohl (London: SCM, 1972), 133–35; see also Karl Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 6th ed. trans. Edwyn C. Hoskyns (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), 314. Hereafter *Romans II*.

11. See John Zizioulas, *Communion and Otherness: Further Studies in Personhood and the Church*, ed. Paul McPartlan (London and New York: T. & T. Clark, 2006), 203; Jürgen Moltmann, *The Crucified God: The Cross of Christ as the Foundation and Criticism of Christian Theology*, trans. R. A. Wilson and John Bowden (London: SCM, 1974), 255; Colin E. Gunton, *The Promise of Trinitarian Theology* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991), 126–27.

existentialism made him reject any point of contact between the Creator and the creature in humanity or religion; besides the downward movement of the Spirit, there is no other relation between God and humanity, and in this relation there is no place for the upward reach of a spirit of man/woman.

4. INSUFFICIENT REFLECTIONS ON HISTORY, NATURE, AND THE CHURCH

Some critics contend that another aspect of the Spirit's "totalitarianism"¹³ is Barth's unsatisfactory explanations about the "fields" of the Spirit's work. In other words, he had undeveloped doctrines of history, creation, and the church, in which the Spirit encounters the creature.¹⁴ As people pay more attention to these "earthly" elements in religion rather than supernatural ones nowadays, and as postmodern thinking increasingly invites people to value their spiritual life, there may increasingly be more and sharper criticisms leveled at Barth's notions of history, nature, and the church as regards his arguably deficient pneumatology.

THE DOCTRINE OF REDEMPTION AS THE LOCUS OF PNEUMATOLOGY

In face of these conflicting and contrasting appropriations of Barth, this study aims to show that it is possible to read Barth as offering a robust Spirit theology, in which he attempted to rehabilitate human subjectivity and to facilitate ethics within a wider framework of God's dealing with humanity and human response to God. More specifically, I will pay special attention to Barth's doctrine of redemption (*Erlösung*),¹⁵ where the *Creator Spiritus* constitutes the

12. See Arnold B. Come, *Human Spirit and Holy Spirit* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1959), 86; Frank D. Macchia, "The Spirit of God and the Spirit of Life: An Evangelical Response to Karl Barth's Pneumatology," in *Karl Barth and Evangelical Theology: Convergences and Divergences*, ed. Sung Wook Chung (Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 163–65; Roger Haight, *Jesus, Symbol of God* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1999), 315, n. 2.

13. This controversial term was used by Hendry in order to critique the Reformed tradition's exclusive emphasis on God's grace. See George Stuart Hendry, *The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology* (London: SCM, 1965).

14. See Jürgen Moltmann, *The Church in the Power of the Spirit: A Contribution to Messianic Ecclesiology* (London: SCM, 1977), 209; Jürgen Moltmann, *God in Creation: An Ecological Doctrine of Creation*, trans. Margaret Kohl (London: SCM, 1985), 161–62; Pannenberg, *Jesus*, 171; Rogers Jr., *After the Spirit*, 32; Colin E. Gunton, *The Barth Lectures*, ed. Paul Brazier (London: T. & T. Clark, 2007), 200.

15. In Barth's *CD*, *Erlösung* was translated into the English word "redemption," which often refers to Christ's atonement. Compared to "redemption," the German word *Erlösung* has strong eschatological (and thus pneumatological) implications. Nevertheless, I will utilize the term "redemption" because it has been widely utilized by Barth scholars and because Barth was aware of this English translation. Barth

eschatological existence of human beings as God's children by shaping them as free, responsible, historical, and prayerful agents.

To explore this possibility, I will approach Barth through four fundamental methodological assumptions. They will provide constructive and critical insights into Barth's unfinished doctrine of redemption, thereby distancing my interpretation from those of previous attempts. First, Barth's Spirit theology should be investigated with reference to his fragmentary accounts of redemption. Many critics acknowledge that Barth did not even begin the first page of *CD V*, which would be devoted to the Spirit's redemption. However, they do not draw the logical consequence that any attempt to interpret Barth's overall vision simply on the basis of the completed volumes of *CD* may be distorted, and fails to fully contextualize Barth's accounts of the Father's creation and the Son's reconciliation.¹⁶ It follows that their studies arguably utilize improper categories and perspectives, distilled from other doctrines or from other theologians' work, rather than discovering the deeper structure of Barth's own pneumatology. In contrast, I propose, Barth's Spirit theology should be studied primarily in light of its own logic, concepts, and motifs within the doctrine of redemption, and it is possible to make reasonable conjectures about Barth's vision of the Spirit's redemption on the basis of his earlier and posthumous writings on the topic.

Second, Barth's Spirit theology needs to be examined by highlighting pneumatological themes interwoven into other doctrines. A few years after the third part of his doctrine of reconciliation (*CD IV/3*, 1959–60) was released, Barth was asked whether he would publish more to complete his *CD*. The answer was “*Nein!*” because he himself thought that he had already written “enough,” and he recommended those who were waiting for his new books to read the previous parts.¹⁷ This remark encourages us to explore basic pneumatological themes from what he had already said in other doctrines, including redemption, revelation, the perfections of God, and election.

himself admitted “a certain ambiguity in the term ‘redemption’ and ‘*Erlösung*.’ Neither of them carries the exact meaning of the biblical notion.” See Barth, *Karl Barth's Table Talk*, 53.

16. Among many reviews of Barth's pneumatology, Hunsinger insightfully summarized the incompleteness of Barth's doctrine of redemption and its implication for his pneumatology. See George Hunsinger, “The Mediator of Communion: Karl Barth's Doctrine of the Holy Spirit,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Karl Barth*, ed. John B. Webster (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 177–80; see also Hunsinger quoted in Eugene F. Rogers Jr., “Supplementing Barth on Jews and Gender: Identifying God by Analogy and the Spirit,” *Modern Theology* 14, no. 1 (1998): 59.

17. Karl Barth, *How I Changed My Mind*, ed. John D. Godsey (Edinburgh: Saint Andrew, 1969), 86.

Third, Barth's pneumatology should be examined in relation to his critical response to eighteenth- and nineteenth-century thinkers. Barth understood the previous century's theologians as living figures, who still exerted a continuing influence. Accordingly, he wrote, "There is no past in the Church, so there is no past in theology."¹⁸ Of course, most scholars have assumed that Barth's radical break with his liberal teachers and his critique of their neglect of the deity of the Spirit made him exclusively center on Christology, thereby undermining pneumatology. However, this simplified explanation improperly overlooks the importance of previous centuries' religious thought in constituting Barth's vision of the Spirit's redemption. In contrast, my study will show that Barth's critical, but sympathetic, reading of his predecessors enabled him to develop his own distinctive argument on the Spirit's being and to connect the Spirit's act with the Christian life.

Fourth, I will take seriously two of Barth's fundamental assumptions to the extent that they will determine the basic structure of this book: the content of theology determines the method, not vice versa, and "*Opera trinitatis ad extra indivisa sunt*" (the external works of the Trinity are undivided). On the one hand, for Barth, the priority of the subject matter determines the ordering principle of dogmatics.¹⁹ This is well illustrated in his mature dogmatics, written according to the *opera Dei ad extra*, rather than merely restating the *loci* of Reformed orthodoxy.²⁰ On the other hand, although the Father's work is attributed to creation, the Son's to reconciliation, and the Spirit's to redemption, all three divine modes of being participate together in the divine acts of history.²¹ Accordingly, instead of seeking one dominant pneumatological perspective, I will examine Barth with special attention to his profound sense of the interrelatedness of all Christian doctrines as reflecting the unity of the Trinity's act. In other words, my study will not separate one doctrine or a certain text from others, but organically read "across" and "through" his theology, tracing the underpinning pneumatological ideas.

18. Karl Barth, *Protestant Theology in the Nineteenth Century: Its Background and History*, new ed., trans. John Bowden and Brian Cozens (London: SCM, 2001), 3. Hereafter *PT*.

19. See, for example, *CD I/1*, 367; *CD II/1*, 44.

20. Whereas Barth's first dogmatic cycle, *Göttingen Dogmatics* (hereafter *GD*), mostly follows the *loci* of the Reformed tradition, his mature *Church Dogmatics* is organized according to the being and act of the triune God. About the *GD*'s use of the Reformed order of *loci*, see Daniel L. Migliore, "Karl Barth's First Lectures in Dogmatics: Instruction in the Christian Religion," in *Göttingen Dogmatics: Instruction in the Christian Religion*, ed. Hannelotte Reiffen, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 35.

21. See *CD I/1*, 362, 392, 397.

THE DOCTRINE OF REDEMPTION REVISITED: CREATION'S GROANING
AND THE SPIRIT'S PRAYER

As I have briefly discussed above, the uniqueness of my approach can be found in my intensive engagement with his unfinished doctrine of redemption. Redemption for Barth is human beings' eschatological participation in the triune God, which means that the Creator-creature relationship in the Father's creation and the Judge-sinner relationship in the Son's reconciliation have been transformed into the Father-children relationship.²² My study will bring a refreshing perspective to this widely discussed topic by paying special attention to the link between Barth's doctrine of redemption and his lifelong interest in Paul's Spirit theology. I will further argue that Barth's doctrine of redemption culminates in his discussion of the Spirit's shaping of praying agents, who hear and live in accordance with the divine Word. In addition, my study will show that Barth's deeply suggestive reading of Paul's pneumatology in Romans 8 plays a vital role in constituting these tantalizing reflections on the Spirit's redemptive work and consequent Christian life.

This Pauline text, which has been prized by Douglas Moo as "the inner sanctuary within the cathedral of Christian faith,"²³ has been the basis for rich pneumatological reflections since early Christianity.²⁴ This rich biblical pneumatology shows that, when human beings cry "Father" (Rom. 8:15) in their finiteness, the Spirit mediates between God and them in their prayer. I will demonstrate in the following chapter that Barth's key pneumatological themes are embedded within his exegesis of Romans 8—the Spirit's incorporation of humanity into the intra-divine fellowship, the Spirit's redemptive work in the form of prayer, the Spirit's shaping of human agency, and prayer as the beginning of the Christian life. In order to grasp in a comprehensible manner Barth's subtle and nuanced treatment of the Spirit's prayer for humanity and humankind's responsive prayer in the Spirit, I will coin and utilize the term "pneumatic prayer" and "prayerful pneumatology."

22. Barth often utilized this trinitarian structure during and after his Münster period, as distinctively shown by his lectures on ethics, dogmatics, and pneumatology. Nevertheless, his earlier theology implicitly hints at his trinitarian reflection on creation, reconciliation, and redemption. The next chapter, on redemption, will deal with this issue.

23. Douglas J. Moo, *Romans 1-8* (Chicago: Moody, 1991), 499.

24. See Sarah Coakley, "The Trinity, Prayer and Sexuality," in *Feminism and Theology*, ed. Janet Martin Soskice and Diana Lipton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 262. Rogers argued that this text allows theologians to conceive of the Trinity as "a community of inclusion" and the Spirit as the "entry" into this intra-divine fellowship. See Eugene F. Rogers Jr., *The Holy Spirit: Classic and Contemporary Readings* (Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 44.

The relationship between the two is well illustrated in Barth's swansong, *Evangelical Theology* (1962), which perhaps shows the theologian at the height of his theological maturity, faithfulness to the Word, and spiritual insight. In the lecture on "prayer," especially, the Spirit's redemptive act in and through prayer is concisely articulated as follows: "*Veni, Creator Spiritus*: In his movement from below to above and from above to below, the one Holy Spirit achieves the opening of God for man and the opening of man for God."²⁵ If "pneumatic prayer" refers to the former movement, "prayerful pneumatology" refers to the latter. As the Spirit's movement is inseparably twofold, pneumatic prayer and prayerful pneumatology cannot be isolated from each other. I suggest that the Spirit's prayer and humanity's prayerful participation in it constitute the thrust of Barth's doctrine of redemption.

Some recent scholars observe that in Barth's mature doctrine of reconciliation, especially in his posthumously published lecture fragments *The Christian Life*, the Spirit's redemptive act is interlocked with the Christian life by God's command to pray.²⁶ In my view, this prayerful link is no "last-minute decision," for Barth had scrutinized it since his student days, even considering this topic for his doctoral proposal. Barth could not commence his doctoral research as he left Marburg to take the assistant pastor position in Geneva in 1909. His desire to continue his study, nevertheless, was expressed in his correspondences with his teacher, Wilhelm Herrmann, in 1910, which fragmentarily show what kind of theological issues were in his mind. Barth's own initial proposal on the impact of Jesus' death did not satisfy Herrmann, and thus more plausible and manageable subjects were recommended: (1) mystical elements of religion, (2) Lutheran orthodoxy's dependence on Kantian philosophy of religion, (3) the ideas of religious duty in Protestantism, (4) the idea of individuality in Schleiermacher, (5) Schleiermacher's relation to Kantian ethics, (6) the reemergence of a practical vision of religion by Schleiermacher, (7) Schleiermacher's doctrine of prayer, or (8) the idea of immortality in Christian communion.²⁷

25. Karl Barth, *Evangelical Theology: An Introduction*, trans. Grover Foley (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1963), 169. Hereafter *ET*.

26. See Eberhard Jüngel, "Invocation of God as the Ethical Ground of Christian Action," in *Theological Essays I*, trans. John B. Webster (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1989); John Webster, *Barth's Ethics of Reconciliation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Matthew Boulton, "We Pray by His Mouth": Karl Barth, Erving Goffman, and a Theology of Invocation," *Modern Theology* 17, no. 1 (2001): 67–83; Donald K. McKim, "Karl Barth on the Lord's Prayer," *The Center Journal* 2, no. 1 (1982): 81–99; Nigel Biggar, "Karl Barth's Ethics Revisited," in *Commanding Grace: Studies in Karl Barth's Ethics*, ed. Daniel L. Migliore (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010).

Because the descriptions of these topics are too brief, and because not every letter between Barth and Herrmann during this period is accessible to us, it is difficult to gauge Barth's enthusiasm about these and hard to speculate how he would have developed these initial ideas. Nevertheless, there seem to be common themes behind them. Under the influence of Marburg neo-Kantianism, the young Barth had interest in the Kantian tradition's emphasis upon the practical dimension of religion in general and in Schleiermacher's appropriation of Kantian philosophy of religion in particular.²⁸ Moreover, and more importantly, his teacher was already encouraging him to conceive of prayer as a central practice in and through which the individual's moral orientation is brought into the heart of the Christian faith.

Barth's encounter with Religious Socialism intensified his interest in the ethical dimension of Christianity on the one hand, and eventually led to disagreement with Herrmann's excessive emphasis upon the inner life on the other. The young Barth of the early 1910s, nevertheless, could not yet find his own distinctive voice concerning what the unique nature of the Christian life was, how the integrative role of prayer should be conceived, and by what right his approach could be justified. In an essay written during his ministry in Safenwil, titled "Jesus and the Movement of Social Justice" (1911), for example, he linked the Christian faith with social actions by juxtaposing a Schleiermachean-Herrmannian notion of life-giving power that enters into history through Jesus and Calvin's idea of a city of God on earth, with a twist of his radical appeal to the kingdom of God.²⁹ Interestingly, this essay attempted to fill the inherent gap between "Jesus" and "the movement for social justice" with a Religious Socialist version of pneumatology.³⁰ He critiqued the dematerialized conception of the Spirit in the Christian tradition, which had propelled the development of apolitical readings of Jesus' proclamation. Instead, he suggested that Jesus' Spirit is the social spirit that is constantly instilled within individuals and thus empowers them to transform the material world.

27. Wilhelm Herrmann to Karl Barth, 08.05.1910 (KBA 9310.11) and 08.05.1910 (KBA 9310.12).

Original in Karl Barth Archive.

28. See Eberhard Busch, *Karl Barth: His Life from Letters and Autobiographical Texts*, trans. John Bowden (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 45, 54.

29. About the complex themes embedded in this essay and its importance in the development of Barth's thought, see Bruce L. McCormack, *Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology: Its Genesis and Development, 1909-1936* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 86-92; Timothy Gorringer, *Karl Barth: Against Hegemony* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 30-32; Gary J. Dorrien, *The Barthian Revolt in Modern Theology: Theology without Weapons* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000), 32-36.

30. Karl Barth, "Jesus Christ and the Movement for Social Justice," in *Karl Barth and Radical Politics*, ed. George Hunsinger (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976), 26-29.

Although Barth hereby proposed the Spirit's work as the basis for Christian moral actions, he still needed to clarify further how God's Spirit is connected to Jesus and to the human spirit, and to explain the way in which ethical human agency is constituted by the Spirit. As I will discuss in the next chapter, on redemption, his renewed understanding of the Spirit and his special interest in the importance of prayer allowed him to offer his own comprehensible framework for reflecting on human agency, the Christian life, and the kingdom of God together. In short, Barth's connection of the moral nature of the Christian faith with the practice of prayer within the context of the Spirit's redemptive work had been an underpinning key motif since his student days, although Barth had to clarify, correct, and improve his earlier views as he developed his own distinctive voice and theological method.

PERCEIVING THE REDEEMER'S WORK *AD EXTRA*: THE STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK

After excavating the deep structure of the Spirit's *redemption* in the next chapter (II), I will then revisit Barth's Trinitarian theology in light of pneumatological themes embedded in this incomplete doctrine. I will especially turn to the three comprehensive modes of the Spirit's redemptive work *ad extra*—the calling of human beings into the drama of salvation in *history* (III), the mediation between divine and human logic in *revelation* (IV), and the drawing of the creation into God's self-glorification through *divine beauty* (V).

The chapter on *history* will be devoted to the Spirit's redemptive work in history as presented in his doctrine of election. For Barth, Jesus Christ is both the electing God and the elected human. This statement results in his radical claim that God elects all human beings in Jesus Christ before the creation and, moreover, that history is the drama of unfolding this gracious decision. If the Spirit's redemptive work is not properly considered, however, Barth's Christology in this doctrine can be misconceived as a metaphysical principle, which eventually nullifies the importance of faith and the diversity of humankind, because it only informs us that everyone is under God's gracious election in Christ.³¹ It is the Spirit who makes God's eternal decision "good news" for us in our particular historical situation by calling us through the concrete community into the drama of salvation. In this doctrine, prayer is a

31. Lossky also claimed that without the Spirit's particularizing and individualizing act, Christ is conceived as the universal and general metaphysical principle. See Vladimir Lossky, *In the Image and Likeness of God*, ed. John H. Erickson and Thomas E. Bird (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974), 97–110.

crucial human act of discerning God's plot and playing one's own part in the drama under the direction of the Spirit.

Contrary to claims that Barth reduced the Spirit's work to the subjective or noetic function of revelation, the chapter on *revelation* will show that Barth viewed revelation as God's primary mode of dealing with humanity in history. God remains the subject of revelation, even when positing God's-self in Christ as the object of human knowledge. By drawing men and women into this christologically structured subject-object relationship, the Spirit constitutes them as secondary subjects who hear and speak about the Word, freely exercising their cognitive and linguistic capacities. Here, instead of the intellectual faculty of the autonomous self, prayer is presented as the basis for human acknowledgment of and response to God.

The chapter on *beauty* will examine Barth's doctrine of glory, focusing on the Spirit's interpretation of beauty as the revelatory form of the divine glory. God's beauty subjectively attracts, persuades, and convinces humanity to participate in the objective movement of God's self-glorification. There are two specific reasons why this study highlights God's perfection of glory. First, Barth often stated that his doctrine of redemption would be mainly about eschatology. It is not very well known, however, that he related the eschatological consummation of creation with God's glory in his *Göttingen Dogmatics* (hereafter *GD*), which is the only complete dogmatic cycle he wrote during his entire life. Second, Barth's doctrine of God in *CD II/1* culminates in the section on glory, which ends with all creation's eschatological participation in God's self-glorification. While many studies on Barth's eschatology have paid close attention to the concept of hope or *parousia*, the concept of glory has not been investigated as much. This chapter thus intends to enrich scholarly discussions on Barth's pneumatology and eschatology alike.

It should be noted before moving on to the next chapter that Barth developed and utilized these pneumatological themes, not because they have validity on their own or a capacity for thoroughly covering the whole of the Spirit's act, but because they help to illuminate particular modes of God's engagement with humanity in a comprehensible and integrative manner. The themes of history, revelation, and beauty cannot exhaust the mystery of God's act and its rich theological implications. However, each motif respectively underlines God's coming to us, God's invitation of us to the divine life, and God's self-binding to our creaturely life, thereby constituting a wider background for conceiving of the Spirit's redemptive act. In this light, I will investigate these motifs, not to offer a complete and systematic framework for interpreting Barth's pneumatology, but to perceive the varied ways in

which human participation in the Spirit's redemptive act attest the content of theology—"God with us." In addition, to learn how to recognize these themes can greatly help us see the Spirit's work of shaping, sustaining, and educating a free and responsible human agent in Barth's theology as well as in our Christian life. Instead of treating Barth's ethics as an independent chapter, therefore, I have incorporated into each chapter discussions of how each mode of the Spirit's work constitutes human agency and encourages moral actions.

This methodological decision also means that many other crucial pneumatological topics and texts cannot be explored in this research. Most of all, I regret not being able to discuss ecclesiology due to the limited focus and scope of my research. It is true that the young Barth had somewhat negative attitudes toward the church, but, as Paul Nimmo succinctly articulates, the mature Barth's pneumatology is the doctrine of the *enchurched* Spirit.³² Moreover, because my primary aim is to constructively approach Barth's doctrine of redemption, the mature Barth's deeply rich and extensive treatments of the Spirit, as presented in his doctrine of creation (*CD III*) and reconciliation (*CD IV*), cannot be sufficiently referenced in this piece of writing. Nevertheless, I propose that to study the grammar, logic, and concept of redemption, and to explore their variations within Barth's discussion of God's history, revelation, and beauty, will be a great resource for any further research on his pneumatology.

32. Paul Nimmo, "Barth and the Election-Trinity Debate: A Pneumatological View," in *Trinity and Election in Contemporary Theology*, ed. Michael T. Dempsey (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 178.