

## **An Unscientific Analysis of Perceptions of Karl Barth among Canadian Evangelical Theologians**

**Karl Barth Conference  
Princeton Theological Seminary  
June 25, 2007  
David Guretzki, PhD  
[dguretzki@briercrest.ca](mailto:dguretzki@briercrest.ca)**

I feel very honoured to have been asked to share this after dinner talk with you this evening. Though Dr. Anderson did not assign me a topic, he did suggest that it might be interesting to hear a bit about perceptions of Barth among Canadian evangelicals. Since I am probably one of the minority of Canadian attendees, this seemed to be a good idea and would serve to give a slightly different but related facet to the topic of discussion this week. I'll also do my best to keep it brief!

### **Preliminary Remarks**

When I first heard about the theme of this conference—Karl Barth and American Evangelicals: Friends or Foes?, I was reminded of Gregory Bolich's 1980 book, *Karl Barth and Evangelicalism*<sup>1</sup> and the similar typology used there. On the one hand, there were clearly vocal opponents of Barth in evangelical circles, most notably Van Til's critique of Barth<sup>2</sup> as a "new modernist" and Charles Ryrie's designation of Barthianism as a "theological hoax."<sup>3</sup> I am well aware that even today many evangelicals continue to be certain that Karl Barth is a theological foe to be soundly denounced and firmly

---

<sup>1</sup> For the original "friend/foe" typology, see Gregory Bolich, *Karl Barth & Evangelicalism* (Downers Grove: IVP, 1980), 77-100.

<sup>2</sup> See especially Cornelius Van Til, *The New Modernism: An Appraisal of the Theology of Barth and Brunner* (Nutley, NJ: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1973), See especially Appendix IV, "Karl Barth and Evangelicalism," 457-84.

<sup>3</sup> Charles Caldwell Ryrie, *Neo-orthodoxy: What it is and What it does* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1956), 62.

resisted. On the other hand, I think also of E. J. Carnell's 1962 comment in *Christian Century* that he felt "physical pain" and was "utterly ashamed" of the fundamentalist attacks on Barth and preferred instead to see Barth as an "inconsistent evangelical."<sup>4</sup> Moreover, I think of the work of influential evangelical theologians such as Bernard Ramm and more recently, Donald Bloesch, whose third volume of his dogmatics is dedicated none other than to the memory of Karl Barth & Emil Brunner!<sup>5</sup> Unless American evangelicals have taken up the practice of dedicating books to memory of their foes, I would have to say that Barth is seen, at least by some evangelicals, as much more a friend than foe.

But as helpful as it was at the time to divide evangelicals into the friend or foe camps, the question today is surely more complex than that. And this is true not only here in the United States, but also in my own home country, Canada. So, the question I will seek very briefly to address this evening is, *What are some current perceptions of Barth among Canadian evangelical theologians?* In the short time we have, I obviously could not possibly do justice to the whole spectrum of evangelical theologians in Canada, and so the problem for me became one of how to select representative sample. I will be the first to admit that my method of selection is "unscientific," but nevertheless, I am hopeful that it will provide an informative sketch. I have selected four Canadian theologians who share something in common: all four have served as president of the Canadian Evangelical Theological Association (CETA)—an association similar to the Evangelical Theological Society here in the United States, though admitted much smaller and with not nearly as much press! In selecting these four presidents of CETA, all of whom I know

---

<sup>4</sup> E. J. Carnell, "Barth as Inconsistent Evangelical" *Christian Century*, 23 (June 6, 1962), 713-4..

<sup>5</sup> Bloesch, *Almighty God*, p. 5.

personally, I hope to provide an “unscientific typology” of sorts that represent four distinct perceptions of Karl Barth—four perceptions that better captures the diversity among Canadian evangelicals than perhaps the two-fold typology of “friend or foe.”

### **I. John Stackhouse, Jr.: Barth as “Outsider” to Evangelical Theology**

I begin with Dr. John Stackhouse, Jr., Sangwoo Youtong Chee Professor of Theology and Culture at Regent College, in Vancouver, BC. Stackhouse served as the second president of the Canadian Evangelical Theological Association (hereafter, CETA) from 1991-94. For those unfamiliar with Stackhouse (not to be confused with his distant cousin, *Globe and Mail* journalist John Stackhouse), he is probably best known for his illuminating study of the history of Canadian evangelicalism, originally initiated as a doctoral dissertation completed under Dr. Martin Marty, and later published as one of the most authoritative works on Canadian Evangelicalism in the twentieth century.<sup>6</sup>

Stackhouse has exerted considerable influence in the larger public perception of Canadian evangelicalism. He is often interviewed by national media when they want comment on an “evangelical view” of this or that issue. Beyond this, Stackhouse has often sought to help distinguish Canadian evangelicals their counterparts in the US. As he once said, “Canadian Evangelicals are not just American Evangelicals in toques and skates.”<sup>7</sup>

Stackhouse has not written extensively about Barth so one might wonder why I’ve selected him in my sample. Simply put, Stackhouse represents a significant portion (and

---

<sup>6</sup> John G. Stackhouse, Jr. *Canadian Evangelicalism in the Twentieth Century. An Introduction to its Character* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1993).

<sup>7</sup> John Stackhouse, Jr. “Who’s Afraid of Evangelicals”? *Faith Today*, January/February 2005. And as a footnote, Stackhouse goes on to say, “If you really want to know what Canadian Evangelicals are like, don’t settle for watching religious television. Visit Tyndale University College in Toronto, or Trinity Western University in British Columbia, or Briercrest College and Seminary in Saskatchewan.”

if I were to be brutally honest, perhaps the majority) of Canadian evangelical thinkers who, though aware of Barth, continue to perceive him as an *outsider* to evangelical commitments. In his essay, “Evangelical Theology should be Evangelical,” Stackhouse writes, “trouble lies . . . within the ranks of the theologians . . . nowadays evangelical theologians over here [speaking of Canadians] are enamored with Karl Barth, or over there [speaking of Americans] by his latter-day saints, the postliberals.”<sup>8</sup> Now, Stackhouse’s concern isn’t simply that evangelicals are reading Barth and the post-liberals; unlike many evangelicals who simply avoid reading Barth all together, Stackhouse is a hardy advocate of reading broadly and across the theological spectrum.<sup>9</sup> Rather, he is concerned that the increased attention given to Barth necessarily means that evangelicals are neglecting to read deeply and broadly from within their own tradition. Barth and the post-liberals, he laments, seem to be trumping the Jonathan Edwards, Adolf Schlatters, John Wesleys, George Whitefields, John Stotts and J.I. Packers more closely associated with the evangelical tradition.<sup>10</sup>

To his credit, Stackhouse’s nervousness with Barth has not resulted in his use of the well-worn critiques of Barth, such as the concern about Barth’s doctrine of Scripture—Stackhouse is, fortunately, too careful to make that mistake. Instead, Stackhouse’s perception of Barth as an “outsider” to evangelicalism is because he sees Barth’s theology as being in tension with distinctive evangelical commitments to particular ways of understanding conversion, mission and evangelism. For Stackhouse, evangelism is not simply proclaiming what is already objectively accomplished but

---

<sup>8</sup> John G. Stackhouse, Jr. “Evangelical Theology Should be Evangelical: A Conservative, Radical Proposal,” in *Evangelical Landscapes* (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos, 2002), 161.

<sup>9</sup> See especially John G. Stackhouse, Jr. “Why Johnny Can’t Produce Christian Scholarship,” in *Evangelical Landscapes* (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos, 2002), 141-60.

<sup>10</sup> Stackhouse, “Evangelical Theology,” 162.

unknown to the world. Nor is conversion simply beginning to speak the language of the new world of the Bible over against the language of modernity. Or in other words, evangelicals should be nervous with the attempt, as he understands Barth and the post-liberal program as doing, to subsume the contemporary world into the biblical world because this entails, as Stackhouse puts it, “a denial of sufficient common ground with the world upon which to proclaim the faith.”<sup>11</sup> Since one of Stackhouse’s major interests lies in apologetics,<sup>12</sup>--mainly, apologetics as a lead-up to evangelism and conversion—and since apologetics was rejected by Barth, Stackhouse is thus convinced that Barth stand outside of evangelicalism; he is “outsider,” even if much of his language might sound compatible with evangelical concerns. Or to put it more starkly, Stackhouse seems to believe that Brunner was right, and Barth was wrong. For if Barth is right about the dubiousness of the apologetic venture, then, as Stackhouse puts it, “evangelism becomes deeply problematic.”<sup>13</sup> And in reality, this concern for evangelism and spiritual conversion is still a common reason that many evangelicals, even those who are aware of and read his work, continue to view him as outside the evangelical camp.

## **II. John Vissers – Barth as “Prophet” to the Canadian Evangelical Church**

The next theologian of interest is Dr. John Vissers, Principal of Presbyterian College at McGill University, Montreal. Though I deal with Vissers second, he was actually the founding president of CETA in 1990-91—a position he held while serving as a professor of systematic theology at the Tyndale Seminary, Canada’s largest evangelical seminary located in Toronto. Like Stackhouse, Vissers hasn’t written extensively on

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., 179.

<sup>12</sup> See especially his book, *Humble Apologetics*.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 179.

Barth per se, though I do know that holds him in high regard. I recall how visitors to his office are come face-to-face with the *Church Dogmatics* in their place of honor on the shelf right behind his chair. Furthermore, I do know that Vissers teaches often from and about Barth. Students training for Presbyterian ministry in Montreal are certain to come out of their studies having been exposed to a good dose of Barth.

Recently, Vissers reworked his doctoral dissertation, completed at Toronto School of Theology under the supervision of Dr. David Dempson and Dr. W. James Farris, and released it as *The Neo-orthodox Theology of W. W. Bryden*.<sup>14</sup> Bryden was, as some of you may recall, a professor of theology at Knox College, Toronto, from 1925 until his death in 1952, where he was involved in training those for ministry in the Presbyterian Church in Canada. To give you a sense of the theological stature given to Bryden, it was T. F. Torrance who once remarked, “I can’t help but think that [Bryden] is more like John Calvin than anyone I’ve ever known.”<sup>15</sup>

W. W. Bryden is significant, Vissers notes, because he was “one of the first Canadian theologians to understand the radical challenge Barth’s protest posed for the modern church.”<sup>16</sup> Indeed, Vissers argues, “the story of the reception of Karl Barth’s theology in Canada and neo-orthodoxy’s subsequent influence in Canadian Protestantism . . . is bound up with the life and thought of Walter W. Bryden.”<sup>17</sup> But, Vissers points out, Bryden’s “neo-orthodoxy” was influenced as much, if not more, by Reinhold Niebuhr and Emil Brunner as it was by Bryden’s direct interpretation of Barth; nevertheless, Visser insists that Bryden was the one of first on the continent, working as he did in the mid to

---

<sup>14</sup> John Vissers, *The Neo-Orthodox Theology of W. W. Bryden*. Princeton Theological Monograph Series, 56. (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2006).

<sup>15</sup> As cited by Vissers, *Neo-Orthodox Theology*, 249.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 8.

late 20's, to see Barth's significance for ministry in North America. This isn't to say that Bryden simply echoed Barth and Vissers notes that "he came through to his basic theological position on his own,"<sup>18</sup> which Vissers describes as theology of Word and Spirit in the tradition of Calvin and Barth.<sup>19</sup> In short, Vissers highlights the quintessential role that Bryden had in "work[ing] out the implications of Barthian insights for the Canadian churches in the second quarter of the twentieth century."<sup>20</sup> Thus in Bryden's most important work, *The Christian's Knowledge of God*, he was able to develop a "Trinitarian theology of the Word and a dialectical, christocentric reconstruction of the doctrine of revelation, which he described as the Judging-Saving Word of God."<sup>21</sup>

Vissers historical portrayal of Bryden's life and thought only speaks indirectly of his own perception of the proper place for Karl Barth among Canadian Protestants, and I think I can safely assume, among Canadian evangelicals. But it is clear that Bryden is commended to us because he offers what Vissers calls a "friendly provocation," mainly, that "Barth's theology provides an ongoing witness which Canadian Protestantism, in any age, ignores at its peril."<sup>22</sup> Vissers is convinced that Bryden engaged the theology of Karl Barth because of how it served as a constant reminder that "the Christian community is always in danger of co-opting the revelation of God to justify the church's existence and advanced its own agenda."<sup>23</sup> Consequently, Vissers views Bryden as model of how Canadian Protestants (and certainly, Vissers includes evangelicals under that broad designation) ought to view Barth as a "modern church father, whose thought deserve[s]

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 10.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 266.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., 10.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 15.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 266.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., 267.

ongoing critical and comprehensive engagement.”<sup>24</sup> In summary, then, Vissers perceives the theology of Barth as serving a *prophetic* function to the churches. It is not that Barth’s theology is to be simply replicated without reference to the historical context one finds oneself in. Bryden demonstrated that mere repetition of Barth was insufficient in and of itself—Canadian Barthians need not apply! Rather, Vissers’ desire would be to have Canadian evangelicals listen carefully, critically and comprehensively to Barth because of how he prophetically challenges and sharpens the evangelical heritage. For Vissers, attention to Barth by evangelicals can simultaneously help them to attain to “rigorous, theological thought” without seeing this as a contradiction to a “lively, evangelical piety”<sup>25</sup> that continues to be at the center of evangelical concern.

### **III. Douglas Harink - Barth as a “Bridge” between Biblical and Systematic Guilds**

A third Canadian theologian I wish to comment on is Douglas Harink of Kings University College in Edmonton, Alberta. Harink, too, served the longest term of office for CETA so far from 1998-2003. Harink is probably best known by his influential book entitled *Paul among the Postliberals*<sup>26</sup> published by Brazos Press, 2003, a book which George Lindbeck claimed to have changed his mind on more themes than any other publication since Hans Frei’s *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative*. Prior to that, Harink completed a doctoral dissertation in 1988 from St. Michael’s College, Toronto, on Karl Barth’s critique of Schleiermacher’s theology.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., 266.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 266.

<sup>26</sup> Douglas Harink, *Paul among the Postliberals* (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2003).

<sup>27</sup> Douglas Karel Harink, "Two Ways in Theology: A Critical Analysis of the Central Aspects of Karl Barth's Critique of Friedrich Schleiermacher's Theology." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of St. Michael's College, 1988.

There is, of course, no time to engage the breadth of Harink's book, and many of you are no doubt already well aware of his argument. Though the book is not meant to be a study in Barth, Barth nevertheless plays a significant, and indeed, leading role in the book as the first theologian that Harink engages. To be precise, Harink views Barth's theology, from *Romans* on through to the *Church Dogmatics*, as "an especially thorough outworking of the Pauline theme of 'justification by the faithfulness of Jesus Christ.'"<sup>28</sup> According to Harink, Barth, along with John Howard Yoder and Stanley Hauerwas, is significant because he understood the notion of *pistou Christou* in Paul to referring to "the faith of Christ" rather than as has been long preached from evangelical pulpits, "faith in Christ," the standard translation of the phrase ever since Luther. Beyond this, Harink sees Barth's commentary on *Romans* as being essentially *apocalyptic* in tone, such that "God's faithfulness is revealed in the faithfulness of Jesus Christ; specifically, in the faithfulness of his standing 'among sinners as a sinner,' placing himself under God's judgment."<sup>29</sup> Though Harink does not hesitate to suggest that Barth is of need of criticism at various points in his exegesis, he nevertheless is convinced that Barth has an unusual and powerful ability to "grasp of the logic of Paul's gospel in Barth's commentary." Consequently, Harink asks, "Has any theologian been so decisively seized by the revelation of God in Jesus Christ as to write theology as 'apocalyptic without reserve'—except perhaps Paul himself?"<sup>30</sup>

So much more could be said of Harink's volume, and beyond these very basic comments, I simply commend you to his book. But the question is, What does Harink

---

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., 45.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., 49.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid, 50. The phrase "apocalyptic without reserve is an allusion to Walter Lowe's article: "Prospects for a Postmodern Christian Thought: Apocalyptic without Reserve," *Modern Theology* 15 (1993): 17-24.

perceive to be Barth's significance? Apart from the material content of what Barth has said about Paul in both his earlier and later, I think it is evident that for Harink, the study of Barth represents an important "bridge," or, dare I say, "point of contact" between academic guilds of biblical studies and systematic theology. In important respects, Harink views Barth as a theological model of what it means to allow Pauline logic to become imprinted upon one's own dogmatic account—a dogmatic account which for Barth has a concern for ethics built in to the very structure of the dogmatics itself. In this regard, Harink agrees with Webster that Barth saw "Christian theology/ethics as a matter of developing a 'moral ontology' in which the gospel of Jesus Christ is the all-encompassing and determinative reality and the church is the necessary context for discerning the shape of the Christian life."<sup>31</sup> Furthermore, though there continues to be many tensions between scholars working in biblical and theological guilds, Harink, at least, seems to be convinced that careful attention to Barth can serve both biblical scholars and theologians alike: To biblical scholars, Barth is a model of one who attends to Paul's text not merely as first century records of the religion of early Christianity, but as one who was truly aware of the apocalyptic, otherworldly *theological* nature of the Gospel. And to theologians, Barth serves as a reminder—yet again—that any dogmatic account of the Gospel that does not allow itself to be imprinted by this same Pauline apocalyptic vision of God's revelation in Jesus is itself a dogmatic exercise in missing the very substance of the Gospel itself!

Of course, many evangelicals will bristle (and some already have) at Harink's (along with other "new perspectives" scholars) re-reading of the doctrines of faith and justification against the traditional Protestant view, and in this respect, his appropriation

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., 64.

of Barth may be further evidence he should be avoided in the first place. Whatever the case, it is difficult to deny that at Harink, at least, thinks that a way to bring the biblical and theological guilds back into conversation is to begin again with Barth!

#### **IV. My Own Perception – Barth as “Clarifier” of Theological Tradition**

I conclude my talk this evening by referring you to one more Canadian evangelical theologian who has served as a president of CETA—namely, me! My term of office as president began in 2004 and I am planning to serve one more year until 2008. Of course, in comparison to the previous three, I am obviously the junior scholar, having only one year ago completed my PhD at McGill University. My dissertation entitled, “The Genesis and Systematic Function of the Filioque in Karl Barth’s *Church Dogmatics*” sought to examine both the origins of Barth’s dogmatic commitment to the filioque and how it functioned in his theology, particularly at those points in the *Dogmatics* where Barth made a point of appealing to the filioque in the course of his argument. I obviously cannot lay out for you the full findings of my work here. Rather, I will focus briefly on what it was that I, as one of the younger Canadian evangelical theologians, found particularly intriguing about Barth on the filioque and how that has contributed significantly to my own perceptions of Barth.

My studies on the filioque went back to my seminary days when I first wrote a paper on Augustine’s doctrine of the double procession of the Spirit in a class on the history of early and medieval Christianity. It was then that I was first introduced to the filioque controversy, having never even heard of it before that time, even though I already had an undergraduate degree in theology from an evangelical Bible College. As I expanded my research, I was under the impression that the filioque was a long-forgotten

piece of theological history—at least, that is what my reading of the standard evangelical theologians seemed to indicate. Indeed, most evangelical theologians hardly mention the filioque debate at all, let alone devote any significant space either defending or critiquing it. But after reading Dr. Gerald Bray’s 1983 article on the filioque clause in history and theology,<sup>32</sup> I discovered that in the twentieth century, Karl Barth stood as one of the most important defenders of the filioque among Protestant theologians who, as Bray put it, “clearly thought it was an important element in the fabric of Western trinitarianism.”<sup>33</sup> And so began my decade-long study of the filioque culminating in the doctoral thesis.

Relative to my colleagues above, you will note more obvious resonance to Vissers and Harink than to my friend John Stackhouse when it comes to the matter of Karl Barth and evangelical theology. Without denying Vissers’ and Harink’s perception of the value of Barth for his prophetic and exegetical/theological value, I view Barth as a model of one who was willing to work out, in the most exhaustive fashion possible, the inner systematic coherence of a theological tradition in which he found himself working. Thus, when it came to the issue of the filioque, Barth represents at least one theologian, who, rather than quickly abandoning the filioque under pressure of coming to ecumenical agreement, sought instead to probe the doctrine from within his stance in the long Western filioquist tradition. In this regard, I was intrigued by what Barth said in his September 1923 Emden lecture addressed to the General Assembly of the German Reformed Church.<sup>34</sup> Though many of Barth’s Reformed colleagues were concerned with

---

<sup>32</sup> Gerald Bray, "The *Filioque* Clause in History and Theology." *Tyndale Bulletin* 34 (1983): 91-144.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 96.

<sup>34</sup> Busch, *Karl Barth*, 149.

what was then known as “the coming clash with Rome,” Barth reacted to what he called the “practical unionizing tendencies of the old Reformed churchmen,” and he chastised some of his own Reformed churchmen as those who sought fellowship “as untheologically as possible.”<sup>35</sup> Rather than seeking a way of coming to agreement with Rome on any number of theological issues, Barth was convinced that it was essential to clarify the doctrinal stance of the Reformed church long before any such clash with Rome could yield fruit. As he put it, “[H]ow can we take issue with ‘Rome’ before we have genuinely taken issue with ourselves as to what we non-Roman Christians are, what we represent, and what we desire? Have we today any vigorous community of purpose in distinction to Catholicism?”<sup>36</sup> Years later, Barth had not yet given up in his work of clarifying his own Reformed tradition, as is evidenced in the comment he made in his little book, *Ad Limina Apostolorum*. When he had returned from his meeting in the Vatican in September 1966, he could still say that he was “just as stubbornly evangelical—I would really rather say, evangelical-catholic—as before.”<sup>37</sup>

It was essentially this desire of Barth to clarify his own tradition before seeking doctrinal uniformity that drove me forward in seeking to better understand Barth’s theology of the filioque. Why did he, when so many others were refusing to do so, continue to defend and make use of the filioque, even to the last pages of the *Church Dogmatics*? I think it was because he was convinced that despite the ecumenical pressures to abandon the filioque, there was still something intrinsically important about its inclusion, despite the ecclesiastical politics surrounding its original appearance and

---

<sup>35</sup> Karl Barth, “The Doctrinal Task of the Reformed Churches,” in *The Word of God and the Word of Man* (New York: Harper & Row, 1957), 224.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid.

<sup>37</sup> Karl Barth, *Ad Limina Apostolorum: An Appraisal of Vatican II* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1968), 18.

continued defence. In this regard, I believe Barth rightly understood that one cannot simply excise the filioque from the Western tradition without harm because to do so is to fail to recognize something distinctly important that the tradition perceived about the nature of God as understood from his self-revelation. And yet, when I had completed my thesis, I was convinced that, despite his admittedly incomplete defence of the filioque, Barth could not easily be identified as either a Western or Eastern theologian in regard to the procession of the Spirit and instead has closer affinity to Athanasius than to either the Cappadocians or to Augustine. And so, his persistent and dogged determination to fill out the theology of the filioque actually serves, I believe, to identify crucial points where both East and West have and continue to make dogmatic mistakes in the debate. Rather than trying to synthesize the Eastern and Western positions, or even to seek a *via media*, as has been a common strategy, Barth was content to work out of the theology of filioque in his dogmatics and in so doing, actually better clarifies, in my opinion, the remaining differences that remain between the Eastern and Western traditions. In short, I perceive Barth's defense of the filioque to be theologically significant not because he has understood and critiqued the Eastern position so well (in fact, it is clear that he didn't understand the Eastern position well), but because he sought to show how the filioque is integral to the Western theological doctrine of God.

So, in this regard, I am compelled as an evangelical theologian not simply to defend this or that distinctive doctrine simply because it has been traditionally defended (and here I think of some evangelical theologians *rejection* of Barth's doctrine of election, for example, simply because it is not identical to Calvin's!),<sup>38</sup> but rather to ask the

---

<sup>38</sup> For example, it appears that Sung Wook Chung rejects Barth's doctrine of election primarily because it is innovative and does not adhere to traditional Reformed notions of covenant. See Sung Wook

forward looking question of how this or that doctrine systematically works itself out within the broader scope of our theology, both historically as it has been evidenced in our theology, and constructively as it may work itself out in the other loci of systematic theology. In this respect, I perceive Barth to be a model of what evangelical theology should always aspire to do: not simply to engage in polemical denunciation or critical deconstruction of opposing positions (as evangelical theology has been apt to do) but rather to form a defense of one's own dogmatic position by actually doing dogmatics from within the tradition! (Interestingly, Stackhouse and I might even be able to agree on that point!). Furthermore, as I think of the current evangelical fascination with and loose appropriation of Cappadocian and social trinitarian theologies, I am convinced that we ought not rush too quickly East before we have understood the distinctive pneumatology that the Western filioquist tradition provides. For after all, I am convinced that most evangelical theologians have been implicitly filioquist in their theology even though many have never acknowledged it. Consequently, to appropriate non-filioquist models of God is to fail both to understand our own evangelical heritage and our own position within the Western trinitarian tradition. Karl Barth, in other words, taught me to slow down, to be more patient and to try to clarify difficult dogmatic issues such as the filioque rather than rushing too quickly to jump on theological bandwagons—a tendency which evangelicals have sometimes been apt to do.

---

Chung, "A Bold Innovator: Barth on God and Election" in *Karl Barth and Evangelical Theology: Convergences and Divergences* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006), 60-76.