

Barth on ‘Preaching Toward Truth’¹

Martin Laubscher
University of the Free State

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21827/ijh.6.1.52-67>

Abstract

Karl Barth's doctrine on "Jesus Christ, the True Witness," in Church Dogmatics IV/3, is an extremely rich and complex text which – strangely enough – still awaits proper reception within both systematic theology and homiletics. Therefore, this paper introduces Barth anew to us, and then in essence explores this well-kept secret in Barth's oeuvre. In doing so, it provides a few important keywords which may reveal some deeper truth(s) in Barth's doctrine of reconciliation and the question of preaching toward truth.

Keywords: Barth; preaching; doctrine of reconciliation; truth; Jesus Christ; true witness

1. Seriously, introducing Barth to us?

Is it not a little bit audacious – and perhaps even ironic given the theme of our conference – to assume Barth needs some form of introduction to us? Why start off by setting the tone with such a seemingly false note? Or, why so blunt (pun intended)? Is “introducing Barth”, at such a prestigious society and conference, on a theme like “preaching toward truth”, in Budapest, not like carrying coals to Newcastle? In other words, why commencing with stating the most “obvious” of “events” in the theological/homiletical scholarship of the past century?

I know we “know” Barth, and the apparent “truth” about him concerning preaching the Word as God’s truth to us. For instance, I cannot really recall any classical or recent homiletical textbook which does not reckon with Barth’s influence on doing theology and preaching during the last 100 years.² One of the best examples in this regard – but as we shall see, also

¹ Paper presented at *Societas Homiletica* 14th International Conference, “Preaching toward truth”, Budapest, Hungary, 12–18 August 2022.

² See for instance *Jared E. Alcántara*, *The practices of Christian preaching. Essentials for effective proclamation* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2019), 15, 19, 26; *Sally A. Brown & Luke A. Powery*, *Ways of the Word* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016), 29, 210 (and although Barth is not referenced on p.5 concerning the three dynamic forms of the Word of God, he is the actual representative of what is presented there); *David G. Buttrick*, *Homiletic. Moves and structures* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1987), 18, 32, 148, 225, 249, 258, 340, 358, 374, 412, 417; *Johan Cilliers*, *The living voice of the gospel* (Stellenbosch: Sun Media, 2004), 14, 27, 46–47, 92, 100, 133–134, 148–149, 171, 187, 191; *Jacob D. Meyers*, *Preaching must die! Troubling homiletical theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2017), 2–3, 9, 20–21; *Paul Scott Wilson*, *Setting words on fire. Putting God at the center of the sermon* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2008), 44, 70, 82, 85, 89, 90, 195. In short, this varying presence of Barth via my very selective peek into the subject index of a few homiletical textbooks on my shelf contributes to the point I want to make, namely that we cannot deny Barth’s name and presence within our midst, and yet one wonders how much of him is also present beneath the surface. See also *O.C. Edwards Jr’s*, *A History of preaching* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2004), where Barth is not named

“ironic” – is perhaps still Thomas Long’s (1989) *The Witness of Preaching*. As Long “correctly” (meaning partly) argues his case, Barth’s image of the preacher as “herald” belongs to the first half of the twentieth century.³ Long wants us to believe that we need to move beyond Barth’s herald, and the new homiletic’s images of pastor and storyteller/poet, in order to embrace the need for the preacher as witness.⁴ Long is (partly) correct, if we read and/or assumed Barth’s theology stopped with CD I/1. Stated differently: If we are truly interested in exploring the idea of a (credible) “witness” within homiletics (and truth being on, and taking, the stand), then there are other sides and parts to (the older, later, more matured) Barth I see fit to introduce to the discourse and how the current trajectories and margins are drawn and mapped within our field(s).

But you may ask, what about some other more in-depth homiletical studies that did indeed engage Barth thoroughly since Long’s influential textbook? Surely, they expanded and corrected these apparent “glitches” of the past? There are two works in this regard which deserve to be mentioned. The first, to my mind, is William H Willimon’s (2006) *Conversations with Barth on preaching*.⁵ It is an all-embracing study covering a vast number of interesting subjects. Its strength is however also its weakness as an in-depth conversation on some very specific, and especially the later parts in Barth’s oeuvre, like the structure (read: flow, rationale and argumentation – in short: anatomy) of the doctrine of reconciliation, does not really surface in the discussion.⁶ However, there are, as I shall shortly point to, serious mitigating factors to consider in making these judgments.

within the table of contents (outline) but does surface in the subject register on pp.680-682, and 814; as well as *Thomas G. Long*, A new focus for teaching preaching, in: T.G. Long & L. Tubbs Tisdale (eds.), *Teaching preaching as a Christian practice. A new approach to homiletical pedagogy* (Louisville: WJK, 2008), 3-17, for a good historical overview and summary of preaching’s development through the twentieth century which puts the matter further into perspective.

³ Cf. CD I/1,52. “[God] speaks like a king through the mouth of his herald.”

⁴ *Thomas G. Long*, *The witness of preaching* (Louisville: WJK, 2005), 18-51. These are of course not the only suggestions and developments concerning a particular apt metaphor in discerning the role of the preacher within a particular context – see *Robert Stephen Reid* (ed.), 2010. *Slow of speech and unclean lips: contemporary images of preaching identity* (Eugene: Cascade, 2010), for a discussion on eight other apt metaphors; as well as *Charles L Campbell & Johan Cilliers*, *Preaching fools. The gospel as a rhetoric of folly* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2012) who suggest the metaphors of the preacher as jester, or clown – in short, the fool – who often disrupts time and space in service of grace.

⁵ *William H. Willimon*, *Conversations with Barth on preaching* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2006). However, it is perhaps important to note that Willimon wrote since this work also two other books on Barth’s relevance for preaching by exploring some (other) very specific sections within Barth’s oeuvre for preaching; see *Karl Barth & William H. Willimon*, *The early preaching of Karl Barth. Fourteen sermons with commentary by William H. Willimon* (Louisville: WJK, 2009), that looks into some of Barth’s sermons in Safenwil; and *Willimon*, *How odd of God. Chosen for the curious vocation of preaching* (Louisville: WJK, 2015), that focuses on Barth’s doctrine of election, CD II/2, and its relevance for understanding preaching.

⁶ There are for instance engagements with various parts of the doctrine of reconciliation throughout the text, but the discussion on the main titles (read: offices of Christ in these sections) as such, is not a clearly highlighted subject under discussion. For example, CD IV/3’s title of “Jesus Christ, The True Witness”, which is Barth’s preferred title in reworking the *manus propheticum*, serves us in the subject register with only *one* reference to “truth”; *nothing* on prophetic; and only *seven* references to “witness”. Now I know there are several justifiable

The other study of note is of course Angela Dienhart Hancock's (2013) *Karl Barth's emergency Homiletic 1932-1933 – A summons to prophetic witness at the dawn of the third Reich*. It is a valuable text which amongst others not only corrects David Buttrick's infamous foreword to Barth's *Homiletics*⁷, but also sheds light on another famous phrase of Barth from that particular era, namely "[what we now need to do (meaning, just after Hitler came to power), is] to carry on theology, and only theology, now as previously, and as if nothing happened."⁸ In a context where "[t]he church did not want to be left behind. It needed to be 'relevant' in a way that National Socialism was clearly relevant to many people"⁹, these emergency classes in homiletics – continuing to do theology as if nothing had happened – was theological resistance of the first order.¹⁰

As with the references to Willimon and Long in the above, there are also some reservations to the value of Hancock's study. First, although it helps us to address some of the stray and misleading interpretations and clouds surrounding the reception of Barth's work on key events like how he reacted when Hitler came to power (and how significant preaching's truth was in the face of the 'Big Lie'), there is also a hidden danger in often associating and framing Barth with these turbulent events. Obviously, Hancock and other primary and secondary work help us well not to be let astray in this regard, but I would surely want to argue and guard against framing Barth's prophetic profile merely in terms of these so-called irregular dogmatic

reasons here to consider – like the wider scope of Willimon's study, and the complex interwoven nature of Barth's text – which just adds to push on and dig into these unexplored depths of Barth's reworking of the prophetic office into "Jesus Christ, the true Witness".

⁷ See *David G. Buttrick*, Foreword. In: K. Barth, *Homiletics* (Louisville: WJK, 1991), 9, in which he said, "Perhaps the most disturbing of Barth's polemics is his attack on 'relevance.' For example, he regrets ever having mentioned World War I in his own sermons. 'Pastors,' he wrote, 'would aim their guns beyond the hills of relevance.' While most of us would agree that a nervous, topical preaching based on ever-changing daily headlines may be deplorable, are we willing to tell Allan Boesak or Bishop Tutu to stop referring to *apartheid* in preaching – particularly if we are white Reformed church people?"

⁸ See *Karl Barth*, *Theological existence today! A plea for theological freedom* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1933), 9. The issue for Barth was never whether we should get involved in social political challenges or not, but rather how we are to do this as theologians. *Eberhard Busch*, *Karl Barth. His life from letters and autobiographical texts* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), 225, tells how Barth told the students in the summer of 1933 the following in class: "only quite serious theological work can have any real significance." A for a more recent and very insightful commentary, see *Arne Rasmusson*, *Barth and the Nazi Revolution*. In: G. Hunsinger & K.L. Johnson (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Karl Barth. Volume 2: Barth in Dialogue* (Chichester: Wiley Blackwell), 968, that states: "This statement does not mean churchly or academic isolation or inactivity, but rather the rejection of the euphoria about Nazi seizure of power. What Barth is saying is that theology and church should disregard all claims that a new beginning has occurred or that God has acted. It means proceeding soberly 'as if nothing had happened.' Only Jesus Christ as attested in Scripture is God's revelation."

⁹ *Angela Dienhart Hancock*, *Karl Barth's emergency homiletic 1932-1933. A summons to prophetic witness at the dawn of the third Reich* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 72.

¹⁰ See also *Hancock*, *Karl Barth's emergency homiletic 1932-1933*, 192, and 321, in which she states: "In a time of political narrowness Barth unfurled a homiletic of theological and eschatological breath, one designed to disturb and unsettle the practitioners of a self-confident, instrumental, and 'relevant' homiletic"; and "[the homiletical classroom as] a place of resistance. ... In simplest terms: Preach from the Bible, that is where God's witnesses speak. *Not anywhere else.*"

events. Stated differently: We should be careful to frame the prophetic, and especially Barth's prophetic profile, just – meaning, either merely or even deliberately – in terms of these well-known episodes of crises and catharsis.¹¹ Secondly, following from the above, and perhaps better stated: what Hancock shares with Long and Willimon, is that that all three of them (too) neglect the fact that Barth would go on a few decades later and thoroughly rework the *manus propheticum* within the doctrine of reconciliation and provide us with an extremely rich text and possible response to Bonhoeffer's famous question, namely that Jesus Christ is today, for us, non-other than "the true Witness."¹²

Which me brings me to the mitigant factors for where homiletical scholarship on Barth currently is, because there are real factors to reckon with in whispering my soft critique on some apparent shortcomings in these esteemed colleagues work on Barth and preaching toward truth. What John Webster said a long time ago of this text within Barth's oeuvre is still true today, namely "Given the importance of Barth's reworking of the *munus propheticum* for an understanding of the structure and content of his doctrine of reconciliation, its neglect in Barth scholarship is surprising"¹³; and, adding also, "Like much of Barth's work, what he has to say here has yet to win an audience."¹⁴ It is indeed, in the most recent words of John Drury, "One of the best-kept secrets of the Church Dogmatics is its radical revision of Christ's prophetic office."¹⁵

In sum: What I am trying to say here, by way of an extensive introduction as possible, is that whether we know it or not, even like it or not, we (still) do theology (as well as homiletics) "after Barth".¹⁶ One the one hand there are numerous signs that we not only (think we) know Barth, but also that we are beyond Barth. Stating and pursuing this is not necessarily false or wrong, but we should be very careful – meaning more nuanced and subtle – in how we pronounce and eventually seek/embody being "after Barth". Being "after Barth" (or anyone for

¹¹ See *Martin Laubscher*, *Publieke teologie as profetiese teologie? 'n Kritiese beskouing van die sosio-ekklesiologiese implikasies van die drieërlei amp in die teologie van Karl Barth* (Stellenbosch: Sun Media, 2022), 53–59, 77–126.

¹² Hancock has however started to explore some of these concerns in a recent essay of hers; see *Angela Dienhart Hancock*, *The prophetic agency of and the task of preaching*, in: Edwin Chr. Van Driel (ed.), *What is Jesus Christ doing? God's activity in the life and work of the church* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2020), 270–292. Hancock is right to point out – and trying to address – the following: "There Jesus Christ (in his history) is not only the content of God's self-revealing but is featured as a proclaimer, as a preacher himself. This sounds promising for the task at hand. But Barth doesn't explore the potential implications of his account of the *manus Christi propheticum* for the practice of preaching in any detail. He deals extensively with the broader categories like proclamation and witness, but preaching in particular receives minimal attention. Homiletical use of Barth's description, then, will involve some constructive effort" (272). This is indeed an insightful and constructive reading of the text, but before one tries to fill in these practical gaps in the text, it might be helpful to linger and ponder longer on the title ("the true Witness") within this newly imagined prophetic office and what that might mean for preaching.

¹³ *John B. Webster*, *Barth's moral theology. Human action in Barth's thought* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998), 126.

¹⁴ *Webster*, *Barth's moral theology*, 127.

¹⁵ *John L. Drury*, *Barth on Christ's resurrection*, in: G. Hunsinger & K.L. Johnson (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell companion to Karl Barth. Volume I: Barth and Dogmatics* (Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2020), 168.

¹⁶ *John B. Webster*, *Systematic theology after Barth: Jüngel, Jenson, and Gunton*, in: D.F. Ford & R. Muers (eds.), *The modern theologians. An introduction to Christian theology since 1918* [3rd ed], (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 249.

that matter), does not imply a flat one-dimensional truth/way, but is deliberately ambiguous and ambivalent in being presented here – and, importantly, not necessarily meant to opt in either-or terms, but seeking ways in which the “and-and” (living reception; constant recognition of his influence and shortcomings) may keep the creative tensions and nuances alive. In short, in “Barthian” terms, “after Barth” does by no means imply echoing and replicating (idolizing) or forgetting and burying (ostracizing) Barth. Stated differently: One should carefully differentiate between Barth, Barthians, and non-Barthians because both groups (and especially the former) often irritated and eventually contradicted Barth’s theological motive.¹⁷ Eberhard Busch, Barth’s biographer, states this clearly when he sensitizes students and readers of Barth to not just hear what he says, but probe what lies behind it, and eventually drives and motivates his theology.¹⁸ Or, as Colin Gunton alluded to in his *Barth lectures*, “the older I get the more dissatisfied I become with the details of his work ... but he is a great man to learn to think theologically!”¹⁹ The point is, once one has gone through Barth, you are also trained and empowered to go further, yes even against, the man’s theology. However, despite these two important interpretations of being “after Barth”, there is another (third) constantly needed embodiment of this phrase, meaning in some cases Barth’s work is still awaiting our exploration. The question is not whether we follow or part with part, but rather how well we know Barth (or even actually have really met the man and his work). We are also, I think, confronted by this third sense of being “after Barth” as much of his work is still in front of us; ahead of us; lying dormant, undiscovered and full of potential meaning).²⁰ The Barth-Renaissance is not yet done; in fact, it has only started as there is so much to come. Thus, “after Barth”, into this lacuna, we now need to go.

¹⁷ Cf. *Dirk J. Smit*, Dogmatics after ‘Barth’? South African Challenges, in: Günter Thomas, Rinse H. Reeling Brouwer & Bruce McCormack (eds.), *Dogmatics after Barth – Facing Challenges in Church, Society and Academy* (Leipzig: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2012), 3–14. Smit’s stress here on Barth as actually *our* “Barth” is both meant to be critical and constructive in terms of what we (often also unfortunately) did with Barth’s reception (especially in the South African context). In fact, there are traces of Barth in a variety of different directions and paths, as discussed by *Piet Naudé*, The reception of Karl Barth in South Africa 1960–1990 – selected perspectives, in: H. van der Westhuizen (ed.), *Pathways in theology – ecumenical, African, and reformed* (Stellenbosch: Sun Media, 2015), 267–278. In sum: The heart of what is at stake here, is perhaps well captured in a much-welcomed recent contribution of *Keith Johnson*, The essential Karl Barth. A reader and commentary (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019), 347, which says: “If such a thing as a Barthian tradition exists in Christian theology, then Karl Barth cannot be considered a member of it. The very idea runs against the grain of his life and theology.” Or, perhaps even more to the point, is the insightful words of *Eberhard Busch*, The Great Passion. An Introduction to Karl Barth’s Theology (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 14, which states: “In addressing its temporal context, his theology was more like a needle of compass than a weather vane. Reflecting on the eternal truth of God, it spoke not from the rocking chair but from the trenches of the church militant. It looked at the church’s present status but also looked beyond the horizon at the present of worldwide church history, the history of our Christian forebears.”

¹⁸ “We really first understand Barth’s work only when we do not merely understand his work but what it is that motivates it” in *Busch*, The Great Passion, 40.

¹⁹ *Colin G. Gunton*, The Barth lectures. Transcribed and edited by P.H. Brazier (London: T. & T. Clark, 2007), 10.

²⁰ Cf. *Willie D. Jonker*, Some remarks on the interpretation of Karl Barth, NGTT XXIX(1): 29–40; as well as *John B. Webster*, Barth [2nd ed] (London: Continuum, 2004), 1–2.

2. "In Locarno, I dreamed of a plan ..."

Eberhard Busch provides in his biography on Barth interesting background and context for the origins of Barth's doctrine reconciliation (CD IV/1-3). Barth started with this text in 1951 at the matured age of 65 years old – and would continue with it until a year before his death in 1968. Reminiscent of the classical picture of Barth who sat in the summer of 1916 under the apple tree with Paul's letter to the Romans, busy with his "copy-book" exercise (read: preparing his famous bomb shortly to be thrown unto the playground of the theologians – in the midst of literally hearing the bombs falling in the North from Safenwil)²¹, we hear again from Busch of a very classical-and-romantic setting in which the doctrine of reconciliation would come to the fore: "In Locarno 'I dreamed of a plan. It seemed to go in the right direction. The plan now had to stretch from Christology to ecclesiology together with the relevant ethics. I woke at 2 a.m. and then put it down on paper hastily the next morning.'"²² The outline and structure of what Barth saw that night in his dream, is to say the least, impressive.

According to a few highly respected Barth scholars, this is not only one of the richest texts in Barth's oeuvre, but also one of the greatest theological treasures of the twentieth century. Again, in the profound words of John Webster: "Barth's doctrine of reconciliation is one of a handful of post-Reformational theological works with a clear title to classical status."²³ Or, in another publication, a few years later, Webster describes this text with words like "exquisite piece of theological writing", "his [Barth's] last great literary accomplishment"; "a highly complex text"; and – this is important, because it is still the case today – "what he [Barth] has to say here has yet to win an audience".²⁴

More recently Michael Beintker reiterated the above with the following emphatic description of this hidden theological treasure:

The elaborate architectural design of Barth's doctrine of reconciliation is unrivalled in recent theological history. With conceptual power and coherence, it interleaves the various levels of statement concerning Christology, hamartiology, justification, ecclesiology, pneumatology and ethics, relating each intensively to the work and significance of Jesus Christ. The innovation associated with this endeavour, particularly in the areas of Christology, hamartiology, and the doctrine of justification, are considerable and have not yet received the attention they deserve. In terms of impact, Barth's doctrine of reconciliation still has an important future ahead of it.²⁵

²¹ See *Busch*, Karl Barth. His life from letters and autobiographical texts, 98; *Karl Barth*, The Epistle to the Romans [Translated from the sixth edition] (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), v; and *Frank Jehle*, The young Karl Barth (1986-1921), in: P.D. Jones & P.T. Nimmo (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Karl Barth* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 29.

²² *Busch* (note 21), 377.

²³ *John B. Webster*, Barth's Ethics of Reconciliation (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 80.

²⁴ *Webster* (note 13), 126-127.

²⁵ *Michael Beintker*, Karl Barth, in: P.T. Nimmo & D.A.S. Fergusson (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Reformed Theology* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 192-193.

This is more than enough reason to delve into this text, but even so much more if we consider what Francis Watson has to say about the significant presence of truth in Barth’s work, and especially towards this third section in the doctrine of reconciliation:

A concern with a truth singular, final, comprehensive, and infinitely rich, communicated in and through Jesus the *Word of God*, is everywhere in Barth’s work. No other theologian before or since has focused so relentlessly and untiringly on this truth as the “one thing needful” for *theology, faith* and life. Yet, prior to the final complete volume of the *CD*, the words true or truth barely feature in the chapter headings and introductory theses of this monumental work (§§17, 26, and 27 are the only minor exceptions). It is in CD IV/3, the third part of Barth’s *Doctrine of Reconciliation*, that the word truth comes into its own as it is employed systematically – in conjunction with terms such as *prophet, witness, light, and falsehood* – to bear the weight of the entire argument.²⁶

In short, against this promising background, let me start slowly introducing the basic structure and flow of his thought in volume four of the Church Dogmatics. The best way is probably to get a feel for the following very helpful basic synopsis Paul T Nimmo provides us with:²⁷

Volume	IV/1	IV/2	IV/3
Title	The Lord as Servant	The Servant as Lord	Jesus Christ, the true Witness
Aspect of the Doctrine	Divine grace in Jesus Christ	Human being in Jesus Christ	Jesus Christ the Mediator
Christology	§59: Obedience of the Son of God	§64: Exaltation of the Son of Man	§69: Glory of the Mediator
- Nature	Divine	Human	[union]
- State	Humiliation	Exaltation	[union]
- Office	Priest	King	Prophet
Doctrine of Sin	§60: Pride	§65: Sloth	§70: Falsehood
- Result	Fall	Misery	Condemnation
Soteriology	§61: Justification	§66: Sanctification	§71: Vocation
Work of the Spirit in the church	§62: Gathering of the community	§67: Upbuilding of the community	§72: Sending of the community
Work of the Spirit in the Christian	§63: Faith	§68: Love	§73: Hope

²⁶ Francis Watson, Truth, in: R. Burnett (ed.), *The Westminster Handbook to Karl Barth* (Louisville: WJK, 2013), 216.

²⁷ Paul T. Nimmo, *Barth. A guide for the perplexed* (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), III.

IV/4: Ethics of reconciliation ²⁸	§75: Baptism	§74, 76-78: [Lord's Prayer]	[Lord's Supper]
--	--------------	-----------------------------	-----------------

3. Providing some “keywords” to get into this “dreamwork”

Now there are a few important makers we need to lay down before we can go into (some of) the specifics of Barth's take on “truth” as discussed in IV/3. Stated differently, there are also aspects of this schematic presentation that are hidden (unsaid and between the lines), or in some instances just not heard, seen, in short: missed – and misunderstood by many of Barth's readers.

The aim here is to propose *three keywords* that are not clearly here indicated, and often missed and misunderstood in terms of Barth's work. Barth himself loved to think and work in terms of keywords. Eberhard Busch tells in his “Memories of Karl Barth” how Barth responded to his initial/first round of feedback on the manuscript of IV/4, namely: “It is not enough. There is more to change. Write me some key-words to change”, upon which Busch comments in his reflection as follows:

I think this was the form in which he thought. I don't know if I can generalize about this or not. But it was my experience, and also while he was writing his Dogmatics, that Barth needed others to give him key-words.²⁹

That is exactly what I also want to do. I have three key words a think that may help to see what lies between the lines (and times) of what Barth trying to say here in volume IV. However, before I do that, let me make a few general introductory qualifications in approaching this task at hand. First, as already alluded to earlier, it is important to keep in mind the bigger framework and structure of Barth's thought when one is interested in certain sections of his work. What is generally said and accepted in how to read Barth, is now perhaps most tangible in the doctrine of reconciliation, namely how extremely layered, interwoven and moving Barth's thought is. On the one hand it is this massive consistent argument, and yet on the other hand it continues to surprise and delight as he spirals forth, stating the same thing but differently, “in other words” (pun intended).³⁰ We will surely struggle to get to the truth in what is discussed in this third part (IV/3) if we do not also reckon with what was already shared and discussed in the previous two sections (IV/1-2). This doctrine of reconciliation, or perhaps even doctrine of atonement (read: at-one-ment), deals with one very particular, concrete, single, all-inclusive, moving reality. It does not matter where you look, we always are confronted/served with the whole. Stated differently, Christ is not in sections/parts that can

²⁸ Barth did not finish the *Ethics of Reconciliation* (IV/4) as only the fragment on baptism saw the light before his death, and sections on the Lord's prayer was posthumously published in a separate publication 1981 entitled *The Christian Life*.

²⁹ Eberhard Busch, *Memories of Karl Barth*, in: D.K. McKim (ed.), *How Karl Barth Changed My Mind* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 12.

³⁰ Cf. Dirk J. Smit, *Vir Ernst Conradie: Hoe vertel hulle die storie? Oor Karl Barth*, in: In R.R. Vosloo (ed.), *Remembering Theologians – Doing Theology. Collected Essays 5, 179-189*. Stellenbosch: Sun Press, 2013), 180-183.

be separated (or taken over or be left behind; under or over played/emphasized) – and all three keywords I'll provide will hopefully allude and underline this insight.

Secondly, this summary (schematic presentation) covers a massive amount of literature (content and pages) of Barth's work within the CD as such. Trying to summarize Barth is already a challenge, and thus even more so with such a long text (volume IV is more or less 3 000 pages; more than a third of the CD self) – and especially when we keep in mind Webster's reference to its complex structure and nature. It is extremely difficult to do this in in a few paragraphs. Surely something will be lost in translation. If Barth, who was a fast and productive writer (who often outpaced his readers), took almost two decades crafting this (with the help of Charlotte von Kirchbaum!), then surely trying to summarize this vast number of words over some time, is daunting and even dangerous. Something will be lost in interpretation, but hopefully also gained (by adding how we can go in a loaded sense after Barth).

However, in commenting on this scheme there is also some good news. Firstly, we do not want to merely repeat what he said but go "after Barth" in a playful (creative, critical, and constructive) manner. I say this deliberately, because there is a valid perception that people writing on Barth is boring, and one should be careful not to step into that trap.³¹ Stated differently: Read the man himself (and not just the famous essays, speeches, even sections of his work, but the CD itself to get a more appreciative feel and sensitivity for the flow and structure of his thought/theology); it is so much more rewarding than searching in the ever growing bulk of secondary literature. It is by truly going through Barth that the possibility of being after and beyond Barth becomes real. Secondly, the other good news is also that Barth himself provides us with a telling two (!) introductions to the doctrine of reconciliation (150 pages in total; 70 and 80 respectively)³². These introductions are extremely helpful as they provide us with some important clues in how to image what is envisioned in these broad strokes, makers, keywords, and flow.

The first keyword to unlock much of the inner flow and dynamic in this scheme/structure is "in other words".³³ It looks very familiar, sounds the same, and yet it is quite different from what we used to hear or know. For instance, in essence he speaks and deals with the threefold office of Christ, but he gives them new names and titles. In fact, he lets the pendulum swings between the two – referring still here and there; cryptically; one might even say, gradually – to indicate he is not breaking with tradition but renewing it.³⁴ The *Sach* is still the same, but

³¹ See *Joseph L. Mangina*, Karl Barth. Theologian of Christian witness (Louisville: WJK, 2004), xi.

³² See Paragraph's 57 and 58 in IV/1, 3-78, 79-154; as well as *Adam Neder*, Participation in Christ. An entry in Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics (Louisville: WJK, 2009), 42.

³³ In the Afrikaans language there is a lovely wordplay to illustrate this point in terms of how to spell and pronounce "weer spreek" and "weerspreek". They look and sound so similar, and yet the former (as two words) means to say it again, whilst the latter (as one word) means to contradict oneself. See also something of this resonating in *Christiane Tietz*, Karl Barth. Ein Leben im Widerspruch (München: C.H. Beck, 2018).

³⁴ There are several places in Barth's oeuvre one can refer to in this regard. For instance, Barth may have attracted some attention with his first edition on Romans in 1919, but it is well-known that shortly after its publication he rewrote every single word of that commentary before he went from Safenwil to Gottingen. So too he comments

we need to say it “in other words” anew, in a different way. For as long as we find ourselves living between the times (and lines), we constantly need to discern, articulate, and witness what lies and moves between the lines (and times). Note as well: it is not merely a case of only what he says, “in other words”, but also in *how* and *where* it is said. It is not simply different words, but also re-placed, re-structured, re-framed, yes re-formed (as in reforming). (In homiletical terms, he is not preaching the same sermon twice; these are no timeless, propositional truths! Its “eternal” nature comes to the fore exactly when its “timely” and “temporarily” nature is also to the fore.) For instance, it is quite fascinating to compare his thought here (CD IV/1-3) and what he said in the early twenties in *Gottingen Dogmatics*.³⁵ In fact, this “in other words” approach in doing in theology is even visible in merely comparing what he said in the *two* introductions to the CD IV/1-3, and how it eventually played out. For instance, the initial plan was to speak of the newly imagined prophetic office of Christ in the third lane as “The Guarantor”.³⁶ The point I want to make here is one should be careful in what you see (and not see), and how it is apparently interpreted. Just because it is not the usual “traditional” words, does not mean it is not present (or even said); and that there are of course many nuances and assumptions and implications to what is stated here. Careful in just taking it at face value – there is with texts, and especially with Barth, and particularly this one, so much more to it (in what is *said*, *not* said, and not-said-but-said).³⁷ In sum: what Barth did “in

on his apparent “false start” in 1927’s *Die Christliche Dogmatik im Entwurf* with the famous phrase, “the same thing, but in a different way”. Five years later, the first volume of – and note the title – Church Dogmatics testifies to this enterprise of doing theology “in other words”. Thus, to hear him later articulating the following, comes (ironically) as no surprise: “The focal point and foundation themselves determine that in dogmatics strictly speaking there are not comprehensive views, no final conclusions and results. There is only the investigation and teaching which take place in the act of dogmatic work and which, strictly speaking, must continually begin again at the beginning in every point” (CD I/2, 868). Tellingly this would not be the last time *Karl Barth* would articulate this, because the often-quoted phrase in this regard comes from reiterating this again (“in other words”) during his famous USA-lectures in Evangelical Theology (London: Weidenfeld Goldbacks, 1963) where he said: “His [the theologian’s] only possible procedure every day, in fact every hour, is to begin anew at the beginning. ... In theological science, continuation always means ‘beginning once again at the beginning’” (165).

³⁵ See *Daniel L. Migliore*, Karl Barth’s first lectures in Dogmatics: Instruction in the Christian Religion, in: K. Barth, *The Göttingen Dogmatics: Instruction in the Christian Religion* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), LI.

³⁶ Towards the end of the prospectus in IV/1, during the second introduction (§ 58.4; IV/1, 137), Barth reflects on preferring the title of “Jesus Christ, the Guarantor” above “Jesus Christ, the true Witness”. At this stage the latter sounds to Barth (still) too formal, with the former having a more neutral assurance in proclaiming his work and person. When he eventually got to IV/3 a few years later, he changed his mind without providing specific reasons for it. I think we can assume – without speculating – “the true Witness” is “in other words” also “the Guarantor”, and vice versa. Not only does it bring His living, eventful, and underway character to the fore, but also impacts more in the later derivative description of the Christian community’s sending (assuming its gathering and upbuilding as discussed in IV/1 and IV/2) as a witnessing community.

³⁷ One way of saying what is not (deliberately) said here, is to allude to the *contextual* nature of Barth’s work. Besides being written in no other century than the twentieth, it was also not done in a single afternoon. One of the best studies in this regard, is (still) *Timothy Gorringer*, *Karl Barth – Against hegemony* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

other words” throughout his career, comes here to exceptional fruition.³⁸ What is anticipated, (“in other words”) cannot be predicted, and vice versa. “The true Witness” represents – “in other words” – no (closed) system or formula to bring the doctrine of reconciliation to a close. It ends by bringing (the) Truth to the fore, without Him being at our end/disposal, and/or Him being yet at His end with us.

Secondly, at this stage it might not be extremely clear how much of the above engages the question of “preaching toward truth”. The presence (read: “voice”) of the truth now comes to the fore in the title and synopsis, and yet it is not an obvious give away.³⁹ It is “last” (IV/3) but not the “least” (meaning limited to IV/3), and vice versa.⁴⁰ In saying this, I am consciously and carefully guarding against two temptations, namely to neither over or underplay its presence and significance in Barth’s thought. He goes at great lengths and pains to make this point abundantly clear. There is always a danger in emphasizing something we in fact reduces its scope and meaning.

³⁸ There are of course numerous other examples and episodes one can refer to in this regard. The conflict with Emil Brunner during the East-West drama is a good example of how Barth’s seeming “silence” (in comparison to his earlier “Nein!”) is severely misunderstood by Brunner and many others. However, in this context where we focus on the doctrine of reconciliation and how it appreciates and accentuates the nature of truth, it is perhaps better to stress the shift in emphasis from “*God for us*” (early Barth) into “*God for us*” (later Barth). Still the same, but different emphasis. In fact, Barth is well-aware of this caricature often associated with his theology when he articulates himself as follows: “[T]he formula ‘God everything and man nothing’ as a description of grace is not merely a ‘shocking simplification’ but a complete nonsense. [...] God is indeed everything but only in order that man may not be nothing, in order that he may be His man [...] (IV/1, 89). [...] By the grace of God, therefore, man is not nothing. He is God’s man, He is accepted by God” (IV/1, 90).

³⁹ A few things are of note here. First, in the words of *Bruce L. McCormack*, *Revelation*, in: Richard Burnett (ed.), *The Westminster handbook to Karl Barth* (Louisville: WJK, 2013), 183–187: “The formal structure given to the concept of revelation by Barth in *Rom II* remained unchanged to the end of his life. The material content by means of which that structure was rendered concrete, however, did change – more than once.” Secondly, that God’s revelation consists in God’s self-giving (self-revelation), happens not in the *distinctions* of the threefold Word of God, but rather in their *interrelatedness*; or, even more to the point: *unity-in-differentiation*. The safeguarding of God’s ontological otherness eventually meant that Jesus Christ is not only the content of revelation, but also the proclaimer of Himself. There are numerous phrases in IV/3 to quote here, but perhaps it is good to start with the commentary of *G.W. Bromiley & T.F. Torrance*, from the “Editor’s preface” in IV/3, xi: “Because Jesus Christ, according to Barth’s title, is also ‘the true Witness,’ the atonement is not merely true; it is active truth shining and revealing itself in the world’s darkness and overcoming it. Reconciliation is not closed in upon itself; it moves out and communicates itself, and is the creative source of a reconciled community and a reconciled world.” It does not take long to hear the following from *Barth* in IV/3, 8: “‘For as *it takes place in its perfection*, and with *no need of supplement*, it also *expresses, discloses, mediates and reveals itself*. It is *to be noted that there is not revealed anything different, higher or deeper, any independent truth*. It *expresses, discloses, mediates and reveals itself*, not as a truth, but as *the truth* [...]. It *declares itself as reality*. It *displays itself*. It *proclaims itself*. [...] [I]t *displays and proclaims itself as truth*, and indeed as *the truth*. [...] [T]he fact that in itself it is *not merely real but true*, the truth, and that as such it is *not dark and dumb but perspicuous and vocal... independent of our actual reception*, being the sovereign basis of all reception and *therefore conditioning our reception but not conditioned by it*” [emphasis – author].

⁴⁰ The crucial issue here is threefold *simultaneous* movement of the one Word of God at work in the doctrine of reconciliation. The proposal of the third keyword will elaborate more on this.

One way to describe this is by tinkering with the spelling and pronunciation of the Afrikaans word “vanselfsprekend” (obvious) into “van-Sélf-*sprekend*” (of-His-voice). Or let me try state it like this: the Word, for Barth, is now not merely an “event”, but an e-*vent* which e-*vents* itself. Reconciliation and revelation cannot be separated; they go hand in hand, and vice versa. God reveals Godself, meaning God will also continue to make known (witness as the true Witness) what He did (read: actualized) in Christ’s cross and resurrection. This is never becoming “obvious” (“vanselfsprekend”) to us but continues to be miraculously “of-His-voice” (van-Sélf-*sprekend*) to us (and the whole world).

God reveals Godself, without letting go of being God for us. Or, in revealing Himself to us, it is revelation in this threefold form, witnessing to the fact that it is not finished and done; it is revelation in its hiddenness; meaning the truth is God’s, and truth remains – begins and ends – with Him; yes, we share and participate with Him/His-story (read: called to witness), deeper towards and into it, but it never becomes our possession, something we can claim, take over, control, manipulate, brand and sell as we like.

In fact, in the discussion on the sin of falsehood in IV/3 (§ 70.2), he shows how this is a particular sin of Christendom. Whereas pride and sloth are universal, the lie often manifests within our own ranks. The lie by which we are tempted is not positioning itself over and against the truth, but rather very sophisticatedly tries to mimic and replicate and replace the Truth itself with itself being the truth. The lie, in this case, does not manifest in the open clear-cut denial of truth, but rather tries to be very close it. There are numerous sections I can quote here, for instance:

“He does not question the truth. He does not oppose to it any antithesis. He does not persecute it. Nor does He ignore it. [...] In his real enterprise he kisses his Master as Judas did in Getsemane. He is not against the truth, but with it, and for it [...] He sets up a theoretical and practical system of the truth. He forms parties in favour of the truth. He establishes fronts on behalf of the truth. He found schools and academies of truth. He celebrates days and even whole weeks of truth. He organises formal campaigns for truth” (IV/3, 436).

In other words, it is about this creative/unbearable tension between “vanselfsprekend” and “Van-Sélf-*sprekend*.” They are close, and yet worlds apart – and Christians, especially preachers/listeners, are finding themselves in this space/spotlight. Besides the temptation of taking it over and trying to replicate and mimic it, we can also betray the truth by hiding in it. Being in the truth does not imply withdrawing into the truth, meaning trying to stop its movement or direction (referring also to the third keyword I’ll shortly share). The moment we think we have the truth, is also exactly the moment when we betray it, and our witness to Him goes “vanselfsprekend”/obviously astray.

Another way to explore and qualify what is meant in the above is to point to the spelling and various nuances a word like “history” plays in Barth’s thought. One of Barth’s other great points (keywords) is that “*His*-story” is our history (and not the other way around). There are numerous references/quotations from the text in this regard, for example:

To put it in the simplest way, what unites God and us men is that He does not will to be God without us, that He creates us rather to share with us and therefore with our being and life and act His own incomparable being and life and act, *that He does not allow His history to be His and ours ours, but ceases them to take place as a common history*" (IV/1, 7)[emphasis – author].⁴¹

Moreover, this "His-story" of Jesus Christ is told in a threefold triadic form. The function of the true witness (prophetic office) is to make known to the world how this "huilsgeschiedenis" (history of suffering) have been met in the telling of the "heilsgeschiedenis" (history of salvation). In short: "His-story" reveals (speak the truth) of a history that is both "huil-" and "heilsgeschiedenis"; the depths and heights, Christology will reveal both hamartiology and soteriology.

As the Reconciler He speaks and witness (reveal) Himself to us and the world (whether we know, do or like this, or not). It starts throughout with Christology, and that will determine the pace, tempo, rhythm throughout. Christ is His own true witness and continues to speak for Himself. Obviously, He wants us to participate within Him doing so (see the sending of the community – *Missio Dei*; or even better put: *Missio Trinitatis*), in fact He claims and calls us (see the *gratia triplex* in not only referring to justification and sanctification, but also calling/vocation as this threefold form of grace [soteriology] is gifted to us) to follow Him in doing so. Christian witness is determined and destined – "bestem" and "be-stem" (meaning literally: destined and be-voiced) – by the true Witness; it derives from Him, and it points/witness to Him. It begins and ends, starts and finishes, with Him, through Word and Spirt, assuming by no means that we are excluded in this process. We are included to be excited – or we are "gaande", even "algaande gaande" (meaning: "ever excited", "out-going", and "going") in witnessing to the truth.

He is the pledge of it in that in His existence He confirms and maintains and reveals it as an authentic witness – attesting Himself, in that its fulfilment is present and shines out and avails and is effective in Him. [...] Jesus Christ is the actuality of the atonement, and as such the truth of it which speaks for itself. [...] He is that truth, and therefore it speaks for itself in Him. It is not in us. We cannot produce it of ourselves. We cannot of ourselves attest it to ourselves or to others. But it encounters us majestically in Him. [...] It is He, and therefore the actuality of our atonement, who stands before us. It is to Him, and therefore to the revelation of this actuality, that we move. [...] He is the Word of God by which He calls us in this relationship and therefore calls us to Him and therefore to ourselves (IV/1, 136- 137).

⁴¹ Or, alternatively: "Hence it is better to abandon the term 'dialectic' and to replace it quite simply by that of history. In itself and as such the Word of God is historical. It takes place in glory, but also in conflict with the opposition and contradiction of the world before it is heard in the world and there is converse between God and man. It is because the biblical witnesses receive and must attest in its own historical concreteness that they must understand and address the existence of the men to whom they speak, not dialectically, but in the historical concreteness corresponding to that of the Word of God itself, so that they are to be both those who already know and those who do not yet know, and their existence is regarded as existence in this antithesis, existence on the way characterised by this antithesis" (IV/3,195-196).

Given the limited space and time available, it is not possible to elaborate/labor much longer all that is at stake here. In short, what He did “previously” (meaning not just yesterday, but also today and tomorrow), He constantly makes known to us in the here and now. It is in this sense that He is the truth/Truth – the *true* Witness, and the true *Witness*. It is crucial to note that what is revealed is true of yesterday, today, and tomorrow. For us, and perhaps especially for us as preachers, this is not to become “vanselfsprekend” (obvious), but rather the “van-Sélf-sprekende” (of-His-voice) actuality of who He is and what He did/does (read: continues to witness to the world). He provides the sound to the words: He not only accomplished His word/work, but confirms, maintains, and reveals it as being true to itself – true to Word, true to the world.

The third keyword to unlock and describe more of the movement (logic and flow) within our synopsis is the spelling of “gebeure” (event) as “ge-beur-e” or (the Word/Truth that) “gebeur”. Whereas the previous point was to highlight how He vents Himself in the event, it now wants to show how He also pushes forward and moves through time and history – (often) against the stream – towards His end/telos. As Barth states in his introduction to volume IV, the doctrine of reconciliation “is not a state, but an event” (IV/1, 6) – and thus consisting of some very dynamic and actual threefold movement(s). Whereas the movement in IV/1 (priestly office: The Lord as Servant) is clearly from the top to the bottom (above to below/beneath; downwards; from heaven to earth), and in IV/2 (kingly office: The Servant as Lord) is clearly from below to the top (from beneath to above; from earth to heaven), then the tricky question becomes “what is the assumed movement in IV/3”? Is just a case of seeing these two simultaneous movements together as one, or is there indeed something else here to take note of? It is indeed the case of the latter. This “His-story” has not only been actualized, but is also moves (push, goes, witness) to make Himself known – true – for the world. Whereas the arrow points downwards in IV/1 (↓), and upwards in IV/2 (↑), it now points forward (→) in IV/3. Stated differently, the point here is not merely to collapse the first two perspective movements into each other and portray the third perspective as simultaneous movement (↕), because not only is it crucial to hear and stick to the simultaneity in all three discussions (IV/1–3), but also that the third (prophetic office: the true witness) is not merely repeating it (or stuck with it; or still about it), but He is revealing it by pulling and pushing it through to the bitter-sweet end (making it known and true Himself).⁴² It is to recall and elaborate more on a previous thought, namely the “voorafgaande is algaande gaande” (in other words, what precedes is going, ongoing, outgoing). It is now indeed about the (theological) teleological determination of what happened and is actual in Jesus Christ (IV/1, 108)⁴³. Thus, the truth of Christ reconciling the

⁴² Interpretations who, to my mind, get the sense and eventual portrayal of movement and direction by “Jesus Christ, the true Witness” (IV/3) wrong, can for instance be found in the following works: *Colin Gunton*, *The Barth lectures* (London: T & T Clark, 2007), 148; *Adam Johnson*, *The Servant Lord: A word of caution regarding the munus triplex in Karl Barth's theology*, in: *SJT* (2012) 65(2): 159–173; and *Michael Weinrich*, *Karl Barth. Leben – Werk – Wirkung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019), 363.

⁴³ “God’s judgment and direction, and therefore man’s justification and sanctification, and therefore faith and love do not embrace the whole of that act of atonement accomplished and revealed in Jesus Christ which constitutes the being of man, and therefore they do not embrace the whole of the specifically Christian being

world to Himself does not (only) belong to somewhere in history (yesterday), but is also our history (today), and will also be our history tomorrow.

Another note here on the reading of the doctrine of reconciliation could also be noted. We should not only read it as one obviously read it, meaning from start to finish; or from the beginning to the end; or that following the linear/chronological path by turning page for page – but also simultaneously across. Stated differently, the movement and flow here are not merely on the vertical axe, but also (actual and happening simultaneously) on the horizontal axe. This is the case in all three parts – and whereas the emphasis is on the movement on the vertical axe in IV/1-2, it is in IV/3 showing how “His-story” moves through time (history) on the horizontal axe. In IV/1-2 He makes (recreates) history (“His-story”), and in IV/3 it shows how He continues to make this known and true (by Himself, but by His grace including us to participate in His witness) through the ages [...] till His end.

The Mediator, the True Witness, is a moving center we enter, often against the grain, stream up, against hegemony, liberating (and not merely free) theology/homiletics. In each of the three parts we are dealing with the one Word of God, but in each case “in other words” with a different nuance and direction – and the function of the prophetic office, or the role of the *true* Witness, is to reveal this not as “vanselfsprekend” (obvious) but “van-Sélf-*sprekend*” (our Master’s voice), and pushing deeper into the future direction of God’s His-story whom reconciled the world to Himself.⁴⁴

established and formed by the knowledge of Jesus Christ. In our presentation so far there is lacking any consideration of what we might call the teleological determination of the being of man and the Christian in Jesus Christ” (IV/1, 108).

⁴⁴ As an afterthought one might still wonder about (elaborating more on) the homiletical relevance and resonance of Barth’s text and these three proposed keywords for our conference theme. If I compare this with Johan Cilliers work, the connections are clear to see. Concerning the issue of preaching toward truth that constantly begs to be said “in other words”, see *Johan Cilliers*, *Timing grace. Reflections on the temporality of preaching* (Stellenbosch: Sun Media, 2019). Some key insights from this text are the following: “Preaching might sound even spectacular or popular ... but it could still be false. The right content, delivered to the ‘right’ people, but it does not fit into the ‘right’ time. Indeed, preaching might sound ‘correct’, but still be ‘wrong’; in fact, it can be ‘so’ correct, that it is ‘so’ wrong ... The what, whom, and when in preaching need to be in sync, and perhaps timing (the when) is the most important ‘homiletical synchroniser’” (23); “Preachers have the calling to pre-sense the Presence of the moving God in the present, in the ‘now’ – knowing all the time (!) that they cannot fast-freeze this God according to a patented image” (58). Regarding this discussion on differentiating between “vanselfsprekend” (obvious) and “van-Sélf-*sprekend*” (of-His-voice), see *Johan Cilliers*, *The living voice of the Gospel. Revisiting the basic principles of preaching* (Stellenbosch: Sun Media, 2004), 22-37, 38-87, 18-223. Cilliers working definition for preaching is “Preaching takes place when God’s voice is heard through the voice of the text, in the voice of the time (congregational context), through the (unique) voice of the preacher. When these four voices become one voice, then the sermon is indeed *viva vox evangelii*” (32). These four living voices are then separately discussed in four chapters, and to my mind it is always remarkable that he does not start but end with the voice of the preacher. The latter is derivative from the former, and not (necessarily) the other way around. God’s voice determines whether the preacher as a voice or not. My voice as preacher is not something I’ll use, but rather receive and discover in Him. Thirdly, regarding the “event” (“*ge-beur-e*”) which pushes forward deeper into this life and world, the “disruptive” and space-creating-element in Cilliers’ thought, immediately comes to mind. See *Johan Cilliers*, *A space for grace. Towards an Aesthetics of preaching* (Stellenbosch: Sun Media, 2016). Insightful formulations from this text are for instance, “God’s ‘presence’ is not set in stone, not cast in concrete, not

Dr. Martin Laubscher is Senior Lecturer at the Department of Practical and Missional Theology at the University of the Free State, South Africa.

immortalized in marble; rather, it is epitomized in fluidity and movement, revealed in flux and flow" (18); and "This space cannot and should not be fixated and monumentalized. ... [T]he empty tomb of Christ is the greatest statue of history! The movement of Christ from death to life transforms all statues into stones that are rolled away from their fixed places. The resurrected Christ now moves through life" (21). In short, some clear connections between the two of them to explore further in another study.