

**A REFORMED DOCTRINE OF SANCTIFICATION FOR THE  
KOREAN CONTEXT**

by

Rev. Joseph Chang Hyung Yoo

In fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

**PHILOSOPHIAE DOCTOR**

A thesis submitted to the Department of Dogmatics and Christian Ethics

In the Faculty of Theology

University of Pretoria, South Africa

Supervisor: Prof. C J Wethmar

February 2007

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

When I planned and began to pray in South Korea to study in South Africa, I did not have confidence that I could finish this study successfully. After long prayer, I knew that this study plan was allowed in heaven and came to this land with courage. Without the help of Missionary Jin-Ho Park, I perhaps would not have come here. At the beginning of research, I was depressed because I did not decide the department to study and the topic of my doctoral thesis and faced serious financial difficulty. This disorder was so serious so as to consider going home. Overcoming the conflict was due to the encouragement and help of several pastors in Korea, who are Jae-Ho Kim, Sung-Cheon Kim, Yoon-Hwan Nam, Byung-Ki Paik, Dong-Soo Sim, and my faithful friend, Sung-Eun Lee, In-Tae Hwang, and a faithful deacon, Doo-Chul Lee. Especially, pastor Jeong-Ho Lee at Cheon-Ahn Presbyterian Church came to South Africa on a visit to mission field and encouraged us to a great extent. I am grateful to him for his own delivering *Kirchliche Dogmatik* to me from Germany and paying for it. It was also very encouraging that I won a scholarship to the University of Pretoria in 2005. I am truly grateful to the University.

The time I progressed in this study was from 2004, when we began to provide bread and cool drinks for homeless people, worshipping God with them in English. Although we are never rich, we did our best to financially help them register at Mabozwane Security Training College or at the waiter training college. In 1991 God promised me to open the door to theology, if I make an effort to pray and relieve the poor. Since I obeyed God's word, this study progressed marvellously. And all finance for study and ministry were provided by God's grace. Accordingly, the one to whom I am really grateful is God.

My supervisor, C J Wethmar, who is an excellent reformed theologian, is very kind to me. Although he was very busy, he directed me to finish my doctoral thesis and prayed for me whenever I was anxious. Professor Chul-Won Suh gave me advice and encouragement many times through his emails. Many companions at UP stimulated me in various ways. I am grateful to In-Chul Shin, Myung Suk-Sim, Hyuk-Jung Kwon, Chun-Sub Bae, Kyung-Hwan Oh, Jong Hun Lee, Ho-Keun Liu, Kyeong-Sun Choi for their encouragements. Especially, Sang-Ung Lee sent me good material from South Korea. Also, Josephin and Anamarie helped me find books and articles necessary for my research. Marius, Laurence, and F.S. Malan edited my thesis faithfully.

Finally, I thank my wife, Jeong-Keun Lee for her prudent care and working for finance, my mother for her prayer and encouragement, Soon-Duk, my sister for sending necessary articles, my late father, Byung-Mo Yoo for his raising me in spite of many difficulties, and Hyun-Kyoung and Kyoung-Ah for their help.

## ABSTRACT

In this thesis I analysed and criticised and compared the doctrines of sanctification in Calvin, Wesley and Barth with one another, and applied the results which were obtained by this study to the Korean context from the perspective of sanctification.

Chapter 2 deals with Calvin's doctrine of sanctification. For Calvin, sanctification is roughly identified with conversion, repentance, and regeneration (Wileman 1998: 15; CO 39, 644). Regeneration is "a restoration of the image of God in them" (CO 23, 26). Human dominion is not included in the image of God (*Inst.* 1.15.3). Predestination does not abolish human responsibility (cf. Brümmer 1994: 452) but enhances human efforts for sanctification (*Inst.* 1.17.3). Sanctification is invisible but can be visible (CO 45, 568; 50:255). Both instantaneousness (Wilcox 1997: 121; CO 43, 345) and gradualness (*Inst.* 3.3.9) were emphasised. The Gospel is superior to the Law in repentance (Calvin 1999: 281). The Ten Commandments are the central means for sanctification. Predestination results in sanctification because its aim is sanctification (CO 49, 308). Good works are called fruits of sanctification (CO 45:118). The sphere of sanctification is the whole realms of man (Koedyker 1981:74).

Chapter 3 treats Wesley's doctrine of sanctification. Sanctification is "an entire deliverance from sin, a restoration of the whole image of God, the loving God with all our heart, soul, and strength" (*Works* 12, 415). The role of the Spirit is to establish our faith, and perfect our obedience, by illumination and rectification (*Works* 9, 149). The human role is to diligently use the means of sanctification like works of piety and mercy. Sanctification is factual and subjective change by the Spirit rather than a forensic declaration by God due to the imputation of the righteousness of Christ (*Works* 1, 642-43). Man's holiness is generally gradual, while justification and entire sanctification happen in a moment, by faith (*Works* 3,123; Cox 1959:155). Perfection is our complete obedience to the known laws of God. As it is a relative perfection (*Works* 6, 413), it is possible in this world (*Works* 12, 398). The Law is superior to the Gospel to lead sinners to repent (*Works* 5, 449). The Sermon on the Mount is the central standard for sanctification. Unbelievers can participate in the Lord's Supper for conversion. Regeneration is the beginning of sanctification (*Works* 1, 225). Sanctification comes prior to final justification, while repentance is antecedent to initial justification (*Works* 8, 50-51). Assurance is founded on the witnesses of both the Spirit and our spirit (*Works* 6, 205), which are quite subjective in contrast to the Word and Sacraments (Williams 1960:203). Election is conditional, not unconditional. Good works are only conditionally necessary, while faith is "*immediately and directly necessary*" for sanctification (*Works* 6, 52; *Works* 3, 13). Social reformation comes through individual transformation (Guy 1988: 116; Edwin 1984: 179).

In Chapter 4, it was seen that Barth did not view original sin as Adam's fall historically, but simply as the reflection of the present sinful state of humans (Barth 1955: 557, 566). The image of God in man is "co-humanity in community," which was shown in Christ's character and life (Green 1989:33). Sanctification is to liberate our beings to be Christians by His vocation (Barth 1965: 652). There is no humanly independent role in sanctification, as man only responds to the initiative of God. Barth admitted the historicity and visibility of sanctification (Barth 1958: 556, 529) while describing the trans-historical and invisibility (Barth 1958: 553). *De jure* sanctification means that the sanctification of the entire humankind has been effectively and authoritatively accomplished in the whole life of Jesus (Barth 1958: 278). *De facto* sanctification signifies our participation in the sanctification of Christ (Barth 1958: 363-373). Perfection means that we are once and for all (ἐφάπαξ) sanctified in Jesus Christ (Barth 1956: 224). Imperfection means that sanctification is just commencing, "not in any sense complete" (Barth 1965: 673). The main means of sanctification is not the Bible (Barth 1957: 675) but the command of God given by the Spirit (Barth 1957: 772). Baptism and the Lord's Supper and prayer are God's gift rather than the means of sanctification (Barth 1961-68/1981: 96; 1969: 128), while "education, right (the law), and custom" are the instruments of sanctification (Barth 1928-29/1981: 363). And faith is sanctification itself rather than a means (Barth 1957: 773). All men are already elected in Jesus and should live a sanctified life as the elected (Barth 1942: 354). Christianity is "a social religion, a religion of solidarity" (Barth 1911/1976). Barth seems to have a proclivity to socialism rather than American capitalism of the day (Barth 1966:47).

Chapter 5 copes with the problems of the Korean context and presents a reformed doctrine of sanctification. It is necessary to maintain the balance between God's grace and human responsibility for sanctification, between antinomianism and legalism, between instantaneousness and gradualness, and between spirituality and rationality. For individual sanctification, the motive of life to bring glory to God by a sanctified life (Lucien 1974: 175-76), a simple and moderate life (Hong 2000: 196), committing self-anxiety to the lord in faith (Mt. 6:25-34), making disciples rather than indiscreet quantitative growth need to be stressed. For social sanctification, the stewardship of community and environment (Lk 12: 42ff.), social order and authority, Christian participation in social justice, creating Korean Christian culture (Grayson 2002:169) need to be emphasised. For the sanctification of the Korean church, preserving the basic truth of the Bible is suggested (Park 1998:304), together with the purification of church doctrines, self-denial for unity and cooperation, harmony between institutionalism and individualism (Daly 1981: 52-55), caution against Minjung theology (Lee 2001: 236), checking of Pentecostalism (Jung 1996:532), and the abolition of syncretistic elements.

## **KEY WORDS**

**Sanctification**

**The image of God**

**Grace**

**Human responsibility**

**Gradualness and instantaneousness**

**Perfection and imperfection**

**Objective aspect and subjective aspect**

**Social sanctification**

**Spiritualism**

**Legalism**

## ABBREVIATION

- Analectics*----- Confucius, *The Analectics*, D. C. Lau, tr. (London: Penguin Book, 1979).
- AS*----- *Against the Stream: Shorter Post-War Writings 1946-52* (London: SCM Press, 1954),
- BAT*-----E. Busch, *Karl Barth: His life from letters and autobiographical texts* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1976).
- BJMS*-----K. Barth, “Jesus Christ and the Movement for social justice,” in G. Hunsinger, ed., *Karl Barth and Radical Politics* (Philadelphia, 1976).
- CB*-----K. Barth, *Christengemeinde und Bürgergemeinde* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1946).
- CD*-----K. Barth, *Church Dogmatics*.
- CL*-----K. Barth, *The Christian Life*. Tr. by J. Strathearn McNab (London: Student Christian Movement Press.1961).
- CO*-----John Calvin, *Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia*, 59 vols. Ed. by Guilielmus Baum/Eduardus Cunitz/Eduardus Reuss. Berolini, Apud C.A.Schetschke et Filium, 1863-1900.
- EAS*-----Jehle, Frank. *Ever against the Stream: The Politics of Karl Barth, 1906-1968*. Tr. by Richard and Martha Burnett (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2002).
- Ethics*-----K. Barth, *Ethik*. 1928/29 Vorlesung, ed. D. Braun, 2 vols, *GA* 2/10 (Zürich 1973/78); ET, G. W. Bromiley (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1981).
- GA*-----K.Barth, *Gesamtausgabe Karl Barths*, 23 vols, Zurich 1971-1994.
- Gallup Korea (2004)---Gallup Korea, *The Fourth Comparative Survey (2004): Korean Religions and Religious Consciousness - The Religions Study Comparing the Results of the '84, '89, '97, '04's Surveys* (Seoul: Gallup Korea, 2004).
- GG*-----K. Barth, *God, Grace and Gospel*. tr. by J. Stratharn McNab (London: Robert Cunningham and Sons Ltd., Alva., 1959).
- GC*-----Karl Barth, *The Holy Ghost and the Christian Life*, tr. by R. Birch Hoyle (London: Frederick Muller Limited. 1938).
- HC*-----K. Barth, *The Holy Ghost and the Christian Life*, tr. by R. Birch Hoyle (London: Frederick Muller Limited, 1938).
- HG*-----K. Barth, *The Humanity of God*, London: Collins, 1961.
- HTS*-----Journal of the Faculty of Theology of the University of Pretoria
- Journal*-----Nehemiah Curnock, ed., *The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley* (London: Epworth, 1909-1916).
- KCD*-----McCormack, *Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology, Its*

*Genesis and Development 1909-1936* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

KD-----K. Barth, *Kirchliche Dogmatik*.

KP-----E. Busch, *Karl Barth and the Pietists: the Young Karl Barth's Critique of Pietism and its Response*, tr. Daniel. Bloesh. USA: InterVarsity Press, 2004.

LC-----*Letters of John Calvin*. Vols. I-IV. Ed. by Bonnet, Jules. English Translation of Vols. I-II. Edinburgh, 1835-7. Vols. III-IV. Philadelphia, 1858.

LW----- American Edition of *Luther's Works* (Philadelphia and St. Louis, 1955-).

MT----- John Webster, *Barth's Moral Theology: Human Action in Barth's Thought* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998).

MTR-----K. Barth, "Moderne Theologie und Reichgottesarbeit," in: *Vorträge und kleinere Arbeiten /1905-1909*, ed. H.-A. Drews and H. Stoevesandt, GA 21, Zurich 1992, 334-66.

PP-----K. Barth, *Prayer and Preaching*. Tr. by Sara F. Terrien (Guildford and London: SCM Press Ltd, 1964).

RH-----K. Barth, „Rechtfertigung und Heiligung“ (1927), *ZdZ* 5: 281-309.

Romans 6<sup>th</sup>-----Karl Barth, *The Epistle To the Romans*, 6<sup>th</sup> edition, tr. E. C. Hoskyns, Oxford, 1933.

Römer 1-----K. Barth, *Der Romerbrief*, first edition, ed. by H. Schmidt, GA 16, Zürich 1985.

Römer 2-----K. Barth, *Der Römerbrief*, second edition (Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1922).

RSEK-----Nak-Heoung Yang, *Reformed Social Ethics and the Korean Church*: Sandra Wawrytko ed., Vol.21, *Asian Thoughts and Culture* (New York etc.: Peter Lang Publishing Co., 1997).

SC-----J. Calvin, *Supplementa Calviniana*..

SEC-----*Sermons on The Epistle to the Ephesians by John Calvin* first edition in French 1562, tr. Arther Golding, published in 1577, revised translation first published in 1973 (London: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1973).

StS-----Edward H., Sugden, ed., *Wesley's Standard Sermon*, 2 Vols. (London: Epworth Press, 1921).

WA----- D. *Martin Luthers Werke*. Kritische Gesamtausgabe (Weimar, 1883-).

Works-----*The Works of John Wesley*, ed. by Thomas Jackson (London: Wesleyan Methodist Book Room, 1872, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2002).

WPKMT-----Jung-Young Lee, "Minjung Theology: A Critical Introduction," in *An Emerging Theology in World Perspective: Commentary on Korean Minjung Theology* ed. by Jung Young Lee (Mystic Connecticut:

Twenty-Third Publications, 1988).

ZdZ----- *Zwischen den Zeiten*, München 1923-1933.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</b>	<b>II</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>KEY WORDS</b>	<b>V</b>
<b>ABBREVIATION</b>	<b>VI</b>
<b>CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 A Background of Research and the Problem Statement	1
1.1.1 The Importance of Sanctification	1
1.1.2 Sanctification is a Crucial Problem in the Korean Church	1
1.1.3 The Reason for the Choice of Calvin, Wesley and Barth	2
1.1.4 An Brief Analysis of Previous Approaches	3
1.2 The Definition of ‘Reformed’	5
1.3 The Purpose and Goals of This Research	8
1.4 The Central Hypothesis	10
1.5 The Method of Research and Its Procedure	10
1.5.1 Method of Research	10
1.5.2 Procedure of Research	10
<b>CHAPTER 2 JOHN CALVIN AND SANCTIFICATION</b>	<b>12</b>
2.1 Introduction	12
2.1.1 Previous Approach	13
2.1.2 A General Evaluation of John Calvin	15
2.1.3 Calvin’s Response to the Theological Trends of His Time	17
<b>2.1.3.1 Romanism</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>2.1.3.2 Libertinism</b>	<b>18</b>
2.1.4 Calvin’s Theology and Doctrine of Sanctification	18
<b>2.1.4.1 The Theological Method and Characteristics of Calvin</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>2.1.4.2 The Structure of His Theology</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>2.1.4.3 The Position of Sanctification in His Theology</b>	<b>20</b>

2.2 Calvin's Doctrine of Sanctification	20
2.2.1 The Conception of Sanctification	20
<b>2.2.1.1 Anthropological Presupposition</b>	<b>20</b>
2.2.1.1.1 Human Nature as the Image of God	20
<b>2.2.1.2 Harmartiological Presupposition</b>	<b>23</b>
2.2.1.2.1 Original Sin	23
2.2.1.2.1.1 The Definition of Original Sin	23
2.2.1.2.1.2 The Cause of Original Sin	24
2.2.1.2.1.3 The Result of Original Sin	26
2.2.1.2.2 Voluntary Sin: Personal Sin	28
2.2.1.2.2.1 Pride	28
2.2.1.2.2.2 Sloth	29
2.2.1.2.2.3 Hypocrisy	30
2.2.1.2.2.4 Avarice	32
2.2.1.2.2.5 Variance and Schism	33
2.2.1.2.3 The Bondage of Will and Grace	34
<b>2.2.1.3 Christological Presupposition</b>	<b>36</b>
2.2.1.3.1 The Elect of Individual and Nation in Christ	36
2.2.1.3.2 The Redemption of Christ: Three Fold Offices	37
2.2.1.3.2.1 Kingship	37
2.2.1.3.2.2 Royal Priesthood	38
2.2.1.3.2.3 Prophetical Office	38
<b>2.2.1.4 Soteriological Presupposition</b>	<b>39</b>
2.2.1.4.1 Union with Christ	39
2.2.1.4.2 The Restoration of Human Nature and Freedom	41
<b>2.2.1.5 The Definition of Sanctification</b>	<b>42</b>
2.2.2 The Motivation and Goal of Sanctification	43
<b>2.2.2.1 The Motivation of Sanctification</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>2.2.2.2 The Goal of Sanctification</b>	<b>45</b>
2.2.3 God's Role and the Human Role in Sanctification	45
<b>2.2.3.1 God's Sovereignty and Human Responsibility</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>2.2.3.2 The Role of God in Sanctification</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>2.2.3.3 The Human Role in Sanctification</b>	<b>49</b>
2.2.3.3.1 Obedience of Faith to the Word of God	50
2.2.3.3.2 Self-Examination for Self-Correction	51
2.2.3.3.3 Watchfulness	51
2.2.3.3.4 Self-Offering	52
2.2.4 The Nature of Sanctification	53

<b>2.2.4.1 Visibility or Invisibility?</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>2.2.4.2 Forensic or Factual?</b>	<b>55</b>
2.2.4.2.1 Forensic Sanctification	55
2.2.4.2.1.1 The Sanctification of Christ	55
2.2.4.2.1.2 The Sanctification of the Church in Christ's Sanctification	56
2.2.4.2.2 Factual Sanctification	56
2.2.4.2.2.1 The Impartation of Christ's Holiness to the Church	56
2.2.4.2.2.2 Our Conformity to the Pattern of the Sanctification of Christ	57
2.2.4.2.2.3 Mortification and Vivification in Christ's Death and Resurrection	59
2.2.4.2.2.4 The Marks of Sanctified Life	61
2.2.4.2.2.4.1 Love	62
2.2.4.2.2.4.2 Modesty and Humility	62
2.2.4.2.2.4.3 Docility and Meekness	63
2.2.4.2.2.4.4 Ordered Life	64
2.2.4.2.2.4.5 Purity	66
2.2.4.2.2.4.6 Moderation and Stewardship	67
2.2.4.2.2.4.7 Mutual Communion and Unity	69
<b>2.2.4.3 Gradualness and Instantaneousness</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>2.2.4.4 Perfection and Imperfection</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>2.2.5 The Modes of Sanctification</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>2.2.5.1 Self-Denial</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>2.2.5.2 Bearing the Cross</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>2.2.5.3 The Meditation on the Future Life</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>2.2.6 The Means of Sanctification</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>2.2.6.1 The Instrumental Role of the Church</b>	<b>79</b>
2.2.6.1.1 The Word of God	80
2.2.6.1.1.1 The Holy Spirit, the Bible and Its Interpretation	80
2.2.6.1.1.2 Preaching	81
2.2.6.1.1.3 Law and Gospel	82
2.2.6.1.1.3.1 The Third Use of the Law	82
2.2.6.1.1.3.2 Moral Law and Christ's Law	84
2.2.6.1.1.3.3 Law and Gospel	85
2.2.6.1.1.3.4 The Decalogue	86
2.2.6.1.1.4 The Old Testament and the New Testament	87
2.2.6.1.2 Sacraments	88
2.2.6.1.2.1 Baptism	89
2.2.6.1.2.2 The Lord's Supper	90
2.2.6.1.3 Church Discipline	91

2.2.6.1.4 Mutual Communion among Church Members	93
<b>2.2.6.2 Prayer</b>	<b>94</b>
2.2.7 The Relation to Other Doctrines	95
<b>2.2.7.1 Justification and Sanctification</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>2.2.7.2 Predestination, Election, Calling, and Sanctification</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>2.2.7.3 Regeneration, Repentance, Conversion, and Sanctification</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>2.2.7.4 Faith and Sanctification</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>2.2.7.5 Perseverance and Sanctification</b>	<b>101</b>
2.2.8 Good Works and Sanctification	102
<b>2.2.8.1 Good Works and Sanctification</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>2.2.8.2 Assurance of Election and Good Works</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>2.2.8.3 A Legalist or an Antinomian?</b>	<b>106</b>
2.2.9 The Sphere of Sanctification: Calvin's Practice	108
<b>2.2.9.1 The Sanctification of the Church</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>2.2.9.2 Political Sanctification</b>	<b>110</b>
<b>2.2.9.3 Social Sanctification</b>	<b>112</b>
2.2.9.3.1 Family and Sex	112
2.2.9.3.2 Female Liberalism	113
2.2.9.3.3 Vocation	114
2.2.9.3.4 Economy	114
2.3 Conclusion	116
2.3.1 Abstract	116
2.3.2 Assessment	118
<b>2.3.2.1 Positive Assessment</b>	<b>118</b>
<b>2.3.2.2 Negative Assessment</b>	<b>120</b>
 <b>CHAPTER 3 JOHN WESLEY AND SANCTIFICATION</b>	 <b>126</b>
3.1 Introduction	126
3.1.1 General Evaluation of Wesley	126
3.1.2 Wesley's Response to the Theological Trends of His Times	129
<b>3.1.2.1 Formalism</b>	<b>129</b>
<b>3.1.2.2 Arminianism</b>	<b>130</b>
<b>3.1.2.3 Rationalism and Deism</b>	<b>132</b>
<b>3.1.2.4 Moravian Mystic Quietism</b>	<b>132</b>
<b>3.1.2.5 German Pietism</b>	<b>134</b>
<b>3.1.2.6 Enthusiasm</b>	<b>135</b>
3.1.3 Wesley's Conversion: Experience at Aldersgate	137

3.1.4 The Structure of Wesley's Theology and Sanctification	142
3.1.4.1 The Theological Methods and Characteristics of Wesley	142
3.1.4.2 The Structure of Wesley's Soteriology	143
3.1.4.3 The Position of Sanctification in His Theology	144
3.2 Wesley's Doctrine of Sanctification	145
3.2.1 The Concept of Sanctification	145
3.2.1.1 Anthropological Presupposition	145
3.2.1.1.1 Human Nature as the Image of God	145
3.2.1.2 Hamartiological Presupposition	146
3.2.1.2.1 Original Sin and Its Result	147
3.2.1.2.1.1 Original Sin	147
3.2.1.2.1.2 The Result of Original Sin	148
3.2.1.2.2 Actual Sin: Voluntary Sin	149
3.2.1.2.2.1 Sin in Believers as Pride, Self-Will, and the Desire of the World	151
3.2.1.2.2.1.1 Pride and Self-Will	153
3.2.1.2.2.1.2 Inordinate Affection	153
3.2.1.2.2.1.3 Inward Sin Clinging to Words and Actions	154
3.2.1.2.2.1.4 Schism	154
3.2.1.2.2.2 Sin against the Holy Spirit and Sin unto Death	155
3.2.1.2.3 The Seat of Sin	156
3.2.1.3 Christological Presupposition: Objective Aspect of Sanctification	156
3.2.1.3.1 Atonement	156
3.2.1.3.2 The Threefold Offices of Christ	158
3.2.1.3.3 The Imputation of Christ's Righteousness	158
3.2.1.3.4 The Imitation of Christ	160
3.2.1.4 Soteriological Presupposition: Grace	160
3.2.1.4.1 Prevenient Grace and Human Recovery	160
3.2.1.4.2 Various Graces in the <i>Ordo Salutis</i>	164
3.2.1.5 The Definition of Sanctification	165
3.2.2 The Motive and the Goal of Sanctification	167
3.2.3 God's Role and Human Role in Sanctification	168
3.2.3.1 The Role of God in Sanctification	168
3.2.3.2 The Human Role in Sanctification	169
3.2.3.3 Monergist or Synergist?	171
3.2.4 The Stages of Sanctification	171
3.2.4.1 The State before Justification	171
3.2.4.1.1 The Sleeping State	171
3.2.4.1.2 Awakening: Repentance before Justification	172

<b>3.2.4.2 Positional Sanctification: Justification</b>	<b>174</b>
<b>3.2.4.3 Initial Sanctification: The New Birth</b>	<b>177</b>
<b>3.2.4.4 Repentance after Justification by Faith in Christ</b>	<b>179</b>
<b>3.2.4.5 Entire Sanctification</b>	<b>180</b>
3.2.4.5.1 The Marks of the New Birth	183
3.2.4.5.1.1 Faith	184
3.2.4.5.1.2 Hope	185
3.2.4.5.1.3 Love	185
3.2.4.5.1.4 Unity	187
3.2.4.5.1.5 Purity and Simplicity	188
3.2.4.5.1.6 Stewardship	189
<b>3.2.5 The Nature of Sanctification</b>	<b>190</b>
<b>3.2.5.1 Instantaneousness and Gradualness</b>	<b>190</b>
<b>3.2.5.2 Perfection or Imperfection</b>	<b>191</b>
3.2.5.2.1 Perfection	191
3.2.5.2.2 Imperfection	194
<b>3.2.6 The Mode of Sanctification: Self-Denial</b>	<b>195</b>
<b>3.2.7 The Means or Ways of Sanctification</b>	<b>197</b>
<b>3.2.7.1 Prayer</b>	<b>200</b>
<b>3.2.7.2 The Word of God</b>	<b>201</b>
3.2.7.2.1 The Bible	201
3.2.7.2.2 The Commandments of God	202
3.2.7.2.3 Preaching	202
3.2.7.2.4 Law and Gospel	203
3.2.7.2.4.1 Law and Gospel as the Means of Repentance	203
3.2.7.2.4.2 The Three Uses of the Law	203
3.2.7.2.4.3 Christ's Law and the Decalogue as the Moral Law	204
<b>3.2.7.3 The Sacraments</b>	<b>205</b>
3.2.7.3.1 Baptism	205
3.2.7.3.2 The Lord's Supper	206
<b>3.2.7.4 Works of Mercy</b>	<b>207</b>
<b>3.2.7.5 Church Discipline</b>	<b>208</b>
<b>3.2.7.6 The Communion of the Saints</b>	<b>209</b>
<b>3.2.8 The Relation to Other Doctrines</b>	<b>210</b>
<b>3.2.8.1 Predestination, Election and Sanctification</b>	<b>210</b>
<b>3.2.8.2 Faith and Sanctification</b>	<b>211</b>
<b>3.2.8.3 Justification and Sanctification</b>	<b>212</b>
<b>3.2.8.4 Assurance and Sanctification</b>	<b>215</b>

<b>3.2.8.5 Perseverance and Sanctification</b>	<b>218</b>
3.2.9 Good Works and Sanctification	220
<b>3.2.9.1 Good Works and Justification</b>	<b>220</b>
<b>3.2.9.2 Good Works and Sanctification</b>	<b>222</b>
<b>3.2.9.3 An Antinomian and Legalist (Moralist)?</b>	<b>223</b>
3.2.10 The Sphere of Sanctification	225
<b>3.2.10.1 The Church: Unity and Schism</b>	<b>225</b>
<b>3.2.10.2 Social Sanctification</b>	<b>228</b>
3.3 Abstract and Assessment	230
3.3.1 Abstract	230
3.3.2 Assessment	232
<b>3.3.2.1 Positive Assessment</b>	<b>232</b>
<b>3.3.2.2 Negative Assessment</b>	<b>233</b>
<b>CHAPTER 4 KARL BARTH AND SANCTIFICATION</b>	<b>239</b>
4.1 Introduction	239
4.1.1 The General Evaluations of Barth's Theology	239
4.1.2 His Response to the Main Theological Trends of His Time	242
<b>4.1.2.1 Barth and liberalism</b>	<b>242</b>
<b>4.1.1.2 Barth and Socialism</b>	<b>245</b>
<b>4.1.1.3 Barth and Pietism</b>	<b>248</b>
4.1.3 Barth's Theology and Doctrine of Sanctification	253
<b>4.1.3.1 The Theological Method of Barth</b>	<b>253</b>
<b>4.1.3.2 The Structure of Barth's Theology</b>	<b>255</b>
<b>4.1.3.3 Sanctification as Theological Ethics</b>	<b>257</b>
4.2 The Doctrine of Sanctification of Karl Barth	259
4.2.1 The Conception of Sanctification	259
<b>4.2.1.1 Anthropological and Christological Presupposition</b>	<b>259</b>
4.2.1.1.1 The Knowledge of Man as God's Image through Christ	259
4.2.1.1.2 Man in Christ	261
4.2.1.1.3 Human Subjectivity in Christ	262
4.2.1.1.4 Human Freedom	263
<b>4.2.1.2 Hamartiological Presupposition</b>	<b>265</b>
4.2.1.2.1 Original Sin and Voluntary Sin	265
4.2.1.2.1.1 Original Sin as the Fall	265
4.2.1.2.1.2 Voluntary Sin	268

4.2.1.2.2 The Three Sins and Their Results	269
4.2.1.2.2.1 Pride and Fall	270
4.2.1.2.2.2 Sloth and Misery	271
4.2.1.2.2.3 Falsehood and Condemnation	272
<b>4.2.1.3 The Definition of Sanctification</b>	<b>274</b>
4.2.3 The Motivation and Goal of Sanctification	276
4.2.4 God's Role and Human Role in Sanctification	277
<b>4.2.4.1 God's Role in Sanctification</b>	<b>277</b>
<b>4.2.4.2 The Human Role and Responsibility for Sanctification</b>	<b>278</b>
4.2.4.2.1 Obedience of Faith as Witness to God's Will and Actions	279
4.2.4.2.2 Prayer	280
4.2.4.2.3 Living Sacrifice	280
4.2.4.2.4 Self-Examination	281
<b>4.2.4.3 Summary and Critique</b>	<b>282</b>
4.2.5 The Nature of Sanctification	282
<b>4.2.5.1 Historicity/Visibility and Transhistoricity/Invisibility</b>	<b>282</b>
<b>4.2.5.2 De Jure and De Facto</b>	<b>284</b>
4.2.5.2.1 <i>De Jure</i> Sanctification	285
4.2.5.2.1.1 Sanctification in the Life of Royal Man	285
4.2.5.2.2 <i>De Facto</i> Sanctification	287
4.2.5.2.2.1 The Direction of the Son	287
4.2.5.2.3 Summary and Critique	290
<b>4.2.5.3 Instantaneousness/Definitiveness and Gradualness/Continuity</b>	<b>291</b>
<b>4.2.5.4 Perfection and Imperfection</b>	<b>293</b>
4.2.5.4.1 The Definitive Perfection of Sanctification	293
4.2.5.4.2 The Imperfection of Sanctification	294
4.2.5.4.3 Summary	295
4.2.6 The Modes of Sanctification	296
<b>4.2.6.1 The Call to Discipleship and Self-Denial</b>	<b>296</b>
<b>4.2.6.2 The Awakening to Conversion</b>	<b>297</b>
<b>4.2.6.3 The Dignity of the Cross</b>	<b>299</b>
4.2.7 The Means of Sanctification	301
<b>4.2.7.1 The Word of God</b>	<b>302</b>
4.2.7.1.1 The Bible and the Word of God	302
4.2.7.1.2 The Command of God	303
4.2.7.1.3 Preaching and Dogmatics	305
4.2.7.1.4 Gospel and Law	306
<b>4.2.7.2 The Sacraments</b>	<b>308</b>



<b>4.2.7.3 Prayer</b>	<b>309</b>
<b>4.2.7.4 The Communion in Covenant Community</b>	<b>311</b>
<b>4.2.8 The Relation with Other Doctrines</b>	<b>312</b>
<b>4.2.8.1 Justification and sanctification</b>	<b>312</b>
<b>4.2.8.2 Predestination, Election, and Sanctification</b>	<b>313</b>
<b>4.2.8.3 Vocation and Sanctification</b>	<b>315</b>
<b>4.2.8.4 Faith, Perseverance, and Sanctification</b>	<b>317</b>
<b>4.2.9 Good Works and Sanctification: the Praise of Works</b>	<b>319</b>
<b>4.2.10 The Teleological Structure of Sanctification: The Sphere of Sanctification</b>	<b>320</b>
<b>4.2.10.1 God's Holiness and Sanctification</b>	<b>321</b>
<b>4.2.10.2 The Sanctification of Christ</b>	<b>322</b>
<b>4.2.10.3 The Sanctification of the Covenant Community</b>	<b>323</b>
4.2.10.3.1 The Upbuilding of the Holy Community	323
4.2.10.3.2 The Growth of the Holy Community	324
4.2.10.3.3 The Upholding of the Community	325
4.2.10.3.4 The Order of the Community	326
4.2.10.3.5 The Unity of the Church: Ecumenical Movement	326
4.2.10.3.6 The Service of the Church for the World	328
<b>4.2.10.4 The Individual Sanctification: the Marks of Christian Life</b>	<b>328</b>
4.2.10.4.1 Faith	329
4.2.10.4.2 Humility	330
4.2.10.4.3 Order	331
4.2.10.4.4 Love	331
4.2.10.4.5 Gratitude	332
4.2.10.4.6 Conscience	333
4.2.10.4.7 Hope	334
<b>4.2.10.5 The Sanctification of the World</b>	<b>335</b>
4.2.10.5.1 Political Sanctification: The Relationship between Church and State	336
4.2.10.5.1.1 Was Barth a Marxist?	339
4.2.10.5.2 Social Sanctification	341
4.2.10.5.2.1 The Holy Day: Sanctification of All Time	341
4.2.10.5.2.2 Marriage, Family, and Neighbours: Relational Sanctification	342
4.2.10.5.2.2.1 Man and Woman: Marriage	342
4.2.10.5.2.2.2 Parents and Children	343
4.2.10.5.2.2.3 Near and Distant Neighbours	345
4.2.10.5.2.3 Social Issues: Murder, Suicide, Abortion, Euthanasia, Self-Defence,	

and the Death Penalty	346
4.2.10.5.2.4 War and Conscription	349
4.2.10.5.2.5 Work	350
4.2.10.5.3 Summary and Critique	351
4.3 Abstract and Assessment	352
4.3.1 Abstract	352
4.3.2 Assessment	354
4.3.2.1 Positive Assessment	354
4.3.2.2 Negative Assessment	355
<b>CHAPTER 5 A REFORMED DOCTRINE OF SANCTIFICATION FOR THE KOREAN CONTEXT</b>	<b>359</b>
5.1 Comparison between Calvin, Wesley, and Barth On the Doctrine of Sanctification	359
5.1.1 Their Responses to the Theological Trends of Their Times	359
5.1.2 The Conception of Sanctification	360
<b>5.1.2.1 Hamartiological Presupposition</b>	<b>360</b>
5.1.2.1.1 Original Sin	360
5.1.2.1.2 Voluntary Sin	360
<b>5.1.2.2 Anthropological Presupposition</b>	<b>361</b>
5.1.2.2.1 Humanity as the Image of God	361
5.1.2.2.2 Grace	362
5.1.2.2.3 Free Will	362
<b>5.1.2.3 The Definition of Sanctification</b>	<b>363</b>
5.1.3 The Role of God and the Human Role	363
<b>5.1.3.1 The Role of God</b>	<b>363</b>
<b>5.1.3.2 The Role of Man</b>	<b>364</b>
5.1.4 The Nature of Sanctification	365
<b>5.1.4.1 Visibility and Invisibility</b>	<b>365</b>
<b>5.1.4.2 Forensic and Factual Sanctification</b>	<b>366</b>
5.1.4.2.1 The Marks of the Sanctified	367
<b>5.1.4.3 Instantaneousness and Gradualness</b>	<b>367</b>
<b>5.1.4.4 Perfection and Imperfection</b>	<b>367</b>
<b>5.1.4.5 Pessimistic or Optimistic?</b>	<b>368</b>
5.1.5 The Motive and Goal of Sanctification	368
<b>5.1.5.1 The Motive of Sanctification</b>	<b>368</b>
<b>5.1.5.2 The Goal of Sanctification</b>	<b>369</b>

5.1.6 The Modes of Sanctification	370
5.1.7 The Means of Sanctification	370
<b>5.1.7.1 The Word of God</b>	<b>370</b>
5.1.7.1.1 Gospel and Law	370
5.1.7.1.2 The Third Use of the Law	371
<b>5.1.7.2 Prayer</b>	<b>372</b>
<b>5.1.7.3 Sacraments</b>	<b>373</b>
5.1.7.3.1 Baptism	373
5.1.7.3.2 The Lord's Supper	374
<b>5.1.7.4 Church Discipline</b>	<b>374</b>
<b>5.1.7.5 Faith</b>	<b>375</b>
5.1.8 Relation with Other Doctrines in the <i>Ordo Salutis</i>	376
<b>5.1.8.1 Regeneration and Sanctification</b>	<b>376</b>
<b>5.1.8.2 Justification and Sanctification</b>	<b>377</b>
<b>5.1.8.3 Predestination, Assurance, and Sanctification</b>	<b>378</b>
5.1.9 Good Works and Sanctification	379
5.1.10 The Sphere of Sanctification	380
5.2 The Contextual Analysis of the Korean Church	381
5.2.1 The Affirmative Evaluation of the Korean Church	382
<b>5.2.1.1 Quantitative Growth</b>	<b>382</b>
<b>5.2.1.2 Enthusiasm for Meeting, Prayer, Praise, and Offering</b>	<b>383</b>
<b>5.2.1.3 Enthusiasm for World Mission</b>	<b>384</b>
<b>5.2.1.4 Conservative Theological Disposition</b>	<b>384</b>
<b>5.2.1.5 Enthusiasm for Education</b>	<b>386</b>
<b>5.2.1.6 Participation in Social Reformation</b>	<b>387</b>
<b>5.2.1.7 The Efforts for the Unity of the Churches</b>	<b>392</b>
5.2.2 The Negative Elements of the Korean Church	394
<b>5.2.2.1 The Stagnation of Growth since the Early 1990s</b>	<b>394</b>
<b>5.2.2.2 The General Attitude of Life</b>	<b>394</b>
5.2.2.2.1 The Discrepancy between Faith and Life	394
5.2.2.2.2 The Excessive Pursuit of Worldly Success	395
5.2.2.2.3 Quantitativism	396
5.2.2.2.4 Materialism	397
5.2.2.2.5 Libertinism	398
<b>5.2.2.3 The Attitude of the Community</b>	<b>399</b>
5.2.2.3.1 Radical Political Sanctification: Minjung Theology	399
5.2.2.3.2 Evasion from Reforming the World and Compromise with the World	402

5.2.2.3.3 Separatism	404
5.2.2.3.4 Individualism	405
<b>5.2.2.4 Theological Problems of the Doctrine of Sanctification</b>	<b>406</b>
5.2.2.4.1 Antinomianism	406
5.2.2.4.2 A Legalistic Tendency	407
5.2.2.4.3 A Bias to Gradualness Rather Than Instantaneousness	408
5.2.2.4.4 Mysticism	409
5.2.2.4.5 Spiritualistic Enthusiasm	412
<b>5.2.2.5 Syncretistic Sanctification</b>	<b>413</b>
5.2.2.5.1 Hananim-Worship	413
5.2.2.5.2 Shamanism	414
5.2.2.5.3 Taoism	416
5.2.2.5.4 Buddhism	417
5.2.2.5.5 Confucianism	419
5.2.2.5.6 The Unification Church	423
<b>5.3 A Reformed Doctrine of Sanctification for the Korean Context</b>	<b>424</b>
5.3.1 Balanced Theological Views on the Doctrine of Sanctification	424
5.3.1.1 The Balance between the Grace of God and Human Responsibility	424
5.3.1.2 Harmony between Spirituality and Rationality	424
5.3.1.3 Maintaining the Balance between Antinomianism and Legalism	425
5.3.1.4 Maintaining the Balance between Instantaneousness and Gradualness	426
5.3.2 Sanctification in Individual Life	427
5.3.2.1 The Proper Motivation of Christian Life	427
5.3.2.2 Simple and Moderate Lifestyle	427
5.3.2.3 Committing Self-Anxiety to the Lord with Faith	428
5.3.2.4 Making Disciples	429
5.3.3 Sanctification in Political, Social Life	429
5.3.3.1 Stewardship for Community and Environment	429
5.3.3.2 Social Order and Authority	431
5.3.3.3 Participation in Social Justice	431
5.3.3.4 Leadership of Culture and Science	433
5.3.4 The Sanctification of the Church: Purity and Unity	434
5.3.4.1 Preserving the Truth of the Bible	434
5.3.4.2 Self-Denial for Unity and Cooperation	436
5.3.4.3 Maintaining the Balance between Institutionalism and Individualism	437
5.3.4.4 Purification from Syncretism	439
<b>5.4 Conclusion</b>	<b>440</b>

<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>448</b>
Primary Resources	448
Related Resources	453
Korean Resources	483
Anonymous Book, Journals & Newspapers	486
Secondary Resources	487
Internet Resources	488

## CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 A Background of Research and the Problem Statement

#### 1.1.1 The Importance of Sanctification

The importance of sanctification is paramount, particularly with respect to its Biblical claim. Sanctification is God's will (1 Thess. 4:3), for God did not call us to be impure, but to live a holy life (1 Thess. 4:7). One who rejects a holy life "does not reject man but God, who gives his Holy Spirit" (1 Thess. 4:8). Sanctification is also the purpose of justification, and is necessary to the glory of God. Furthermore, Christian sanctified life greatly affects the evangelization of the world. Unsanctified life is one of the main causes of the stunted growth of the Korean Church.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, it is beyond doubt that the inward holiness of our hearts and our holy lives should become our "priority-number-one."<sup>2</sup> This is the reason why the doctrine of sanctification is researched.

#### 1.1.2 Sanctification is a Crucial Problem in the Korean Church

What problems are facing the Korean society? They include the giving and receiving of bribes, disproportionate richness, evasion of tax or conscription, individualism, regionalism, drug addiction, sexual libertinism, materialism and quantitativism.

Most Christian crimes may be attributed to the wrong aims of their lives. Many Christians often seem to live for secular success, namely their own worldly happiness. They work hard to earn large sums of money and educate their children diligently. In many cases, their real aim is not the glory of God, but their own worldly success. This secular tendency causes unbelievers to slander Christians, for they completely resemble non-Christians in the world. Furthermore, they even violate the law for worldly success and thereby bring disgrace upon God. This is the reason why a study of the right motivation for Christian life is necessary. The final end of Christian life is God's glory. Human sanctification contributes to it.<sup>3</sup>

The Korean Church has been affected by such social trends. Individualization of local churches, sectarianism, the collapse of authority, a rise of heresy and the deficiency of

---

<sup>1</sup> Chang-Dae Gwak and Jurgens Hendriks, "An Interpretation of the Recent Membership Decline in the Korean Protestant Church," *Missionalia*, Vol.29, no.1 (Apr., 2001): 55.

<sup>2</sup> James Sidlow Baxter, *Christian Holiness Restudied and Restated Includes the Complete Text of A New Call to Holiness, His Deeper Works in Us, Our High Calling* (Zondervan Publishing House, 1967), p.13.

<sup>3</sup> Matthew 5:16. In the same way, let your light shine before others, so that they may see your good works and give glory to your Father in heaven.

pastors' leadership are said to be the causes of the stunted growth of the Korean Church.<sup>4</sup> What are the theological problems that face the Korean church? They are spiritualism, antinomianism, legalism, mysticism, institutionalism and religious syncretism. The Korean society and church are in need of a correct view of sanctification and its practice. Therefore, as a way of solving such problems, a correct view of sanctification and an effort to apply it to the Korean society and church will be researched.

### 1.1.3 The Reason for the Choice of Calvin, Wesley and Barth

The reason why Calvin, Wesley, and Barth were chosen as the main subjects of this study is that they are the representative theologians of the main denominations of the Korean Protestant Church. Calvin is at the root of the conservative Presbyterian Church, such as the *Hapdong* denomination, Wesley is at the root of the Methodist Church, the Pentecostal Church,<sup>5</sup> and the Holiness Church,<sup>6</sup> and Barth was widely accepted in the Presbyterian Churches such as the *Tonghap* denomination and other liberal Churches such as the *Kijang* denomination in South Korea.<sup>7</sup> Accordingly, our study of these three theologians will help us understand the doctrines of sanctification and the way it has been influencing the Korean church. While they share some common aspects, they also differ doctrinally on

---

<sup>4</sup> Young-Han Kim, "A Study of Analysis of the Cause of Growth Stagnation and Its Countermeasure," in *The Analysis of Stagnation of Korean Church Growth and Countermeasure of it* (Seoul: An Institute for Korean Christianity Culture, 1998), pp. 30-35.

<sup>5</sup> Modern Pentecostalism has advanced through five distinct theological developments. Among them, the "Wesleyan notion of conversion followed by a definable second work of grace" is regarded as the first development. Stanley M. Burgess and Gary B. McGee ed., *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movement* (Grand Rapids: Regency Reference Library, 1988), p.2.

<sup>6</sup> The Korean Holiness Church was established in 1907 by Sang Jun Kim and Bin Chang, who graduated from the Tokyo OMS (Oriental Mission Society) Bible College. OMS was in the Wesleyan line of the Methodists Church, but because OMS liked the original Wesleyan colour, it came to separate from the latter. Sung-Ho Kim, *History of the Korean Evangelical Holiness Church*, ed., by the History Compilation Committee of the Korea Evangelical Holiness Church, tr., by Chun-Hoi Heo, Hye-Kyung Heo (Seoul: Living Waters, 1998), pp.386f; Rhee Kwan Kim, *A History of the Korean- American Church Division* (Seoul: Christian Literature Press, 1995), p. 85. (In Korean).

<sup>7</sup> Young-Gwan Kim (a full time Professor of Systematic Theology at Sungkyul Christian University, Anyang in Korea) mentions, "It is the theologically progressive or liberal theologians of the Presbyterian Seminary of Korean (Tonghap), Hankuk Theological Seminary (Kijang), and Methodist Theological Seminary who mostly accepted Karl Barth's theology." He holds that "Professors from Yonsei University Faculty of Divinity, and Ehwa Woman's University School of Theology also adopted Barth's theology enthusiastically." Y. G. Kim, "Karl Barth's Reception in Korea: An Historical Overview," *Evangelical-Review-of-Theology* vol. 27, no. 1 (Ja., 2003): 79. Myong-Gul Son also views Kijang's theology as "Neo-Orthodox and ecumenical in concern." See Myoung-Gul Son, *Korean Churches in Search of Self-identity, 1930-1970: An Examination of Some Protestant Efforts during the Period of Japanization, National Division, and Resurgence* (Ph. D. diss., Southern Methodist University. Ann Arbour: Xerox University Microfilms, 1974), p. 284.

several main points of sanctification.<sup>8</sup> To compare and analyse them with one another in the light of the Bible will be necessary to get a reformed model of sanctification adequate for the Korean context. For this reason, they were chosen as the objects of this research.

#### 1.1.4 An Brief Analysis of Previous Approaches

Up to the present time, many works have dealt with only one theologian, either Calvin, Wesley, or Barth in view of sanctification. I will refer sufficiently to them in the introduction of each chapter, or in the subsection related to each issue of sanctification. In contrast, there are not as many works which dealt with several theologians in one book. Representative works among them include:

(1) Peter Toon, *Foundation for Faith: An Introduction to Christian Doctrine: Justification and Sanctification* (Westchester: Crossway Book, London: Marshall Morgan & Scott, 1983). Toon discussed Augustine, Aquinas, the Lutheran Church, the Council of Trent, the Reformed Church, the Anglican Church, Wesley, Newman and Schmaus, Tillich and Berkouwer from the perspective of the relationship between justification and sanctification. Theologians familiar to South Koreans include Augustine, Aquinas, Calvin, Luther, Wesley, and Barth. Because Toon touches on many theologians, his book could not deal sufficiently with the doctrine of sanctification of each theologian. Nonetheless, his work is useful as an introduction to the doctrine of sanctification. Regretfully, he did not refer to Karl Barth.

(2) *Five Views on Sanctification* (Grand Rapids: The Zondervan Corporation, 1987) dealt with: Wesleyan perspectives on sanctification by Melvin E. Dieter; the Reformed perspective by Anthony A. Hoekema; the Keswick perspective by J. Robertson Mcquilin; the Pentecostal perspective by Stanley M. Horton; and the Augustinian-dispensational perspective by John F. Walvoord. Each view was briefly examined by four other theologians. Though this book did not deal with Karl Barth's perspective on sanctification either, its contribution to the study of our issue is useful.

(3) *Christian Spirituality: Five Views of Sanctification* edited by Donald L. Alexander (Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1988) is a book which contains contributions by different theologians. The Lutheran view was dealt with by Gerhard Forde, the Reformed View by Sinclair B. Ferguson, the Wesleyan view by Laurence W. Wood, the Pentecostal view by Russel P. Spittler, and the Contemplative view by Glenn Hinson. Instead of the Keswick perspective and Augustinian dispensational perspective, the Lutheran view and the Contemplative view were discussed in their place. Similarly, each view was briefly

---

<sup>8</sup> D. B. Spross mentions that Evangelical churches within both traditions (Reformed and Arminian) recently have far more similarities than differences. D. B. Spross, "The Doctrine of Sanctification in the Theology of Karl Barth," *Wesleyan Theological Journal*, Vol. 20, no.2 (1985): 54-76



responded to by four other theologians. This book did not deal with Barth's view on sanctification either. Nonetheless, for me, the Lutheran view and the Contemplative view seem to be more relevant to the Korean situation rather than the Keswick perspective and the Augustinian-dispensational perspective.

(4) Dr. Kwang. R. Kim, *Salvation and Sanctification in Christ* (Seoul: Chongshin University Press, 2000). As a Korean theologian, who has been teaching dogmatics at Chongshin University in South Korea, Kim examined the Lutheran view on sanctification, the Wesleyan view, the Reformed view, the view of the American Holiness Movement, the Keswick view, the definitive sanctification of John Murray, the Pentecostal view, and the doctrines of sanctification of the past professors who had taught at Chongshin seminary. He unfolded the biblical doctrine of sanctification in view of our union with Christ. His book is similar to the above books in its structure, but laid stress on the Reformed view on sanctification, and the correlation between biblical theology and systematic theology, and suggested an educational application of the doctrine of sanctification to the Korean church. This book did not deal with Barth's view on sanctification either, because Barth's view of the Bible is not harmonious with the theological tradition of Chongshin University.

(5) Jonathan R. Pratt, "The Relationship between Justification and Sanctification in Romans 5-8," unpublished Ph. D. diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 1999. This thesis also reviewed the above five views and dealt with the relation between justification and sanctification centering on *Romans* 5-8 from the perspective of reformed theology. He concludes as follows. Firstly, sanctification "necessarily and inevitably" flows from justification,<sup>9</sup> in other words, the indicative of sanctification is "the basis and motivation" for the imperative.<sup>10</sup> Secondly, sanctification is "a developmental work of the Spirit" by which believers gradually grows in holiness.<sup>11</sup> Thirdly, perfection is not possible.<sup>12</sup> Fourthly, perseverance should be expected in Christian life.<sup>13</sup> I generally agree with him. However, he did not deal with Barth's view on sanctification either.

This study of the doctrine of sanctification will centre on Calvin, Wesley, and Barth according to the denominational distribution of the Korean church, as said above. The reason why I do not deal with the Lutheran view is that it is a very small church in South Korea. As the Catholic view is very important in South Korea, it will be dealt with in the subsections related to each issue.

The approach followed in this study has a merit in that it is able to read the currency of the times in contrast to the above five views, which described the five views congruently

---

<sup>9</sup> Jonathan R. Pratt, "The Relationship between Justification and Sanctification in Romans 5-8," unpublished Ph. D. diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 1999, p.226, 250.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p.253.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p.242.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.242-43

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p.250.

regardless of their contexts. The views of these three theologians are studied in a chronological order because it is important that their views on the doctrine of sanctification were formed in response to their times' trends. Although Christianity has absolute truth, which is not shaken by the trends of any time, it should not be silent to the challenges and questions given by its time. It is the responsibility of Christian theologians to lead the theological trends of our times to the biblical truth.

## 1.2 The Definition of 'Reformed'

J. D. Douglass defines Reformed theology as “a tradition of doing theology in a Reformed mode, certainly in continuity with the classical Reformed theologians of the sixteenth century like Calvin and Bullinger”,<sup>14</sup> which is found in the catechisms and confessions of the Reformed Churches; e.g. “the French Confession (1559), the Scots Confession (1560), the Belgic Confession (1561), the Heidelberg Catechism (1563), the Second Helvetic Confession (1566), the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England (1562, 1571), the Canons of the Synod of Dort (1619), the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms (1647) and the Formula Consensus Helveticus (1675)”.<sup>15</sup> The Reformed line was continued through Beza, Zanchius and Vermigli in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, Jonathan Edwards in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, Charles Hodge, A. A. Hodge and B. B. Warfield in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, in the Netherlands, by Abraham Kuyper and Herman Bavinck.<sup>16</sup>

E. H. Kim delineates the marks of reformed theology as God's sovereignty, human responsibility,<sup>17</sup> and holistic salvation embracing human intelligence, feeling, the will, society, and the environment. If we emphasise intelligence, we tend to scepticism; if we stress emotion, we tend to mysticism; if we are biased to the will, we tend to moralism. Holistic salvation implies that Reformed theology maintains the balance between individual salvation and social salvation, while pietism is biased to individual salvation, and liberalism to social salvation. Human responsibility means that man should respond to God's initiative grace.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Jane Dempsey Douglass, “What is Reformed Theology?,” *Princeton Seminary Bulletin* Vol. 11, no.1 (1990), p.4.

<sup>15</sup> S. B. Ferguson, & J. Packer, *New dictionary of theology* (electronic ed.) (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998, 2000), p.569.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.* p. 571.

<sup>17</sup> Douglas J. W. Milne considers the main task of a biblical covenant theology as “to establish simultaneously the sovereignty of divine grace while upholding the truth of human responsibility” (p.124). He maintains that “the human response of faith and obedience by the individual is always meaningful and is indispensable for salvation.” (p.132) “A Barthian Stricture on Reformed Theology-The Unconditionality of the Covenant of Grace”, *The Reformed Theological Review*, Vol. 55 (S-D, 1996): 123-126, 132.

<sup>18</sup> Eui-Hwan, Kim (President of Calvin University in Korea), “Pietism, Reformed, and Liberalism,” in *Presbyterian Theological Quarterly* 156 (Spr.,1972) (electronic ed.), pp.4-5.

K. T. Park represents the distinctions of reformed theology as emphasis on the Word rather than on any institution in sacraments, the Word rather than the gifts of the Holy Spirit, spiritual rationality in political and social realm.<sup>19</sup> I generally agree with his view, but my emphasis of reformed theology is to maintain the balance between spirituality and rationality (which implies we should accept the dynamicity of the Spirit), institutionalism and individualism,<sup>20</sup> preserving the centrality of the Word of God.

W. S. Johnson regards the principles of Reformed theology as grace alone,<sup>21</sup> Christ alone, faith alone, scripture alone.<sup>22</sup> His view is typical of reformed theology. R. C. Sproul adds “devoted to the Prophet, Priest, and King”, and “nicknamed covenant theology” to John’s view.<sup>23</sup> He thinks that Reformed theology centres on Christ and his covenant. He describes the five points of Reformed theology as “humanity’s radical corruption”, “God’s sovereign choice”, “Christ’s purposeful atonement”, “the Spirit’s effective call”, and “God’s preservation of the saints”.<sup>24</sup>

George W. Stroup interprets Reformed identity from the perspective of “polity”, “essential tenets”, “themes and emphases”, “*habitus*”, and “the cultural-linguistic model”.<sup>25</sup> The reformed polity is a polity represented by elders. Essential tenets are written in the *Book of Order* and the *Book of Confession* of the Presbyterian Church (USA).<sup>26</sup> Themes and emphases which are typical of Reformed theology are, for example, “the sovereignty of God, God’s gracious covenant with humanity in Jesus Christ, and the special significance commonly ascribed to the Old Testament revelation and to the Law of God.”<sup>27</sup> There are five habits are five; “deferential” (which means it respect tradition), “critical” (especially of the tradition it reverses), “open to wisdom”, “unabashedly practical” (truth is in order to goodness), and “evangelical”.<sup>28</sup> Among these views themes and emphases typical of reformed theology and practical habits will be reflected in this thesis.

John H. Leith understands the characteristics of Reformed theology as “a theology of

---

<sup>19</sup> Keon-Taek, Park (a professor in charge of Church History at Chongshin University in Korea), “What is Reformed?,” in *Presbyterian Theological Quarterly* 257 (Win.,1998): 191-217.

<sup>20</sup> See 5.3.4.3 Maintaining the Balance between Institutionalism and Individualism on this thesis.

<sup>21</sup> For more detail, see Brian A. Gerrish, “Sovereign Grace Is Reformed Theology Obsolete?” *Interpretation* Vol. 57, no.1 (2003): 45-56.

<sup>22</sup> William Stacy Johnson, “Theology and the Church’s Mission: Catholic, Orthodox, Evangelical, and Reformed,” in *Reformed Theology: Identity and Ecumenicity* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Publishing Co, 2003), pp. 67-81.

<sup>23</sup> R. C. Sproul, *Grace Unknown: The Heart of Reformed Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1997), p.7.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p.118.

<sup>25</sup> George W. Stroup, Reformed Identity in an Ecumenical World, in *Reformed Theology: Identity and Ecumenicity* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 2003), pp. 259-268.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 261.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p.262.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p.262.

the holy catholic church”, “a theocentric theology”, “a theology of the Bible” and “predestination”.<sup>29</sup> It seems inappropriate that Leith omits Christocentricity.

According to *New Dictionary of Theology*, the principal characteristics of Reformed theology are “the centrality of God”, “Christocentricity”, and “pluriformity”. The centrality of God is expressed as follows. *Firstly*, “Human self-knowledge is attained only in the light of the knowledge of God.” Man is the image of God. *Secondly*, Salvation is wholly the work of God. Although sanctification and perseverance are the process which require our arduous effort, that effort itself is God’s gift. *Thirdly*, the entirety of individual and communal life is to be ordered according to God’s request in the Bible.<sup>30</sup> Pluriformity implies that Reformed theology “has possessed creative vitality sufficient to encompass diversity within an over-all consensus.” However, this pluriformity does not embrace Arminianism.<sup>31</sup>

The theology of Karl Barth can be said to have a reformed element, considering the Christocentricity of his theology and his forceful refutation of anthropocentric liberal theology.<sup>32</sup> However, his theology is not reformed in the strict sense because he denied the historicity of Adam’s fall and miracles by distinguishing *Geschichte* and *Historie*, did not recognize natural revelation except Christ, had a universalistic tendency and “never entirely eradicated existentialism,” and took his position between Reformed theology and neo-Kantianism.<sup>33</sup> Although Barth broke with liberal theology and returned to Reformed theology, his theology never means “a pure restoration of Reformed orthodoxy”.<sup>34</sup>

Y. H. Kim sees the identity of Reformed theology as “*sola scriptura, solus Christus*, the human as image of God but totally depraved, Reformed spirituality, and cultural transformation”.<sup>35</sup> As an example of Reformed spirituality, he presents the spiritual experience of Wesley and his fellows. However, although Wesley is reformed in following the principle of the Reformation, he differs from Reformed theologians in the strict sense because he embraced Arminianism. Kim considers the ecumenicity of Reformed theology as “Reformed post-modern theology”, inclusive transformation towards other religions,

---

<sup>29</sup> John H. Leith, *Introduction to the Reformed Tradition: a Way of Being the Christian Community* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981), p.96-106.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.* pp.570.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.* pp.569-570.

<sup>32</sup> John H. Leith regards Karl Barth’s *Church Dogmatics* as well as *Calvin’s Institutes of the Christian Religion* as the theologically “authoritative achievements” in the Reformed tradition. John H. Leith, *Introduction to the Reformed Tradition: a Way of Being the Christian Community* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981), p.8.

<sup>33</sup> S. B. Ferguson, & J. Packer, *New dictionary of theology* (electronic ed.) (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998/ 2000), p.571.

<sup>34</sup> Jan Rohls, “Reformed Theology-Past and Future”, in Wallace M. Alston, Jr. & Michael Welker, *Reformed Theology: Identity and Ecumenicity* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 2003), p.34.

<sup>35</sup> Y.H. Kim, “The Identity of Reformed Theology in the Twenty-First Century”, in *Reformed Theology: Identity and Ecumenicity* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 2003), p.8.

God's sovereignty versus human responsibility and the eschatological worldview, "creation theology and Reformed eco- and bio-ethics", and "the cultural mandate: Christ as the Lord of culture".<sup>36</sup> As I generally agree with his view, it will be reflected in '5.3 A Reformed Doctrine of Sanctification in the Korean Context' of this thesis.

Although Wesley and Barth are not reformed theologians in the strict sense, some merits in their doctrines of sanctification should not be excluded. They emphasised the importance of the Bible in theology in their times and reformed their societies according to the will of God as is revealed in the Bible. It is the reason why they are dealt with in this research.

### 1.3 The Purpose and Goals of This Research

The purpose of this study is to help the Korean Church have a biblical and reformed view of sanctification and participate in reforming herself and the Korean society by practising the doctrine of sanctification.

The goal in Chapter 2 Calvin, 3 Wesley, 4 Barth is to analyse and criticise the following issues in their doctrine of sanctification. (1) Their definition of sanctification. (2) Their anthropological, Christological, and Soteriological presuppositions. Such presuppositions must have affected their view of sanctification. How they delineated God's image, God's grace and human free will, original sin and its results will especially investigated. (3) Whether they emphasised the means of sanctification or the automatic sanctification by the operation of the Spirit. For example, while Calvin and Wesley emphasised the active use of the means of sanctification, spiritualistic enthusiasm stressed the direct guidance and operation of the Spirit. (4) The relationship between justification and sanctification. Generally speaking, Catholicism incorporates sanctification into justification. Luther also did not sufficiently deal with sanctification, while he concentrated justification by faith. In contrast to them, Calvin is said to maintain the balance between justification and sanctification. Wesley is said to move to sanctification from justification. Barth may be said to be close to Calvin. (5) Whether each of them is legalistic or antinomian in the doctrines of justification or sanctification. Dr. J. D. Kim mentions that Calvin avoided "the dangers of legalism and antinomianism by resolving the apparent tension between the objective aspect and the subjective aspect on sanctification."<sup>37</sup> (6) Whether these three theologians admitted the third use of the law will be investigated. (7)

---

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.14-19.

<sup>37</sup> Jae-Duk Kim, *Holiness in the Triune God: Calvin's Doctrine of Sanctification with Special Reference to the Eschatological Dialectic Between Its Objective and Subjective Aspects, and with Application to the Calvinist Doctrine of the Korean Presbyterian Church*, unpublished Ph. D. diss., the University of Bristol, (2002), p. ii.

Whether their view of sanctification is closer to perfection or imperfection. Generally, the view of Calvin and Barth are said to be close to imperfection, while Wesley's view is close to perfection. If so, we will examine whether they insisted on a particular view, and what their reasons and grounds were. (8) Whether their views on sanctification are objective or subjective. Dr. J. D. Kim holds that Calvin maintained the balance between objectivity and subjectivity.<sup>38</sup> Wesley is said to be close to a subjective view because of his emphasis on experience. Barth is said to be close to an objective view due to his stress on human sanctification in Christ from eternity. (9) Whether their views on sanctification are close to instantaneousness or gradualness. In other words, it is about whether Christians are instantaneously or gradually sanctified when they believe in Christ. Generally, Calvin's view is said to be close to gradual sanctification.<sup>39</sup> However, such a view needs to be examined in more detail. (10) Whether their views laid more stress on human responsibility or on God's role in sanctification. Wesley is said to emphasise human responsibility to the extent that human salvation depends upon human good works and faith in Christ. Barth is said to accentuate God's role rather than human responsibility because of his stress on human objective and universal sanctification in Christ from eternity. Calvin is also said to stress God's role in his doctrine of predestination, but did not exclude human responsibility. (11) Whether their views laid stress on communal sanctification or not. This issue is important because the Korean Church has been biased towards individualization for a long time. The neglect of participation in social issues brings about a general ethics, namely social justice without God.<sup>40</sup> Glock and Stark contend that the only basis for Christian ethics is sanctification, which occurs within the covenant life of the people of God.<sup>41</sup> (12) The relationship between good works and sanctification. This issue is connected with legalism or antinomianism. (13) The motive of the Christian life.

The goals of Chapter 5 are *firstly*, to compare the doctrine of sanctification in the three theologians according to main issues; *secondly*, to analyse the Korean context from the perspective of sanctification; *thirdly*, to apply a reformed view of sanctification, which will be obtained by this research, to Korean context.

---

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>39</sup> W. Bouwsma insists that Calvin always "emphasised the gradualness rather than the suddenness of conversion." William J. Bouwsma, *John Calvin: A Sixteenth-Century Portrait* (New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), p. 11

<sup>40</sup> Rodney Stark & Charles V. Glock, "Will Ethics Be the Death of Christianity?," *Trans-action*, V (June, 1968), p. 12.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*



## 1.4 The Central Hypothesis

The central hypothesis of this research is that a reformed doctrine of sanctification, which is obtained by analysing and comparing and criticising the views of these three theologians on sanctification in the light of the Bible will be helpful to the Korean context. With good theological work, the church can change dubious behaviour and thoughts among Christians because their lives are greatly influenced by their religious presuppositions.<sup>42</sup>

## 1.5 The Method of Research and Its Procedure

### 1.5.1 Method of Research

The research method of this thesis is primarily an extensive literary study of the doctrines of sanctification of the three theologians. Secondly, this thesis uses a historical-grammatical method to reach a right understanding of the Bible on sanctification.<sup>43</sup>

The remoulded form of the eight hermeneutical principles of Grant R. Osborne will be applied as the method of research in this research.<sup>44</sup>

At first, “reformed” was defined before beginning this study. *Secondly*, all works related to sanctification in the three theologians will be collected and analysed. *Thirdly*, relevant biblical passages related to the issue will be expounded and collated in a biblical theological perspective. *Fourthly*, Calvin, Wesley and Barth will be configured in chronological order to trace the development of the contextualisation of the doctrine of sanctification. *Fifthly*, to compare a reformed view of sanctification with another model, Wesley was chosen as one of the objects of this research. It will help us get a better model for the contemporary situation. *Sixthly*, to recontextualise a reformed doctrine of sanctification within the Korean context *Seventhly*, the approaches to the notion of sanctification currently followed in the Korean context will be analysed. *Finally*, a reformed doctrine of sanctification, which is obtained by this research, will be applied to the Korean context.

### 1.5.2 Procedure of Research

The presentation chapter explained the background of this research, stated problems, presented several goals and the central hypothesis, as well as the research procedure. In

---

<sup>42</sup> Paul D. Matheny, *Dogmatics and Ethics: The Theological Realism and Ethics of Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Peter Lang GmbH, 1990), p. iv.

<sup>43</sup> B. De Klerk & F. Van Rensburg, *The Making of A Sermon: A Practical guide to Reformed Exegesis and Preaching* (Potchesfstrom: PU vir CHO, 1999).

<sup>44</sup> To compare the eight hermeneutical principles of Osborne with my methodology, see Grant R. Osborne, *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1991), pp.314-317.

addition, the reason for the choice of the three theologians was indicated. It is the basis of the delimitation of this research. Several views regarding sanctification were reviewed.

Chapter 2, 3, and 4 will generally deal with main issues in the three theologians in the following order: The general evaluation of each theologian, the definition of sanctification, Anthropological presuppositions, Christological presuppositions, Soteriological presuppositions, the motive and aim of sanctification, the subject of sanctification, the means of sanctification, the nature of sanctification, good works and sanctification, and the sphere of sanctification. Each chapter will contain the critique and assessment of their views.

Chapter 5 will firstly compare the doctrine of sanctification in the three theologians and secondly analyse the positive and the negative aspects of the Korean Church by a historical and statistical approach, and thirdly, suggest a reformed view of sanctification to solve the problems of the Korean society and church. Finally, in '5.4 Conclusion' a résumé of the research will be given together with the writer's view on sanctification from a reformed perspective .



## CHAPTER 2 JOHN CALVIN AND SANCTIFICATION

### 2.1 Introduction

Four reasons can be offered for the legitimacy to choose Calvin in a study of the doctrine of sanctification. The first reason is that he transformed the church on a biblical basis which is of great significance in our times when the authority of the Bible is gradually undermined. The second reason is that he stressed the correspondence between doctrine and life. It is also of importance because we live in a time when people reject any norm to control their lives. The third one is that he took a middle line between frozen orthodoxy and fanatic Pentecostalism. This throws light on our theological future. The fourth is that he emphasised the unity and the purity of the church, which is a very important issue in our times. These reasons are to be observed in more detail.

In relation to the first reason, we may present the statement of David Streater. He states that the contemporary Western church is “under threat of the hedonism of modern secular culture” and the “immense challenge of resurgent ancient religions.” Postmodernism induced the church to bring the world into the church “to sanctify the world, but the result has been to de-sanctify the church.”<sup>45</sup> This is due to the lack of confidence in the Bible. As a solution to this problem, Streater suggests Calvin’s teaching, for as Jane Dempsey Douglass writes, Calvin was a theologian who transformed human lives and the church in accordance with the apostolic faith.<sup>46</sup> In regard to the second reason, Paolo Ricca also claimed, “What remains alive in the Calvinian doctrine is thus the unity of doctrine and life.”<sup>47</sup> His view is respondent to Zachman’s opinion that Calvin was a “theologian in the service of piety.”<sup>48</sup> Richard Ngun also comments, “Christian life in general and regeneration in particular occupied an important place in Calvin’s theology.”<sup>49</sup> Calvin’s emphasis on ‘the transformation of human lives’ in accordance with the Bible acquires him to be a noteworthy theologian of sanctification. With respect to the third reason, we may present the statement of Daniel J. Adams. He insisted, “Calvin took a middle position

---

<sup>45</sup> David Streater, “The Significance of John Calvin Today,” *Churchman* Vol. 113, no.3 (1999): 215.

<sup>46</sup> Jane Dempsey Douglass, “Calvin’s Teaching What Still Remains Pertinent?,” *The Ecumenical Review* 39 (Jan., 1989):24. cf. G. Cole, “A Responsible Lifestyle in Old Testament Perspective: A Consideration of Some Popular Proposals,” *The Reformed Theological Review*, Vol. 41, no. 1 (1982): 6-7. He presents Gutierrez and Marx as examples of the reformers of corrupt society. However, we do not have to reach them for that purpose because we have better exemplars, like John Calvin and John Wesley, who were faithful to the Bible.

<sup>47</sup> Paolo Ricca, “A Vision of Unity,” *The Ecumenical Review* 39 (Jan., 1989): 39.

<sup>48</sup> Randall C. Zachman, “Theologian in the service of piety: A New Portrait of Calvin,” *The Christian Century* 114 (Chicago: Christian Century Co., 1997): 413.

<sup>49</sup> Richard Ngun, “A Survey of the Role of the Law in Sanctification among Selected Calvinists,” *Stulos Theological Journal*, Vol. 8, no. 1/2 (Bandung: Bandung Theological Seminary, 2000): 45.

concerning the doctrine of the Holy Spirit between those (Catholic Church) who trapped the Holy Spirit within the bounds of rigid doctrine, traditions, and ecclesiastical laws and those (the Pentecostal Church) who were fanatical and overly emotional.”<sup>50</sup> This has an important significance in our times and makes it meaningful to learn Calvin. Considering the fourth reason, Calvin stressed the unity of the church on the ground that we should not separate from one another because of non-essential matters. His ecumenical view can be applied in our times as a buffer against separatism. In this manner, Calvin pointed to the unity of the church with its purity, which clarified for us the right direction of the sanctification of the church. Four these reasons the selection of Calvin for a study of the doctrine of sanctification should be legitimate.

### 2.1.1 Previous Approach

John H. Leith wrote *John Calvin's Doctrine of the Christian Life* as his Ph.D. thesis in 1947-49.<sup>51</sup> Peculiarly, he dealt with human responsibility in connection with providence and predestination in Chapter 3. In chapter 4, he described the Christian life in terms of history and the transhistorical. This is a particular subject of his thesis. In the introduction, he offered useful information, which had been studied up to the time of his writing. He described the relation between sanctification and other doctrines in soteriology in detail in Chaps. 2, 3 and 4. His thesis can generally be said to be a summary and analysis of Calvin's writings on Christian life. Unlike his approach, Calvin's doctrine of sanctification itself rather than the relation with the other doctrines of soteriology will be emphasised in this study. Anthropological, Hamartiological, Christological and Soteriological presuppositions will be touched on in the sense that sanctification is about overcoming the sinfulness and weakness of being humans, and the restoration of the image of God through our union with Christ and through the power of the Holy Spirit.

The other scholar who dealt with this topic is Ronald S. Wallace, who wrote *Calvin's Doctrine of the Christian Life* as his doctoral thesis in 1959. In part I, he dealt with “the Sanctification of the Church in Christ.” This recalls Barth's theological structure, which stressed communal sanctification in Christ. In fact, Calvin did not use this scheme in his *Institutes*. Wallace may have drawn this composition mainly out of Calvin's commentaries and sermons. By and large faithful to the original text of Calvin, Wallace delved into Calvin's concept of the Christian life. His vast investigation and reorganization of the materials on this subject was very helpful to this study. Regrettably he skipped over the letters of Calvin in his thesis. Besides, his thesis is no more than a simple summary of

---

<sup>50</sup> Daniel J. Adams, “Calvin's Understanding of the Holy Spirit and the Contemporary Church,” *Taiwan Journal of Theology* 11 (1989): 84.

<sup>51</sup> It was published by Westminster/John Knox Press at Louisville, Kentucky, USA in 1988.

Calvin's teaching on the Christian life, though it is very useful and faithful. The absence of attention to the various scholarly debates on different aspects of Calvin's doctrine of the Christian life is, however, a serious shortcoming in Wallace's study. Contrary to the work of Wallace, this study will attend to Calvin's letters in addition to *Institutes* and commentaries, and in the process select a structure to arrange the material on the Christian life, which is congenial to Calvin's thought. Most of the small sections of this chapter will include the diverse issues that have been raised by many scholars on this topic.

A recent scholar who grappled with Calvin's doctrine of sanctification is Jae-Duk Kim, whose Ph.D. thesis' title is "Holiness in the Triune God: Calvin's Doctrine of Sanctification with Special Reference to the Eschatological Dialectic Between Its Objective and Subjective Aspects, and with Application to the Calvinist Doctrine of the Korean Presbyterian Church," (The University of Bristol, 2002). Kim analysed the doctrine of sanctification of the Korean Presbyterian Church and pointed to two problems. The first problem is that Korean Presbyterians lack the assurance of salvation which is the already accomplished aspect of sanctification.<sup>52</sup> He regards it as a legalistic tendency of the Korean Presbyterians which emphasises human deeds such as service, prayer meetings, bible study, offering and evangelism. However, they realize their inability and deficiency to obey the law, which consequently lead to a pessimistic view of sanctification. The emphasis on good works as a sign of election makes them anxious about their salvation. The second problem is dualism between their church life and social life.<sup>53</sup> Kim found its cause in Korean history. In the period of Japanese colonial rule over Choson, the Korean believers obtained comfort and hope in the next world instead of in the dark real society. During persecution they were seriously injured, which led to their withdrawal from society. As a remedy for those problems, Kim suggests Calvin's doctrine of sanctification, which is focused on our acceptance of the Triune God who already accomplished Christ's life, and is now working within us, and will come for our sanctification, not for our accomplishment of subjective sanctification by our faith and good works.<sup>54</sup> His view is the logical priority of objective sanctification over subjective sanctification.<sup>55</sup> Though his view seems quite germane, it is based on Barth's interpretation of Calvin's doctrine of sanctification, neglecting the problem in Barth's view of the Bible. Kim's view will be reflected in '5.3.1.3 Maintaining the Balance between Antinomianism and Legalism'.

---

<sup>52</sup> Jae-Duk Kim, "Holiness in the Triune God: Calvin's Doctrine of Sanctification with Special Reference to the Eschatological Dialectic Between Its Objective and Subjective Aspects, and with Application to the Calvinist Doctrine of the Korean Presbyterian Church," Ph. D. diss., The University of Bristol, 2002, p.253.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, p.255.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, p.268.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, p.255.

## 2.1.2 A General Evaluation of John Calvin

With reference to the character and resource of Calvin's theology, N. P. Williams insists that Calvin is a philosopher rather than a theologian because his doctrine of predestination was taken from a philosophical framework.<sup>56</sup> Still, his opinion cannot be accepted because Calvin's teaching of predestination seems to be more biblical than philosophical. J. Bohatec held that Calvin's "passion for order" was very great and it was influenced by Stoic philosophy in order to control the disordered society of his times.<sup>57</sup> It will be shown that Calvin's concept definitely stemmed from the Bible as well as from stoic philosophy. Brian G. Armstrong views Calvin's theology and biblical work as "conditioned by his own religious experience." He comments that Calvin neither brought his interpretation of the Bible to dogmatic assumption nor was he "objective in his exegesis."<sup>58</sup> These assessments ask us to observe whether Calvin's doctrine of sanctification is based on a faithful interpretation of the Bible or not.

There are some assessments useful for the study of Calvin's transformation of Geneva. W. Stanford Reid considers Calvin a good communicator who was capable of delivering his ideas "effectively and dynamically."<sup>59</sup> John Leith is of the opinion that Calvin was simple in person as well as in his theology. Calvin disliked the pretentious, the pompous, the ostentatious, the contrived, and the artificial. Calvin's life was in correspondence with his theology.<sup>60</sup> This makes his theology persuasive, both in his times and in our times. Robert D. Knudsen sees Calvin as a helpful realist in that "his principles had effect because he was in contact with real-life situations and was in a position to change them."<sup>61</sup> Gary Scott Smith writes that Calvin developed a scriptural world-and-life view that transformed medieval society, viz., he reordered "all of life - school, marketplace, home, state, society, and the arts" in accordance with the Bible.<sup>62</sup> M. Eugene Osterhaven considers Calvin's

---

<sup>56</sup> N. P. Williams, in *The Study of Theology*, ed. by K. E. Kirk (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1939), p. 78. "[T]he philosophical framework which has been inserted into the doctrine has deprived it of all flexibility and life."

<sup>57</sup> Josef Bohatec, *Calvin and das Recht* (Feudingen in Westfalen: Buchdruckerei u. Verlagsanstalt G. m.b. H, 1934), p. 62.

<sup>58</sup> Brian G. Armstrong, "Response to Calvin's Conversation to Teachableness," in *Calvin and Christian Ethics: Fifth Colloquium on Calvin & Calvin Studies*, ed. Peter De Klerk (Grand Rapids: Calvin Studies Society, 1987), p. 82.

<sup>59</sup> W. Stanford Reid, "The Transmission of Calvinism in the Sixteenth Century," in *John Calvin: His Influence in the Western World*, ed. W. Stanford Reid (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1982), p. 47.

<sup>60</sup> John H. Leith, "Calvin's Theological Realism and the Lasting Influence of His Theology," in *Towards the Future of Reformed Theology: Tasks, Topics, Traditions*, ed. David Willis & Michael Welker (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999), pp.344-345.

<sup>61</sup> Robert D. Knudsen, "Calvinism as a Cultural Force," in *John Calvin: His Influence in the Western World*, ed. W. Stanford Reid (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1982), p.28.

<sup>62</sup> Gary Scott Smith, "The Reformation: Luther, Calvin, and the Anabaptists," in *Building a Christian World*

contribution to the faith of the church as “the rubric of order and the Holy Spirit.”<sup>63</sup> Gary North viewed Calvin as a ‘theonomist’ in the sense that the “biblical law served as the basis of Calvin’s ethics.”<sup>64</sup> His view will be dealt with in more detail later.

There are some negative evaluations of Calvin. Jean Chelini claims that “Calvin established a rigid theocratic dictatorship in Geneva, much heavier than that of the gregorian papacy” for the reason that “those who did not profess the same faith were arrested, sentenced, banished and [note the plural] even burned at the stake, like the Spaniard Michael Servetus.”<sup>65</sup> His insistence is impertinent because he does not consider the situation of Calvin’s times. In his times, religious persecutions were a general phenomenon. Georges Haldas compared Calvin to twentieth-century dictators like Adolf Hitler and Joseph Stalin.<sup>66</sup> His comparison is invalid because Calvin did not have any jurisdictional authority over the city of Geneva. With respect to Calvin’s reformation of economics, Max Weber stated that Calvin’s innovation is connected with “the development of the capitalist spirit.” His statement seems to be valid.<sup>67</sup> Weber, however, neither directly described Calvin as “one of the founders of capitalism,” nor viewed capitalism as a creation of the Reformation. His thesis was that the Reformation “co-participated in the qualitative formation and quantitative expansion” of capitalism. Notably, Steven Ozment insists that Calvin should be responsible for the “‘re-Catholicizing’ of Protestant theology at its most sensitive point, the doctrine of justification by faith... Calvin’s teaching, like his conduct of the Genevan church, once again made good works and moral behaviour the centre of religious life and reintroduced religious anxiety over them.”<sup>68</sup> His critique seems excessive to me given the fact that Calvin never gave up justification by faith, though he stressed that church discipline was necessary for a pious life. His control over the city of Geneva was for their sanctification, not for their justification. His restriction of freedom is

---

*View* Vol.2 *The Universe, Society and Ethics*, ed. by W. Andrew Hoffecker (Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1988), p.234.

<sup>63</sup> M. Eugene Osterhaven, “John Calvin: Order and the Holy Spirit,” *The Reformed Review* 32 (Holland in Michigan: Westminster Theological Seminary Press, 1978-79): 24.

<sup>64</sup> James B. Jordan, ed., *The Covenant Enforced: Sermons on Deuteronomy 27 and 28 by John Calvin* (Tyler, Texas: Institutes for Christian Economics, 1990), publisher’s preface, pp. ix-xi.

<sup>65</sup> Chelini Jean and Blandine Chelini, *Histoire de l’Église. Nos racines pour comprendre notre présent* (Paris: Centurion, 1993), p. 163. “Calvin installe une dictature théocratique sans faiblesse, bien plus lourde que celle de la papauté grégorienne ! Ceux qui ne professent pas la même foi sont arrêtés, condamnés, bannis et même brûlés, comme l’Espagnol Michel Servet.” quoted by René Paquin, “Calvin and Theocracy in Geneva,” *ARC* 28 (2000) : 92.

<sup>66</sup> George Haldas, *Passion et mort de Michel Servet* (Lausanne, 1975). Quoted by Rene Paquin, *op. cit.*, p. 93.

<sup>67</sup> Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethics and the Spirit of Capitalism*, tr. by Stephen Kalberg (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2002), p. 47.

<sup>68</sup> Steven Ozment, *The Age of Reform, 1250-1550: An Intellectual and Religious History of Late Medieval and Reformation Europe* (New Haven, 1980), pp. 374 and 379.

connected with the third use of the law for Christian life.<sup>69</sup>

To summarise, Calvin was a remarkable biblical theologian as well as a systematical theologian. He can also be regarded as a noteworthy theologian in our study because he was a helpful realist and theologian of sanctification who transformed medieval society in accordance with God's holy will. His personality and ability to communicate with others contributed to his transformation of Geneva.

### 2.1.3 Calvin's Response to the Theological Trends of His Time

Calvin had to face many kinds of heretical trends in his time; Mariology, Papacy, Anabaptism, Libertinism, and Anti-Trinitarianism. Only two of these are relevant in the present context, namely Romanism and Liberalism.

#### 2.1.3.1 Romanism

The Roman Catholic Church held that she had a full grasp of truth and therefore all should acknowledge the fact and be subject to her. But Calvin viewed it as a blind obedience and allegiance and asserted that truth belongs to Scripture, not to the authority of the Church.<sup>70</sup> He regarded the papacy as "the open enemy of Christ's mercy and his commandments."<sup>71</sup> Notwithstanding his stern critique of Romanism, Calvin inherited from Thomas Aquinas his superb sense of "unity, universality, order and authority."<sup>72</sup> Under the influence of Duns Scotus, Calvin recognised that all true knowledge is the result of obedience<sup>73</sup> and agreed with Occam's view that God's absolute freedom is not bound to any sacramental or human tie. Though he stressed the Word of God more than the emotional experience or the asceticism of mysticism or spiritualism, he seems to have owed the *imitatio* and the *communio mystica cum christo* to them to some extent.<sup>74</sup>

To sum up, we can say Calvin criticized Romanism and furthermore, creatively reconstructed it according to his theological standpoint.

---

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Reinhard Hütter, "(Re)Forming Freedom: Reflections 'after Veritas splendour' on Freedom's Fate in Modernity and Protestantism's Antinomian Captivity," *Modern Theology*, Vol. 17, no. 2 (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 2001): 117-161. He holds that the end of the law is true freedom...antinomianism of post-modernism cannot give us true freedom.

<sup>70</sup> Dr. W. Balke, "Calvin and The Theological Trends of His Time," in *Calvinus Reformator: His Contribution to Theology, Church and Society* (Potchefstroom: Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education, 1982), pp.51.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 49.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 53.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 54.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 55.



### 2.1.3.2 Libertinism

Calvin regarded the libertines as “the madmen, who would want the world to turn to libertine madness, and pretend that the gospel speaks of nothing but the revolt against the authority and the licentiousness of life.”<sup>75</sup> They were the most dangerous and horrifying enemy of sanctification. They put the instantaneous inspiration of the Holy Spirit above the Word of God, in other words, they made the Word of God submissive to their own theological impulses.<sup>76</sup> Among them, there were Fleming Quentin Thieffry and Pocque. libertinism and its related issues will be dealt with in ‘2.2.9.3.2 Sexual Purity,’ ‘2.2.4.2.2.4.5 Purity,’ ‘2.2.6.1.1.1 The Holy Spirit, the Bible and Its Interpretation,’ ‘2.2.8.3 A Legalist or an Antinomian?.’

## 2.1.4 Calvin’s Theology and Doctrine of Sanctification

### 2.1.4.1 The Theological Method and Characteristics of Calvin

As his theological method or approach, Calvin adopted the middle way between both extremities, i.e., defect and excess by describing virtue as “a sort of means between extremes, of which the one tends to defect, the other to excess” in his Commentary on Seneca’s “*De Clementia*” (2.4.1). For example, he took a middle stance between Spiritualists and Papists on the issues of the law,<sup>77</sup> and between Luther and Zwingli on the Lord’s Supper, between stoical asceticism and prodigality of lifestyle,<sup>78</sup> between living in this world and meditating on the next life, and between history and trans-history on the reality of sanctification.<sup>79</sup> This moderate attitude of Calvin is an important element in our understanding the character of his doctrine of sanctification. As Wilhelm Niesel puts it, Calvin was neither pessimistic nor optimistic in his teaching of sanctification, because he considered our participation in both the death and resurrection of Christ.<sup>80</sup>

With regard to the characteristics of Calvin’s theology, John Leith speaks of simplicity

---

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 49.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 66.

<sup>77</sup> The Roman Catholic Church stressed the authority of the church in interpreting the Bible and human obedience of the law to attain salvation while Spiritualists emphasised the direct revelation through the Spirit, while they neglected the authority of the Bible and the role of the law for Christian life. Cf. Augustus Nicodemus Lopes, “Calvin, Theologian of the Holy Spirit: the Holy Spirit and the Word of God,” *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology* 15 (1997): 40-44.

<sup>78</sup> *Institutes* 3.19.9.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Donald K. McKim, “John Calvin: A Theologian for an Age of Limits,” in *Reading in Calvin’s Theology*, ed. by Donald McKim (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984), pp. 292-306; *Institutes* 3.10.3.

<sup>80</sup> Wilhelm Niesel, *The Theology of Calvin*, tr. by Harold Knight (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980, first published by Lutterworth Press in 1956), p. 151.

and concreteness, which enabled his theology to influence his times and ours.<sup>81</sup> Calvin ruled out speculation in theology, but concentrated on the simplicity and clarity of theology in order that it might be easily teachable and preachable in service of the real transformation of human life.<sup>82</sup> For this purpose he pursued the simple, terse interpretation of the Bible and insisted that theology must deal with the concrete realities of human life in ordinary language.<sup>83</sup> Calvin's stress on the simplicity of theology and the use of ordinary language for the transformation of human life presents his theological orientation for human sanctification.

#### 2.1.4.2 The Structure of His Theology

The construction of Calvin's theology is based on two pillars, the exposition of the Bible and systematic work like *Institutio christianae religionis* accompanied by arguments and treatises on dogmatic and ethical themes.<sup>84</sup> His exegetical research supported and shaped the *Institutes* profoundly and "his theology shaped his exegesis."<sup>85</sup> Accordingly, it can be supposed that his doctrine of sanctification grew out of his exegesis of the Bible.

To analyze the structure of Calvin's theology from his entire work is neither possible nor necessary for our study. It may be pertinent to and useful for our aim to briefly observe the structure of the final edition of his *Institutes*. Leith also stated that "the commentaries, sermons, letters, ecclesiastical advices, and practical churchmanship are best interpreted" in the light of his *Institutes*.<sup>86</sup> The final edition of Calvin's *Institutes* followed the framework of the Apostles' Creed in contrast to the first edition, which was constructed in the order of the Ten Commandments, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer. Calvin assigned the knowledge of God the Creator to Book I, the knowledge of God the Redeemer in Christ to Book II, Pneumatology to Book III, the means of grace to Book IV.

---

<sup>81</sup> John Leith, "Calvin's Theological Realism and the Lasting Influence of His Theology," *Towards the Future of Reformed Theology: Tasks, Topics, Traditions*, ed. David Willis & Michael Welker (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999), p. 341.

<sup>82</sup> Cf. Sermon on 1 Tim. 5: 4-5, CO 53, 453-466.

<sup>83</sup> John H. Leith, *John Calvin's Doctrine of the Christian Life: foreworded by Albert C. Outler* (Louisville: Westminster/ John Knox Press, 1988), p. 19.

<sup>84</sup> Cf. Hans-Joachim Kraus, "The Contemporary Relevance of Calvin's Theology," in *Towards the Future of Reformed Theology: Tasks, Topics, Traditions*, ed. David Willis & Michael Welker (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999), p. 325.

<sup>85</sup> Elsie Anne McKee, "Calvin's Teaching on the Elder Illuminated by Exegetical History," in *John Calvin & the Church: A Prism of Reform* ed. by Timothy George (Louisville in Kentucky: Westminster/ John Knox Press, 1990), p. 147.

<sup>86</sup> John H. Leith, *op. cit.*, p. 15.



### 2.1.4.3 The Position of Sanctification in His Theology

As Pruyser has declared, “[T]he regeneration of willing ...is perhaps the most crucial concept in his [Calvin's] doctrine of man,”<sup>87</sup> Calvin held that the essential problem of human existence was not to comprehend the world but to change it in conformity to the will of God. Thus, he stressed sanctification throughout all his writings. His sermons and lectures were directed to a change of life style.<sup>88</sup> Accordingly, in order to know his doctrine of sanctification, his sermons, commentaries and letters must be studied. In Calvin's *Institutes*, Book III and IV are mainly concerned with the doctrine of sanctification. Nevertheless, because anthropology is included in Book I, 14-15, the doctrine of providence in Book I, 14-18, Hamartiology in Book II, 1-5, and Christology in Book II, 12-17, all the entire volumes of the *Institutes* should be probed. Accordingly, sanctification can be said to cover the extent of Calvin's theology.

## 2.2 Calvin's Doctrine of Sanctification

### 2.2.1 The Conception of Sanctification

#### 2.2.1.1 Anthropological Presupposition

Sanctification is closely connected with anthropology in the sense that it is the restoration of human nature to the image of God. Accordingly, anthropology should be viewed from the angle of human nature as the image of God.

##### 2.2.1.1.1 Human Nature as the Image of God

Man was created as bearer of the image of God. Calvin interpreted the image of God as “the reflection of the glory of God.”<sup>89</sup> God's glory given to Adam was manifested by endowment with “wisdom, righteousness, and holiness.”<sup>90</sup> Johannes von Staupitz (1542) held that Adam's creation in the image of God involved conformity to Jesus Christ. It is similar to Osiander's opinion that “man was formed only after the type and exemplar of Christ as man.” Calvin rejected such a viewpoint on the grounds that the Bible teaches that Adam was created in the image of God.<sup>91</sup> In the 1559 edition of the *Institutes*, Calvin held

---

<sup>87</sup> Paul W. Pruyser, “Calvin's View of Man: A Psychological Commentary,” *Theology Today* 26 (Apr., 1969): 64-66.

<sup>88</sup> *Institutes* 3.6.4.

<sup>89</sup> *Institutes* 1.15.4.

<sup>90</sup> *Comm.* on Gen. 1:26, CO 23, 25-27. In the commentary on Col. 3:10, the image is described as true knowledge, righteousness and holiness; in the commentary on 2 Cor. 3:18, it is depicted as true piety, righteousness, purity and intelligence.

<sup>91</sup> *Institutes* 1.15.3; *Comm.* Gen. 1: 26, CO 23, 27. “Christum esse unicam patris imaginem: sed hunc tamen

that “God’s image expresses Adam’s integrity - his full possession of understanding, his affections subordinated to reason, all his senses in harmony, and his recognition that all these were gifts of God.”<sup>92</sup> Had Adam remained upright, he “would have passed to a better life.”<sup>93</sup> Calvin elucidated the image of God as follows:

Therefore by this word the perfection of our whole nature is designated, as it appeared when Adam was endued with a right judgment, had affections in harmony with reason, had all his senses sound and well-regulated, and truly excelled in everything good.<sup>94</sup>

In his Commentary on Gen. 1:26, Calvin recognized dominion as a very small part of the image of God.<sup>95</sup> In his *Institutes* 1.15.3 (1559), he stated that “although the primary seat of the divine image was in the mind and heart, or in the soul and its powers, yet there was no part of man, not even the body itself, in which some sparks did not glow.” Nevertheless, in the *Institutes* 1.15.4, by confirming the image of God to an inner good of the human soul, Calvin rejected the opinion that the image of God lies “in the dominion to be given to man.”<sup>96</sup> Though Calvin disclosed his inconsistency, his primary stress on the image of God referred to the human soul or heart rather than human body or his dominion. Owing to Calvin’s inconsistency, B. A. Gerrish could insist that “Calvin has already admitted that the upright posture of the human body is at least an outward token of the divine image.” Nonetheless, his opinion does not seem particularly legitimate because Calvin clearly argued in the *Institutes* 1.15.4 that “nor is there any probability in the opinion of those who locate God’s likeness in the dominion given to man” and “God’s image is properly to be sought within him, not outside him, indeed, it is an inner good of the soul,” and also in his commentary on Gen. 1:26 he insisted that the opinion that “the image of God is in the body of man because his admirable workmanship there shines brightly” is “by no means consonant with Scripture,” and “[t]he exposition of Chrysostom is not more correct, who refers to the dominion, which was given to man in order that he might, in a certain sense, act as God’s vicegerent in the government of the world.” Of course, Gerrish’s argument is surely based on Calvin’s statement that “I *retain* the principle I just now set forward, that the likeness of God extends to the whole excellence by which man’s nature towers over all the kinds of living creatures” and “if anyone wishes to include” the upright posture of the

---

sensum Mosis verba non recipiunt: In imagine, id est in Christo.”

<sup>92</sup> *Institutes* 1.15.3.

<sup>93</sup> *Comm.* on Gen. 3:19, CO 23, 77. “Transiturus quidem fuit primus homo in meliorem vitam, si integer stetisset.”

<sup>94</sup> *Comm.* on Gen 1:26, CO 23, 26. “Ergo hac voce designatur totius naturae integritas, quum Adam recta intelligentia praeditus foret, affectus haberet compositos ad rationem, sensus omnes sanos et ordinatos, vereque bonis omnibus excelleret.”

<sup>95</sup> *Comm.* on Gen 1:26, CO 23, 26. “Est quidem haec imagines Dei aliqua portio, sed perquam exigua.”

<sup>96</sup> Cf. B. A. Gerrish, “Mirror of God’s Goodness,” *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 45 (1981): 214.

human body “under the image of God,” “I shall not contend too strongly - provided it be regarded as a settled principle that the image of God, which is seen or glows in these outward marks, is *spiritual*” (Italics are my emphasis). Though Gerish’s insistence is based on Calvin’s depictions, given Calvin’s clearer statements above, we must admit that for Calvin, the image of God is absolutely in the human soul, and scarcely in the human body or his dominion.<sup>97</sup> In brief, Gerrish’s argument is almost groundless and Calvin’s view was inconsistent.

L. O. K. Lategan criticized Calvin’s anthropology for not being biblical but “very much influenced by the ancient Greek philosophy.” Calvin regarded the soul as superior to the body and the human body as a prison of his soul,<sup>98</sup> while the Bible states that “no part of man is inferior or superior to any other part of his personhood.”<sup>99</sup> Interestingly, Charles L. Cooke infers that Calvin’s illnesses might have influenced his thought that the soul is active but the body is passive.<sup>100</sup> Calvin’s view that the image of God is in the human soul, not in his body grew out of the Bible (Job 4:9; 2 Cor. 5:1). By and large, Job and Paul explicated the human body in a negative manner. In Job’s case, many unfortunate accidents might have had an effect on his viewpoint of the body. In Paul’s times, the thought that the soul is superior to the body was very general. Paul’s statement might reflect such a Greek philosophy. Nonetheless, Calvin’s negative view of the human body must be complemented by the biblical statements that taking a human life is regarded as destroying the image of God (Gen. 9:6), and our body is used for God’s glory as instruments of righteousness (Rom. 6:13), the temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor 6:19-20) and will partake in the glory of the resurrection. Like Chrysostom, Charles Hodge considered human dominion over the creatures as the image of God.<sup>101</sup>

For Calvin, the human soul is not itself the image, but rather the mirror in which the image is reflected. The soul consists of understanding and will. Understanding as the power to distinguish between objects is the leader and governor of the soul. The will chooses and follows what the understanding approves, and refuses what it disapproves. They were perfect in themselves and perfectly in harmony with other beings when Adam was created. The first man had the freedom of will, by which he could have arrived at

---

<sup>97</sup> *Institutes* 1.15.3. Here Calvin regarded Osiander’s opinion to extend God’s image both to the body and to the soul as indiscreetly “mingling heaven and earth.”

<sup>98</sup> *Institutes* 1.15.2. “...when the soul is freed from the prison of the body, God is its perpetual guardian.” Lategan insists that the concept “that the body is the prison of the soul [is] foreign to the Bible.” L O K Lategan, “The Significance of Calvin’s Anthropology for Preaching on Ethical Themes,” *HTS* (Journal of the Faculty of Theology of the University of Pretoria), Vol. 54, no. 1 & 2 (1998): 145.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 143-144.

<sup>100</sup> Charles L. Cooke, *Calvin’s Illness in John Calvin & the Church: A Prism of Reform* (Louisville in Kentucky: Westminster/ John Knox Press, 1990), p.68.

<sup>101</sup> Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology* II (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Company, 1977), pp. 102-103.

eternal life if he had obeyed the Word of God.<sup>102</sup> B. A. Gerrish insists that for Calvin, the image does not lie only “in what he possesses” but also “in the spiritual right relationship to God.” For example, the zeal to glorify God is the primary element of the right relationship to God.<sup>103</sup> Man was created as the thankful counterpart of God, differently from other creatures, which do not have any personal relationship with God, though they are also the mirrors of the glory of God.<sup>104</sup> There are no such notions of our relationship with God as the image of God in Calvin’s *Institutes* 1.15 (first edition), but there are such notions in 2.1.4 and 2.2.12.<sup>105</sup> Hence, Gerrish’s insight seems to be remarkable in understanding Calvin’s view of the image of God. According to his viewpoint, we need to consider the image of God as the right relationship with God. In conformity with Chrysostom and Hodge, human dominion over creatures may be as the image of God because the image of God may imply human right relationship with the creatures as part of human right relationship with God.

According to Calvin, the *imago Dei* was lost at the fall. After the fall, it was “so vitiated and almost blotted out that nothing remains after the ruin except what is confused, mutilated, and disease-ridden.”<sup>106</sup> The fall and original sin will be probed in more detail.

## 2.2.1.2 Harmartiological Presupposition

### 2.2.1.2.1 Original Sin

#### 2.2.1.2.1.1 The Definition of Original Sin

Calvin had an idea common with his precedents, but he also formed his own view different from theirs.<sup>107</sup> Firstly, he rejected Augustine’s opinion that sexual desire plays a role in the

---

<sup>102</sup> *Institutes* 1.15.8. “...the will being thus perfectly submissive to the authority of reason. In this upright state, man possessed freedom of will, by which, if he chose, he was able to obtain eternal life...in the mind and will there was the highest rectitude, and all the organic parts were duly framed to obedience”; cf. *Comm.* on Gen.1:26, CO 23, 27. “In the mind perfect intelligence flourished and reigned, uprightness attended as its companion, and all the senses were prepared and moulded for due obedience to reason; and in the body there was a suitable correspondence with this internal order.”

<sup>103</sup> *Institutes* 2.3.4.

<sup>104</sup> B. A. Gerrish, “Mirror of God’s Goodness,” *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 45 (1981): 215-216. He also insists that “the doctrine of sin is not strictly about a person’s moral condition, but about his relationship to God” (220) as well as the image of God.

<sup>105</sup> *Institutes* 2.1.4. “Since the woman through *unfaithfulness* was led away from God’s Word by the serpent’s deceit.” *Institutes* 2. 2.12. “Among these are *faith, love of God*, charity towards neighbor, zeal for holiness and for righteousness, all these, since Christ restores them in us, are considered adventitious, and beyond nature: and for this reason we infer that *they were taken away*” (italics are my emphasis).

<sup>106</sup> *Institutes* 1.15.4.

<sup>107</sup> Since Calvin, the federal theologians viewed original sin as a transgression of the first covenant. Holmes Rolston III, “Responsible Man in Reformed Theology: Calvin versus the Westminster Confession,” *Scottish*

transmission of original sin because its propagation is by divine decree. He deemed to be inappropriate the Augustinian-Lombardian notion of original sin as concupiscence.<sup>108</sup> Still, Calvin viewed concupiscence as sin<sup>109</sup> in contrast to Augustine who considered it as only a wound and a disease.<sup>110</sup> He also criticized Peter Lombard for designating it the *fomes peccati*, which means the seat of original sin lies in the flesh.<sup>111</sup> In contrast, Calvin defined original sin as the corruption of all parts of the soul rather than the inherited corruption of the flesh. He corrected Lombard's opinion stressing the use of the will to control human sexual desire, by expanding the effect of original sin to the mind as well as the will.<sup>112</sup> In concordance with Melanchthon's view, Calvin considered the effect of original sin as the 'blindness' of the mind and the 'depravity' of the heart rather than the ignorance of good.<sup>113</sup> Briefly, for Calvin, original sin is concupiscence as the depravity and corruption of our whole nature.

Calvin also explicated original sin as Adam's sin. Adam's sin is the cause of the estrangement between God and man. Adam and Eve were beings with freedom of choice. God tested whether Adam exerted his freedom rightly or not, by giving his command to prohibit him from eating the fruit of the knowledge of good and evil. Regrettably, Adam failed to keep the command of God. They chose evil freely without any compulsion, though their fall can be said to be "according to the appointment of Divine Providence."<sup>114</sup> Hence "God is not the author of sin."<sup>115</sup> In other words, free will became the formal ground of original sin, and its misuse is the formal cause of original sin.

#### 2.2.1.2.1.2 The Cause of Original Sin

Though freewill is the basis of human disobedience, there is the question whether the cause of disobedience is pride or unfaithfulness, or the defect of intellect, which allowed Satan to

---

*Journal of Theology*, Vol. 23, no. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), p. 135; cf. Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology II* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1977), pp.120-121.

<sup>108</sup> *Institutes* 2.1.8.

<sup>109</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.10.

<sup>110</sup> "...his evil concupiscence is not cured." "On the Proceedings of Pelagius," in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, edited by Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D., Vol. V *Saint Augustine: Anti-Pelagian Writings* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark/ Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1987), p.192.

<sup>111</sup> Lombard, *Sentences* II. XXX. 7f., XXXI. 2 – 4 (MPL 192, 722, 724).

<sup>112</sup> *Institutes* 2.1.9.

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*; P. Melanchthon, "Apology of the Augsburg Confession," article 2, in *The Book of Concord: The Confession of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, tr. and ed. T. G. Tappert (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1959), p. 104.

<sup>114</sup> *Institutes* 3.23.7; *Comm.* on Gen. 3:7, CO 23, 64. "Sed ubi ad hominem ventum fuerit, reperietur *sponte* peccasse, et non minus *libero* quam perverso animi motu, discessionem fecisse a Deo factore suo." (Italics are my emphasis).

<sup>115</sup> Letter to the seigneurs of Geneva 6<sup>th</sup> October 1552; LC 2,301,368.

deceive Adam and Eve by his lie. While Augustine viewed the cause of the fall as self-love conjoined with pride<sup>116</sup>, Calvin ascribed it as unfaithfulness (*infidelitatem*) to the Word of God.<sup>117</sup> From this, unfaithfulness, ambition, pride, ungratefulness<sup>118</sup> and “obstinate disobedience” arose. Accordingly, unfaithfulness can be regarded to be “the root of the fall.”<sup>119</sup> Notably, Dewey Hoitenga argues that Calvin “undermines the intellectualist account he has just given” by attributing “the fall not to a failure of the intellect, but to the free choice of the will.”<sup>120</sup> In fact, Calvin ascribed the cause of the fall to the unfaithfulness of the woman in his *Institutes* 2. 1. 4 and later he ascribed it to Adam’s own will in *Institutes* 1. 15. 8. Conversely, Barbara Pitkin sides with Calvin for two reasons. One is that in *Institutes* 1. 15. 8, Calvin did not intend to explicate the scenario of the fall itself but rather original human nature that made such a defection possible. The other is “the fact that the occasion for the fall lay primarily in the will does not mean that the actual fall itself was, for Calvin, an act of the will alone.”<sup>121</sup> Calvin’s intention is that “the fall involved an act of the intellect, a movement of the mind from truth to falsehood, for both Adam and Eve.” Pitkin interprets that Calvin stressed free will in explicating the possibility of the fall, while he emphasised the intellectual in describing the scenario of the fall. In other words, Pitkin argues that Calvin stressed the involvement of both faculties i.e., intellect and will in original sin.<sup>122</sup> Pitkin’s analysis seems sound.

Still, we need to classify more clearly the explication of the cause of the fall. Clearly, Calvin depicted the cause of the fall, in both Adam and Eve, as their unfaithfulness, as in *Institutes* 2.1.4. “...the woman through unfaithfulness was led away from God’s Word by the serpent’s deceit.” “...Adam would never have dared oppose God’s authority unless he

---

<sup>116</sup> Cf. Larry D. Sharp, “The Doctrine of Grace in Calvin and Augustine,” *The Evangelical Quarterly*, Vol. 52, no. 2 (1980): 85. Sharp however missed that for Calvin, the cause of original sin is unfaithfulness. He viewed Calvin’s view of the cause of original sin as “pride and rebellion and outright disobedience.” Those things are the secondary causes of original sin, while the primary cause is distrust in God’s Word (*Institutes* 2.1.4).

<sup>117</sup> *Comm.* on Gen. 3: 6, CO 23, 59. “...fides enim quam habebat verbo Dei, optima erat cordis et sensuum omnium custos. Nunc postquam a fide et obedientia verbi cor defecit, secum pariter corrumpit omnes sensus...”; *Institutes* 2.1.4. “Since the woman through unfaithfulness was led away from God’s Word by the serpent’s deceit, it is already clear that disobedience was the beginning of the fall”; *Comm.* on Isa. 57: 13, CO 37, 315. “...mala omnia ab incredulitate et diffidentia oriuntur.” “...all evils arise from unbelief and distrust.”

<sup>118</sup> “But Adam...through his ingratitude alienated himself from God.” Sermon on Deut. 28:46-50 in *The Covenant Enforced: Sermons on Deuteronomy 27 and 28* by John Calvin, ed. by James B. Jordan (Tyler: Institute for Christian Economics, 1990), p.216.

<sup>119</sup> *Institutes* 2.1.4.

<sup>120</sup> Dewey J. Hoitenga Jr., *John Calvin and the Will: A Critique and Corrective* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997), p. 48; *Institutes* 1.15.8. “...he fell solely by his own will.”

<sup>121</sup> Barbara Pitkin, “Nothing but Concupiscence: Calvin’s Understanding of Sin and *Via Augustini*,” *Calvin-Theological-Journal* 34 (1999): 351-352.

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*



had disbelieved in God's Word." In addition, in his commentary on 1 Tim. 2:14, Calvin refuted the theory<sup>123</sup> that the cause of Adam's fall was his love for his wife, not Satan's falsehood, while Eve's fall was her unfaithfulness to the Word of God, which stemmed from her belief in Satan's lie for the following two reasons. One is that "if Adam had not given credit to the falsehood of Satan, God would not have reproached him: Behold, Adam is become like one of us." (Gen. 3:22). The other is that Paul's statement (1 Tim. 2:14)<sup>124</sup> does not mean that "Adam was not entangled by the same deceitfulness of the devil, but that the cause or source of the transgression proceeded from Eve." However, Calvin's interpretation seems unpersuasive in the light of Paul's clear statement that "Adam was not deceived; but the woman." As far as this issue is concerned, it is right that Eve was deceived by Satan's lie and Adam disobeyed the Word of God. For Eve, the cause of the fall was unfaithfulness, an intellectual problem, and for Adam, it was disobedience, a problem of free will.

#### **2.2.1.2.1.3 The Result of Original Sin**

Calvin also defined original sin as the inherited corruption that stems from the result of Adam's sin.<sup>125</sup>

Original sin, therefore, seems to be a hereditary depravity and corruption of our nature, diffused into all parts of the soul, which first makes us liable to God's wrath, then also brings forth in us those works which Scripture calls 'works of the flesh'. And that is properly what Paul often calls sin.<sup>126</sup>

This original sin brought about the death and curse of all human beings and all creatures. Adam's sin was inherited by humankind and man became a sinner from his birth. All of us "have descended from impure seed" and "are born infected with the contagion of sin."<sup>127</sup> This corrupt nature never stops in us, but continually bears new fruits of the flesh "just as a burning furnace gives forth flame and sparks, or water ceaselessly bubbles up from a spring."<sup>128</sup>

Calvin explicated the result of original sin in three elements of human nature. Firstly, man lost his free will, so that he came to be unable to turn to God by himself. The will itself was not destroyed by the fall, but it was totally distorted. Secondly, reason also was

---

<sup>123</sup> Augustine, "De civitate Dei," 14.11, in *Patrologiae cursus completus, series Latina*, ed. J.-P. Migne (Tournhout: Brepols, n.d.), 41: 419.

<sup>124</sup> Adam was not deceived; but the woman, being deceived, was in the transgression.

<sup>125</sup> *Institutes* 2.1.5.

<sup>126</sup> *Institutes* 2.1.8.

<sup>127</sup> *Institutes* 2.1.5.

<sup>128</sup> *Institutes* 2.1.8.



not destroyed but its soundness was impaired. It is “utterly blind and stupid in divine matters” as St. John states that “this light shines in the darkness, but the darkness comprehends it not.”<sup>129</sup> It has ability as far as political and social life, the arts, the science and technology is concerned, while it is ‘blinder than a mole’ in the knowledge of God.<sup>130</sup> It can also discern between moral good and evil by the natural law carved in his heart. This makes man inexcusable for not willing the good but the bad.<sup>131</sup> Thirdly, man sins unavoidably by his own *libido* due to his depraved nature rather than external compulsion.<sup>132</sup> After the fall, man came to be unable to control his feelings.<sup>133</sup> Love towards God and neighbour was changed into concupiscence, which is self-centred in principle, i.e., the self-love that Paul called “flesh.”<sup>134</sup> As the active principle of sin, concupiscence is viewed as a disease that sends forth wrong desires which allure us to sin.<sup>135</sup> “[W]hatever is in man, from the understanding to the will, from the soul even to the flesh has been defiled and crammed with the concupiscence.”<sup>136</sup> Since Adam’s fall, “nothing pure or sincere can come forth from a corrupt and polluted nature.” All man’s abilities are so depraved and corrupted that all his actions are threatened by “persistent disorder and intemperance.”<sup>137</sup>

On the other hand, Calvin held that the image of God remains in the human being. In spite of the fall, Adam did not cease to be man. In his commentary on Gen. 1:26, Calvin noted that “since the image of God had been destroyed in us by the fall,” we can be “transformed into the image of God by the gospel.” Spiritual regeneration is nothing else than the restoration of the same image (Col. 3:10 and Eph. 4:23). In Gen. 9:6, Calvin expounded God’s commandment of prohibiting the killing of human beings in connection with God’s image.<sup>138</sup> Murder is prohibited because after the fall, man still has the image of God.

Briefly, original sin as Adam’s fall results in ingratitude to God, disharmony with the

---

<sup>129</sup> *Institutes* 2.2.19.

<sup>130</sup> *Institutes* 2.2.18.

<sup>131</sup> *Institutes* 2.2.22.

<sup>132</sup> *Institutes* 2.3.5.

<sup>133</sup> *Comm.* on Jn. 11:33, CO 47, 266. “...quod autem (affectus) nunc sunt incompoti et rebelles, accidentale est vitium” (affectus is my addition). “That those affections are now disorderly and rebellious is an accidental fault.”

<sup>134</sup> Letter of John Calvin to the Brethren of France, November 1559, *LC* 4, 539, 49.

<sup>135</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.10.

<sup>136</sup> *Institutes* 2.1.8.

<sup>137</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.12.

<sup>138</sup> *Comm.* on Gen. 9:6, CO 23, 147. “...sed quia ferunt imaginem Dei insculptam, violari se existimat in eorum persona.” “...but since they bear the image of God engraven on them, He deems himself violated in their person.”

laws of nature, disintegration of the self, and injustice.<sup>139</sup> Sanctification means healing of the inherited corruption and the receiving of a new nature.<sup>140</sup>

### 2.2.1.2.2 Voluntary Sin: Personal Sin

Calvin was indifferent to the distinction between original sin and voluntary sin. For him, human voluntary sin originates from our corrupted nature after the fall. Accordingly, original sin as inherited corruption of human nature can be said to be the root of all voluntary sins. The “heart of man is the abode of all evils.”<sup>141</sup> While Calvin viewed concupiscence as the substance of sin, he considered the transgression of the law as [voluntary] sin.<sup>142</sup> Voluntary sins are sins committed by free choice, i.e., free will. Calvin listed three stages in the conception of sin: The first is a fleeting fancy that is not yet “imputed unto us for sin.” The second is when our will swings that way, and although we do not consent to it, we are inwardly provoked to do it. The third stage is when we consented and settled our will upon it and a wicked sin is already conceived and fully formed in us.<sup>143</sup>

In his *Institutes*, he enumerated the following sins: murder, fornication, drunkenness, pride, contention, avarice and fraud.<sup>144</sup> In his commentary on 1 Cor. 6:9, he expounds such sins as adultery, thievery, greed, and revilement. In his commentary on Gal. 5:20-21, he expounded the sins which shall not inherit the kingdom of God as adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, anger, hatred, envy, emulations, variance, strife, sedition, murder, witchcraft, revelling and heresy.<sup>145</sup> Let us now examine in detail Calvin’s main terms of sins.

#### 2.2.1.2.2.1 Pride

For Calvin, pride is our foolish admiration of ourselves, which arises from contempt of the brethren. It is the oblivion of all humanity and “the mother of all wrong.”<sup>146</sup> An arrogant man “can hardly endure that others should be on a level with him,” for anyone wants to be superior to others.<sup>147</sup> Calvin also explicated pride in relation to self-love. Man is blinded

---

<sup>139</sup> *Comm.* on Gen. 3:1.

<sup>140</sup> *Institutes* 2. 1. 9.

<sup>141</sup> *Comm.* on Mt.15:19, CO 45, 455. “...cor hominis omnium malorum sedem esse...”

<sup>142</sup> Cf. *Institutes* 3.18.10. “...works righteousness is perfect obedience to the law.”

<sup>143</sup> Sermon on Job 31: 1-4, *Sermons on Job by John Calvin*, selected and tr. by Leroy Nixon, with an introductory Essay by Harold Dekker (Grand Rapids: Baker use, 1979), p. 521.

<sup>144</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.14.

<sup>145</sup> CO 50, 254-55; cf. Sermon on Gal. 5:19-21, CO 51, 31-46.

<sup>146</sup> *Comm.* on Ps. 10:2, CO 31, 109. “...humanitatis obli, ...superbia omnium iniuriarum mater est.”

<sup>147</sup> *Comm.* on Phil. 2:3, CO 52, 24. “...ut aegre quisquam ferat alios sibi aequales. Nemo enim est qui non eminere cupiat.”

with self-love, which causes him to be proud of himself and “to despise all others in comparison.”<sup>148</sup> If we receive some precious thing from God, we “immediately lift up our minds, and are not only puffed up but almost burst with pride.” We endeavour to hide our vices from others, flattering ourselves that they are trivial and unimportant, and even now and then regard them as virtues. The proud man cannot stand that others manifest good gifts, or even superior ones, so that he maliciously disparages and sneers at those gifts in order to avoid yielding himself to them. On others’ faults, he does not only reproach them harshly but also spitefully exaggerates them. Pride is the insolent attitude that wishes to tower above others, and to abuse every man haughtily and savagely, or to despise them as inferior. Calvin insisted, “They who are haughty and refractory towards men are acting insolently towards God.”<sup>149</sup> Everyone cherishes “within himself some opinion of his own pre-eminence.” Insisting the superiority of his own gift to others’, the proud man criticizes the disposition and morality of others. When the critiques of each other meet in conflict, the proud man bursts forth his venom. This pride stems from forgetting the fact that “those talents which God has bestowed upon us are not our own goods but the free gifts of God.” Whoever becomes proud of them displays his ingratitude.

#### **2.2.1.2.2.2 Sloth**

Calvin presented the features of sin as lethargy, sloth, indolence, weakness, dullness, coldness, indifference, and the final collapse of liveliness. By him, sloth as a representative sin causes men to be excessively addicted to worldly interests and be unconcerned with the heavenly life.<sup>150</sup> When everything goes smoothly with us, we tend to lapse into sloth.<sup>151</sup> And sloth “detains people bound to their nests”, so that makes them “not bear doing without convenience to be defrauded”.<sup>152</sup> It prevents them from searching for God<sup>153</sup> and darkens their eyes.<sup>154</sup> Sloth of prayer makes us to be unable to expect God’s aid.<sup>155</sup> It makes us “defraud God of his lawful worship.” Calvin depicted sloth as the bauble of the

---

<sup>148</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.4.

<sup>149</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Pet. 5: 6, CO 55, 288. “Ergo qui fastuosi sunt vel prae fracti erga homines, eos dicit adversus Deum protervire.”

<sup>150</sup> *Comm.* on Matt. 16:2, CO 45, 465.. “...eos terrenis commodis ac caducis nimium addictos quidquid ad coelestem spiritualemque vitam spectaret susque deque habere... .”; *Comm.* on Is. 41:1, CO 37,33. “...alii socordia quadam negligunt, et sepulti in terrenis delitiis ad regnum coeleste attendere gravantur.”

<sup>151</sup> *Comm.* on Is. 41:17, CO 37, 47. “...quia ad segnitiam delabi solemus, quum res fluunt ex animi sententia.”

<sup>152</sup> *Comm.* on Ps. 84:7, CO 31, 782. “...multos nidis suis affixos teneat haec socordia, ut nulla commoditate fraudari se sustineant.”

<sup>153</sup> *Comm.* on Ps. 32:6, CO 31, 321. “...sed quia nos segnitias, vel etiam socordia impedit ab eo quaerendo.”

<sup>154</sup> *Comm.* on Is. 41:28, CO 37, 55. “...hebetantur hominum oculi socordia, quod neque interrogent, neque considerent, neque observent.”

<sup>155</sup> *Comm.* on Is. 41:17, CO 37, 47. “...sed iis qui ipsum precantur, quod si adeo socordes simus ut negligamus auxilium eius, omnino destitui... .”

devil “to put to sleep those he has taken”<sup>156</sup> in order that man might not follow God.<sup>157</sup> Sleep is with sinners and points to death. Death lurks in dullness of perception of spiritual realities and is foreshadowed by coldness. Accordingly, we should endeavour to shake off sloth and to arouse ourselves to receive God’s consolation.<sup>158</sup>

Sanctification is to wake up and to be alert.<sup>159</sup> It is to “to awaken us amidst our slothfulness.”<sup>160</sup> Christian life as sanctification is to respond to God with “a burning affection” towards him, to be “set on fire” with praise for him, to be “inflamed with desire” to please him.<sup>161</sup>

### 2.2.1.2.2.3 Hypocrisy

Calvin declared, “Nothing is more opposite to righteousness than hypocrisy.”<sup>162</sup> The reason was that hypocrisy represented the concealment of sinfulness and the refusal to confess the truth about oneself. Hypocrisy veils a discrepancy between the human inside and his outward appearance. Hypocrites with some outward sanctity show themselves to advantage by defaming others, and do this under the cover of zeal, but really “through the lust of slandering.” They are addicted to arrogance and blinded “by an immoderate love of themselves.”<sup>163</sup> Accordingly, their hypocrisy becomes the poison to which all human relationships were vulnerable. It leads hypocrites to fail to recognize the obligation to express one’s faith in works of love. Though they pretend to worship God by keeping many ceremonies, hypocrites commit all kinds of evils, without obeying any law of love towards their neighbours.<sup>164</sup> From the standpoint of Calvin, obedience to the first table of the Law without obedience to the second is no more than hypocrisy.<sup>165</sup> Furthermore, Calvin designated hypocrisy as dependence for salvation on anything other than God’s grace, i.e., “all artificial methods for appeasing God or obtaining his favor.”<sup>166</sup> It means

---

<sup>156</sup> Serm. No. 3 on I Cor 1:7, CO 49, 610.

<sup>157</sup> Serm. No.44 on Deut., CO 24, 413-414.

<sup>158</sup> *Comm.* on Is. 51: 4, CO 37, 229. “...et hoc modo excitare sese, atque excutere torporem suum, ut consolationem admittat.”

<sup>159</sup> Serm. No.44 on Deut., CO 24, 413-414.

<sup>160</sup> *Comm.* on Dan. 9:18, CO 41, 158. “...ut expergefaciat nostram pigritiem.”

<sup>161</sup> Serm. No.16 on 2 Sam., 133; *Comm.* on Is. 42:3, CO 37, 61.

<sup>162</sup> *Comm.* on Isa. 26:2, CO 36, 427. “Nam iustitiae nihil magis contrarium est quam hypocrisis.”

<sup>163</sup> *Comm.* on Jam. 1:26, CO 55, 396. “Fontem enim petulantiae, cui addicti sunt hypocritae, designat quo immodico sui amore caeci... .”

<sup>164</sup> *Comm.* on Dan. 4:27; CO 40, 674-675.

<sup>165</sup> *Comm.* on Isa. 58:10, CO 37, 331. “Pergit commendare caritatis officia. Haec enim est summa totius concionis, frustra homines colere Deum, si frigidam tantum et nudam caeremoniam ei offerant.”

<sup>166</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Tim. 4:2, CO 52, 294. “Ita factitios omnes placandi aut promerendi Dei modos comprehendit.”

“that kind of doctrine which adulterates the spiritual worship of God by exchanging its genuine purity for bodily exercises.”<sup>167</sup>

Because of their incomplete devotion to God despite their desire for peace with Him, hypocrites come to “wander off and want to attract God to themselves.”<sup>168</sup> They do not take human miseries and predicaments seriously and “are offended at being considered sinners.”<sup>169</sup>

W. J. Bouwsma values Calvin’s moralism as made by his anxiety of antinomistic disorder.<sup>170</sup> Excessive anxiety to be and to do right presumably pushed Calvin and his followers to hypocrisy that is more serious or may have attracted them to antinomianism.<sup>171</sup> In my view, if they did not depend upon the help of the Holy Spirit, they could not but be seriously hypocritical. Conversely, if they relied upon God’s Spirit in using the law for their sanctification, they could retain the balance between legalism and antinomianism. Richard J. Mouw thinks, “It is almost impossible” but “it is not impossible *per se*” to take proper roles without any hypocrisy on occupational and other visible societal arenas before God.<sup>172</sup> His view seems valid in the sense that our sanctification is already accomplished, but not yet.

Briefly, Calvin posited hypocrisy and pride as the most hateful vices in the eyes of God,<sup>173</sup> and called hypocrisy “the mother of all the vices”.<sup>174</sup> To overcome hypocrisy in union with Christ with the help of His Spirit is sanctification. This will be discussed in

---

<sup>167</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Tim. 4:2, CO 52, 294. “...deinde eam doctrinae speciem significat, quae spiritualement Dei cultum exercitiis corporalibus mutando genuinam eius puritatem adulterat.”

<sup>168</sup> *Comm.* on Jer. 21:1- 4, CO 38, 358. “...quia non possunt se Deo penitus addicere, hinc fit ut circumeant et velint Deum ad se allicere... ”

<sup>169</sup> *Comm.* on Matthew 9:12, CO 45, 250. In his comments on Mt. 6:2, Calvin classified hypocrites in three types: the first group is those “who in themselves have a fearful conscience, but have the face to go around as decent men and conceal their vices, of which they are inwardly convicted.” The second is those who “have such bland self-assurance that even in God’s eyes they dare to claim a perfect righteousness.” And the third group has those who have “no concern for good or for the glory of God, but do good deeds to win themselves a reputation for sanctity.” Another type of hypocrisy is described as “guile or deceit” in Calvin’s comments on John 1:47. David Foxgrover named this type “inner hypocrisy,” which has been formed by a lengthy process of self-deception and self-flattery. It leads people to a stupor “which prevents their conscience from convicting.”

<sup>170</sup> William J. Bouwsma, *John Calvin: A Sixteenth-Century Portrait* (New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), p.97.

<sup>171</sup> William J. Bouwsma, “Calvin and the Dilemma of Hypocrisy,” in *Calvin and Christian Ethics: Fifth Colloquium on Calvin & Calvin Studies*, ed. Peter De Klerk (Grand Rapids: Calvin Studies Society, 1987), p. 8.

<sup>172</sup> Richard J. Mouw, “Response to Calvin and the Dilemma of Hypocrisy,” in *Calvin and Christian Ethics: Fifth Colloquium on Calvin & Calvin Studies*, ed. Peter De Klerk (Grand Rapids: Calvin Studies Society, 1987), p.18.

<sup>173</sup> *Comm.* on Mk. 10:21, CO 45, 541. “...qui fieri potuerit, ut Christus hominem superbum et hypocritam diligeret, quum his duobus vitiis nihil odiosius sit Deo.”

<sup>174</sup> *Comm.* on Is. 10:6, CO 36, 215. “...hypocrisis illa mater est omnium vitiorum.”

‘5.2.1.2.2.1 The Discrepancy between Faith and Life.’

**2.2.1.2.2.4 Avarice**

In his sermon on Micah 2:1-3,<sup>175</sup> Calvin posited avarice as “the root of all evil” in the sense that “if our hearts burn with insatiable desire, we will give in to all forms of cruelty and inhumanity.”<sup>176</sup> Avarice is the result of our unfaithfulness. In other words, it happens to us when we do not commit our anxiety to God by faith that nourishes us in our poverty. The avaricious soul becomes more than ever greedy and “would not be satisfied if he had all the goods in the world.”<sup>177</sup> Our insatiable greed does not let us sleep. Avarice leads men to covet and steal the possession of others.<sup>178</sup> It compels men to oppress their neighbours “to grab up his house and inheritance.” It leads to repression, brutality, extortion, and violent behaviour against our neighbours. Avaricious men envy others even their use of water of a river. There is nothing more dreadful than their “avarice and insecurity.”<sup>179</sup> God is “the sworn enemy of avaricious souls, who acquire goods by evil means.”<sup>180</sup>

In his sermon on Micah 7:1-13, Calvin particularly criticized leaders for their avarice. Their avarice is the source of all evil. “The princes demand, and the judges accept bribes.”<sup>181</sup> They assume the righteous despite their wickedness. The governors “are very skilled in evil” and are “gluttons trying to swallow up everything.” The judges do not care “what one has done” but “wish only to work for the rich, giving them license to do great evil.” Those who pay off the judges go scot-free but “those who have committed lesser offences and cannot afford to pay off a judge” are severely punished.<sup>182</sup> The poor are sucked dry of their blood by pillage, “loan sharking, fraud, and crooked deals,” and widows and orphans suffer from debts.<sup>183</sup> The cunning deceivers are nothing more than the pirates who cut the throats of poor people. Though they hide behind a façade of righteousness, God cursed them. “When the wicked reign, everything falls apart.” The greed of leaders is “the principal cause of all disorder and chaos.”<sup>184</sup> Such avarice of leaders and honourable citizens of our times may be no less than that of Micah’s times.

---

<sup>175</sup> Serm. on Micah 2:1-3, Mon, Nov. 24, 1550; *Sermons on Micah by Jean Calvin* tr. by Blair Reynolds in *Texts and Studies in Religion*, 47 (Lewiston/ Queenston/ Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1990), pp.70-81.

<sup>176</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 72.

<sup>177</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 73.

<sup>178</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 74.

<sup>179</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 75.

<sup>180</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 80.

<sup>181</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 391.

<sup>182</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 392.

<sup>183</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.398-399.

<sup>184</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 401.

Accordingly, sanctification is to turn away from avarice to moderation and trust in God's care. This can be dealt with in '5.2.1.2.2.3 Quantitativism' and '5.2.1.2.2.4 Materialism.'

#### **2.2.1.2.2.5 Variance and Schism**

In relation to variance, Calvin reproached three groups: monastic sectarianism, the Anabaptists, and individualism. In his *Institutes* 4.13.14, he pointed out that "all those who enter into the monastic community break with the church" by means of adopting "a peculiar ministry and a private administration of sacraments." In contrast to them, the early monks lived apart from others, but did not establish a separate church. They took part in the sacraments with others. As part of the people, they took their seats at "solemn assemblies." The present-day monks have broken "the bond of unity" by ignoring "the ordinary ministry by which the Lord willed to preserve peace and love among his people." Accordingly, Calvin posited every monastery as "a conventicle of schismatics" agitating the order of the church and separating themselves from the ordinary community of believers. They had various names of sects, which Paul execrated (1 Cor. 1:12, 13; 3:4). It is wrong to Christ that they call themselves Benedictines, or Franciscans, or Dominicans in place of Christians. By taking those titles, they gratify their pride to be different from common Christians.

In *Institutes* 4.12.12 (Beveridge tr.), Calvin rebuked the Anabaptists for their disruptive severity. They acknowledged "no assembly of Christ unless conspicuous in all respects for angelic perfection, and overthrew everything which tends to edification" under pretense of zeal. They were fond of their own contentions rather than hating other men's wickedness. Entangling the weak by bragging of their own virtues, they endeavour "either to draw them all to their side or at least to divide them." Puffed up with pride, raving with peevishness, treacherous in slander, tumultuous in their seditions, they cover themselves with the shadow of a stern severity in order not to be seen how lacking in the light of the truth they are. Under the pretext of just severity, to divide the unity of the church is to be deceived by the strategy of Satan, who transforms himself into an angel of light. Schism as "separation from the church is the denial of God."<sup>185</sup>

In his *Institutes* 4.1.5 (Battles tr.), Calvin harshly criticized individual separation. They who proudly convict that "they can profit enough from private reading and meditation," and look down on public meetings and consider preaching as unnecessary, will be punished because of their unholy separation. They will fascinate themselves "with pestilent errors and foulest delusions." Calvin reproached the apostates who drove "the sheep from

---

<sup>185</sup> *Institutes* 4.1.10.



their fold” and cast “them into the jaws of wolves” with zeal to scatter churches.

Briefly, variance and schism are the characteristics of men without the Spirit. This must be overcome by the mortification of the flesh in the power of the Holy Spirit.

### 2.2.1.2.3 The Bondage of Will and Grace

On free will, Calvin criticized some philosophers for the opinion that free will is our ability to choose to do a certain thing or not.<sup>186</sup> He denied their argument that “since the will has free choice, it cannot be hindered from following reason as its leader in all things.”<sup>187</sup> He neither admitted Chrysostom’s opinion that “let us bring what is ours; God will furnish the rest”<sup>188</sup> nor Jerome’s that “ours is to begin, God’s to fulfil; ours to offer what we can, his to supply what we cannot.”<sup>189</sup> Calvin rejected Duns Scotus’ view that a reason is immaculate and a will is mostly unimpaired.<sup>190</sup> He seems to have acceded to Origen’s definition that free will is a faculty to choose one or the other.<sup>191</sup> Augustine thought that the will is a faculty “to choose good with the assistance of grace; evil, when grace is absent.”<sup>192</sup> Thomas argues, “Since freedom properly belongs to the will, it would be most suitable to call free will the ‘power of selection’.”<sup>193</sup> Bernard held three kinds of freedom: the *liberum arbitrium* (freedom from necessity), the *liberum consilium* (freedom from sin), and the *liberum complacitum* (freedom from misery).<sup>194</sup>

After arguing about their opinions at length, Calvin held that though man lost his free will after the fall, the freedom from compulsion remains, so that man acts wickedly by voluntary will, not compulsion.<sup>195</sup> Without such freedom we cannot be held responsible as personal agents for our behaviour. Since the fall, the human will is so enslaved that it is unable to choose the good, but voluntarily submits to the evil without compulsion.<sup>196</sup> Human choice of evil becomes necessary. In this manner, Calvin made clear the distinction between freedom from necessity and freedom from compulsion. He harshly criticized

---

<sup>186</sup> *Institutes* 2.2.3. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* III, 5,1113b. tr. R. McKeon, *Basic Works of Aristotle*, p. 972; Seneca, *Moral Epistles* xc, 1 (LCL Seneca, II, 394f.).

<sup>187</sup> *Institutes* 2.2.3.

<sup>188</sup> Chrysostom, *De Proditione Judaeorum*. hom. i. (MPG 49, 377), *Homilies on Genesis*: hom. xix. 1; hom. xxv. 7 (MPG 53,158; 54, 466; 53, 228).

<sup>189</sup> Jerome, *Dialogus contra Pelagianos* III. 1 (MPL 23. 569).

<sup>190</sup> Duns Scotus, *In sententias* II. xxix. 1; *Opera omnia* xiii, 267f.

<sup>191</sup> *Institutes* 2.2.5; Origen, *De principiis* III. i. 3 (GCS 22. 197; MPG 11. 252; tr. ANF IV, 303; Butterworth, *Origen on First Principles*, 159).

<sup>192</sup> Augustine, *Sermons* clvi, 9-13 (MPL 38, 855-857; tr. LF, *Sermon* II, 767-770).

<sup>193</sup> Aquinas, *Summa Theologia* I, ixxxiii, 3.

<sup>194</sup> Bernard, *De gratia et libero arbitrio* iii. 7 (MPL 182, 1005; tr. by W. W. Williams. *Concerning & Grace and Free Will*, pp. 15 f.).

<sup>195</sup> *Institutes* 2.2.6.

<sup>196</sup> *Institutes* 2.2.7.

Lombard for not distinguishing necessity from compulsion.<sup>197</sup> Vincent Brümmer is of the opinion that by and large, Calvin agreed with Bernard on the three freedoms,<sup>198</sup> but Calvin was much more impressed by our necessary bondage to sin than was Bernard.<sup>199</sup> Brümmer's opinion seems germane in the respect that Calvin stressed the unavoidability of servitude to sin and the necessity of God's grace for good work, and Bernard conceded to man's natural impulse to seek good will.<sup>200</sup>

On the other hand, Calvin recognized that free will implies that man can convert to God only by the choice of the will. By the fall, human free will "has been so enslaved" that nobody can "turn to God for himself."<sup>201</sup> In order to come back to God, man needs the help of God's grace. When man hears the Gospel of Christ, he becomes able to choose Christ by his will because God corrects his depraved will and reinforces his weak will to receive the Gospel (Phil. 1:6).<sup>202</sup> In concordance with Augustine, he held that "free will is established through grace."<sup>203</sup> Without grace, the human will cannot do any righteous thing. The righteousness of God is fulfilled not when the law commands, but when man's will be freed by the help of God's Spirit. Grace must take precedence over every good work in order that the human being could follow grace "as its attendant."<sup>204</sup> The fact that man becomes free from sin by the grace of Christ makes us humbly rely upon God's mercy.<sup>205</sup>

In this manner, Calvin ascribed all responsibility of sin to the human will, while he gave all credit of good works to God's grace. His emphasis on God's grace was criticized by Vincent Brümmer for the reason that his view made man a passive object rather than a responsible being in the sense that man simply consents to sin or grace rather than chooses to obey or to resist it.<sup>206</sup> Brümmer's critique does not seem germane because Calvin admitted true obedience by freedom without the compulsion of the law and stressed human responsibility to use the means to help men.<sup>207</sup> Humans must seek God's will clearly manifested in the Bible, not in His secret providence and decree. We should do good work according to the Bible by means of God's grace offered to us in our prayer.

---

<sup>197</sup> *Institutes* 2.3.5.

<sup>198</sup> *Institutes* 2.2.6.

<sup>199</sup> Cf. Vincent Brümmer, "Calvin, Bernard and the Freedom of the Will," *Religious Studies* 30 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994): 450.

<sup>200</sup> *Institutes* 2.3.6-14; Bernard, *De gratia et libero arbitrio* xiv, 46 (MPL 182. 1026 ; tr. by W. W. Williams, *Concerning Grace and Free Will*, p. 48.

<sup>201</sup> *Institutes* 2.2.8.

<sup>202</sup> *Institutes* 2.3.6 and 7.

<sup>203</sup> *Institutes* 2.2.8.

<sup>204</sup> *Institutes* 2.3.7; Augustine, *Letters*, clxxxvi, 8, 10 (MPL 33, 819; tr. FC 30, 196).

<sup>205</sup> *Institutes* 2.2.11.

<sup>206</sup> Vincent Brümmer, "Calvin, Bernard and the Freedom of the Will," *Religious Studies* 30 (1994): 453.

<sup>207</sup> *Institutes* 3.19.4-5; 1.17.3-5, 9.

To sum up, human free will was lost by sin, so that it needs the grace of God. Since justification, free will was restored to some extent by the Holy Spirit. It is the hypothesis of human duty for sanctification. Yet, it is still incomplete due to our sin, but will be completed at the end.

### 2.2.1.3 Christological Presupposition

Christology should be dealt with because sanctification is the result of the election in Christ and the atonement of Christ, and it is accomplished in our union with Him.

#### 2.2.1.3.1 The Elect of Individual and Nation in Christ

For Calvin, Christ is the elected One and the election of other people is in Christ. “As he is predestined to be our head, so many of us are predestined to be his members.”<sup>208</sup> As election takes place in Christ, it is executed in Christ. The elect belonged to the Father, but he vouchsafed them on his only Son. Jesus will not lose them but will instead raise them at the last day. The security of the elect is absolute because Christ will keep them forever. Our salvation “cannot waver or fail” because it is sustained “by the election of God,” and has “been joined to the steadfastness of Christ.”<sup>209</sup> This certainty enables our continual sanctification rather than renders us dissolute.<sup>210</sup> Election in Christ is the eternal foundation of sanctification and “the root that yields good fruits.”<sup>211</sup> Our sanctification flows from the “*fonte divinae electionis*,” that is to say, our sanctification is “*vocationis nostrae scopum*.”<sup>212</sup> In virtue of the eternal economy, the elect in Christ are sanctified in the Holy Spirit, who is conferred to the elect by Christ. Hence, we can call the election in Christ the presupposition of our sanctification.

In Calvin’s view, God not only elects individual persons, but also a race. Habib Badr connects the general election of Israel with “general calling,” and secret election with “the inner grace of special calling.”<sup>213</sup> His analysis seems valid. Israel was elected as the bearer of salvation, not elected to salvation. In the two forms of election, the cause of election is identical as God’s love and joy. For Calvin, election is not communal but individual. Still, sanctification can be accomplished both communally in the church and individually at home after they are engrafted into Christ.

---

<sup>208</sup> John Calvin, *Concerning the Eternal Predestination of God*, tr. by J. K. S. Reid, (London: James Clarke, 1961), p. 64.

<sup>209</sup> *Institutes* 4.1.3.

<sup>210</sup> Serm. on Deut. 7:7-10, CO 26:524.

<sup>211</sup> Serm on Eph. 1:4-6. *Sermons on The Epistles to the Ephesians* by John Calvin (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth & Trust, 1987), p.35.

<sup>212</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Cor. 1:2, CO 49, 308.

<sup>213</sup> Rev. Habib Badr, “Medium Quiddam: The Problematic Relation of General Election and Individual Salvation in Calvin’s Theology,” *Theological Review* 10 (Lebanon: The School, 1989): 49.

Calvin's doctrine of election is different from Barth's in the respect that the latter means the election of all humankind in Christ, while the former implies just the election of a small part of humankind. For Calvin, only the elect in Christ are sanctified in conformity with the image of Christ.

### **2.2.1.3.2 The Redemption of Christ: Three Fold Offices**

Human sin as original sin and voluntary sin can be forgiven and overcome only by the righteousness of the Son of God. Jesus Christ "cleanses and washes us in the sacrifice of his death, which is our sanctification."<sup>214</sup> Christ made atonement "by the whole course of his obedience."<sup>215</sup> His cross was the summit of all of his previous obedience. T. H. L. Parker views the office of Christ as "both act and being."<sup>216</sup> For example, "Christ not only teaches wisdom but is wisdom" itself. His opinion seems germane in the sense that Christ's atonement was accomplished by means of his being, i.e., his immaculate humanity and his divinity to overcome the power of the Satan. Consequently, Christ's redemption by his being and work can be said to be the presupposition of our sanctification, given that the Holy Spirit is conferred to us in virtue of it.

#### **2.2.1.3.2.1 Kingship**

Calvin understood Christ's kingship of us as prophesied in Psalms 89: 35-37, where God promised, "He will be the eternal protector and defender of his church."<sup>217</sup> God anointed Christ as eternal king as we know from Ps.110:1. His kingship does not belong to this world, but is spiritual and belongs to the coming world (Jn. 18:36).<sup>218</sup> That Christ is the son of David supports his kingship.<sup>219</sup>

This is started by his taking on our human nature. The incarnated Christ was anointed by the Holy Spirit when he was baptized. It was the consecration of Christ as our king. With his divinity Christ wrestled with death and won victory for us.<sup>220</sup> His strife is in order to destroy the devil that wielded the power of death.<sup>221</sup> By his resurrection, our king defeated the power of death.<sup>222</sup> He "conquered the devil and triumphed over him."<sup>223</sup>

---

<sup>214</sup> Letter To Richard Le Fevre, Geneva, *19th January 1551*; LC 2, 272, 304-305. God, of his own pleasure, delivered to guilty men for their sanctification.

<sup>215</sup> *Institutes* 2.15.2.

<sup>216</sup> T. H. L. Parker, "John Calvin," in Hurbert Cunliffe-Jones, ed., *A History of Christian Doctrine* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark Ltd., 1978), p.155.

<sup>217</sup> *Institutes* 2.15.3

<sup>218</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>219</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>220</sup> *Institutes* 2.12.3.

<sup>221</sup> *Institutes* 2.16.7.

<sup>222</sup> *Institutes* 2.16.11.

Christ's victory in his human nature becomes the justification that his triumphal victory might be ours.<sup>224</sup> In his humanity, Christ triumphed over the devil and sin as our representative and substitute. Christ's victory is the foundation of our sanctification as victory over sin and its power. His kingship reaches the climax with his exaltation to the throne at God's right hand. From there, he rules forever to help and protect us.<sup>225</sup> Christ rules us in the Spirit. He pours out his abundant gifts for us through his Spirit. His sanctifying us by the Spirit will be completed at the last Judgment.

T. Palmer holds that "Christ's work as Priest is the cause of our justification; his work as King is responsible for our sanctification."<sup>226</sup> His latter statement is generally valid. But Christ's work as Priest is not only the cause of our justification, but also the accomplishment of our objective sanctification in the sense that he purified our sins through his sanctification.

#### **2.2.1.3.2.2 Royal Priesthood**

Calvin explicated the royal priesthood of Christ in his commentary on various biblical passages. As in the case of Melchidezek, Christ was consecrated as royal priest in his person by God.<sup>227</sup> In Psalm 110 God's Son is addressed as eternal priest who has been seated in royal dignity at the right hand of God. In Zechariah 6:9-11, "being ordered to *set the crowns* on the head of Joshua" implies that "Joshua had immediately undertaken the two offices of a king and a priest." Calvin interpreted Joshua's coronation as typical of the coming Christ. Christ's consecration, as the royal priest was done by the unction of the Holy Spirit in his baptism. His receiving the Spirit without measure means that the fullness of all gifts and virtues e.g., "power, wisdom, righteousness, purity, life," "meekness, chastity, sobriety, truth and holiness" lies in his person.<sup>228</sup> It was intended to be bestowed upon us. Christ's priesthood will be touched in '2.2.4.3.1.1 the sanctification of Christ.'

#### **2.2.1.3.2.3 Prophetic Office**

Calvin expounded the prophetic office of Christ in the light of Is. 55:4. It reads, "Behold, I have made him a witness to the peoples, I have given him as a leader and commander for the peoples." Calvin understood Christ as a prophet on the ground that "Isaiah called him

---

<sup>223</sup> *The Gospel According To Isaiah: Seven Sermons on Isaiah 53 Concerning the Passion and Death of Christ* by John Calvin, tr. by Leroy Nixon (Grand Rapids: WM. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1953), p. 92.

<sup>224</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>225</sup> *Institutes* 2.16; *Comm. on Zech.* 6:9-11; *Institutes* 2.15.5.

<sup>226</sup> T. Palmer, "John Calvin's View of the Kingdom of God," Ph. D. Thesis, The University of Aberdeen, 1991, p. 213.

<sup>227</sup> *Comm. on Ex.* 28; *Comm. on Zech.* 3:5; *Comm. on Gen.* 14:18.

<sup>228</sup> *Comm. on Jn.* 7:38, CO 47, 181; *Comm. on Isa.* 11:2, CO 36, 236.

‘messenger or interpreter of great counsel’” (Is.9:6). Though “in many and various ways God spoke of old to our fathers by the prophets,” in these last days he has spoken to us “through his Son” (Heb. 1:1-2). Accordingly, Christ is the perfect Prophet as Mediator.<sup>229</sup> Calvin posited Christ as “the end of all prophecies.”<sup>230</sup> He was consecrated as the prophet “to preach to the humble...to proclaim the year of the Lord’s good pleasure” by the anointing of the Holy Spirit (Is. 61:1-2; Lk 4:18-19).<sup>231</sup> God firmly upheld Christ’s authority as his prophet by his command, which proclaims “[t]his is my beloved Son...hear him.” Christ as a prophet is a bearer of “all the treasures of knowledge and understanding.” He is our wisdom.<sup>232</sup> His prophetic office helps us to recognize our sin and weakness and correct it.

## 2.2.1.4 Soteriological Presupposition

### 2.2.1.4.1 Union with Christ

Calvin regarded our union with Christ as the presupposition of our sanctification in the sense that our sanctification is obtained through union with Christ.<sup>233</sup> We are sanctified “by Christ” and become new creatures “in Christ” because it is not from any other source that the Spirit is conferred.<sup>234</sup>

Pertaining to the mode of this union, Calvin explicated it in two ways. One is by His incarnation; the other is by his dwelling within us through his Spirit. Christ united Himself with us by taking our nature in his incarnation. By the Holy Spirit, we are engrafted into Christ and “grow into one body with him.”<sup>235</sup> The Spirit unites the elect with Christ by creating faith in them. Calvin called the Holy Spirit the bond of union because He generates faith, which enables us to unite subjectively with Christ.<sup>236</sup> Our union with Christ is effected by faith in the Gospel and by the Sacraments, which give us faith in Christ.<sup>237</sup>

---

<sup>229</sup> *Institutes* 2.15.1.

<sup>230</sup> *Institutes* 2.15.2.

<sup>231</sup> *Institutes* 2.15.2.

<sup>232</sup> *Institutes* 2.15.1.

<sup>233</sup> David K. Winecoff is of the opinion that the conclusion that “we must draw is that our participation in the sanctification of Christ depends on our union with the human nature of Christ. David K. Winecoff, “Calvin’s Doctrine of Mortification,” *Presbyterian: Covenant Seminary Review* 13 (Saint Louis: Covenant Theological Seminary, 1987): 86.

<sup>234</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Cor. 1:2, CO 49, 308.

<sup>235</sup> *Institutes* 3.1.1.

<sup>236</sup> *Ibid.*; *Institutes* 4.17.26.

<sup>237</sup> *Institutes* 4.15.6; 4.17.2; 4.14.7 and 11; cf. Wallace, *Calvin’s Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament*, pp. 218 ff.

Calvin insisted that this union offers us assurance of our salvation.<sup>238</sup> Through union with Christ, we are justified and sanctified.<sup>239</sup> Our sanctification is effected when we are engrafted into the body of Christ. By this secret union, Christ's power is transferred to His followers. The death of Christ effectively destroys the "depravity of our flesh," and his resurrection renews "a better nature."<sup>240</sup> It is within union with us that Christ "has taken away all our impurities and sprinkled us with his innocence."<sup>241</sup> Sanctification as our conformity to Christ "depends on union rather than on imitation."<sup>242</sup>

With respect to the growth of this union, Calvin contended: "Not only does he cleave to us by an indivisible bond of fellowship, but with a wonderful communion he daily grows more and more into one body with us, until he becomes completely one with us."<sup>243</sup> By means of this union, we become "bone of His bones and flesh of His flesh."<sup>244</sup> Union with Christ is to be one with him in the cross and resurrection, in forgiveness and reconciliation and in newness of life.

Calvin delineated believers' union with him in terms of a 'wondrous exchange'. They can participate here and now in His ascended life and glory. In Him, they become the partakers of eternal life.<sup>245</sup> This is a wondrous exchange between Christ and the saints. Having taken our weakness and poverty, Christ has transferred his power and wealth to us. Having taken our impurity, "he has clothed us with his righteousness".<sup>246</sup> Calvin described the exchange in Sermon on Isa. 53:4-6 as follows. "He is imprisoned, we are delivered, he is condemned and we are absolved. He is exposed to all outrages and we are established in honour. He has descended to the depths of Hell, and the Kingdom of Heaven is opened to us."<sup>247</sup> He took our uncleanness, and gave his holiness to us instead.

To sum up, this union is an essential presupposition of sanctification in the sense that without it, there can be no sanctification and the death and resurrection of Christ would be of no advantage to us.

---

<sup>238</sup> *Comm.* on Heb. 5:9, CO 55, 64. "Quo significat omnes eius passiones ad salutem nostram spectasse."

<sup>239</sup> Cf. *Comm.* on Gal.2:20, CO 50,199. "Porro vivit Christus in nobis dupliciter. Una vita est, quum nos spiritu suo gubernat atque actiones nostras omnes dirigit. Altera quod participatione suae iustitiae nos donat."

<sup>240</sup> *Comm.* on Rom. 6:4; CO 49, 105. "...mors Christi efficax est ad nequitiam carnis nostrae exstinguendam ac profligandam: resurrectio vero ad suscitandam melioris naturae novitatem."

<sup>241</sup> *Comm.* on Mt. 8:3. CO 45, 232. "...sordes omnes nostras exhaustit, et nos perfudit sua sanctitate."

<sup>242</sup> Ronald S. Wallace, *Calvin's Doctrine of the Christian Life*, 1959, p 47. ,

<sup>243</sup> *Institutes* 3.2.24.

<sup>244</sup> *Institutes* 3.1.3.

<sup>245</sup> *Institutes* 3.15.5.

<sup>246</sup> *Institutes* 4.17.2.

<sup>247</sup> Sermon on Isa. 53:4-6 in *The Gospel According To Isaiah: Seven Sermons on Isaiah 53 Concerning the Passion and Death of Christ*. Tr. by Leroy Nixon (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1953), p. 92.



#### 2.2.1.4.2 The Restoration of Human Nature and Freedom

The restoration of the human will is dealt with first because the will may be considered as the most important aspect of human nature in sanctification. The restoration of our feelings will be referred to in connection with the work of the Spirit and the Gospel, and that of reason will be observed in relation to the law. Briefly, our feelings and reason are restored by the operation of the Spirit in our union with Christ. Still they are not perfect on account of our sin, but get better day by day in his Spirit.

J. D. Douglass stresses that there are “over seven hundred uses of words derived from the basic Latin term for liberty or freedom.”<sup>248</sup> This shows us that Calvin made much of freedom in his theology. According to Calvin, human freedom was restored by the union with Christ in the Holy Spirit. This freedom is incomplete on account of remaining sin, but it will be completed at the end of time with the completion of the kingdom of God.<sup>249</sup> The author of their freedom is “the heavenly Vindicator” Christ.<sup>250</sup> Christian freedom extends to the political realm. Christ frees the believer from timid submission to impious laws, and authorizes them by his Spirit to fight boldly against evil power.<sup>251</sup>

Freedom consists of three parts.<sup>252</sup> The first part is the freedom from the Law to seek assurance of justification before and beyond the Law. This is the freedom of Gods’ children, who are free from the accusation of the Law.<sup>253</sup> A good conscience comes only when men “feel that they are being freely given what is not their legal right.”<sup>254</sup> The second part is the freedom to observe the Law willingly. Their obedience and service in freedom are acceptable to God. This freedom contributes to our progress in sanctification by our voluntary obedience to the third function of the Law. For Calvin, true freedom is freedom in obedience.<sup>255</sup> This willingness to observe the Law depends upon trust in the goodness of God. However difficult our situation is, if our conscience testifies that “God is my *arbitrator* and *approbator*,” it is an undoubted evidence of genuine faith.<sup>256</sup> The third part of Christian freedom of conscience is that we can sometimes use outward things unessential and indifferent to our faith life. These things, for example, include “unrestricted eating of meat, use of holidays and of vestments” and “a woman’s going out

---

<sup>248</sup> Jane Dempsey Douglass, “Christian Freedom in Calvin’s Theology: The Foundation and Significance of Christian Freedom,” *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, Vol. 4, no.2 (1983): 70.

<sup>249</sup> *Institutes* 2.2.20.

<sup>250</sup> *Institutes* 2.8.15.

<sup>251</sup> *Institutes* 3.20.31-32.

<sup>252</sup> Edward Meylan viewed Calvin’s doctrine of freedom as dependent upon Melancthon’s four stages of Christian freedom Edward F. Meylan, “The Stoic Doctrine of Indifferent Things and the Conception of Christian Liberty in Calvin’s *Institutio religionis christianae*,” *The Romanic Review* 29 (1937): 135-145

<sup>253</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.14; 3.19.5.

<sup>254</sup> *Institutes* 3.14.2.

<sup>255</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Pet. 2:16, CO 55, 236.

<sup>256</sup> *Comm.* on Psalm 19:8, CO 31, 200-201. “Vere quidem pacis origo est ex fide... .”

without shawl, women’s silence in the church”... .<sup>257</sup> Calvin warned of two dangers, namely intemperance and having no regard for weaker brethren.<sup>258</sup> Our freedom should be used for “the edification of our neighbours” and “must be subordinated to love,” which ought “to abide under purity of faith.”<sup>259</sup>

Briefly, as the necessary hypothesis of Christian obedience, freedom contributes to the promotion of our sanctification.

### 2.2.1.5 The Definition of Sanctification

For Calvin, conversion as *μετάνοια* (change of mind and purpose) is the process of repentance, which is “a real conversion of our life to God, that proceeds from a sincere and serious fear of God, and consists of the mortification of our flesh and the old man and the quickening of the spirit.”<sup>260</sup> In this statement, we can know that for Calvin, conversion is equated with repentance. In addition, Calvin identified repentance with regeneration. “In a word, I interpret repentance as regeneration.”<sup>261</sup> Repentance is “departing from ourselves we turn to God, and having taken off our former mind, we put on a new.”<sup>262</sup> He equated conversion with “the inner turning, when God regenerates us by his own Spirit.”<sup>263</sup> Calvin’s statements above denote that conversion, repentance, and sanctification are almost identical terms.<sup>264</sup> He usually used repentance more than regeneration, sanctification, and conversion. For example, in his *Institution of the Christian Religion* (Tr. by H. Beveridge), he used repentance (including repent) two hundred and seventy six times, regeneration (including regenerated and born again) one hundred and forty eight times, sanctification (including be holy, sanctified, and sanctify) one hundred thirty seven times, and conversion (including convert) eighty seven times.<sup>265</sup>

In view of the goal of sanctification, Calvin also defined regeneration as “a restoration of the image of God in them.”<sup>266</sup> The image of God means the righteousness of God, from which through Adam, we have fallen. This restoration is not conformity to Christ, but “the

---

<sup>257</sup> *Institutes* 3.14.7; 3.10.31.

<sup>258</sup> *Institutes* 3.14.9.

<sup>259</sup> *Institutes* 3.19.2;3.19,13.

<sup>260</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.5.

<sup>261</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.9.

<sup>262</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.5.

<sup>263</sup> *Comm.* on Lam. 5:21, CO 39, 644. “Est conversio interior, ubi Deus nos regenerat spiritu suo... .”

<sup>264</sup> William Wileman, *John Calvin: His Life, His Teaching, and His Influence in Books For The Ages* (AGES Software • Albany, OR USA Version 1.0 © 1998), p. 15. “...though the somewhat differing terms in essence mean the same—as regeneration, conversion, the new birth, and effectual calling, can record it, of himself or of another... .”

<sup>265</sup> I counted the number of these terms by acrobat reader in my computer.

<sup>266</sup> “Whose only soul is to restore in us the image of God.” *Institutes* 3.3.9; *Comm.* on Gen. 1:26, CO 23, 26. “...regeneratio spiritualis nihil aliud est quam eiusdem imaginis instauratio.”

image of Christ,” which implies the contemplation of Jesus Christ as he was revealed to us in his human nature and life.<sup>267</sup> In his Commentary on Ps. 7:12 Calvin expounds sanctification as spontaneous and joyful conformity to God’s will. “Conversion here should not be taken to mean repentance, but only a change of will.” The results of our conversion are our obedience to God’s will, justification, sanctification, and piety from God’s grace. Calvin insisted that the restoration of the human heart to the image of God could be described as sincerity, integrity, gratitude, a right conscience, eagerness, joy, and cheerfulness. He connected conversion with healing on the ground of the passage “And be converted, and I should heal them” (Isa. 6:10).

In terms of separation from the world, Calvin interpreted sanctification as to offer “ourselves to God as if in sacrifice, renouncing the world, and clearing ourselves from the pollutions of the flesh.”<sup>268</sup> It implies our mortification. Larry D. Sharp states that for Calvin, “sanctification is the process of growth in holiness and piety throughout life.”<sup>269</sup> In his commentary on 1 Cor. 1:2, Calvin defined sanctification as separation which “takes place in us when we are regenerated by the Spirit to newness of life, that we may serve God and not the world.”<sup>270</sup> This may be the clearest definition among his explications of sanctification.

In regard to the seat of sanctification, Calvin put “a seat and residence of sanctification in the inmost affection of the heart.” Sanctification is not “a doctrine of the tongue but of life; it is not apprehended merely with the understanding and memory, like other sciences, but it is only then received when it possesses the whole soul.”<sup>271</sup>

In summary, for Calvin, sanctification can be understood as the work of the Holy Spirit to restore the image of God in us, by continually mortifying the lusts of our flesh and renewing the whole man, in our union with Christ, in order to serve Him.

## 2.2.2 The Motivation and Goal of Sanctification

### 2.2.2.1 The Motivation of Sanctification

In his *Institutes* 3.3.1, Calvin posited the Scriptural warning that we must be made holy because our God is holy (Lev. 19:12, 1 Pet. 1:15-16) as the foundation and aim of

---

<sup>267</sup> *Comm.* on Rom. 8: 29, CO 49, 160. “...ut conformes sint Christo, sed imagini Christi, ut doceret vivum et conspicuum exemplar exstare in Christo...”

<sup>268</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Thess. 4:3, CO 52, 161. “...renuntiantes mundo, et carnis inquinamentis exuti, nos Deo velut in sacrificium offeramus.”

<sup>269</sup> Larry D. Sharp, “The Doctrine of Grace in Calvin and Augustine,” *The Evangelical Quarterly*, Vol. 52, no. 2 (1980): 85.

<sup>270</sup> *Comm.* on 1Cor 1:2, CO 49, 308. “Ea fit in nobis quum per spiritum in vitae novitatem regeneramur, ut serviamus Deo, et non mundo.”

<sup>271</sup> *Institutes* 3.6.4.

Christian life.<sup>272</sup> The second motive is that “God has been set before us as an example, whose pattern we ought to express in our life.”<sup>273</sup> To express Christ in our life is one condition that “we have been adoption as sons by the Lord.”<sup>274</sup>

In his *Institutes* 3.16.2, Calvin presented “the end of our redemption and calling” as the strongest motive of our sanctification.<sup>275</sup> “We have been delivered from the hand of our enemies in order that we may serve him without fear in holiness and righteousness before him all our days” (Luke 1:74). “We have not been called to uncleanness but to holiness” (1 Thess. 4:7). Our holiness is the will of God. We have been freed from sin in order to obey righteousness.<sup>276</sup> “We love one another as God has loved us” (1John 3:10). Since we have the hope to see our Lord, we sanctify ourselves (1 John 3:3).

He also found the grounds to the exhortation for holy life in the Bible. First, God revealed himself as our Father. Nonetheless, unless we do not show ourselves his sons, it will be ungrateful. Secondly, since Christ cleansed us with his blood and imparted this cleansing through baptism, “it would be unfitting to befoul ourselves with new pollutions.”<sup>277</sup> Since we are engrafted into his holy body, we must be careful not to disfigure ourselves with any spot or blemish. Christian moral behaviour flows from our recognition of the headship of Jesus Christ, which means that we belong to Christ, so that we are not ours but his. As our Head, Christ wants us to conform to his example.<sup>278</sup> Thirdly, “since the Holy Spirit dedicated us as temples to God, we must take care that God’s glory shine through us, and must not commit anything to defile ourselves with the filthiness of sin.”<sup>279</sup> In this manner, Calvin explicated the ground upon which we must pursue holy life in view of the Trinity.

Calvin emphasised our gratitude for these benefits as the motive for our good works. “If anyone is still not so forcibly affected by the glory of God, the remembrance of his benefits will, nevertheless, amply suffice to arouse such persons to well-doing.”<sup>280</sup> Our gratitude of God’s mercy on us becomes the motivation of our holy life because “nobody can be fit for the pursuit of holiness” unless he has first “imbibed” the doctrine that we are justified only by Christ’s merit.<sup>281</sup>

---

<sup>272</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>273</sup> *Institutes* 3.6.3.

<sup>274</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>275</sup> “Indeed, if men have to be aroused, no one can put sharper than those derived from the end of our redemption and calling” (*Institutes* 3.16.2).

<sup>276</sup> *Institutes* 3.16.2.

<sup>277</sup> *Institutes* 3.6.3. .

<sup>278</sup> Serm. on Eph. 5:28-30.

<sup>279</sup> *Institutes* 3.6.3.

<sup>280</sup> *Institutes* 3.16.3.

<sup>281</sup> *Institutes* 3.16.3.

### 2.2.2.2 The Goal of Sanctification

With respect to the aim of our sanctification, Calvin stressed God's glory.<sup>282</sup> One reason to do good works "ought to be enough: that God may be glorified" by our good works.<sup>283</sup> We are employed for God's glory. It is unreasonable to live for any other purpose except his glory. "Nothing is to be sought beyond his own glory."<sup>284</sup> Conspicuously, Jr. Burnell F. Eckardt compared Luther and Calvin in the light of the goal of God's behaviour.<sup>285</sup> For Luther, God is merciful: "he punishes the wicked because he has to; he saves the faithful because he wants to." For Calvin God is sovereign: "he saves the faithful to glorify himself; he punishes the wicked likewise to glorify himself." Calvin's view that God acts for his own glory was "foreign and inimical to Luther." "The reason God loves a cheerful giver (2 Cor. 9:7)" is that God himself is a giver rather than a receiver. The reason God asked his children to love their enemies is that he is love itself and he loved thus (Jn 3:16). Eckardt's thesis is quite evangelical and logical in the sense that his argument is based on the Bible, especially the New Testament. Then, is Calvin's insistence not biblical? It surely is biblical! (Is. 42:8, 12; 46:13). A great many passages of the Bible testify that whatever we do, we should do for the glory of God (Mt. 5:16, NASB; 1 Cor 10:31; Phil. 2:11; 1 Pet. 4:11). Hence, Calvin's argument that the aim of our sanctification is God's glory is legitimate. His view does not exclude that God's nature is merciful. He emphasises the fact that God is the creator of our salvation and holy life, so that he should be glorified.

In summary, for Calvin, the motivation of our sanctification is to remember that the end for which God called us is to our holy life and not to forget our gratitude for salvation. The goal of our holy life is to glorify God.

### 2.2.3 God's Role and the Human Role in Sanctification

God's absolute dominion and human free will must be dealt with before examining God's role and human role in sanctification, because sanctification presupposes human responsibility in God's sovereignty.

#### 2.2.3.1 God's Sovereignty and Human Responsibility

George Hendry notes that "the traditional understanding of predestination has been held to destroy the freedom of the individual and has led some to call for a revolt against God in

---

<sup>282</sup> *Institutes* (1536) 1.37; *Institutes* 3.16.3.

<sup>283</sup> *Institutes* 3.16.3.

<sup>284</sup> *Comm.* on Rom 11: 36. CO 49, 232. "...nihil extra eius gloriam quaerendum esse."

<sup>285</sup> Burnell F. Eckardt Jr., *Bondage of the Will: Calvin and Luther in Logia: A Journal of Lutheran Theology* Vol. 7 (1998): 29.

the name of human freedom.”<sup>286</sup> George Harkness holds that Calvin did not reconcile a “conflict between his doctrine of God’s absolute sovereignty and man’s responsibility.”<sup>287</sup> Vincent Brümmer criticizes Calvin for abolishing human responsibility by eliminating our ability to refuse God’s grace.<sup>288</sup> Brümmer’s view seems valid in terms of the fact that Calvin held that “God...so regulates all things that nothing takes place without his deliberation.”<sup>289</sup> Still, given that Calvin denied the freedom from necessity, but admitted the freedom from compulsion by grace, Brümmer’s argument seems impertinent.<sup>290</sup> Of course, Calvin averred that “the intermediate movement...which men are free either to accept or refuse ...[is] obviously excluded when it is asserted that constancy is efficacious for perseverance.” Calvin’s statements simply mean that man willingly obeys God’s efficacious grace or necessarily submits to sinful desire, by which God rules over him without any compulsion.<sup>291</sup>

It must not hastily conclude that Calvin insisted on irresistible grace in the way that it demolishes the spontaneity of the human will, because man follows God’s intention by His efficacious grace, not compulsorily against his will, but voluntarily. To my knowledge, Calvin had never directly used the term, “irresistible” in his *Institutes* 2.3.10 though John S. Bay insists that for Calvin, the grace of God through the Holy Spirit is irresistible on the basis of the *Institutes* 2.3.10.<sup>292</sup> The term, “irresistible grace” (if its use is permissible) implies the causal sufficiency of God’s grace to move believers in a personal way rather than the abolition of human freedom from compulsion.<sup>293</sup> There is no contradiction between God’s absolute rule and human will. “Two things are true: humans are free and God is sovereign. Both are true, and this is paradoxical!”<sup>294</sup>

---

<sup>286</sup> George S. Hendry, “On being a Creature,” *Theology Today* 38 (1981/82): 72

<sup>287</sup> Georgia Elma Harkness, *John Calvin: the Man and his Ethics* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1958), p. 74.

<sup>288</sup> Cf. Vincent Brümmer, “Calvin, Bernard and the Freedom of the Will,” *Religious Studies* 30 (1994): 452.

<sup>289</sup> *Institutes* 1.16.3.

<sup>290</sup> I concur with Paul Helm’s critique of Brümmer’s view. “Brümmer is mistaken in thinking that Calvin’s account of perseverance ‘is based above all on the “efficacious” compulsion of grace which eliminates our ability to reject it’. It is true Calvin, with Augustine teaches that grace overcomes a person’s desire to reject it, but this is done not by (psychological) compulsion, but ‘when we, who are by nature inclined to evil with our whole heart, begin to will good, we do so out of mere grace’...he equates efficacious grace with overriding compulsion”...efficacious grace...is causal sufficiency...not psychological compulsion.” Paul Helm, “Calvin and Bernard on Freedom and Necessity: A Reply to Brümmer,” *Religious Studies* 30 (1994): 463.

<sup>291</sup> *Institutes* 2.3.5.

<sup>292</sup> John S. Bay, “The Value of Works in the Theology of Calvin and Beza,” *Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol.4, no. 2 (1973): 79.

<sup>293</sup> Cf. F. Wendel, “Justification and Predestination in Calvin,” in *Reading in Calvin’s Theology*, ed. by Donald McKim (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984), p. 169. “...the elect soul is nonetheless incapable of resisting God...this is not to say that his will is annihilated. On the contrary, regeneration liberates his will, but by making him will what God expects of him.”

<sup>294</sup> Robert H. Ramey, Jr. & Ben Campbell Johnson, *Living the Christian Life: A Guide to Reformed Spirituality* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), p.29.



Remarkably, Calvin vaguely stated that “not only is grace offered by the Lord, *which by anyone’s free choice may be accepted or rejected*; but it is this very grace which forms both choice and will in the heart” (italics are my stress). Though it was Augustine’s testimony, Calvin regarded it as his especial wish to obtain. The statement of Calvin may be used to support that he admitted human free choice in God’s grace. In any event, Calvin stressed God’s absolute dominion over the human will regardless of the elect or the reprobate.<sup>295</sup>

Burnell F. Eckardt Jr. calls Calvin’s doctrine of God’s providence “divine determinism.”<sup>296</sup> His choice of term seems not to be pertinent because determinism echoes human irresponsibility. For Calvin, human responsibility remains unchangeable because God’s governance is generally so secret that men cannot know it until it is finally revealed to us. Accordingly, Calvin asserted that the Christian must inquire and learn from the Bible “what is pleasing to God” so that he may accomplish it under the help and guidance of the Spirit.<sup>297</sup> Especially with respect to future events, man must zealously seek human supports or the means to help him “as far as it can be attained by intelligence and understanding.”<sup>298</sup> Our faith in God’s sovereign governance, which particularly takes care of us, becomes our great solace in all adversities.<sup>299</sup> Consequently, it contributes to our perseverance, which enables our continual sanctification.

In conclusion, though Calvin stressed God’s sovereignty over the world including men, he was not a determinist but recognized human responsibility.

### 2.2.3.2 The Role of God in Sanctification

For Calvin, regeneration to circumcise the hearts of men was regarded as the work of God alone. It is not ascribed to any other than God Himself. All “our holiness proceeds from God’s mercy and men bring nothing of their own making.”<sup>300</sup> Though God frequently “invites us to repentance,” only He is “declared to be the Author of conversion.” “[W]e are as rotten carcasses until God has renewed us again by the power of the Holy Spirit.”<sup>301</sup> Calvin explicated this in his Commentary on Ezekiel 11:19-20 as follows:

After Ezekiel had announced the conversion of the people, at the

---

<sup>295</sup> *Institutes* 1.18.2

<sup>296</sup> Burnell F. Eckardt Jr., *Bondage of the Will: Calvin and Luther in Logia: A Journal of Lutheran Theology* Vol. 7 (1998): 23.

<sup>297</sup> *Institutes* 1.17.3.

<sup>298</sup> *Institutes* 1.17.9.

<sup>299</sup> *Institutes* 1.17.6, 8.

<sup>300</sup> Serm. on Eph. 1:17-18 in *Sermons on The Epistle to the Ephesians by John Calvin* first edition in French 1562, tr. Arther Golding, published in 1577, revised translation first published in 1973 (London: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1973), p.101. Hereafter it is written *SEC*.

<sup>301</sup> *SEC*, p.165.



same time he taught that the singular gift of repentance would be bestowed: because when any one has turned aside from the right way, unless God extends his hand, he will plunge himself even into the deep abyss. Hence after a man has once left God, he cannot return to him by himself.<sup>302</sup>

To believe that free will plays the slightest role in “conversion as repentance” is considered as a lapse into Pelagianism. Calvin’s view corresponds with Augustine’s view that it is not in man’s power to be converted or to pray. Of course, Calvin admitted the role of pastors as the intermediate agency of this conversion. Still, even though they labour by praying, sowing and watering, it is God alone that gives the increase, it should be declared to be His work alone too.<sup>303</sup> In this way, the human role in sanctification was completely denied.

Calvin understood the role of the Holy Spirit as the subject to unite us with Christ. The Spirit unites us with Christ in our participation in the Lord’s Supper and Baptism.<sup>304</sup> He creates faith in the human heart by which we are justified. In this union, we are sanctified. He converts us by his secret work and inspiration.<sup>305</sup> Calvin posited the role of the Spirit as purifying us from all uncleanness. The Holy Spirit is called “the Spirit of sanctification” because he is “the seed and root of a heavenly life within us.”<sup>306</sup> He sanctifies us by purging us from all wickedness and corruption, and by submitting us to divine righteousness through restraining our lusts.<sup>307</sup> Lest “the shedding of his sacred blood” should be invalidated, our souls are purified “by the secret watering of the Spirit.”<sup>308</sup> All the exercise of piety cannot be effectual “without the secret operation of the Spirit.”<sup>309</sup>

The Holy Spirit transfuses spiritual energies into the Christian to overcome his powerlessness. Calvin describes the result as “quickening.”<sup>310</sup> The Spirit is called “the Spirit of sanctification, because he quickens and cherishes us.”<sup>311</sup> The power of the Holy Spirit “enflames our hearts with the love of God and with zealous devotion” and “accomplishes what we desire,” “persistently boiling away and burning up our vicious and inordinate desires.”<sup>312</sup>

---

<sup>302</sup> CO 40, 242.

<sup>303</sup> Cf. *Comm.* on Eph. 3:14, CO 51, 185; *Comm.* on 1 Cor. 3:6, CO 49, 349.

<sup>304</sup> *Serm.* on Acts 2:1- 4; CO 48, 634.

<sup>305</sup> *Comm.* on Jer. 24: 7, CO 38, 465-66. “...denique ut trahat, et sentiamus in nobis opus illud spiritus sancti...nec sponte, vel propria industria nos convertimus, sed hoc est opus spiritus sancti.”

<sup>306</sup> *Institutes* 3.1.3.

<sup>307</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.14.

<sup>308</sup> *Institutes* 3.1.1.

<sup>309</sup> *Comm.* on Ex. 30:23, CO 24, 446. “...absque arcana operatione spiritus.”

<sup>310</sup> *Sermons on Job with an Introductory Essay selected by Harold Dekker*, tr. by Leroy Nixon (Grand Rapids: Baker use, 1979), p. 109; *Serm.* No.70 on Job. 21:13-15, CO 34, 227-239.

<sup>311</sup> *Institutes* 3.1.2.

<sup>312</sup> *Institutes* 3.1.3.

Calvin explicated the office of the Holy Spirit as *interior magistrator* in connection with illumination. The Spirit illuminates our minds, and forms our hearts to love, and cultivates righteousness.<sup>313</sup> He illuminates us with sound knowledge (*sana intelligentia*), and then “makes us docile by his secret influence.”<sup>314</sup> He enlightens the mind and converts the will to understand and consent to the Gospel.<sup>315</sup> He gives us a new mind that corresponds to Christ. His illumination enables us to have “new eyes for the contemplation of the heavenly mysteries.”<sup>316</sup> The Spirit “endues us with judgment and discernment, lest we should be deceived by lies.”<sup>317</sup> He removes our doubt to shape our assurance of salvation by his illustrating of Scripture.<sup>318</sup> This role of the Spirit enables us to be sanctified by the Word.

He describes the role of the Spirit in connection with the sacraments as follows: The Spirit “softens our obdurate hearts, and frames them to the obedience which is due to his word” lest the Word should beat us in vain, and the sacraments strike our eyes in vain. He “transmits those outward words and sacraments from our ears to our soul.” The Spirit strengthens our faith “by engraving the confirmation in our minds,” when Word and sacraments “set before our eyes the good will of our Heavenly Father towards us.”<sup>319</sup> He also moderates our emotions in prayer.<sup>320</sup>

To sum up, the Holy Spirit plays a primary and crucial role in our sanctification.

### 2.2.3.3 The Human Role in Sanctification

According to Jesse Couenhoven, though Calvin thought sanctification was not a human work but the work of the Holy Spirit, he often delineated it “in terms of a job that is to be done, actions that the Christian should accomplish, and virtues in which the Christian should grow.”<sup>321</sup> Since Christ has united us to his body, we “should use our utmost exertions so that the glory of God may be displayed by us.”<sup>322</sup> Calvin did not deny the human aspect in conversion. “There is, indeed, a twofold turning or conversion of men to God, and a twofold turning of God to men.”<sup>323</sup> Unless we dedicate ourselves to

<sup>313</sup> *Institutes* 2.5.5.

<sup>314</sup> Comm. on Ps. 124, CO 32, 270. “...intus nos Deus arcano spiritus sui instinctu dociles redderet.”

<sup>315</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Thess. 5:19, CO 52, 175. “...proprium spiritus officium sit illustrare mentes... .”

<sup>316</sup> *Institutes* 3.2.34; 3.1.4.

<sup>317</sup> Comm. on 1 Jn. 2: 27, CO 55, 328. “...iudicio et discretione nos regere, ne mendacio fallamur... .”

<sup>318</sup> *Institutes* 1.7.1 and 4.

<sup>319</sup> *Institutes* 4.14.10 (Beveridge, tr.)

<sup>320</sup> Cf. *Comm.* on Jer. 29:12, CO 38, 595. “...nos non proprio carnis impulsu orare, sed quum spiritus sanctus corda nostra dirigit, et quodammodo orat in nobis.”

<sup>321</sup> Jesse Couenhoven, “Grace as Pardon and Power: Pictures of the Christian Life in Luther, Calvin, and Barth,” *Journal of Religious Ethics*, Vol. 28, no. 1 (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2000): 72.

<sup>322</sup> *Institutes* 3.6.3.

<sup>323</sup> Comm. on Lam. 5:21, CO 39, 644. “Est enim duplex, conversio hominum ad Deum, et conversio etiam Dei ad homines”

righteousness, “we not only most perfidiously revolt from our Creator but also abjure him as our Savior.”<sup>324</sup> In a letter to the Churches of Languedoc, Calvin stressed, “We have good reason to think, if we would not designedly shut the door against his grace - not to be negligent in discharging the duties which fall to our own share.”<sup>325</sup> These statements insinuate that Calvin did not deny human responsibility in answer to the initiative grace of God in our sanctification. Still, it does not mean that God’s work in our sanctification must be complemented by our work or cooperation. Calvin rejected the concept of “co-operating grace,” “which makes God only a co-worker with us.”<sup>326</sup> For Calvin, sanctification is entirely the work of God’s grace from the beginning to the end, but it did not exclude our responsible response to and participation in the sanctification of Christ. Our participation is also precipitated and kept only by God’s grace. Our duty is to respond to God’s disposing us to participate in the sanctification of Christ. Briefly, our role is to constantly use the means of sanctification, which God offers us in his grace.

#### 2.2.3.3.1 Obedience of Faith to the Word of God

Because Adam failed to obey God in faith, Christians should trust the goodness of God, wholly depending upon the Word of God.<sup>327</sup> For Calvin, obedience can never be distinguished from faith. Obedience is below, in and beyond faith. By faith, we obey the Gospel.<sup>328</sup> Obedience can be said to be an excellent evidence of our faith.<sup>329</sup> Obedience is the grace of God in the sense that our faith is the gift of God.

Calvin describes the characteristics of Christian life in relation to our obedience. “Christian life is not only shown in bearing arms and exposing our bodies and wealth in order to maintain the quarrel of the gospel, but also *in subjecting ourselves entirely to the obedience of Him* who has bought us at so dear a price, that he may be glorified in our life as well as in our death”<sup>330</sup> (Italics are my accent). In Calvin’s view, man can not know God as Lord and Father, “without being dutiful children and obedient servants to him.”<sup>331</sup>

He declared that “indeed [t]he basis of religion is in obedience.”<sup>332</sup> This obedience is not based on determinism or a secret decree, but on God’s guide publicly manifested in the

---

<sup>324</sup> *Institutes* 3.6.3.

<sup>325</sup> LC 4, 634, 278.

<sup>326</sup> *Institutes* 2.3.11.

<sup>327</sup> John Calvin, *Geneva Catechism*, 1541, question 7.

<sup>328</sup> *Comm.* on Rom. 1:5, CO 49, 11. “illae per fidem obediunt.”

<sup>329</sup> Letter to the Prince Porcien, May, 1563; LC 4, 645, 308.

<sup>330</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>331</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Jn 2:3, CO 55, 311. “...quin praebeamus nos illi vicissim morigeros filios, et servos obsequentes.”

<sup>332</sup> *Comm.* on Jer. 7:21-24, CO 37, 692. “...nempe pietatem fundatam esse in obedientia.” (Translation is mine).

law and in Jesus Christ.<sup>333</sup> The obedience to God relies on the knowledge of God's will, which is known through the Law.<sup>334</sup> Obedience is the active response in accordance with the commands of God revealed in the Bible. It is our submissive acceptance of God's will. A man "could not love God unless he submits all to him."<sup>335</sup> To submit "without delay" or even without understanding is regarded as the highest obedience.<sup>336</sup> The only way of sanctification is our obedience.

### 2.2.3.3.2 Self-Examination for Self-Correction

Calvin definitely asserted that in order to heal our vices, "we should carefully examine our thoughts and desires," and "shake off whatever in us is reprehensible or vicious" without pleasing or deceiving ourselves "by empty flatteries."<sup>337</sup> Every Christian is persistently to examine himself to discover "his calamity, poverty, nakedness, and disgrace."<sup>338</sup> This opinion of Calvin was also well represented in his letter to Mademoiselle:

You will find it to be of advantage to call yourself to account day by day, and while acknowledging your faults to groan within yourself and mourn over them before God so that your displeasure against whatsoever is evil may grow more intense.<sup>339</sup>

Calvin seems to maintain that the only way to please God was to censure ourselves severely. His view reflects his thoughts on the mortification of our flesh. Such a view of self-examination seems a little excessive, because we have freedom, as the children of God, from the condemnation of the Law. As a result, this inclination may promote rather than reduce hypocrisy. If grace's role is emphasised in self-examination, self-examination will contribute to our sanctification.

### 2.2.3.3.3 Watchfulness

Calvin warned us of the necessity of watchfulness from various angles.

---

<sup>333</sup> *Comm.* on Is. 10:6, CO 36, 215. "...arcano consilio cuius homines conscii non sunt: praecipit etiam lege, qua voluntarium obsequium a nobis postulat."

<sup>334</sup> *Comm.* on Acts 2:23, CO 48, 40. "...nemo obedit Deo, nisi cui comperta est eius voluntas."

<sup>335</sup> *Comm.* on Jn. 5:42, CO 47, 126. "Amare enim Deum nemo potest, quin...totum illi submittat." (Translation is mine).

<sup>336</sup> *Comm.* on Jn. 13:6, CO 47, 306. "...ut parati simus absque mora subscribere, simul atque aliquid mandat."

<sup>337</sup> *Comm.* on Jer. 8:4-5; CO 38, 6. "Ergo si cupimus sanari a vitiis nostris, semper incipiendum est ab hac parte, nempe ut excutiamus sedulo et cogitationes nostras et studia, et non placeamus nobis, neque fallamus inanibus blanditiis; sed appetamus excutere quidquid in nobis est reprehensione dignum aut vitiosum." (Translation is mine).

<sup>338</sup> *Institutes* 3.17.3.

<sup>339</sup> Letter to Mademoiselle de..., January 12, 1549; LC 2, 233, 205.

In relation to knowledge of God, Calvin emphasised that if we are inattentive for a while, our knowledge of God soon falls off because of our vanities and evil affections, which easily corrupt “the good seed which God has sown in us” without our constant cultivating it by “plucking up the evil” and “confirming the good”.<sup>340</sup>

With respect to zeal, he accentuated that we must not quench “the light of the Holy Spirit” given to us, but maintain “a burning fire.”<sup>341</sup> We ought to diligently utilize the gifts of the Spirit and “never allow them to lie dead and useless,” because of our slackness.<sup>342</sup> When God vouchsafes the means for our sanctification, we must use it without a moment’s delay. Otherwise, the door of God’s grace may be shut.<sup>343</sup> We must be neither indolent “nor faint-hearted,” but be awake in asking, receiving, and making use of the gifts of God.<sup>344</sup> Calvin emphasised that we should rouse our fervour and inflammation in us and “assail the whole world”.<sup>345</sup> He warned that if we neglect God’s warning to be watchful. He would take up arms and chastise “the torpor of men”.<sup>346</sup>

Such expressions denote watchfulness as one of our duties in response to the initiation of God in sanctification.

#### 2.2.3.3.4 Self-Offering

Calvin understood that sanctification consists not only of our participation by faith in all the power and gifts in Christ, but also of the offering of ourselves entirely to God in body and soul.<sup>347</sup> He accentuated that because God has sanctified us for his service, in accordance with His calling, “we must endeavour to cleanse ourselves more and more from all vices, and we must give ourselves wholly to him so that we are no more like worldings, who take leave to do what they wish.”<sup>348</sup> At the beginning of right spiritual right living, “the inner feeling of the mind” should be “unfeignedly dedicated to God for the cultivation of holiness and righteousness.”<sup>349</sup>

As the acceptability of the sacrifice depends upon the consecration of the priest, our self-offering relies upon the wholehearted devotion of our self to God. Because “whatever

---

<sup>340</sup> Letter to French Church at Antwerp, December 21, 1556; LC 3, 449, 305.

<sup>341</sup> *Comm.* on Jer. 20:8-9, CO 38, 346. “...ignis ardens...lucem spiritus sancti...”

<sup>342</sup> Letter to M. De Falais, October 14, 1543; LC 1, 110, 397.

<sup>343</sup> Letter to Mademoiselle de..., the 12<sup>th</sup> of January 1549; LC 2, 233, 206.

<sup>344</sup> Letter to the women detained in prison at Paris, September 1557; LC 3, 476, 365.

<sup>345</sup> *Comm.* on Jer. 20:10, CO 38, 346. The expression “assail the whole world” is similar to Barth’s. Presumably, Barth was influenced by Calvin. Barth used the expression in “the great assault which is directed against the world,” *CD IV/2*, 543.

<sup>346</sup> *Comm.* on Dan.9:13, CO 41, 148. “...castigat hominum torporem.”

<sup>347</sup> *Comm.* on 2 Cor. 7:1, CO 50, 84. “Ergo ut te rite sanctifices Deo, et corpus et animam illi in solidum dicare oportet.”

<sup>348</sup> Serm. on Eph. 1:17-18; *SEC*, 103.

<sup>349</sup> *Institutes* 3.6.5.

is touched by an unclean person is polluted,<sup>350</sup> the proper motive is most important in our self-offering. Our motive for sacrifice should be an unfeigned and pure love of God.<sup>351</sup> Our pure heart must step out before our feet and hands. When our heart is offered to God as a whole sacrifice, the rest of our life becomes sanctified.<sup>352</sup> Calvin explicated the expansion of our sanctification to all the spheres of our life in the light of Zechariah 14:20. That “*all the pots in the house of Jehovah shall be like the vessels before the altar*” is interpreted as the meaning that all the realms of our life should be holy to God.<sup>353</sup> It implies that “they would still offer a pure sacrifice to God, both in eating and drinking, and even in warfare.”<sup>354</sup> It is applied to us as the instruction that our life should be a sacrifice whatever we do anywhere. Our common things and works in union with Christ are sanctified by the Word of God and prayer. It is our self-offering in our life.

Our self-offering should be done not only by love and gratitude, but also with fear and trembling on account of the holiness of God.<sup>355</sup> Calvin called this fear “reverence.”<sup>356</sup> Such a reverential fear is inspired by the goodness and fatherhood of God, not servile and constrained fear of Him.<sup>357</sup> Without true fear of God, there cannot be true love and service of God.<sup>358</sup>

## 2.2.4 The Nature of Sanctification

### 2.2.4.1 Visibility or Invisibility?

Visibility of sanctification is connected with the incompleteness of our sanctification while invisibility is connected with completeness.

Pertaining to the invisibility and the transhistorical of our sanctification, Calvin depicted it as the completed form of our sanctification that will appear at the last day.<sup>359</sup> Our whole participation in Christ’s sanctification is “hidden by his flesh, its manifestation

---

<sup>350</sup> *Comm.* on Hag. 2:11-15, CO 44, 110. “...pollui scilicet ab homine immundo quidquid attingit, . . .”

<sup>351</sup> *Serm.* on Deut. 5:17, CO 26, 333; *Serm.* on Deut. 5:8-10, CO 26: 268

<sup>352</sup> Prayer in *Comm.* on Joel 2:14 in *Commentaries on the Twelve Minor Prophets by John Calvin*, tr. by the Rev. John Owen, Vol. 2. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1950).

<sup>353</sup> *Comm.* on Zech. 14:20, CO 44, 388-389.

<sup>354</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>355</sup> cf. *Comm.* on Lk 1:12, CO 45, 12. “Neque hominibus a Dei praesentia metus tantum incutitur, qui eos ad reverentiam erudiat, sed qui humiliet carnis superbiam, quae tam proterva est, ut nunquam se nisi violenter subacti Deo subiiciant.”

<sup>356</sup> *Serm.* on Deut. 6:4-9, CO 26: 440.

<sup>357</sup> *Institutes* 1.4.4;

<sup>358</sup> *Serm.* on Deut. 6:3-15, CO 26, 458.

<sup>359</sup> *Comm.* on Mt. 25:32, CO 45, 686. “...ut sciant pie et innoxie vivendo se operam non ludere, quia tandem apparebit discrimen.”



is properly delayed until the last day.”<sup>360</sup> As the glorious state of Christ was behind the veil of “the despised form of a servant,”<sup>361</sup> our glorious state is hidden in his resurrection. His resurrection reminds us that we already participate daily in heavenly renewal. This hope is the basis of our continual striving for sanctification. Our faith cannot stand unless it is resolutely based on the trustworthy promise of God.<sup>362</sup> Our sanctification in history is not yet completed. It looks to its accomplishment “beyond history.”<sup>363</sup>

With respect to the visibility of our sanctification, Calvin explicated it in connection with the fruit of the Holy Spirit. The fruit of the Spirit are “the sign of our union with Christ.” That some people are spiritual is “evident from their works.”<sup>364</sup> He admitted that “newness of life is testified by good works,” though our good works are different from Christ’s.<sup>365</sup> In other words, because our good works are visible, our sanctification can be said to be visible. In his commentary on Rom. 14:17 (footnote no. 426), Calvin regarded “righteousness, peace, and joy” as things “apparent and visible” for the reason that they are “things acceptable to God and approved by men.” “Righteousness” must mean ‘the doing of what is right and just towards one another’ and “peace” is “concordant unanimity, as opposed to discord and contentions.” In addition, “joy” is “the fruit of this peaceable state, a cheering delight, a mutual rejoicing, instead of the sorrow and grief occasioned by discord.” These are the characteristics of the sanctified, which are visible to men. Accordingly, we can say that for Calvin, sanctification is visible in our life.

Considering both of them, Calvin explicated it in view of the sacraments as being true “that there may be invisible sanctification without a visible sign, and, on the other hand, a visible sign without true sanctification.”<sup>366</sup> The former means that men put on Christ, even “to the extent of holiness of life”; the latter only “to the extent of partaking in the sacrament,”<sup>367</sup> “The former is peculiar to the good”; the latter may be common to the good and the bad. In this way Calvin insinuated the invisibility of our sanctification but he did not deny its visibility

To sum up, for Calvin, “the church has been sanctified by Christ” but “only the beginning of its sanctification is visible here”; its perfect completion will appear when Christ “perfectly fills the church with his holiness.”<sup>368</sup>

---

<sup>360</sup> *Comm.* on Lk. 19:12, CO 45, 568. “sed quia carni absconditus est hic regnandi modus, proprie in ultimum diem eius manifestatio differtur.”

<sup>361</sup> *Comm.* Mt. 25:31, CO 45, 686. “...sub contempto servi habitu iacebat.”

<sup>362</sup> *Que cest que Esperance*, CO 22: 59.

<sup>363</sup> John H. Leith, *John Calvin’s Doctrine of the Christian Life* (Louisville: Westminster / John Knox Press, 1989), p. 147.

<sup>364</sup> *Comm.* on Gal. 5:22, CO 50, 255. “Nam ab operibus spirituales apparent.”

<sup>365</sup> *Comm.* on 1Jn. 3:7, CO 55, 334. “Docet hic apostolus testandam esse bonis operibus vitae novitatem.”

<sup>366</sup> August. *de Quaest. Vet. 1437 Test. Lib.* iii, quoted in *Institutes* 4.14.14.

<sup>367</sup> August. *de Bapt. Cont. Donat.* cap. xxiv, quoted in *Institutes* 4.14.14.

<sup>368</sup> *Institutes* 4.8.12.



## 2.2.4.2 Forensic or Factual?

As Jesse Couenhoven writes, Calvin attempted to show harmony between our salvation accomplished by Christ and our growth in righteousness.<sup>369</sup> The former with forensic and the latter is connected with factual sanctification. Forensic sanctification is the objective aspect of sanctification and factual sanctification is the subjective aspect.

### 2.2.4.2.1 Forensic Sanctification

#### 2.2.4.2.1.1 The Sanctification of Christ

Calvin held that when Christ sanctified himself and performed the office of a priest, we were sanctified by his sacrifice.<sup>370</sup> Christ “consecrated himself to the Father that his holiness might come to us.”<sup>371</sup> We become participators in his holiness through the work of the Holy Spirit, who cleans us “by the holiness of Christ.” Calvin compared this to the metaphor of the first-fruit of the harvest. “The blessing on the first-fruits is spread over the whole harvest.” He explicated this not only in terms of the imputation of righteousness but also in the light of the High Priest, because Christ has become for us righteousness and sanctification (1Cor.1:30). Christ “has blotted out our transgressions” and “has removed the disobedience of Adam” by the total obedience of his life.<sup>372</sup> His consecration culminated in the sacrifice of his death. As the true High Priest, by the power of his Spirit, he consecrated “the temple, the altar, all the vessels, all the people.” He “presented us to his Father in his own person, that we may be renewed to true holiness by his Spirit.”<sup>373</sup> Christ has “perfected forever them that are sanctified” by one offering.<sup>374</sup> Wallace interpreted Christ’s self-consecration as vicarious.<sup>375</sup> It seems persuasive in that Christ is the representative and substitute of humankind, especially other human High Priests, who have offered imperfect sacrifice. However, Christ’s self-consecration is his preparation for his sacrifice to accomplish our atonement.

Our forensic transformation is the basis of our factual regeneration from flesh to spirit,

---

<sup>369</sup> Jesse Couenhoven, “Grace as Pardon and Power: Pictures of the Christian Life in Luther, Calvin, and Barth,” *Journal of Religious Ethics*, Vol. 28, no. 1 (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2000), p.73.

<sup>370</sup> *Comm.* on Heb. 10:10, CO 55, 125. “...Christum se offerendo, patris mandata satisfecisse, ...nos fuisse sanctificatos...”

<sup>371</sup> *Comm.* on Jn. 17:19, CO 47, 385; Cf. *Serm.* on Eph. 1:17-19; “Jesus Christ sanctified himself for us, in order that we might be washed and cleansed from all our pollutions”; *SEC*, 102.

<sup>372</sup> *Comm.* on Heb. 5:9, CO 55, 64. “...sua obedientia Christus deleverit nostras transgressiones... inobedientiam Adae contrario remedio sustulit.”

<sup>373</sup> *Comm.* on Jn. 17:19. CO 47, 385. “...nos in sua persona quodammodo patri obtulit...”

<sup>374</sup> *Comm.* on Heb. 10: 11-14, CO 55, 126. “Plenam enim consecrationem habent sancti omnes in unica Christi oblatione.”

<sup>375</sup> R. S. Wallace (1955), *op. cit.*, p.13.

i.e., “a renewal of the divine image in us,” which makes activity, which is pleasing to God possible<sup>376</sup> and enables us to follow the pattern of Jesus Christ.

#### **2.2.4.2.1.2 The Sanctification of the Church in Christ’s Sanctification**

As the death of the old man in us and the birth of the new man, sanctification expresses a reality in Christ. This reality has its existence solely in Christ. As long as we are living on earth, we reach and participate in that reality only in the same measure as we are united with Christ. Christ’s sanctification as our king and priest was acted in the name of his people. Because he is our representative, his act is regarded as ours. In terms of this representation theory, his sanctification becomes our sanctification. Christ’s sanctification is transferred to us in his union with us. It is explicated through the metaphor of Head and Body. It is in the life and work of Jesus Christ who is our head that we are transformed into the new humankind for a new obedience. Sanctification fulfilled in Christ as our Head has really been fulfilled in all his members, his Body, too.<sup>377</sup> In other words, all the saints were fully sanctified “in the one offering of Christ” (Heb. 10:14).

This sanctification means the transformation of our status from God’s enemy to God’s children rather than that of our corrupt human nature. In other words, this implies our justification and forgiveness, and adoption. Spiritually, we are seated with Christ at the right hand of God. It denotes our sanctification as the elevation of our status. This is the second creation in Christ, from which every good comes.<sup>378</sup> From the fact that we became the new man in Christ, “all godly exhortations flow, like streams from a spring.”<sup>379</sup>

#### **2.2.4.2.2 Factual Sanctification**

##### **2.2.4.2.2.1 The Impartation of Christ’s Holiness to the Church**

Though Christ has already fully accomplished our sanctification in his death and resurrection, he continues to work within us in order to impart gradually his holiness to us through the power of his Holy Spirit. The Spirit “sprinkles us with the holiness of Christ and makes us participators of it.”<sup>380</sup> Accordingly, the inward purification by the Holy Spirit can be regarded as his impartation to us of the sanctification of Christ. Impartation is represented metaphorically when the “blessing of the first-fruits of the harvest is

---

<sup>376</sup> *Comm.* on Gal. 5:17, CO 50, 252. “Spiritus enim naturam reformatam, vel gratiam regenerationis significat. Quid igitur aliud caro quam vetus homo?”; *Institutes* 3.17.5.

<sup>377</sup> *Comm.* on Dan. 7:27; CO 41: 84; Serm. on Eph. 1:17-19; SEC, 108. “[W]e have been sanctified in him.”

<sup>378</sup> *Institutes* 2.3.6.

<sup>379</sup> *Comm.* on Eph. 4:25, CO 51, 209. “...iustitia novi hominis, omnes piae exhortations, tanquam ex fonte rivi, fluunt.”

<sup>380</sup> *Comm.* on Jn 17:19, CO 47, 385. “...ita spiritus Dei nos Christi sanctitate adspersit facitque eius participes.”

transferred to the whole harvest.”<sup>381</sup> It is gradually expanded as “out of the stock will come forth a branch, which will grow into a tree, and spread its branches and fruits far and wide.”<sup>382</sup> This impartation is practised on the basis of the fact that Christ sanctified Himself in order that the whole body of the Church and the whole world might be filled with His sanctity.<sup>383</sup>

On the other hand, Calvin stressed that the impartation of Christ’s holiness is accomplished by our participation in the unction of Christ, our High Priest. At his consecration, Jesus’ human nature became the storing place of all the graces of the Spirit, which are necessary to change men into the image of Christ.<sup>384</sup> The sanctification of the church can be interpreted as the impartation of the graces which are stored in Christ’s humanity. Christ is the full “fountain” from which we draw all blessings.<sup>385</sup> It means our participation in the one unction of Christ as the royal priesthood. Calvin illustrated to the church the impartation of Christ’s sanctification in the light of the anointing of the priest in the Old Testament. As in the rite, the unction was poured first over the head and flowed down over the whole body, so the anointing of the Holy Spirit which Christ has received has flowed “over the whole body of the Church,” his Body.<sup>386</sup> By distributing to us out of his full anointing, Christ bestows the gifts of the Spirit on us.<sup>387</sup>

#### **2.2.4.2.2.2 Our Conformity to the Pattern of the Sanctification of Christ**

The imitation of Christ is achieved in the context of our union with Christ. Our conformity can result only from this union, not our own strength.<sup>388</sup> As our Head, Christ is not only our example but also the subject of our sanctification in the sense that Christ gives us the Holy Spirit “that he may renew us inwardly,” namely, “that a new life may afterward follow the newness of the mind and heart.”<sup>389</sup> R. C. Doyle is of the opinion that for Calvin,

<sup>381</sup> *Comm.* on Jn 17:19, CO 47, 385. “Sicuti enim a primitiis benedictio diffunditur in totum proventum... .”

<sup>382</sup> *Comm.* on Isa. 11:1, CO 36, 234. “...ex trunco proditurum surculum qui exrescat in arborem, ramosque et fructus longe et late diffundat.”

<sup>383</sup> *Serm.* on Mt. 4:1, CO 46, 596; *Serm.* on Mk. 1:23, CO 46, 736.

<sup>384</sup> *Serm.* on Matt. 2:23, CO 46, 457. “Car nous sçavons ce qui est dit par le Prophete Isaie, que l’Esprit de Dieu à reposé sur luy, l’Esprit de sagesse et d’intelligence, l’Esprit de force et de discretion, l’Esprit de crainte de Dieu. Bref, il a falu que Iesus Christ receust en sa nature humaine, et vestist tout ce que nous pouvons desirer, et qui est requis à nostre felicité: voire, et a falu qu’il receust tout cela en perfection.”

<sup>385</sup> *Comm.* on Isa. 11:2, CO 36, 235. “...ut deinde participes efficeremur omnium bonorum...Nos enim ex eius plenitudine...velut ex fonte haurire oportet.”

<sup>386</sup> *Comm.* on Isa. 11:2, CO 36, 237. “...sic Christus coelestis suae unctionis defluxu totum ecclesiae suae corpus irrigat.”

<sup>387</sup> *Comm.* on Isa. 11:2, CO 36, 235-36. “...recepit spiritus dona quibus nos ornaret...dum cuique ex sua plenitudine distribuit secundum gratuitae donationis mensuram?”

<sup>388</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Jn 2:6, CO 55, 312. “Quamquam non simpliciter hortatur ad imitationem Christi: sed ab unitate, quam habemus cum eo... .”

<sup>389</sup> *Comm.* on Acts 5:31, CO 48, 111. “Nam ideo spiritum regenerationis affert nobis Christus, ut nos intus

sanctification means that Christian behaviour is in conformity with the humanity of Jesus Christ as the image of God.<sup>390</sup> His viewpoint seems legitimate given that Calvin referred to Christ as our *patron*, which means image, example, or pattern.<sup>391</sup> “Christ...is set before us as a model, the image of which our lives should express.”<sup>392</sup> Christ’s bearing the cross and patient compliance with His suffering is the model that we are to imitate because God has foreordained all children whom He adopts to be conformed to the pattern of Christ’s life and death.<sup>393</sup> The purpose for which Christ made us his disciples is “to form us to the imitation of himself.”<sup>394</sup> Christ wants us to “be obedient and devoted to him, just as he is wholly devoted to his Father.”<sup>395</sup>

According to Calvin, Christ is our example through his whole life; in his incarnation, life, death and resurrection. In his incarnation, Christ showed us an example of humility. He gave up his possession and became poor to make us rich. Accordingly, we should not think it difficult to expend our abundant property for our brethren.<sup>396</sup> Through his life, Christ is our example of manliness and meekness, of prayer, of resisting the devil, of moderation and orderly emotion, of mercy and humanity.<sup>397</sup> In his passion and death, we should learn to take up our cross. To bear the cross needs our patience, mortification, and hope.<sup>398</sup> In his resurrection, we see our resurrection and glory to be given to us after bearing the dying of Christ in our body.<sup>399</sup>

Calvin stressed that we should follow the exemplar and pattern of Christ, not ape him.<sup>400</sup> Calvin warned us of the danger of misunderstanding our following of Christ. Our

renovet: quo novitatem mentis et cordis sequatur deinde nova vita.”

<sup>390</sup> R. C. Doyle, “John Calvin, His Modern Detractors,” *The Reformed Theological Review*, Vol. 42, no. 3 (1982), p. 75, 79; *Comm.* on Rom 8:29.

<sup>391</sup> Serm. on Deut. 8:10-14, CO 26, 611. “...nous avons nostre patron, et image en nostre Seigneur Iesus Christ, auquel il nous faut estre conformez, si nous voulons ester enfans de Dieu.”

<sup>392</sup> *Institutes* 3.6.3 (translation by Henry Beveridge).

<sup>393</sup> *Comm.* Rom 8:28-29, CO 49, 160. “Summa porro est, gratuitam adoptionem, in qua salus nostra consistit, ab hoc altero decreto inseparabilem esse, quod nos ferendae cruci addixit: quia nemo coelorum haeres esse potest, qui non ante unigenito Dei filio fuerit conformis.”

<sup>394</sup> *Comm.* on Mt. 11:29, CO 45, 322. “...nos ad imitationem sui format.”

<sup>395</sup> *Comm.* on Jn. 10:15, CO 47, 243. “...vult nos habere obsequentes et sibi addictos, quemadmodum totus ipse est patris...”

<sup>396</sup> *Comm.* on 2 Cor. 8:9, CO 50, 99. “...bonorum omnium dominio se abdicavit, ut nos sua inopia locupletare...hoc exemplo nos ad beneficentiam incitari, ne parcamus ipsi nobis, quum fratribus subveniendum est.”

<sup>397</sup> Cf. *Comm.* on Is. 42:4; *Comm.* on Heb. 5:7; *Comm.* on Mt 4:6; *Comm.* on Lk. 5:29; *Comm.* Jn.4:50.

<sup>398</sup> *Comm.* on Heb. 12:1-2.

<sup>399</sup> *Comm.* on Rom. 8:17, CO 49, 151. “...atiqui eam (God’s inheritance) Christus per crucem adiit: ergo et nobis eo modo adeunda est; *Comm.* on 1 Pet. 3:18, CO 55, 264. “...nos in corpore nostro ferre mortificationem Christi, quo vita eius manifestetur in nobis. (God’s inheritance is my addition).”

<sup>400</sup> *Comm.* on Jn. 2:17, CO 47, 46. “...in capitis exemplo generalis toti corpori doctrina proponitur”; *Comm.* on Jn. 13:15, CO 47, 309. “Adde quod ubi Christum sequi decebat, simiae fuerunt magis quam imitatores.”

conformity is with his faith, humbleness, meekness, and patience and obedience rather than with such divine actions as his fasting for forty days, his cleansing of the Temple, or his miracles.<sup>401</sup> In imitating Christ, we must consider the difference between Him and us in calling, authority, and historical situation.<sup>402</sup>

In that manner, Calvin held that our partaking in grace is no more than “a sharing in this humanity through our union with God.”<sup>403</sup> The whole process of our conformity to Christ produces our being ‘sanctified with Christ in glory’, that is “a sowing which, in due time, will yield fruit.”<sup>404</sup> Our participation in the death of Christ results in our partaking in the glory of Christ. With Christ’s second coming and final resurrection, we will see the reality of the glory of resurrection which Christ will share with those united to Him. At that time, we will have to be conformed to the heavenly life of our Lord Jesus Christ in place of our fragile being.<sup>405</sup> Still, we are not identical to Christ in being conformed to Him. Though there is similitude between Christ and us, He remains the Son of God far from us and we remain His creatures.<sup>406</sup> The level of conformity is diverse, though all the children of God commonly participate in “the mortification of Christ.” A believer “comes so much the nearer to conformity with Christ” in the proportion that he participates in the mortification of Christ.<sup>407</sup>

Let us then observe in more detail our participation in the death and the resurrection of Christ in the light of mortification and vivification.

#### **2.2.4.2.2.3 Mortification and Vivification in Christ’s Death and Resurrection**

Calvin viewed sanctification or repentance as the whole process of our dying and rising with Christ. Our sanctification consists “in the mortification of the flesh and of the old man, and the quickening (vivification) of the Spirit.”<sup>408</sup> Our evil is abolished and subdued within us “by communion with His death and our heart is renewed by communion with His resurrection. By the continual working of the Spirit, Christ gradually “mortifies the

<sup>401</sup> *Comm.* on Mt. 4:1-4, CO 45, 127-132; *Comm.* on 1 Pet. 2:21, CO 55, 249-250.

<sup>402</sup> *Comm.* on Mt. 21:12, CO 46, 580. “...ne sibi quilibet privatus idem licere existimet...sed, ne imitationis praetextu quisquam temere irruat, videndum est, quid ferat vocatio,....”

<sup>403</sup> Trevor A. Hart, “Humankind in Christ and Christ in Humankind: Salvation as Participation in Our Substitute in the Theology of John Calvin,” *Scottish Journal of Theology*, Vol. 42, no.1 (1989): 81.

<sup>404</sup> *Comm.* Jn. 12:23-24, CO 47, 288. “...sationem, quae suo tempore fructum profert.”

<sup>405</sup> *Serm.* on Thess. 1: 6-10, CO 52, 234. “...et en lieu que maintenant nous sommes si pleins d’infirmité que c’est pitié, il faudra que nous soyons configurez à la vie celeste de nostre Seigneur Iesus Christ.”

<sup>406</sup> *Comm.* 1Jn 3: 16, CO 55, 340. “...nos Christo esse longe impares.”

<sup>407</sup> *Comm.* 2 Cor. 4:11, CO 50, 55. “Est quidem hoc omnibus filiis Dei commune, portare Christi mortificationem: sed ut quisque ampliore donorum mensura excellit, ita proprius accedit ad hanc Christi similitudinem.”

<sup>408</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.5.

remnants of the flesh and renews in us a heavenly life.”<sup>409</sup>

Calvin explicated mortification as “sorrow of soul and dead conceived from the recognition of sin and the awareness of divined judgment.”<sup>410</sup> By the recognition of sin, “man begins truly to hate and abhor sin; then he is heartily displeased with himself, he confesses himself miserable and lost and wishes to be another man.” His sense of the judgment of God makes him stricken, overthrown, humbled, cast down, discouraged, and despaired.<sup>411</sup> Calvin classified mortification as two fold - inward and outward. Inward mortification relates to self-denial and outward mortification relates to bearing one’s cross. Through inward mortification, our old man is dead and extinct in us and our new man is renewed. Since human nature as concupiscence is always going to fight against God and is insatiable,<sup>412</sup> it must die. If we wish truly to follow Christ, we must mortify ourselves and struggle against our concupiscence.<sup>413</sup> We mortify our natural inclinations by deliberately and consciously attempting to submit our unruly thoughts.<sup>414</sup> By self-denial, “we renounce the lusts of the flesh, and are renewed unto obedience to God.” To be crucified with Christ means the mortification of our flesh “by the effect of Christ’s cross.”<sup>415</sup> Our participation in Christ’s death “kills the old man in us so that he may not flourish and bear fruit.”<sup>416</sup> The Spirit operates the mortification of “the understanding and will, and of the whole of our corrupt nature.”<sup>417</sup> Outward mortification relates to the cross which refers to affliction, suffering, and humiliation, through which we are brought closer to Christ.<sup>418</sup> Such afflictions are given to us by the loss of earthly comforts, e.g., health, wealth, friendships, honour and the like.<sup>419</sup> Self-denial and bearing of the cross as the modes of sanctification will be dealt with in full at 3.2.5.

On the other hand, vivification is that after being laid by the consciousness of sin and stricken by the fear of God, a man looks to the goodness of God - to his mercy, grace, salvation. It indicates that through Christ a believer raises himself up, takes heart, recovers courage, returns from death to life. In a word, Calvin understood vivification as “the desire

---

<sup>409</sup> *Comm.* on Rom. 8:11, CO 49, 146, “...de continua spiritus operatione, qua reliquias carnis paulatim mortificans coelestem vitam in nobis instaurat.”

<sup>410</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.3.

<sup>411</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>412</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.10.

<sup>413</sup> Cf. *Serm.* on Deut. 5:12-14, CO 26, 283. “Il nous faut mortifier ce qui est de nostre nature si nous voulons ester conformes à nostre Dieu.”

<sup>414</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.1.-2.

<sup>415</sup> *Comm.* on Gal. 5:24, CO 50, 256. “...mortificationem carnis esse crucis Christi effectum.”

<sup>416</sup> *Institutes* 2.16.7.

<sup>417</sup> *Comm.* on Col. 3:5, CO 52, 119. “...nempe ingenii et voluntatis, totiusque naturae nostrae corruptae.”

<sup>418</sup> *Comm.* on Rom. 8: 29, CO 49, 160.

<sup>419</sup> *Comm.* on 2 Cor. 4:16, CO, 50, 58. “...bona valetudine, sed opibus etiam, honoribus, amicitiiis et aliis subsidiis continetur. Quantum ergo nobis imminuitur vel deperit ex bonis illis... .”



to live in a holy and devoted manner, a desire arising from rebirth”.<sup>420</sup>

Vivification should not be understood as the happiness that the mind receives after its perturbation and fear have been quieted. Our dying with Christ is not a death in despair by the Law but “the quickening (vivifying) death” in the Gospel, which leads us to life.<sup>421</sup> As the result of mortification, vivification means our putting “on the inclination to righteousness, judgment, and mercy.” Vivification happens “when the Holy Spirit so imbues our souls, steeped in his holiness, with both new thoughts and feelings.”<sup>422</sup> It is “to be renewed in the spirit of our mind.” By the working of His Spirit, we are drawn to him, and are mortified to live unto him.<sup>423</sup> Vivification is also our participation in the resurrection of Christ. In His resurrection, Jesus recreates the image of God in a humanity corrupted by sin, so that believers may live according to the law. Through our participation in his resurrection, “we are raised up into newness of life to correspond with the righteousness of God.”<sup>424</sup> By his resurrection, we “pass from the realm of sin into the realm of righteousness.”<sup>425</sup> Regeneration is “the actualization in the believer of the risen life of Christ.” In this present life, mortification is more visible than vivification because our risen life is hidden in Christ.<sup>426</sup>

To sum up, our sanctification as repentance is accomplished by continual mortification and vivification in our participation in the death and resurrection of Christ.

#### **2.2.4.2.2.4 The Marks of Sanctified Life**

Calvin posited the outward fruit of the Spirit as the signs of our regeneration. “[A]ll virtues, all proper and well regulated affections, proceed from the Spirit, that is, from the grace of God, and the renewed nature which we derive from Christ.”<sup>427</sup> Accordingly, such virtues can be regarded as the marks of sanctified life. In his commentary on Gal. 5:22, Calvin dealt briefly with the fruit of the Spirit. Joy is “cheerful behaviour towards our fellow-men, which is the opposite of moroseness.” Faith means truthfulness, which is “contrasted with cunning, deceit, and falsehood.” Peace is “contrasted with quarrels and contentions.” Long-suffering is gentleness of heart enabling us “to take everything in good part, and not to be easily offended.” Conversely, unbelievers can not have all kinds of virtues, though

---

<sup>420</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.3.

<sup>421</sup> Serm. on Gal. 2:17-18. *SERMONS ON GALATHIANS* by John Calvin, Books For The Ages (AGES Software • Albany, OR USA Version 1.0 © 1998), p. 202.

<sup>422</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.8.

<sup>423</sup> Serm. on Gal 2:17-18.

<sup>424</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.9.

<sup>425</sup> *Institutes* (1536) 1.35.

<sup>426</sup> *Comm.* on Phil. 3:21, CO 52, 56. “Praesentem corporum nostrorum humilitatem cernimus quum in vita, tum praecipue in morte: gloria, quam habebunt conformem Christi corpori, incomprehensibilis est.”

<sup>427</sup> *Comm.* on Gal. 5:22, CO 50,255. “...omnes virtutes, honestos et bene compositos affectus a spiritu prodire docet: hoc est, a gratia Dei et renovatione, quam habemus a Christo.”



they can have one or two.

#### 2.2.4.2.2.4.1 Love

Calvin insisted that love is “a sure sign of our regeneration,” for it “the special fruit of the Holy Spirit.”<sup>428</sup>

In his commentary on 1 Cor. 13:4-7, Calvin referred at length to the attributes of love. He delineated the first praise of love as “patient endurance of many things” in the sense that “it promotes peace and harmony in the Church.” The *second* excellence is gentleness and lenity, which are “the meaning of the verb *χρηστεύεται*. The *third* commendation is not to emulate, which is “the seed of all contentions” and is a vice that frequently springs from envy. Accordingly, wherever envy is in power, love can not exist. The *fourth* nature is that which does not act insolently — *is* in the Greek *χρηστεύεται*. It means “not being fierce or insolent” presumptuously. It is a kind of moderation as “a bridle to restrain men” in order that “they may not break forth into ferocity, but may live together in a peaceable and orderly manner.” The *fifth* is not to be “puffed up with pride,” in order to look down upon others and “feel satisfied with himself.” The *sixth* is not to rejoice in a foolish flamboyance, or does not brag, but keeps temperance and decency. The *seventh* attribute of love is “to leave off caring for ourselves, and feel concerned for our neighbours,” in order to love them and take care of their happiness. The *eighth* is “not easily provoked” by “a bridle to repress quarrels,” which follows forbearance and gentleness. The *ninth* is “to think no evil.” Though we tend to think badly of everything because of our natural malice, love asks us to think auspiciously and honestly of our neighbours. The *tenth* is “not to bear with vices.” It is “not to give our sanction to them by flattery, or, by winking at them, encourage them through our supineness.” Love “does not exclude corrections and just punishments.” Love is also “not to rejoice in iniquity” as a sort of “kindness in judging of things.” Finally, Calvin described other attributes of love in relation to bearing all things, believing all things, hoping all things, enduring all things. The love that believes all things needs “*simplicity* and *kindness* in judging of things.” To believe our brother in simplicity and kindness is better than to wrong him by “an unfriendly suspicion.” Calvin viewed prayer especially as “the perpetual office of love.”<sup>429</sup>

#### 2.2.4.2.2.4.2 Modesty and Humility

Modesty and humility are the marks of a sanctified person. It is contrary to pride, as the primary character of a sinner. For Calvin, modesty means to honour others, not to neglect and have contempt towards them. He viewed humility as “the best fomenter of love.”<sup>430</sup>

<sup>428</sup> *Comm.* on 1 John 3:14, CO 55, 339. “...quum caritas praecipuus sit fructus spiritus, certum quoque est regenerationis symbolum.”

<sup>429</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Cor. 13:4-5, CO 49, 510-511.

<sup>430</sup> *Comm.* on Rom. 12:10, CO 49, 241. “...optimum amoris fomentum est modestia... .”

Humility is the remedy for strife and vain glory. It is “the mother of moderation.” It is yielding up our own right, giving preference to others, and not being agitated easily. True humility is to think less of oneself than others. It may be the most difficult thing in our whole life, given that “[e]very one has in himself the mind of a king, by arrogating everything for himself.”<sup>431</sup> Calvin presented us with the example of Christ’s humility. Christ humbly abased himself “from the highest pinnacle of glory to the lowest ignominy.” Christ took the form of a servant and became obedient even as far as to endure death, even though He is Lord. “He was not only covered with ignominy in the sight of God, but was also accursed in the sight of God.” This is great humility. Accordingly, we must refrain “from exalting ourselves by a false estimation.” If we lift up ourselves with pride even though the Son of God lowered Himself so much, it would be very inappropriate.

Calvin did not regard Christ’s exaltation as motivation for our imitation of his humility because it is peculiar to himself only, so that we must not imitate it. He explicated the motive of our humility in the light of the elevation of God. We commonly fear that our humility should be a disadvantage to us, and for this reason, others might grow more insolent. Thus God promises us that he will elevate those who are humble in due time.<sup>432</sup>

#### 2.2.4.2.2.4.3 Docility and Meekness

While hardness and obstinacy is in the nature of a sinner, docility and meekness is that of a sanctified person. For Calvin, docility is the gentleness that enables a person to learn the word of God. This docility is produced by the work of the Holy Spirit, as He instantly made Saul docile by His presence with him.<sup>433</sup> When he regenerates his elect, God takes away “the heart of stone”, i.e., a hard and obstinate heart, and gives them “a heart of flesh”, i.e., a flexible and obedience heart.

According to Pete Wilcox, for Calvin, “docility is as permanent a prerequisite of the Christian life as conversion and repentance.”<sup>434</sup> His view is valid, given that Calvin regarded fear and docility as the preparation for our understanding of God’s will.<sup>435</sup> True docility is found in us after “all our senses are completely mortified.”<sup>436</sup> Calvin saw submission and teachableness as necessary to obtain judgment and discernment. If anybody “in a teachable and gentle spirit shall pursue truth, and give himself over and

---

<sup>431</sup> *Comm.* on Phil. 2:3, CO 52, 24. “...regis quisque intra se animum habet, omnia sibi arrogando.”

<sup>432</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Pet. 5:6, CO 55, 288. “Significat ergo opus esse ut humilitatem ad tempus discamus: Dominum vero satis tenere quando nos attolli expediat.”

<sup>433</sup> *Comm.* on Acts 9:5; CO 48, 200-202.

<sup>434</sup> Pete Wilcox, “Conversion in the Thought and Experience of John Calvin,” *Anvil*, Vol. 14, no. 2 (1997): 125.

<sup>435</sup> *Comm.* on Dan. 8:17, CO 41, 111. “...ut consilium suum...explicaret...ut nobis viam monstraret, atque ita nos secum formaret non tantum ad docilitatem, sed etiam ad metum.”

<sup>436</sup> *Comm.* on Dan. 10:8, CO 41, 201. “...quia nunquam reperietur in nobis vera docilitas, donec similes simus mortuis quantum attinet ad omnes nostros sensus.”

submit himself to God as a disciple,” he “will never be deprived of the spirit of judgment and discernment.”<sup>437</sup> (Translation is mine).

He dwelled on the meekness of Moses.<sup>438</sup> Moses’ meekness made him submit in silence and patience to his accusers. By his example, Moses teaches us to wait for the judgment of God quietly and calmly “if it should happen to us to be oppressed with indignity.”<sup>439</sup> (Translation is mine). When anybody injures us, our resentment is apt to carry away our feelings in all directions, and our pain tends to boil up without measure. The case of Moses teaches us “the silence of longsuffering itself is more effectual before God than any cries, however loud.”<sup>440</sup> That Christ bore wrongs calmly, and did not avenge wrongs, and committed his judgment to God, becomes our example as in Moses’ case. Furthermore, Christ “did not demand vengeance to be taken on his enemies,”<sup>441</sup> but prayed for their forgiveness” (Luke 23:34) in accordance with His teaching that “he bids us to do good to those who injure us, to pray for those who speak evil of us (Mat. 5:44). In this respect, the meekness of Christ is superior to Moses’. Hence, though the feelings of our flesh are far from the example of Christ, we should be so meek as to want our opponents to become our supporters, and attempt to convert them to the right way, and consign our own cause to God, according to the meekness of Christ.”<sup>442</sup>

#### 2.2.4.2.2.4.4 Ordered Life

While disorder, confusion, and misrule are the results of original sin,<sup>443</sup> order is that of the restored image of God. Ordered life is the most important aspect of sanctified life in the sense that it comprises the entire sphere of sanctification and Christian life (see 5.3.3.2 Social Order and Authority).

Calvin begins at the order of creation. Originally, the universe created by God had the regular order of things in the commands and decrees of God.<sup>444</sup> This order gave stability to man’s surroundings.<sup>445</sup> Man was born to be a witness to the beauty and glory of God

<sup>437</sup> *Comm.* on Deut. 13:3, CO 24, 279. “...verum quisquis docili et mansueto spiritu verum quaeret, ac Deo se tradet ac subiiciet discipulum, nunquam spiritu iudicii et discretionis privabitur.

<sup>438</sup> *Comm.* on Num. 12:1-3; CO 25, 179-181.

<sup>439</sup> *Comm.* on Num. 12:3; CO 25, 181. “...si nos indigne opprimi contingat, quietis et placidis animis exspectandum esse Dei iudicium.”

<sup>440</sup> *Comm.* on Num. 12:3; CO 25, 181. “...ipsius tolerantiae silentium pluris est coram Deo quam ullae quantumvis sonorae voces.”

<sup>441</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Pet. 2:23, CO 55, 251. “...ut tamen de hostibus suis vindictam non posceret.”

<sup>442</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Pet. 2:23, CO 55, 251. “Qui ergo sic animo compositus est, ut cupiat amicos sibi fieri qui nunc adversarii sunt, reducere eos in viam conetur: is causam suam rite Deo tradet...”

<sup>443</sup> *Comm.* on Ps. 96:10, CO 32, 41. “...tenendem est omnia esse confusa, et horribilem át ačřan...”

<sup>444</sup> *Comm.* on Ps. 119: 91, CO 32, 254. “...totius naturae ordinem, solius Dei imperio vel decreto niti.”

<sup>445</sup> *Comm.* on Jer. 31: 35-6, CO 38, 698. “...ubi mare violenter concitatum est, et tamen Deus tranquillat mare ipsum, et sic finem imponit procellis et tempestatibus, ut semper appareat aliquid firmum esse et continuum in natura.”

manifested in nature. God's glory is also manifested in human inner harmony, as Calvin viewed man as microcosm.<sup>446</sup> Calvin presented us with the example of Christ's ordered life in his inner faculties. Christ, in his perplexity, did not show any "extravagant behaviour as is seen in us when we strive mightily to control ourselves."<sup>447</sup> His passion and affection were based on reason and sound judgment and did not go beyond proper bounds.<sup>448</sup>

With the fall, original order was "trodden under foot."<sup>449</sup> By Christ's redemption, this order has been restored under the guidance of the Spirit.<sup>450</sup> By our mortification in the cross and our vivification in the Holy Spirit, we are restored to the ordered life. In Christ's cross, "the whole world has been renewed, and every thing restored to good order."<sup>451</sup> The final restoration of true order will be accomplished at the second coming of Christ.

Calvin connected the ordered life to the life according to the law of God.<sup>452</sup> The Law aims to restore the harmony lost in original sin. It counteracts the distortions occasioned by bad morals, habits and customs. The law manifests what God's will to govern the spheres of our life is. Accordingly, human life "cannot be ordered (*non posse institui*) unless it is framed (*formetur*) according to the law of God (*ad Dei legem*)."<sup>453</sup> Ordered life is a life in accord with the Decalogue.<sup>454</sup> It can be summarised as a life to keep our relationship with God and neighbours in due proportion.<sup>455</sup> Our love towards man is the evidence of our love towards God.<sup>456</sup> Calvin also emphasised the importance of the subjection to social authority and order. This order begins from the relationship between parents and their children, via the relationship between husband and wife, to the master and servant.<sup>457</sup> By our subjection to our parents, we learn to obey legitimate authority. The order of society is kept by our mutual subjection and servitude.<sup>458</sup> Ordered life includes proper speech,

<sup>446</sup> *Institutes* 1.15.8; *Comm.* on Gen.1:26, CO 23, 25. "...ut merito a veteribus dictus sit μικρόκοσμος."

<sup>447</sup> *Institutes* 2.16.12.

<sup>448</sup> *Comm.* on John 11: 266, CO 47, 266. "...nulla enim eius passio ultra suum modum unquam erupit, nulla nisi iusta et ex ratione rectoque iudicio suscepta."

<sup>449</sup> *Comm.* on Zech. 11:10, CO, 44, 310. "...quia quum pessumdatus esset ordo..."

<sup>450</sup> *Comm.* on Eph. 1:10, CO 51, 151. "...omnia extra Christum dissipata per ipsum in ordinem redacta esse."

<sup>451</sup> *Comm.* on Jn. 13:31, CO 47, 317. "...toto denique mundo reparato omnia in ordinem restituta."

<sup>452</sup> *Serm.* on Job 9:29-35. *Sermons on Job*, first published in 1574 (Avon: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1993), pp. 170-171.

<sup>453</sup> *Comm.* on Ps. 19:8; CO 31, 200.

<sup>454</sup> Cf. *Serm.* on Deut. 5: 16, CO 26, 309-21.

<sup>455</sup> *Comm.* on Lk. 1:75, CO 45, 50. "...legitime tunc demum nos servire Deo, quum ad sanctitatem et iustitiam composita est vita nostra...sanctitas...ad priorem legis tabulam...Iustitia...in secunda legis tabula..."

<sup>456</sup> *Comm.* on Gal. 5:14, CO 50, 251. "...Ergo caritas erga homines non nisi ex timore et amore Dei nascitur."

<sup>457</sup> *Comm.* on Eph. 5:22, CO 51, 222.

<sup>458</sup> *Serm.* on 1 Tim. 2:1-2 in *Sermons on The Epistle to Timothy & Titus* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth & Trust, 1579, 1983).

proper attitude, and the proper use of money.<sup>459</sup> We should abandon filthy and evil talk, jesting, all wanton songs, lechery, and lewd talk. Instead of those things we should practise good exhortative talk for edification.<sup>460</sup> Our observance of the law as ordered life is accomplished by the operation of the Holy Spirit to engrave the law in our heart.<sup>461</sup> The true love of the law engraved in our heart is a sure mark of our adoption.<sup>462</sup>

#### 2.2.4.2.2.4.5 Purity

Here we will only deal with spiritual and religious purity because sexual purity will be dealt with in the sanctification of family and sex. Calvin stressed the purity of doctrine in his dispute with the Libertines. He accused the spiritual Libertines of “confounding the heavens and the earth,” nullifying “all religion,” erasing “all knowledge from the understanding of men, deadening consciences,”<sup>463</sup> removing “discretion between good and evil,”<sup>464</sup> and destroying “the difference between God and the devil.”<sup>465</sup> Libertines corrupted the pure meaning of God’s Word. For example, they rationalized their faults by the theory that “since it is God who does everything, and under this cloak all abominations are covered and all sorts of filth is found to be of good odor.”<sup>466</sup> Their pantheistic and deterministic teaching was rejected by Calvin on the basis that God’s freedom and His goodness are not dissociated from each other, and “the freedom of Satan and the wicked formed and preserved by God does not limit God’s freedom” because God “works in and through their works.”<sup>467</sup>

Calvin also touched upon the purity of religion against astrology. Astrology is “foolish curiosity to judge by the stars everything that will come to men, and to inquire there and take counsel about one’s affairs,” is ‘diabolical superstition’.<sup>468</sup> Likewise, the worship of saints and relics of the Roman Church are superstitions. They are idolatry which depends

---

<sup>459</sup> Sermon on 1 Tim. 6:9-11 in *Sermons on The Epistle to Timothy & Titus*.

<sup>460</sup> Sermon on Eph. 4: 29-30; *Sermons on The Epistles to the Ephesians* by John Calvin (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth & Trust, 1987), pp.461-465..

<sup>461</sup> *Comm.* on Ps. 40:8, CO 31, 412. “...proprium esse munus spiritus sancti, legem Dei cordibus nostris insculpere.”

<sup>462</sup> *Comm.* on Ps. 119:159, CO 32, 286. “...quod sincerus legis Dei amor certum est adoptionis signum, quum opus sit spiritus sancti.”

<sup>463</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.14. “‘Such difference arises’, they say, ‘from the curse of old Adam, from which we have been freed through Christ.’ Therefore, there will now be no difference between fornication and chastity, integrity and cunning, truth and falsehood, fair dealing and extortion.”

<sup>464</sup> Calvin, *Contre la secte des Libertines*, CO 7, 185, tr. Robert G. Wilkie and Allen Verhey, *Against the Fanatic and Frantic Sect of Libertines Who Call Themselves Spirituals*, Ch.13-16, in Allen Verhey, “Calvin’s Treatise, ‘Against the Libertines’” of *Calvin Theological Journal*, Vol. 15, no. 2 (Grand Rapids: Calvin Theological Seminary): 205-219.

<sup>465</sup> Calvin, *Contre la secte des Libertines*, CO 7, 184-198.

<sup>466</sup> *Epistre Contre Un Cordelier*, CO 7, 361.

<sup>467</sup> *Contre la secte des Libertines*, CO 7, 187.

<sup>468</sup> *Contre L’astrologie Iudiciaire*, CO 7, 515-16.

on any other thing than on the only Intercessor Christ in his Word, sacraments, and spiritual graces.<sup>469</sup> As “The Lord grants that idolatry may be entirely uprooted out of the hearts of all,”<sup>470</sup> the Christian can and must keep himself from this idolatry. “True religion and idolatry cannot be joined together.”<sup>471</sup> Calvin viewed the separation of the church from the world as natural as light is separated from darkness.<sup>472</sup>

For Calvin, the purity of heart is more important than any other thing. In the case of Job, the true integrity of his heart produced the fruits of godly and upright conduct.<sup>473</sup> A good conscience is nothing more than “inward integrity of heart,”<sup>474</sup> which is from standing before God.<sup>475</sup> One role of the church is to help us avoid all kinds of impieties, idolatries, and defilements “which corrupt and vitiate the holy service of God.”<sup>476</sup> It is an incompatible and discordant thing that “Jesus Christ dwells in us and at the same time we are given to all villainy and filth.”<sup>477</sup> Sanctification is the separation from the world allied with the devil.<sup>478</sup>

In summary, Christian sanctified life lies in keeping the spiritual and physical purity in life in conformity with the purity of God’s Word. Religious purity as a mark of sanctified life can be applied to purify the Korean church from religious syncretism (see 5.2.1.2.5; 5.3.3.4).

#### 2.2.4.2.2.4.6 Moderation and Stewardship<sup>479</sup>

Calvin asserted that moderation is a guiding principle in dealing with issues not covered in Scripture. It means curbing extravagant appetites and intemperance, fleeting excesses, and

---

<sup>469</sup> J. Calvin. *Traité des reliques*, in *La vraie piété*, ed. I. Backus and C. Chimelli (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1986), p.163. Quoted by Bernard Cottret, *Calvin: A Biography*, first published in 1995 under the title, *Calvin Bibliographie*, tr. M. Wallace McDonald (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2000), p.283.

<sup>470</sup> Letter to Francis Daniel, Lausanne, 13<sup>th</sup> October 1536; LC 1, 12, 46.

<sup>471</sup> *Comm.* on Amos 5:4-6, CO 43, 73. “Neque enim haec simul coniungi possunt, vera religio et idololatria..”

<sup>472</sup> *Comm.* on Gen. 17:7, CO 23, 237. “...non secus a reliquis gentibus divisa est ecclesia atque in mundi creatione lux e tenebris emersit.”

<sup>473</sup> *Comm.* on Job 1:1; John Calvin, *Sermons on Job*, first published in 1574 (Avon: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1993), p. 3.

<sup>474</sup> *Institutes* 3.14.16.

<sup>475</sup> *Institutes* 3.14.15.

<sup>476</sup> *Comm.* on Ps. 16:4, CO, 31, 151. “Neque enim aliter in unum ecclesiae corpus coalescimus sub Deo, quam dum abrumpimus omnes impios nexos, disiungimus nos ab idololatriis, et ab omnibus inquinamentis, quae purum Dei cultum corrumpunt ac vitiant, integri sumus ac immunes.”

<sup>477</sup> *Serm.* on 2 Thess. 1:6-10, CO 52, 236.

<sup>478</sup> *Serm.* on Deut. 9:20-24, CO 26, 708.

<sup>479</sup> John H. Leith deals with moderation in stewardship. John H. Leith, “John Calvin and Stewardship,” *Journal for Preachers*, Vol. 9, no. 1 (1985): 2-7.



bridling “an immoderate desire to grow rich or ambitiously pant after honours.”<sup>480</sup> As “the chief virtue of believers,”<sup>481</sup> moderation is “a bridle to restrain men” in order not to “break forth into ferocity”, but to live peacefully and orderly.<sup>482</sup> It may be a model to the contemporary people who are addicted to egoism, doctrine of growth, and the waste mentality (see 5.2.1.2.2; 5.2.1.2.3.3 and 4; 5.3.2.2).

In his *Institutes* 3.10.3-5, Calvin explicated moderation as our lifestyle. We must restrain the lust of our flesh, because unless it is bridled, it “overflows without measure.”<sup>483</sup> He suggested three ways to practise moderation: First, it is our recognition of and thankfulness for the kindness of God, who created all things for us.<sup>484</sup> With the recognition that our things are God’s gifts, we should use it with gratitude and curb our lust. The second way is to learn how to dispense with things patiently.<sup>485</sup> A third rule is to remember that we must account for stewardship before the Lord. God praises “abstinence, sobriety, frugality and moderation,” and hates “excess, pride, ostentation, and vanity” and denounces “all delights that draw man’s spirit away from chastity and purity, or befog his mind.”<sup>486</sup>

Calvin understood our excessive concern to be prohibited because it is “an immoderate and blind attachment to ourselves.”<sup>487</sup> We must compose our mind to patience by moderating even our grief.<sup>488</sup> Calvin presented the example of Christ, who even when afraid and sorrowful “continued to be regulated by the true rule of moderation”<sup>489</sup> In Christ, “the feelings were adjusted and regulated in obedience to God and were altogether free from sin.”<sup>490</sup> Likewise, Calvin held that excessive curiosity about speculative theories must be regulated with moderation. Calvin rebuked Lelio Socin for monstrous questions due to his immoderate inquisitiveness.<sup>491</sup>

In this manner, Calvin stressed moderation in all the spheres in our life, i.e., outward

---

<sup>480</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.9.

<sup>481</sup> *Comm.* on Rom. 12:16, CO 49, 244. “...praecipua fidelium virtus moderatio est...”

<sup>482</sup> *Comm.* 1 Cor. 13:4, CO 49, 510. “Tribuit ergo Paulus caritati modestiam, ac fraenum esse testatur ad retinendos homines ne ad ferociam prosiliant, sed placide et compositae inter se degant.”

<sup>483</sup> *Institutes* 3.10.3.

<sup>484</sup> John Leith insists that for Calvin, human proper response to created existence as “gratitude to the creator,” his article “John Calvin and Stewardship,” *Journal-for-Preachers* Vol. 9, no. 1 (1985): 3.

<sup>485</sup> *Institutes* 3.10.5.

<sup>486</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>487</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Cor. 13:5, CO 49, 511. “...excessum qui provenit ex immodico et caeco nostri amore.”

<sup>488</sup> *Comm.* on Ps. 39: 2, CO 31:396; cf. *Comm.* on Ps. 109:16, CO 32, 153. “...ab altera dolorem nostrum temperat adhibito solatio, quo patienter feramus iniurias.”

<sup>489</sup> *Comm.* on Mt. 26:37, CO 45, 720. “Christus autem tristitia et metu sic turbatus fuit, ut tamen adversus Deum non insurgeret: sed maneret compositus ad veram temperantiae regulam.”

<sup>490</sup> *Comm.* on Jn 11: 33. CO 47, 265 “...in Christo autem, quia compositi fuerunt in Dei obsequium et moderati, vitio prorsus carebant.”

<sup>491</sup> Letter to Lelio Socin, 1551; LC 2, 284, 330-331.



life, inner feelings, and intelligent desire. This will be applied to 5.3.2.3 Committing Self-Anxiety to God.

#### 2.2.4.2.2.4.7 Mutual Communion and Unity

According to Calvin, the basis of human unity is our common humanity as the image of God. As Jesus declared in the Parable of the Good Samaritan, “neighbour extends to every man, because the whole human race is united by a sacred bond of fellowship,”<sup>492</sup> which means “the image of God.”<sup>493</sup> Calvin also stressed that our unity with our fellow Christians is closer than our fellow man. He compared injuring our fellow Christian to tearing Jesus Christ in pieces, while he compared injuring our fellow man to perverting the order of nature.<sup>494</sup> This mutual communion includes helping others and trading one’s goods.<sup>495</sup> In this sense, J. D. Douglass’ view that for Calvin, “restored humanity is not individual but social” seems valid.<sup>496</sup>

Calvin connects the unity of the church to union with Christ

All the elect are so united in Christ that, as they are dependent on one Head, they also grow together into one Body ... They are made truly one since they live together in one faith, hope, and love, and in the same Spirit of God. For they have been called not only into the same inheritance of eternal life but also to participate in one God and Christ.<sup>497</sup>

The crucial corollary of this unity is that all the elect share the goods of Christ in this unity, viz., in Christ’s body with one another. The unity of faith is attained “when all-from the highest to the lowest - aspire towards the Head.”<sup>498</sup> To keep the unity in Christ is the mark of Christian maturity. The saints matured by learning and advancing the church order established by God “with common accord.” They gathered “by one bond.”<sup>499</sup> Calvin’s idea of unity is taken from to the teaching of the Apostle Paul that we should “maintain unity of mind in the bonds of peace”(Eph. 4:2).<sup>500</sup> This unity needs our “humility, meekness, patience,” tolerance, and support for one another.<sup>501</sup> Our unity is kept by our mutual

---

<sup>492</sup> *Comm.* on Lk. 10:30, CO 45, 613. *Serm.* on Deut. 5:19, CO 26, 351.

<sup>493</sup> *Comm.* on Gal.5:14, CO 50:251. “Praesertim vero imago Dei vinculum coniunctionis sacrosanctum esse debet.”

<sup>494</sup> *Comm.* on Mt. 25:40, CO 45, 689; cf. *Serm.* on Deut. 2:1-7, CO 26, 5-16.

<sup>495</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.7; 4.1.3.

<sup>496</sup> Jane Dempsey Douglass, “Calvin’s Relation to Social and Economic Change,” *Church & Society*, Vol. 74, no. 4 (1984): 75.

<sup>497</sup> *Institutes* 4.1.2.

<sup>498</sup> *Institutes* 4.1.5.

<sup>499</sup> *Institutes* 4.1.5.

<sup>500</sup> *Institutes* 4.12.13.

<sup>501</sup> Letter to the French Church of Frankfort, 24<sup>th</sup> June 1556; LC 3, 437, 277.

subjection. Calvin insisted that mutual subjection includes mutual servitude according to love.<sup>502</sup>

This can be an answer to '5.2.1.2.3.3 Separatism' and '5.2.1.2.3.4 Individualism' and will be applied to '5.3.4.2 Self-Denial for Unity and Cooperation'.

### 2.2.4.3 Gradualness and Instantaneousness

Concerning the necessity of continual strife in connection with the gradualness of sanctification, Calvin explicated it as follows: Even after the sudden death-blow against self-love, the struggle between the old man and the new man continues, for the self-centred principle never dies. Without God's restraint, "our hearts will violently boil with a proud and insolent contempt of God."<sup>503</sup> We must choose the will of God rather than our own desires, "however virtuous they may be."<sup>504</sup> In *Institutes* 3.3.9, Calvin stressed continuous sanctification as follows:

And indeed, this restoration does not take place in one moment or one day or one year; but through continual and sometimes even slow advances God wipes out in his elect the corruptions of the flesh, cleanses them of guilt, consecrates them to himself as temples renewing all their minds to true purity that they may practice repentance throughout their lives and know that this warfare will end only at death...In order that believers may reach God's image, God allocates them a race of repentance throughout all their lives.

Our life is like a journey, which is a struggle.<sup>505</sup> Though the Christian is freed from bondage to sin through regeneration, he does not obtain full freedom in order to feel no more annoyance from their flesh. It implies that he must struggle to overcome remaining sin.<sup>506</sup> Because we are so weak, our spiritual progress is slow.<sup>507</sup> We "cannot succeed all at once" in removing our weakness, but we "must persevere in seeking the remedy for it, until we have been completely cured."<sup>508</sup> Since we are grafted in Christ, though we do not immediately "cease entirely to sin, we become at last victorious" in the fight.<sup>509</sup> If "we

---

<sup>502</sup> Serm. on Eph. 5:21, CO 51, 230.

<sup>503</sup> *Comm.* on Ps. 19:13, CO 31, 206. "...quia nisi nos contineat Deus, furiose ebulliet superbia contra Deum."

<sup>504</sup> Letter to Marquis de Vico, July 19, 1558 ; LC 3, 504, 440.

<sup>505</sup> *Comm.* on Phil. 3:13, CO 52,52. "Comparat autem vitam nostram stadio, cuius spatium nobis ad currendum definierti Deus..."

<sup>506</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.9.

<sup>507</sup> *Institutes* 3.6.5.

<sup>508</sup> Letter to Mademoiselle De..., the 12<sup>th</sup> of January 1549; LC 2,233, 205

<sup>509</sup> *Comm.* on Rom 6:6, CO 49, 108. "...non quod statim desinamus in totum peccare, sed ut simus tandem in pugna superiores."

keep following however faintly,” our progress in sanctification is certain.<sup>510</sup>

In view of Christ’s sanctifying work, Calvin explicated continual sanctification as follows: “Christ does each day in the church rather than what he has already accomplished.” “By his Word, God alone sanctifies temples to himself for lawful use.”<sup>511</sup>

In relation to instant conversion, Ganoczy writes that Calvin’s thought on repentance as a sudden and miraculous “beginning” applies only to exceptional cases of conversion where only a few members among many people are snatched “from perdition at a time.” Conversion generally happens in a gradual manner whether individual or collective.<sup>512</sup> A. N. S. Lane offers a similar point, “Calvin could speak of his own “sudden conversion” to the Protestant cause, but he does not seem to have regarded it as the norm.”<sup>513</sup> W. Bouwsma also insists that Calvin always “emphasised the gradualness rather than the suddenness of conversion.”<sup>514</sup>

On the contrary, Pete Wilcox holds the view that Calvin never distinguished between initial conversion experience and general conversion experience. Rather, Calvin regarded “a sudden conversion experience as the norm.”<sup>515</sup> Wilcox mainly presented Calvin’s commentary on the Prophets in the Old Testament. In his Commentary on Micah 4:3, Calvin explicated it as follows: Because of “the wickedness and perversity of our flesh,” “even the best of us would never offer themselves to God, without being first subdued, and that by God’s powerful correction.”<sup>516</sup> God’s first correction of our perversity is “the beginning of the kingdom of Christ.” In his commentary on Ps. 81:14, Calvin averred, “Men by their own free-will cannot turn to God, until they first change their stony hearts into hearts of flesh.”<sup>517</sup> This renovation is “a work surpassing that of the creation itself.” In his commentary on Isa. 65:25, Calvin stressed that people like cruel and untamed beasts “begin to abstain from doing injury when the Lord subdues their wicked inclination.”<sup>518</sup> Calvin rejected human preparation for their conversion in the sense that conversion

---

<sup>510</sup> Letter to the Duchess of Ferrara, June 10, 1555; LC 3, 384,129.

<sup>511</sup> *Institutes* 4.1.6,

<sup>512</sup> Alexandre Ganoczy, *The Young Calvin*, tr. David Foxgrover and Wade Provo (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1987), p.251.

<sup>513</sup> A. N. S. Lane, “Conversion: A Comparison of Calvin and Spener,” *Themelios*, Vol. 13, no. 1 (1987-88): 20.

<sup>514</sup> William J. Bouwsma, *John Calvin: A Sixteenth-Century Portrait* (New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), p. 11.

<sup>515</sup> Pete Wilcox, “Conversion in the Thought and Experience of John Calvin,” *Anvil* Vol. 14, no. 2 (1997): 121.

<sup>516</sup> *Comm.* on Mic. 4:3, CO 43, 345. “...denique hic notatur malitia et perversitas carnis nostrae, quia nunquam se offerrent Deo etiam optimi quique, nisi prius subacti, et qualiter? Nempe violenta correctione Dei.”

<sup>517</sup> *Comm.* on Ps. 81:14, CO 31, 766. “...non esse hanc conversionem in libero hominum arbitrio, donec ex cordibus lapideis Deus carnea reddiderit.”

<sup>518</sup> *Comm.* on Isa. 65:25, CO 37, 434.

happens “when a sinner is slain” by God’s formidable wrath.<sup>519</sup> His commentary on Jonah 3: 6-8 offers another example of instant conversion. “The Ninevites, who had no knowledge of the true doctrine of religion, who were imbued with no religious principles, were so suddenly converted by the preaching of Jonah.”<sup>520</sup> Calvin’s other commentary on instant conversion is Haggai 2:6-9. Men “are thus powerfully, and in an extraordinary or supernatural manner influenced, so that they follow *spontaneously* at the same time. ...It will indeed be a wonderful conversion, because “the nations who previously despised God, and regarded true religion and piety with the utmost hatred, shall habituate themselves to the ruling power of God.”<sup>521</sup> (Italics are my emphasis).

Calvin’s commentary on Acts 9:1-6 more clearly delivers to us his view of the immediacy of conversion, which he recognized as a norm. Christ’s voice with his glorious presence made the heart of Paul *suddenly* “a fleshy heart of a stony heart,” i.e., “it received softness from the Spirit of God” (italics are my emphasis).<sup>522</sup> Calvin understood this event as “the beginning of our conversion,” in which the Lord “changes the stubborn affections of our heart, to the end he may have us to be apt to be taught.”<sup>523</sup> We can know Calvin recognized the instant conversion as a norm in the following statement, “when as the Lord does mortify our flesh, he subdues us and brings us under, *as he did Paul*” (my emphasis).<sup>524</sup> This corresponds to Calvin’s own experience of sudden conversion, which was written in the preface of his commentary on the Psalms. Given Saul’s sudden conversion, Calvin’s sudden conversion, and Pete Wilcox’s statements above,<sup>525</sup> the views of A. Ganoczy, A.N.S Lane, and W. Bouwsma are invalid.

The immediacy of sanctification can be observed from another angle. Calvin depicted ‘once and for all’s sanctification, i.e., definite conversion in relation to committing serious sin. In contrast to Philip Jacob Spener who considered nominal Christians committing serious sin as “non-Christians in need of conversion,” Calvin “treated them as erring sheep in need of discipline.”<sup>526</sup> That is to say, Calvin held the view that once converted to God,

<sup>519</sup> *Comm.* on Ezek. 13: 22-23, CO 40, 299. “Itaque haec vera est ad conversionem praeparatio, ubi peccator occiditur, . . . .”

<sup>520</sup> *Comm.* on Jon. 3: 6-8, CO 43, 253. “...Ninevites, qui nunquam veram pietatis doctrinam gustaverant, qui nullis rudimentis fuerant imbuti, tam cito conversi fuerint ad Ionae praedicationem?”

<sup>521</sup> *Comm.* on Haggai 3:7-9, CO 44, 105.

<sup>522</sup> *Comm.* on Acts 9:6, CO 48, 203. “...cor autem Pauli ex ferreo repente carneum evasit, postquam illi a spiritu data est mollities. . . .”

<sup>523</sup> *Comm.* on Acts 9:5, CO 48, 202. “...ut prae fractos cordis nostri affectus mutet, quo nos sibi dociles habeat.”

<sup>524</sup> *Comm.* on Acts 9:5, CO 48, 202. “...quum carnem nostram mortificat Deus, non aliter nos subigit quam Paulum.”

<sup>525</sup> Wilcox’s view that Calvin incorporated the concept of a sudden conversion, which was written in the preface of Psalms, “into the 1559 *Institutes* as well as into the *Lectures of the Minor Prophets*” is notable. Pete Wilcox, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

<sup>526</sup> A. N. S. Lane, “Conversion: A Comparison of Calvin and Spener,” *Themelios*, Vol. 139, no.1 (1987-88):

one remains a believer even though he commits any serious sin. In his commentary on the Hebrews 6:1, Calvin referred to definite regeneration. Though “regeneration is not indeed made perfect in them,” because the seed of new life is in them, “however small it may be,” “they cannot be deemed dead before God.” In other words, because he has eternal life due to regeneration, the Christian has nothing to do with dead works, i.e., sin which “leads us to death” or “proceed from the spiritual death of the soul”. Repentance as our first conversion to God is ‘once and for all’. Likewise, sanctification as the first regeneration, which is being born again as a Christian, is ‘once and for all’..

To sum up, for Calvin, Christian sanctification as the first conversion, which is initiated by God’s intervention, is instant, but the whole process of sanctification is gradual. The Christian continually grows to the sound extent of the image of God in the grace of God. Immediacy and gradualness of conversion are consistently experienced. This will be applied to ‘5.3.1.4 Maintaining between Instantaneousness and Gradualness.’

#### 2.2.4.4 Perfection and Imperfection

In Calvin’s view, the perfection of sanctification signifies the single-hearted integrity and sincerity which we are enabled to attain when we can totally offer ourselves to God through the Holy Spirit. In this sense, perfection is merely the antonym of double-heartedness.<sup>527</sup> It is a total, complete, integral response to God’s grace and command. It is “the entire devotion” of our heart and soul excluding any fiction or hypocrisy as in Job’s case.<sup>528</sup>

Calvin denied that any Christian has grown into the full stature of Christ in this world. “Our holiness shall never be perfect as long as we are in this world, for we always carry our infirmities.” Because “though sin may not overpower us, yet it dwells in us,” “we continually battle against it to get the upper hand.”<sup>529</sup> Christian faith will gradually progress more and more. “Each day in some degree our purity will increase and our corruption be cleansed,” while we live in this world.<sup>530</sup> The Church is holy “in the sense that it is daily improving, but not yet perfect.” The Church “is daily progressing but has not yet arrived at its goal of holiness.”<sup>531</sup> That Christ “daily sanctifies all his people, cleanses and polishes them, and wipes away their stains” is an evidence that the saints “are still sprinkled with some defects and spots, and that something is lacking to their

---

20.

<sup>527</sup> *Comm.* on Jer. 29:13, CO 37, 596. “...propheta cor totum opponit duplici.”

<sup>528</sup> *Serm.* on Job 1:1, CO 33, 27-8.

<sup>529</sup> *Serm.* on Eph. 1:17-19; *SEC*, 103.

<sup>530</sup> *Institutes* 3.2.19.

<sup>531</sup> *Institutes* 3.2.19.

sanctification.”<sup>532</sup>

Pete Wilcox argues that “Calvin sees the Christian life of repentance and renewed forgiveness in the light of the tension between the present age and the next.”<sup>533</sup> Insofar as Christians are new creatures, they experience the fullness of salvation; insofar as they are still subject to sin, they live in constant need of repentance and faith. Insofar as Christians are in Christ, their salvation is complete. Insofar as they are still in the world, they experience a constant progress of regeneration towards its final consummation.<sup>534</sup> His argument of Calvin’s tension between sanctification as ‘already’ accomplished and not ‘yet’ completed is quite pertinent.

## 2.2.5 The Modes of Sanctification

In a broad sense, these modes can be regarded as the means of sanctification because God sanctifies us by these ways.

### 2.2.5.1 Self-Denial

Calvin regarded self-denial as the core of Christian life.<sup>535</sup> Self-denial is the way to receive the grace of Christ.<sup>536</sup> It is to mortify self-will and consecrate our will to God’s service, for we are not our own but God’s. Calvin posited *Nostrum non sumus - Dei sumus* (We do not belong to ourselves - we belong to God) as a basic principle of self-denial. Self-denial is to let neither our reason nor our will “sway our plans and deed,” but to let God’s “wisdom and will rule all our actions.”<sup>537</sup> The Christian should totally resign himself to the Lord that “every part of his life” might be “governed by God’s will.”<sup>538</sup> This commitment helps us to bear adversity. Calvin regarded adversity as God’s rule, not our destiny. We can look to the love and mercy of God in various adversities.

Self-denial “not only erases from our minds the yearning to possess, the desire for power, and the favor of men, but it also uproots ambition and all craving for human glory and other more plagues.”<sup>539</sup> It is also to eradicate such ungodliness and worldly desires as pride, arrogance, ostentation, avarice, desire, lasciviousness, effeminacy and other evils in connection with our self-love.<sup>540</sup> We are called to fight “against everything that might turn

---

<sup>532</sup> *Institutes* 4.8.12.

<sup>533</sup> Pete Wilcox, “Conversion in the Thought and Experience of John Calvin,” *Anvil* Vol. 14, no. 2 (1997): 119-120.

<sup>534</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>535</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.

<sup>536</sup> The title of *Institutes* Book III.

<sup>537</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.1.

<sup>538</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.10.

<sup>539</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.2.

<sup>540</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.3.

us aside from walking in the right path.”<sup>541</sup> Hence, we should “neither desire nor hope for, nor contemplate any other way of prospering than by the Lord’s blessing.”<sup>542</sup>

Calvin depicted self-denial in view of our relationship with our neighbours. God calls us to self-denial “to edify our neighbor in his eternal interests than consult our own selfish desires.”<sup>543</sup> Self-denial is “the rule which the Holy Spirit lays down to reconcile us to one another.”<sup>544</sup> It designates “to yield our right” for our neighbor and “to strive against ourselves.”<sup>545</sup> Our duty to our fellow men is based on God’s image in them rather than any worth belonging to them. This self-denial happens when we fulfil our duty of love. Our duty to our neighbour is fulfilled by our true love. The right attitude to help brethren excludes arrogance, contempt, and pride as a giver. We must see and help them “with a feeling of mercy and humaneness” “as if we experienced and bore it.” Each man should perceive that “in all his greatness he is a debtor to his neighbours.”<sup>546</sup> It enables us to be “imbued with lowliness and with reverence for others.”<sup>547</sup> Self-denial serves us in the right attitude towards our fellow man and our God.<sup>548</sup>

Self-denial needs radical treatment similar to the scriptural teaching of plucking out one of one’s eyes and cutting off one’s hands because self-love is lethal.<sup>549</sup> It denotes a crucial first step in which a believer leaves himself behind to serve God.<sup>550</sup> Calvin explicated self-denial as the temple sacrifices.<sup>551</sup> As a knife slays an animal in sacrifice, only the sword of the Holy Spirit slays our corrupt nature in order that we ourselves can be offered to God. It is impossible to serve God sincerely with both our soul and body if we even slightly agree with idolaters.<sup>552</sup> Christians must not dare “to appropriate the smallest portion of the glory which God claims for himself.”<sup>553</sup>

Likewise, self-denial asks our total sacrifice. We can find similar expression in his letter to Farel, where Calvin confessed about his own self-denial as follows: “I offer up my heart presented as a sacrifice to the Lord.” “I have no other desire than that, setting aside all consideration of me, they may look only to what is most for the glory of God and the advantage of the Church.” “I submit my will and my affections, subdued and held - fast, to

---

<sup>541</sup> Letter to the Prince Porcien, May 1563; LC 4, 645, 308.

<sup>542</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.8.

<sup>543</sup> Letter to the French Church in Frankfurt, March 3, 1556; LC 3, 437, 274.

<sup>544</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>545</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.5.

<sup>546</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.7.

<sup>547</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.4.

<sup>548</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.4-7.

<sup>549</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.4.

<sup>550</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.8.

<sup>551</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.5.

<sup>552</sup> Letter to A French Seigneur, October 18, 1548; LC 2,228, 179.

<sup>553</sup> *Comm.* on Ps., 9:1.



the obedience of God.”<sup>554</sup>

Ronald S. Wallace held that Calvin’s idea of self-denial was influenced by Thomas à Kempis’ work, *On the Imitation of Christ*.<sup>555</sup> In any way, for Calvin self-denial can be achieved only by the grace of God, namely, through the Holy Spirit. Self-denial is our imitation of Christ’s self-denial.

### 2.2.5.2 Bearing the Cross

According to Calvin, the whole Christian life is the bearing of a cross as Christ showed to us by his example of bearing the cross through all his life.<sup>556</sup> This cross designates “harsh and difficult conditions” such as disablement of body or mind, poverty, unemployment, disaster, bereavement, boredom, inner and outward frustration, and slander.<sup>557</sup> God’s will is not to exempt us from persecution, but to prove “the patience of all his children.”<sup>558</sup> This trial is foreordained for us, so that we cannot avoid this situation. In this cross, “we should dedicate our lives as a sacrifice to Him.”<sup>559</sup> It is the burdens of our life, which sometimes remain despite our best efforts.

Calvin regarded the cross as poverty, famine, disease, exile, and death as a useful discipline to awaken a sense of our duty in this world. The suffering of the cross tests and reinforces faith, develops persistence and humility, purifies the impulses of the flesh, and induces Christians to look up to heaven.<sup>560</sup> Our sickness is also useful for our sanctification, “if we testify our obedience by resigning ourselves to his (God’s) good pleasure, - if we give proof of our faith by resisting temptation- if we take advantage of the consolation which he gives us in order to overcome the troubles of the flesh.”<sup>561</sup> The cross restrains our stupid and empty confidence in our flesh by showing our incapacity and fragility.<sup>562</sup> With the remedy of the cross, God restrains our unrestrained flesh lest we become proud and swollen with other good things like honours or riches.<sup>563</sup> Sometimes, our adversity comes from the discipline of the God of our tribulations.<sup>564</sup> Through this discipline, the believer repents of his sin and learns that he must rely on God at all levels of

---

<sup>554</sup> Letter to Farel, August 1541; LC 1, 73, 280; CO 9,17-18.

<sup>555</sup> Ronald S. Wallace, *Calvin, Geneva, and the Reformation* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1988), p.191.

<sup>556</sup> *Institutes* 3.8.1.

<sup>557</sup> *Institutes* 3.8.2.

<sup>558</sup> Letter to the Church of Angers, 19<sup>th</sup> April 1556; LC 3, 432, 262.

<sup>559</sup> *Ibid.*, p.264.

<sup>560</sup> *Institutes* 3.8.4.

<sup>561</sup> Letter to Monsieur De Falas, 16<sup>th</sup> of November 1546; LC 2,178, 82.

<sup>562</sup> *Institutes* 3.8.2.

<sup>563</sup> *Institutes* 3.8.5.

<sup>564</sup> *Institutes* 3.8.6.

his being.<sup>565</sup> “God’s wrath towards his Church is...only intended to bring her back to well-doing.”<sup>566</sup> The cross is a means by which God quickens believers and keeps them alert lest they should lie asleep or grow sluggish with too much rest.

Calvin held that suffering often stems from persecution for righteousness’ sake.<sup>567</sup> “Not only they who labour for the defence of the Gospel but they who in any way maintain the cause of righteousness, suffer persecution for righteousness.” In this manner, Christian life for Christ’s disciple sometimes causes various afflictions.<sup>568</sup> If we have a good conscience before God and men, we may stand uncomplainingly all the false censures and disparages which our adversaries hurl at us.<sup>569</sup> Furthermore, even when we are in the midst of pain, groaning and tears, we must bear our cross cheerfully, because suffering is not only necessary but also good for our salvation.<sup>570</sup> These thoughts bring us spiritual joy “however much in bearing the cross our minds are constrained by the natural feeling of bitterness.”<sup>571</sup> In the end, it will be our blessing<sup>572</sup> because Christ will be glorified by our cross.<sup>573</sup> Accordingly, Calvin could delineate the scent of martyrdom as follows: “For if the confession of the faith before a crooked and perverse generation be a sacrifice grateful to God, how much more sweet-smelling will that savour be, which is diffused abroad for the salvation of many!”<sup>574</sup>

Calvin criticized Nicodemism for its evasion of the cross. For Calvin, Nicodemism means dissemblance between one’s faith and behaviour, for example, Nicodemite designates the person who feigns to be an unbeliever, though he is really a believer like Nicodemus in the Bible because he fears persecution. Calvin referred to Nicodemite behaviour as “sloth and negligence.”<sup>575</sup> Nicodemism is ‘dissemblance’ different from hypocrisy, which is the opposite of true faith. The inner heart is a Protestant but the outer behaviour follows Catholic rites because of fear of persecution. Nicodemism is the evasion from the cross.

Briefly, bearing the cross is a means of our sanctification, by which our flesh is mortified and it trains us to imitate the example of Christ.

### 2.2.5.3 The Meditation on the Future Life

---

<sup>565</sup> *Institutes* 3.8.4.

<sup>566</sup> Letter to the church of Geneva, 1<sup>st</sup> of October 1538; LC 1, 25, 87.

<sup>567</sup> *Institutes* 3.8.7.

<sup>568</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.1.

<sup>569</sup> Letter to Richard Le Fevere, 19<sup>th</sup> January 1551; LC 2, 273, 297.

<sup>570</sup> *Institutes* 3.8.10 and 11.

<sup>571</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>572</sup> *Institutes* 3.8.7.

<sup>573</sup> *Institutes* 3.8.8.

<sup>574</sup> Letter to Godfrey Varaglia, 17<sup>th</sup> December, 1557: LC 4, Appendix no.13, 427.

<sup>575</sup> Letter to Martin Luther, 1545; LC 1, 124, 442.

According to Calvin, our whole soul is enmeshed in such enchantments of the flesh as “riches, power, honour,” “avarice, ambition and lust” and “the seeking of happiness on earth.”<sup>576</sup> So we are inclined to forget not only death but also mortality itself, “as if no inkling of it had ever reached us,” we are sure of earthly immortality.<sup>577</sup> Our mind will never sincerely meditate the life to come “unless it be previously imbued with contempt for the present life” by the cross of adversary.

In order that we might not be captivated by a brutish love of this world, God “instructs his followers in the vanity of the present life by continual proof of its miseries.”<sup>578</sup> By wars or tumults, robberies, exile, barrenness of the earth, fire, the depravity of our spouses and the like, God shows us the mortality of all the goods on earth. This enables us to recognize the uncertainty and vanity of this world. Recognizing this life “to be of itself nothing but misery” prompts believers to devote themselves entirely “to meditate upon that eternal life to come.”<sup>579</sup>

In comparison with the eternal life to come, we can “despise this life and long to renounce it on account of bondage of sin.”<sup>580</sup> Such meditation for the life to come can comfort believers so that they might bear their difficulties.<sup>581</sup> If believers look to the power of the resurrection, they will recognize that the “cross of Christ will at last triumph over the devil, flesh, sin, and wicked men.” At that day when the Lord judges the world, he “will wipe away every tear from their eyes, will clothe them with ‘a robe of glory...and rejoicing’.” At the last judgment day, Christ will “grant rest to the unhappy and unjustly afflicted” and will “repay with affliction the wicked who afflict the godly.”<sup>582</sup>

In addition to despising this life, Calvin stressed that this life is a divine and generous gift.<sup>583</sup> We should use this life with gratitude to God’s generosity. Whereby, we arouse “our hope and desire to seek after the full revelation” of divine generosity. Our present experience of regeneration is a foretaste to induce us to long for the whole participation in Christ to provide us in the life to come. The gift of life that we are enjoying here is the foretaste of ultimate life in Christ.<sup>584</sup> If we participate in the suffering of Christ, we will certainly partake in his glory. Those who meditate on heavenly life are those whose minds have been “raised above this world by a taste of the heavenly life.”<sup>585</sup> This life cannot take place through the unaided efforts of man’s own mind, but only by means of participation in

---

<sup>576</sup> *Institutes* 3.9.1.

<sup>577</sup> *Institutes* 3.9.2.

<sup>578</sup> *Institutes* 3.9.1.

<sup>579</sup> *Institutes* 3.9.4.

<sup>580</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>581</sup> *Institutes* 3.9.6.

<sup>582</sup> *Institutes* 3.9.6.

<sup>583</sup> *Institutes* 3.9.3.

<sup>584</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>585</sup> *Comm.* on Ps. 30:6, CO 31, 295. “*qui coelestis vitae gustu supra mundum feruntur.*”

the sacramental worship of the Church.<sup>586</sup>

To sum up, our meditation on the life to come helps us to mortify the desire of our flesh towards this world and to long for the glory of our resurrection in our sufferings.

## 2.2.6 The Means of Sanctification

For Calvin, the means of sanctification can be described as the exercise of faith or the ways of grace.<sup>587</sup> Interestingly, F. Wendel observed that for Calvin, the preaching and the teaching of the Gospel “promote the collective sanctification” of the church members, while the sacraments “contribute to their individual sanctification.”<sup>588</sup> His standpoint of preaching seems valid, but his opinion of the sacraments is not completely legitimate, given that the Lord Supper can also promote our collective sanctification because it stresses our partaking in Christ’s one body, though each one partakes in it after examining one’s conscience.

Calvin held that God works in two ways for our sanctification. One is “by his Spirit, illuminating their minds and forming their hearts to the love and cultivation of righteousness, he makes them a new creation.” The other is “by his Word, he arouses them to desire, to seek after, and to attain the same renewal.” The former is Gods’ work within the elect, the latter is from outside them.<sup>589</sup> The reason why we do not call the Spirit a means of sanctification is that He is the Subject that sanctifies us and we cannot use Him for our sanctification. We must recognize that the Spirit makes the means of sanctification efficacious.<sup>590</sup>

### 2.2.6.1 The Instrumental Role of the Church

According to Calvin, the church is a divinely formed body, within which God effects the sanctification of his people. God uses the church as a definite earthly means for the salvation of his elected people.<sup>591</sup> Although he is not utterly restricted by these means, he usually works within them. The church gives and fosters the life of Christ to believers in the proclamation of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments.<sup>592</sup> The reason is that God’s sanctifying grace is in Christ and Christ is presented in the proclamation of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments.

---

<sup>586</sup> *Comm.* on Ps. 84:2, CO, 31, 780.

<sup>587</sup> Cf. the title to *Institutes* 3:20.

<sup>588</sup> Wendel, *op. cit.*, p. 292.

<sup>589</sup> *Institutes* 2.5.5.

<sup>590</sup> *Comm.* on Eph. 1:13, CO 51, 153; Letter to Henry Bullinger, Geneva, June 26, 1548; LC 2,224, 182.

<sup>591</sup> Wendel, *op. cit.*, p.292.

<sup>592</sup> *Institutes* 4.1.4.

## 2.2.6.1.1 The Word of God

### 2.2.6.1.1.1 The Holy Spirit, the Bible and Its Interpretation

Cyris Hee-Suk Moon depicts Calvin as an interpreter of the Bible by the Holy Spirit.<sup>593</sup> The interpretation by the Holy Spirit makes it possible that people avoid both the rigid methodological or mechanical interpretation and the dangers of a literal reading of the text.<sup>594</sup> As Moon points out, Calvin interpreted the Bible in light of the testimony by the Holy Spirit.<sup>595</sup> In the application of the Bible to our life, as we can see in Apostle Peter's case of the dietary Laws in the Old Testament, God's command through the Holy Spirit has more authority than the written commandment of God. This means that the application of God's word to our life rests on the interpretation by the Holy Spirit rather than a literal one.<sup>596</sup> Not only literalistic interpretation of the Bible, but also the viewpoint of Libertines as Spiritualists, i.e., the Anabaptists who forsake Scripture and rely on the direct leading of the Holy Spirit<sup>597</sup> was rejected by Calvin. For "God does not supply day by day oracles direct from heaven" any longer since Jesus Christ,<sup>598</sup> and "the Spirit that introduces any doctrine or invention apart from the gospel is a deceiving spirit, and not the Spirit of Christ."<sup>599</sup>

For Calvin, the application of the Bible for our holy life is never automatic or literal. It needs meditating upon the law in the Spirit and analyzing present situations with faith that God is truly present and active in them.<sup>600</sup> D. Douglass points out that Calvin recognized "the importance of reading the texts in the original languages," viz., Greek and Hebrew, and of learning the meaning of "biblical stories in their historical and cultural contexts."<sup>601</sup> Because it needs some discipline, Calvin did not allow the individual to interpret the Bible. The task was given to special men, i.e., pastors and teachers. The fanatics "who pretend to be favoured with secret revelations of the Spirit" and proud men "who imagine that to them the private reading of Scriptures is enough," and that "the ordinary ministry of the church" is unnecessary were considered as crazy.

---

<sup>593</sup> Cf. Eifon Evans also estimates Calvin as a theologian of the Holy Spirit in his article, "John Calvin: Theologian of the Holy Spirit," *Reformation and Revival*, Vol. 10, no. 4 (2001): 99.

<sup>594</sup> Cyris Hee-Suk Moon, *The Ecumenical Review* 39 (Ja., 1989): 42-43.

<sup>595</sup> Cf. T. H. L. Parker, *Calvin's Preaching* (Louisville, Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), p.2.

<sup>596</sup> *Institutes* 2.8.7 and 8.

<sup>597</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.14. "[T]hey assert, restored to the state of innocence, now need not take care to bridle the lust of the flesh, but should rather follow the Spirit as their guide, under whose impulsion they can never go astray."

<sup>598</sup> *Institutes* 1.9.1-3; Parker, *op. cit.*, p.2.

<sup>599</sup> *Comm.* on Jn. 14:26, CO 47, 335. "Atqui impostor est spiritus, non Christi, qui extraneum aliquod ab evangelio commentum ingerit."

<sup>600</sup> *Institutes* (1536) 1. 26.

<sup>601</sup> Jane Dempsey Douglass, "Calvin's Teaching What Still Remains Pertinent?," *The Ecumenical Review*, Vol. 39 (Ja., 1989): 26.

Briefly, Calvin stressed the inseparable relationship between the Spirit and the Word. Hence, for their sanctification Christians should learn the Word from the church in light of the Holy Spirit. This part can be applied to ‘5.2.1.2.4.3 Mysticism,’ ‘5.2.1.2.4.4 Spiritual Enthusiasm,’ ‘5.3.1.2 Harmony between Spirituality and Rational,’ ‘5.3.4.3 Maintaining the Balance between Institutionalism and Individualism.’

### 2.2.6.1.1.2 Preaching

In regard to the definition and justification of preaching, Calvin explained that preaching is “the primary means by which God’s presence becomes actual to us and by which God’s work is accomplished in individual life and in the community.”<sup>602</sup> Calvin stressed the role of preaching as a means of conversion, on the basis that “I will teach sinners your ways, and the wicked will be converted unto you” (Ps.51:13).<sup>603</sup> Pure preaching must be in continuity with Christ and the apostles. The justification of preaching “is rooted in the will of God” rather than “in the effectiveness for education or reform.”<sup>604</sup> Preaching is a witness of God’s will towards the world regardless of its acceptance.<sup>605</sup>

Calvin delineated the aim of preaching as follows: First, the aim of preaching is to convert people to God. Gospel is to be exclaimed “to us in order that our vices should be extirpated in such a way that God would appear to reign in our midst.”<sup>606</sup> The declaration of the Gospel and doctrines intends to awaken faith and certify the communal sanctification of the church members. Secondly, a more comprehensive purpose of preaching is the edification of the congregation.<sup>607</sup> It consists of teaching, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness.<sup>608</sup> Edification needs the affection of the preacher. Thirdly, the ultimate purpose of preaching is to communicate Christ to sinners estranged from God. The preaching of the Gospel enables us to participate daily in all the benefits Christ has acquired for us.<sup>609</sup>

Because private Bible reading is not sufficient, the congregation must convene to be instructed. Preaching is like a mother breaking bread for her infants and putting the crumbs

---

<sup>602</sup> *Institutes* 4.14.26; John H. Leith, “Calvin’s Doctrine of the Proclamation of the Word and Its Significance for Today,” in *John Calvin & the Church: A Prism of Reform* ed. by Timothy George (Louisville in Kentucky: Westminster/ John Knox Press, 1990), p. 206.

<sup>603</sup> For Calvin, preaching is essentially teaching. T. H. L. Parker, *Calvin’s Preaching* (Louisville: Westminster, John Knox Press, 1992), p.35.

<sup>604</sup> John H. Leith, “Reformed Preaching Today,” *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, Vol.10, no.3 (1989): 227.

<sup>605</sup> *Comm.* on Is. 6:10, CO 36, 135-138

<sup>606</sup> *Serm.* on Act 5:13-16; *Sermons on the Acts of the Apostles*, ed. by W. Balke and W. H. Th Moehn (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verslag des Erziehungsvereins, 1994), *Supplementa Calviniana*, vol. 8, p.46. It is written as SC.

<sup>607</sup> *Serm.* 24 on 2 Tm: 3:16-17, CO 54, 287; cf. T. H. L, Parker, *Calvin’s Preaching*, pp.11-12.

<sup>608</sup> *Serm.* 24 on 2 Tm: 3:16-17, CO 54, 288-294.

<sup>609</sup> *Serm.* on Acts 4:21-26, SC 8:46.

in their mouths so that they can eat.<sup>610</sup> It is similar to nourishing a baby.<sup>611</sup> Preaching is the divine work as well as a human work.<sup>612</sup> Accordingly, a preacher should be careful of the fidelity to Scripture, the skill of syntax and rhetoric, and the liveliness of the delivery. For Calvin, preaching is done in the light of a biblical and theological vision of reality.<sup>613</sup>

For Calvin, the preaching is to be listened to as if God himself were speaking.<sup>614</sup> For this purpose, preaching should be simple. The qualifications of a preacher are humility and trust in Scripture, obedience to the teaching which he is urging on the congregation, and courage to proclaim the truth on the authority of God's Word.<sup>615</sup> The congregation should be entirely submissive to a preacher's message from God. This acquiescence to the Word of God is the work of the Holy Spirit. Through submission of a preacher and congregation to the authority of God, preaching becomes a means of sanctification.

### 2.2.6.1.1.3 Law and Gospel

#### 2.2.6.1.1.3.1 The Third Use of the Law

Calvin saw the Law as a revelation of the eternal will of God. For Calvin, the Law had a threefold function. First, the *usus elencticus legis* is the function to guide men to Christ by uncovering, accusing, and condemning their sin.<sup>616</sup> The Law functions as a mirror showing us the spots on our face in order that "we can contemplate our poverty" and weakness.<sup>617</sup> Secondly, the *usus politicus legis* is the function to control misdeeds and criminal acts for the political order of life. This is necessary for Christian godly and stable life.<sup>618</sup> Thirdly, the *tertius usus legis* is the function to instruct Christians to obey God's commandment and will.<sup>619</sup> As Dowey puts it, for Calvin, because the curse of the *usus elencticus legis* "is removed" and "justification by works of any kind is banished, the Law can return to its original and proper role," which is the expression of God's love.<sup>620</sup> As Paul Jacob points

---

<sup>610</sup> Serm. 12 on 2 Tm: 3:14-15, CO 54, 150- 151.

<sup>611</sup> T. H. L. Parker, *Calvin's Preaching*, p.141.

<sup>612</sup> John H. Leith, "Calvin's Doctrine of the Proclamation of the Word and Its Significance for Today," in *John Calvin & the Church: A Prism of Reform* ed. by Timothy George (Louisville in Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1990), p. 211.

<sup>613</sup> John H. Leith, "Reformed Preaching Today," *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, Vol.10, no. 3 (1989): 230-31.

<sup>614</sup> *Institutes* 4.1.5.

<sup>615</sup>; Serm. on Deut. 1:43, CO 26.304; Serm. on 1 Tim. 1:2; CO 25. 713-714.

<sup>616</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.6. Luther called it "the true...most important and the highest" use of the law (*WA* 40.533; *LW* 26, 91, and 310-13).

<sup>617</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.1.

<sup>618</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.10.

<sup>619</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.12. Hans-Joachim Kraus, "The Contemporary Relevance of Calvin's Theology," in *Towards the Future of Reformed Theology: Tasks, Topics, Traditions*, ed. David Willis & Michael Welker (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999), p. 331.

<sup>620</sup> Edward Atkinson Dowey, Jr., "Law in Luther and Calvin," *Theology Today* 41 (1984/85): 152.



out, Calvin's doctrine of sanctification is no more than an unfolding of the doctrine of the *tertius usus legis*.<sup>621</sup> Calvin called the *tertius usus legis* the *usus in renatis* (the use for the regenerated), which was regarded as the Law's principal use for believers,<sup>622</sup> while the first use of the Law might be the primary use for unbelievers.<sup>623</sup> This is where Calvin differed from Luther who stressed the theological use of the Law rather than the third use "for fear that it would undercut the clear tension between Law and Gospel" and would threaten "to destroy the preaching of the gospel."<sup>624</sup> Stephen W. Ramp points out that Calvin did not worry about distinguishing between the first and the third uses of the Law from the pulpit because he wanted to condemn human corrupt nature and purify it from all kinds of filths.<sup>625</sup>

The Law points to our sin and compels us to repent of it.<sup>626</sup> It serves as "a whip to an idle and balky ass to arouse to work" and as "a constant sting that will not let him [Christian] stand till" ([ ] is my addition).<sup>627</sup> Calvin also designated that the office of the Law is "to call us back from our wandering, and to lead us to the mark set before us."<sup>628</sup> The Law forms human life according to "the archetype of divine purity."<sup>629</sup> This purity is described as loving God and neighbour. Loving God is proved by loving our neighbour.<sup>630</sup> The situational ethics of Fletcher that "the ruling norm of Christian decision is love: nothing else" should be criticized for antinomianism by reason that it does not have any

---

<sup>621</sup> Paul Jacobs, *Prädestination und Verantwortlichkeit bei Calvin* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968 reprint), p. 103.

<sup>622</sup> *Institutes* (1536), ed. Rev. Ed., tr. annotated by Ford Lewis Battle (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 1. 35-36.

<sup>623</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.12.

<sup>624</sup> Jesse Couenhoven, "Grace as Pardon and Power: Pictures of the Christian Life in Luther, Calvin, and Barth," *Journal of Religious Ethics*, Vol. 28, no. 1 (2000): 67; David J. Lose, "Luther and Calvin on Preaching to the Human Condition," *Lutheran Quarterly*, ns.10 (autumn, 1996): 291. cf. Mary Lane Potter, "The Whole Office of the Law in the Theology of John Calvin," *The Journal of Law and Religion*, Vol. 3, no. 1 (St. Paul: 1985): 117. Calvin did not strive "to ignore the punitive function of the moral law, as the papists were wont to do."; Merwyn S. Johnson also is of the opinion that for Calvin, "the third use of the law parallels directly the first use of the law." Merwyn S. Johnson, "Calvin's Handling of the Third Use of the Law and Its Problems," *Calviniana*, p. 48.

<sup>625</sup> Stephen W. Ramp, "John Calvin on Preaching the Law," *Word and World*, Vol. 21, no. 3 (Luther-Northwestern Theological Seminary, 2001): 267-269; cf. Michael S Horton insists that "Calvin combined the civil and moral use until the 1559 *Institutes*, although there is a reference to the "three-fold use," in the 1539 edition." Michael S. Horton, "Calvin and the Law-Gospel Hermeneutic," *Pro Ecclesia*, Vol. 6, no. 1 (Northfield: Center for Catholic and Evangelical Theology, 1997): 35.

<sup>626</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.4.

<sup>627</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.12.

<sup>628</sup> *Comm.* on Jer. 5:5, CO 37, 613. "...quoniam hoc est legis officium, revocare nos ab errore, et deducere ad finem nobis propositum."

<sup>629</sup> *Institutes* 2.8.51.

<sup>630</sup> *Comm.* on 1Cor. 8:3, CO 49, 430. "...si Deum diligamus. Nam si hoc fit, proximos quoque in ipso diligemus."

norm to know what love is.<sup>631</sup> God's law reveals to us the certain norm of true love. Accordingly, Calvin could base his sixteen sermons of the Decalogue on the third use of the Law. As the rule of perfect righteousness,<sup>632</sup> the Law clearly informs us "what things are to be followed, and what things are to be avoided."<sup>633</sup> In light of Alasdair MacIntyter's view that the *telos* of the law is true human freedom and the latter is formed by the former,<sup>634</sup> Calvin's third use of the law for our sanctification is legitimate.

#### 2.2.6.1.1.3.2 Moral Law and Christ's Law

Calvin defined moral law as "the testimony of the natural law" and of conscience "engraved on the minds of men."<sup>635</sup> Moral law is never wholly lost in the fall.<sup>636</sup> Man has a "natural instinct to cherish and preserve society."<sup>637</sup>

For Calvin, the core of the natural Law is piety and justice. Especially, justice as seed implanted in all men<sup>638</sup> "is the name given to the rectitude and humanity which we cultivate with our brethren, when we endeavour to do good to all, and when we abstain from all wrong, fraud, and violence."<sup>639</sup> Justice as mainly the precepts of the second table is exercised in and through conscience. As William F. Keesecker comments, Calvin regarded justice or equity as "part of the Law of nature engraved on our hearts." It is the Golden Rule that "we should not do to anyone except what we would wish done to us." It is "the whole sum of the Law and the Prophets."<sup>640</sup> However, Keesecker failed to distinguish the Law of nature and the Law of Christ. The former is fundamentally deontological but the latter is fundamentally dispositional. Christian sanctification is accomplished not by natural Law but by Christ's Law.

Jesus Christ clarifies and interprets the moral Law of Moses as natural law. The teaching of Christ offers all fitted "for the conduct of life and all that is needful to be

---

<sup>631</sup> Fletcher, *Situational Ethics*, p.69. Also see I. John Hesselink, "Christ, the Law, and the Christian: An Unexplored Aspect of the Third Use of the Law in Calvin's Theology," in *Reading in Calvin's Theology*, ed. by Donald K. McKIM (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984), p.183.

<sup>632</sup> *Comm.* on Rom. 10:5, CO 49, 197. "...vera pietatis regula..."

<sup>633</sup> *Comm.* on Rom. 4:23, CO 49, 86. "...quae facta imitanda, et quae cavenda..."

<sup>634</sup> Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*, second edition (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984), p. 78

<sup>635</sup> *Institutes* 4.20.16..

<sup>636</sup> For further study, see Rae Simon, "Calvin, Natural Law and Contemporary Ethics: a Brief Note," *The Reformed Theological Review*, Vol. 30, no.1 (Ja.-Ap.,1971): 14-20.

<sup>637</sup> *Institutes* 2.2.3.

<sup>638</sup> *Institutes* 2.2.13.

<sup>639</sup> *Comm.* on Gen. 18:19, CO 23, 259.

<sup>640</sup> William F. Keesecker, "The Law in John Calvin's Ethics," in *Calvin and Christian Ethics: Fifth Colloquium on Calvin & Calvin Studies*, ed. Peter De Klerk (Grand Rapids: Calvin Studies Society, 1987), p.36; John Calvin, *Sermons on Job*, selected and tr. by Leroy Nixon, with an introductory Essay, by Harold Dekker (Grand Rapids: Baker use, 1979), p. 13.

known.”<sup>641</sup> The actions of Christ can also be presented as an example of love, of well-ordered emotions, of perseverance and moderation in adversity, for Christian sanctification.<sup>642</sup> In contrast, the moral Law of Moses is far from being a perfect expression of the divine ideal. It was accommodated to the limitation of a people who had only very primitive concepts of God’s character. As God’s true prophet, Jesus Christ reveals God’s will in our heart in order that we might be sanctified by being obedient to it in the Holy Spirit. That is to say, without Christ, the Law is not perfect in the sense that only Christ enables Christians to be free from the shackles of the Law and to live the Law of love.<sup>643</sup> The law of love is to “govern our wills, our endeavours and our actions.”<sup>644</sup> Love is affection and action which is guided and inspired by the Law. The law of love is a guide in those settings where Scripture is not explicit.

Briefly, natural law functions to restrain social wrongs and promote social justice for social sanctification, but it should be interpreted and compensated for by Christ’ law.

### 2.2.6.1.1.3.3 Law and Gospel

Calvin explicates the difference between the Law and the Gospel in their roles of sanctification as follows: The Gospel is a means of “spiritual regeneration,” by which we are transformed into the image of God.<sup>645</sup> The Gospel “produces of itself reverence, fear, and obedience.”<sup>646</sup> The Gospel is the gracious promise of mercy towards us and the object and the foundation of faith.<sup>647</sup> The grace of God in the gospel of Jesus Christ “nourishes us without support of the law.”<sup>648</sup> Conversely, the judgment of the Law against us “disturb our faith rather than to establish it.”<sup>649</sup> “The Law, on the other hand, even though it prescribes the rule of a good life, does not change the heart for a righteous.”<sup>650</sup> It cannot do anything more than remind us of our duty. Only the Gospel’s promise can move us to grateful obedience.<sup>651</sup> When it is used by the Holy Spirit, moral law as a pedagogue and

---

<sup>641</sup> *Comm.* on Jn. 13: 36, CO 47, 319. “...audimus ex ore Christi, quaecunque ad usum vitae apta et cognitu necessaria sunt.”

<sup>642</sup> *Comm.* 1 Jn. 3: 16, CO 45, 340; *Comm.* on Jn. 11:33, CO 47, 265.

<sup>643</sup> Cf. Serm. on Gal. 4:8-11.CO 50, 595-608. Apart from Jesus Christ, “this is no more than minor baggage,” “than a mockery.”

<sup>644</sup> *Institutes* 2.8.49.

<sup>645</sup> *Comm.* on Gen. 1:26, CO 23, 26. “Dicit Paulus nos per evangelium transfigurari in imaginem Dei...regeneratio spiritualis nihil aliud est quam eiusdem imaginis instauratio.”

<sup>646</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Thess. 2:13. “...quae reverentiam, timorem et obedientiam ex se generet.”

<sup>647</sup> *Institutes* 3.2.7, and 29.

<sup>648</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.7.

<sup>649</sup> *Institutes* 3.2.7.

<sup>650</sup> *Calvin: Commentaries* of The Library of Christian Classics (Institute for the Christian Information & Data, 1999), p.281.

<sup>651</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.12.

spur can promote true piety.<sup>652</sup>

#### 2.2.6.1.1.3.4 The Decalogue

William J. Carl III insists, “The Decalogue is a corrective to...antinomian, libertarian society.” It offers us “some walls that provide structure for our lives” that might prevent us from harming ourselves, and leads “to deeper freedom as they become internalized.”<sup>653</sup> Carl III’s insistence on Calvin’s viewpoints seems germane, given that Calvin regarded the Decalogue as the basis of civil law<sup>654</sup> and as a guide for the new life of forgiven Christians.<sup>655</sup> Unlike the early Luther who did not consider the Decalogue as an ethical blueprint for being a Christian,<sup>656</sup> Calvin stressed the Decalogue as a guide to be applicable for Christians of all ages “to the end of the world.”<sup>657</sup> Hugo Röthlisberger criticizes Calvin for reducing the will of God to the Decalogue without any consideration of the Sermon on the Mount, the apostolic exhortations, and injunctions in catechetical instruction for Christian life.<sup>658</sup> His critique seems illegitimate, given that Calvin expounded the Decalogue in the light of Christ’s teaching, i.e., the Sermon on the Mount and the entire instructions of the New Testament.<sup>659</sup> Briefly, in his teaching of Christian holy life, Calvin preferred to refer to Christ’s birth, life, teaching, death, and resurrection rather than the law.<sup>660</sup>

In *Institutes* 2.8.15-59, Calvin expounded the Decalogue in detail. Briefly, the Decalogue directs and helps us to love God and our neighbours. It intends “the fulfilment of righteousness to form human life to the archetype of divine purity.”<sup>661</sup> That is, it

---

<sup>652</sup> *Institutes* 4.20.2, 3.

<sup>653</sup> William J. Carl III, “The Decalogue in Liturgy, Preaching, and Life,” *Interpretation*, Vol. 43, no. 3 (Richmond: Union Theological Seminary Press, 1989): 269.

<sup>654</sup> *Institutes* 4.20.15.

<sup>655</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.12.

<sup>656</sup> David Wright, “The Ethical Use of the Old Testament in Luther and Calvin: A Comparison,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* Vol. 36, pp. 471, 473. Luther did not regard the Decalogue as an ethical standard for the reason that it needs deJudaization and Christianisation because of its Judaic character, which was described in the prologue, the promise of long life in the land in the Fourth Commandment, the ban on images, and the specification of the Sabbath. Conversely, in his Large Catechism, Luther viewed the Decalogue as “the true foundation from which all good works must spring, the true channel through which all good works must flow.” [Large Catechism, para. 311; *The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, Theodore G. Tappert, ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978), p. 407]. That is to say, Luther early took a negative attitude towards the Decalogue against the legalism of the Roman Church and later a positive against antinomianism.

<sup>657</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.13.

<sup>658</sup> Hugo Röthlisberger, *Kirche am Sinai - Die Zehn Gebote in der christlichen Unterweisung* (Zurich: Zwingli, 1965). pp. 130f., 143f., 101.

<sup>659</sup> *Institutes* 2.8.51-59.

<sup>660</sup> Cf. I. John Hesselink, “Christ, the Law, and the Christian: An Unexplored Aspect of the Third Use of the Law in Calvin’s Theology,” in *Reading in Calvin’s Theology*, ed. by Donald K. McKIM (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984), p.189.

<sup>661</sup> *Institutes* 3.8.51.

functions as a means for our sanctification by His Spirit.

#### 2.2.6.1.1.4 The Old Testament and the New Testament

Calvin criticized the Anabaptists for positing the Israelites as “nothing but a herd of swine...without any hope of heavenly immortality.”<sup>662</sup> To Calvin, those who wanted the Law to be cast out of the Church were some disgusting scoundrel, whose common slogan was “No more Law or Prophets for us!”<sup>663</sup> Their opinion to render God double-minded, fickle and inconstant was rejected by Calvin on the ground that the Law and the Prophets is a permanent and immortal truth.<sup>664</sup> Calvin insisted that God is constant in the sense that the Bible consists of a single covenant of grace. The Old Testament and the New Testament differ only “in clarity of manifestation,”<sup>665</sup> and in the mode of dispensation, but are actually the same in one covenant of salvation through Christ.<sup>666</sup> In this manner, Calvin accentuated the constancy of both Testaments.

He presupposed that every event and story in Scripture is useful for human edification. Thus, he used abundant passages of epidemic oratory, admiring or censuring Moses and David, and the prophets and apostles in his writings and preaching. Interestingly, Calvin’s evaluation of Abraham and Rebecca’s behaviour was different from Luther’s. While Luther advocated their immoral behaviour as steadfast adherence to God’s promise,<sup>667</sup> Calvin did not justify their illegitimate devices and regarded them as ethically in demerit due to deficiency of faith.<sup>668</sup> In contrast to Luther who made his Old Testament exegesis serve the history of salvation rather than ethical concern, Calvin maintained an ethical use of the Old Testament through his distinction between ends and means.<sup>669</sup>

After Christ’s redemption, in the application of God’s Word for Christian sanctification, the New Testament is superior to the Old Testament because revelation progressed. Calvin explicated it in the case of Peter. Peter hesitated when God commanded him to go to Cornelius because the Law prohibits a Jew from eating with a heathen, but he followed the direction of the living God.<sup>670</sup> As far as this topic is concerned, Calvin’s view that the New Testament clarifies the Old Testament is quite valid in terms of the progress of

---

<sup>662</sup> *Institutes* 2.10.1.

<sup>663</sup> Sermon on 2 Tim. 3:16-17, CO 54, 284.

<sup>664</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>665</sup> *Institutes* 2.9.4.

<sup>666</sup> *Institutes* 2.10.2. cf. For the distinction between the two, see I. John Hesselink, “Law & Gospel or Gospel & Law?: Calvin’s Understanding of the Relationship,” in *Calviniana*, p.20.

<sup>667</sup> *LW* 2, 293-296.

<sup>668</sup> *Comm.* on Gen. 16:1, CO 23, 223; *Comm.* on Gen. 27:12, CO 23, 375; cf. David F. Wright, “The Ethical Use of the Old Testament in Luther and Calvin: A Comparison,” *Scottish Journal of Theology*, Vol. 36, no.3 (1983): 465-467.

<sup>669</sup> David Wright, *ibid.*, pp. 467-468.

<sup>670</sup> *Comm.* on Acts 10: 17-21, CO 48, 234.

revelation, though Habib Badr's critique that Calvin interpreted the Old Testament in light of Paul's writing is notable.<sup>671</sup>

Briefly, rejecting the view that "we need neither the law nor the prophets any more," Calvin held that preachers must preach the Law and the prophets, and the Gospel for Christian sanctification as St. Paul used the Old Testament in this manner.<sup>672</sup> As far as the same topic is concerned, the New Testament is superior to the Old Testament in the light of the progress of revelation.

### 2.2.6.1.2 Sacraments

Calvin defined a sacrament in conjunction with its usefulness as follows: It is "an outward sign, by which the Lord seals on our consciences his promises of good will towards us, in order to sustain the weakness of our faith."<sup>673</sup> The sacraments are highly useful means "to foster and strengthen faith."<sup>674</sup> They are necessary for us to overcome "the infirmity and hard-heartedness" in us.<sup>675</sup> The sacraments help us to cherish, confirm and increase the true knowledge of Christ. We have communion with Christ in our participation in the sacraments.<sup>676</sup>

He stressed the necessity of preaching in a sacrament. Because a sacrament must be based upon 'a promise and a command of the Lord,' the Word should be preached in order to make us understand what the visible sign means.<sup>677</sup> The sacraments as seals confirm what the Word of God proclaims preceding the sacraments.<sup>678</sup> Their true office is to offer Christ to us and display the treasures of heavenly grace in Him.<sup>679</sup> He dismissed five of the seven sacraments of the Catholic Church on account of it being unbiblical and retained only baptism and the Lord's Supper.<sup>680</sup>

Calvin also emphasised the work of the Holy Spirit to make the sacraments effective. The whole efficiency of the sacraments lies in "the secret working of the Spirit."<sup>681</sup> The

---

<sup>671</sup> Rev. Habib Badr, "Medium Quiddam: The Problematic Relation of General Election and Individual Salvation in Calvin's Theology," *Theological Review*, Vol. 10, no.1-2 (Lebanon: The School, 1989): 45.

<sup>672</sup> *The Mystery of Godliness and Other Selected Sermons by John Calvin* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1950), p. 130, 134.

<sup>673</sup> *Institutes* 4.14.1.

<sup>674</sup> *Institutes* 4.1.1.

<sup>675</sup> Letter to the King of France; October 1557; LC 3, 480, 375.

<sup>676</sup> *Institutes* 4.14.6.

<sup>677</sup> *Institutes* 4.14.4.

<sup>678</sup> *Institutes* 4.14.5.

<sup>679</sup> *Institutes* 4.14.17.

<sup>680</sup> *Institutes* 4.19.1. These five sacraments are Confirmation, Penance, Extreme Unction, the Sacraments of Holy Orders and Marriage. *Institutes* 4.19.1-37.

<sup>681</sup> Letter to Henry Bullinger, 26<sup>th</sup> June 1548; LC 2, 224, 169. "their whole efficacy is due to the Holy Spirit."



sacraments are efficient for our sanctification only in Christ and the Holy Spirit.<sup>682</sup> The Spirit softens the stubbornness of our hearts so that the Word may not beat upon our ears in vain. He transmits those outward Words and sacraments from our ears to our souls.<sup>683</sup> Christ is present in the elements of the sacrament in such a way that only faith can discern it. This faith is generated by the Spirit.

To sum up, the sacraments are a means of our sanctification as well as the Word.<sup>684</sup>

#### 2.2.6.1.2.1 Baptism

Calvin understood baptism as a public demonstration of our loyalty to God in accordance with Zwingli.<sup>685</sup> Baptism “is the initiatory sign by which we are admitted into the fellowship of the Church, so that, engrafted in Christ, we may be reckoned among the children of God.”<sup>686</sup>

With regard to the benefit of baptism, Calvin said that Baptism arouses, nourishes, and confirms our faith.<sup>687</sup> It strengthens our weak faith in God’s promises in three respects. First, it signifies the removal of sin by the death of the Son of God. “When we are baptized, we are, once for all, washed, purged for our whole life.” By recalling the memory of our baptism, we can be “confident of the forgiveness of sins.”<sup>688</sup> Secondly, the performance of the rite means mortification and new life, a uniting of the person with the death and resurrection of Christ.<sup>689</sup> Baptism symbolizes our participation in the death of Christ, i.e. our mortification of flesh and sin. Calvin also connected baptism with suffering. Baptism is “a sign of the inevitable suffering that will accompany the Christian life.”<sup>690</sup> Thirdly, it is the sign of union with Christ himself, which leads to the fellowship with the Trinity. All believers are taught and encouraged in the Christian life to lift their heart to God in the sacrament of baptism.<sup>691</sup>

In the relationship between the baptism with water and the baptism of the Spirit, Calvin denied that “the external baptism of water” is identified with “the regeneration of the Spirit.”<sup>692</sup> The baptism with water is not necessary for our salvation but “the token of our union with Christ.”<sup>693</sup> Still, he acknowledged that whoever “receives baptism with true

---

<sup>682</sup> Letter to the King of France; October 1557; LC 3, 480, 375.

<sup>683</sup> *Institutes* 4.14.10.

<sup>684</sup> *Institutes* 4.14.17.

<sup>685</sup> *Institutes* 4.15.5.

<sup>686</sup> *Institutes* 4.15.1.

<sup>687</sup> *Institutes* 4.15.14.

<sup>688</sup> *Institutes* 4.15.3.

<sup>689</sup> *Institutes* 4.15.5.

<sup>690</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>691</sup> John D. Witvliet, “Baptism as a Sacrament of Reconciliation in the Thought of John Calvin,” *Studia Liturgica*, Vol. 27, no. 2 (1997): 159.

<sup>692</sup> Letter to John Clauburger, Geneva, 24th June 1556; LC 3, 438.

<sup>693</sup> *Institutes* 4.15.6.



faith” should be said to receive “the pardon of his sins” by his faith in Christ.<sup>694</sup>

Calvin viewed the practice of infant baptism as an authentic tradition of the early church, not a medieval development.<sup>695</sup> He recognized that infants can be regenerated by God’s power.<sup>696</sup> The seed of their repentance and faith lies hidden within them by the secret working of the Spirit.<sup>697</sup> The benefit of infant baptism is that because infant baptism is the sign that God will be with believers and their descendants, it floods their pious hearts with great happiness and makes them feel “a deeper love of their kind Father.”<sup>698</sup> Through infant baptism, believers are aroused to a surer confidence of the salvation of their children and the children are “engrafted into the body of the church” and rather “more commended to the other members.” It spurs them on “to an earnest zeal for worshipping God” when they grow up and recognize its meaning.<sup>699</sup> Seeds of their understanding and cherishing of God’s promise in faith are sown in infant baptism by the Holy Spirit so that “infants are baptized into future repentance and faith.”<sup>700</sup> The presence of Christ through the Spirit “is continually offered in Word and sacrament” until the child becomes “an effective incipient.” Baptism continually offers “the sealed promise that in Christ, sins are forgiven and justification continually applied.”<sup>701</sup>

#### **2.2.6.1.2.2 The Lord’s Supper**

Here we do not have to refer to the whole doctrine of the Lord’s Supper. Accordingly, we will deal with how the Lord’s Supper operates for our sanctification as a means of grace.

In contrast to Bullinger,<sup>702</sup> Calvin regarded the Lord’s Supper as an instrument of sanctification, which the Spirit uses to deepen our faith. We are quickened by the true partaking in the sacrament because Christ’s life is delivered to us in it. The life-giving body and blood of Christ are brought to us “by the secret and incomprehensible power of the Spirit,”<sup>703</sup> who “truly unites things separated by space.”<sup>704</sup> The Sacrament heightens our awareness and newness of life. By the Lord’s Supper, we grow into “one body with Christ” and partake in all His benefits, which are redemption, righteousness, sanctification,

---

<sup>694</sup> Letter to Henry Bullinger, 26<sup>th</sup> June 1548; LC 2, 224, 169.

<sup>695</sup> *Institutes* 4.16.8.

<sup>696</sup> *Institutes* 4.16.18.

<sup>697</sup> *Institutes* 4.16.20.

<sup>698</sup> *Institutes* 4.16.9.

<sup>699</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>700</sup> *Institutes* 4.16.20.

<sup>701</sup> Jill Raitt, “Three Inter-related Principles in Calvin’s Unique Doctrine of Infant Baptism,” *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 11, no. 1 (1980): 60.

<sup>702</sup> Paul Rorem, “Calvin and Bullinger on the Lord’s Supper: Part I. The Impasse,” *Lutheran Quarterly*(Sum, 1988): 183. Bullinger explicitly rejected “instrumentalism.”

<sup>703</sup> Letter to the King of France; October 1557; LC 3, 480, 376

<sup>704</sup> *Institutes* 4.17.10.

and eternal life.<sup>705</sup> Generally, the Supper was allowed to the baptized who could discern the body and blood of Christ.<sup>706</sup>

Calvin stressed that the Supper “can more forcefully than any other means quicken and inspire us both to purity and holiness of life, and to love, peace, and concord.”<sup>707</sup> Since He makes us one in his body, we become made one body by our participation in the Supper. To injure our fellows who believe in Christ is to abuse Christ. As we are one body of Christ, we should take care of our brethren’s bodies, as if they are ours. In this respect, the Supper is called “the bond of love.” There could be no sharper goad “to arouse mutual love among us” than the Lord’s Supper. In this sense, the Supper contributes to our collective sanctification.

In his *Institutes* 4.17.42, Calvin averred that the “sacred feast is medicine for the sick, solace for the sinners, alms to the poor” but that it brings “no benefit to the healthy, righteous, and rich if such could be found.” It was “ordained not for the perfect, but for the weak and feeble, to awaken, stimulate, and exercise the feeling of faith and love, indeed, to correct the defect of both.” In his sermon on Titus 1:1-15, Calvin insisted, “the Supper is a special witness to us that our God helps us.” When we are lazy, “it is to make us go on forward, to drive still to our God.” “The Supper is to correct and make an end of such things as are yet out of frame” (Spelling is modernized).<sup>708</sup>

Briefly, the Lord’s Supper is a means of sanctification to correct our defects and heighten newness of life, and inspire us to holy life and unite us as one.

### 2.2.6.1.3 Church Discipline

Calvin explained the necessity of church discipline as follows: “Discipline and the correction of vices” are indispensable to our sanctification as the nerves are essential to uphold the body in a healthful state.<sup>709</sup> Without this order which guarantees their safety and concord, churches are “wholly deformed and scattered.”<sup>710</sup> “There is no person of sound mind and unbiased disposition” that does not need the church discipline.<sup>711</sup>

Calvin saw three ways in which to explain the purpose of church discipline.<sup>712</sup> The first is to protect the honour of Christ and his Church by prohibiting impious men from being called Christians. The second purpose is that the good might be not corrupted by the

---

<sup>705</sup> *Institutes* 4.17.11.

<sup>706</sup> *Institutes* 4. 16.30.

<sup>707</sup> *Institutes* 4.17.38.

<sup>708</sup> *Sermons on the Epistle to Timothy & Titus by John Calvin*, (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth & Trust, reprinted in 1983, first published in 1579), p.1060.

<sup>709</sup> Letter to the protector Somerset; LC 2, 229, 197.

<sup>710</sup> *Institutes* 4.10.27.

<sup>711</sup> Letter to the pastors and doctors of the church of Zurich, 26<sup>th</sup> November 1553; LC 2, 335, 444.

<sup>712</sup> *Institutes* 4.12.5.

communion with the wicked. The third is that “those overcome by shame for their baseness begin to repent.” In addition, disciplinary measures “were directed especially against Roman Catholic practices such as praying to the Virgin and the use of altars and images.”<sup>713</sup> In this manner, for Calvin, church discipline was “a means of preserving the purity of the Church’s teaching and the believers’ efforts towards sanctification.”<sup>714</sup>

In terms of the stages of discipline, mutual encouragement, advice and warning were offered for tolerable offences including “fondness for idle theological speculation, neglect of the study of Scripture, levity, slander, stinginess, quarrelling and anger.”<sup>715</sup> In order “to awaken us from our indolence,”<sup>716</sup> Calvin chose the various church disciplinary programmes and devices, including the scheduling of times and places for worship.<sup>717</sup> A more severe means for correction is to bar immoral people from the communion of the Lord’s Supper.<sup>718</sup> As the severest punishment, excommunication was offered for “manifest adulterers, fornicators, thieves, robbers, seditious persons, perjurers, and false witnesses.”<sup>719</sup> Those who engaged in “immorality, drunkenness, gaming and dancing”<sup>720</sup> were included as well as the obstinate who do not acquiesce to admonition even though they were duly warned of their lighter vices.<sup>721</sup> Excommunication is “a holy and lawful discipline” stemmed from the word of God.<sup>722</sup> It is the key of the door of heaven by which the Church binds the sinner and loosens him when she receives him again into communion.<sup>723</sup> Excommunication is different from anathema in the sense that the latter is condemnation without pardon, and consigns a man to eternal destruction.<sup>724</sup>

Administration of justice is not in one man, but “in the hands of the assembly of the elders.” This is different from the Roman Catholic’s view of excommunication.<sup>725</sup> From Calvin’s viewpoint, the Roman Catholic’s practise was arbitrary, merciless and despotic.<sup>726</sup>

---

<sup>713</sup> Timothy E. Fulop, “The Third Mark of the Church? - Church Discipline in the Reformed and Anabaptist Reformations,” *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol. 19, no.1 (1995): 33.

<sup>714</sup> Wendel, *op. cit.*, p. 298.

<sup>715</sup> Calvin, ‘Draft Ecclesiastical Ordinances’ in *Theological Treatises*, pp. 60-61.

<sup>716</sup> *Institutes* 4.19.13. “If this discipline were in effect today, it would certainly arouse some slothful parents.”

<sup>717</sup> *Comm.* on Dan.9:18, CO 41, 157-160.

<sup>718</sup> *Institutes* 4.11.5; Letter to the protector Somerset; LC 2, 229, 197.

<sup>719</sup> *Institutes* 4.12.5.

<sup>720</sup> Those lists were regarded as intolerable offences. Calvin, ‘Draft Ecclesiastical Ordinances’ in *Theological Treatises*, pp. 60-61.

<sup>721</sup> Letter to the French Church of Frankfort, 23d February, 1559; LC 4, 524, 21.

<sup>722</sup> Letter to the pastors and doctors of the church of Zurich, 26<sup>th</sup> November 1553; LC 2, 335, 443 and 444; CO 14, 676.

<sup>723</sup> For formative process of this doctrine, see Robert White, “Oil and Vinegar: Calvin on Church Discipline,” *Scottish Journal of Theology*, Vol.38, no.1 (1985): 25-40.

<sup>724</sup> *Short Treatise on the Lord’s Supper* (1541) in *Theological Treatises*, p. 154.

<sup>725</sup> *Institutes* 4.11.5,6.

<sup>726</sup> *The Necessity of Reforming the Church* (I 544), in *Tracts and Treatises*, tr. by H. Beveridge (reprint).

Anabaptists were also too severe in their use of the ban.<sup>727</sup> In concert with Bucer, Calvin concluded that “the Anabaptists were more rigid than Paul.”<sup>728</sup> Church discipline can only be exercised by spiritual authority, in other words, it relies on the spontaneous perspicacity of faith. Calvin thought ministers and elders to be responsible for church discipline. The steps of discipline consist of individual, communal, and official admonition.

On the issue pertaining to tolerance, Castellio held that “tolerance in matters of faith is a good thing” and “persecution of supposed heretics is evil” according to the advice of Gamaliel.<sup>729</sup> Calvin rejected Castellio’s view for the reason that Gamaliel’s advice would destroy both civil and ecclesiastical order.<sup>730</sup> Of course, Calvin recognized the importance of toleration. He stressed gentleness and moderation in exercising excommunication. We should observe gentleness “lest we slip into some kind of hell-fire, and soon descend from discipline to butchery.”<sup>731</sup> “Yet all this should be done with such moderation, that there be no rigour by which anyone may be injured; for even corrections are only medicines of bringing back sinners to our Lord.”<sup>732</sup>

To sum up, church discipline is “a means of grace which, along with the Word, sacraments and prayer, Christ has given to his church, and which his Spirit uses for the sanctification and edification” of the believers.<sup>733</sup>

#### 2.2.6.1.4 Mutual Communion among Church Members

Calvin stressed the necessity of “mutual teaching and admonition” for edification as follows:<sup>734</sup> “As we are slow to what is good,” we need to be stimulated by mutual communion for edifying each other.<sup>735</sup>

He explicated the importance of mutual communion in comparison to the relationship

---

Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1958), Vol. I, pp. 205-256.

<sup>727</sup> Cf. *Institutes* 4.12.12. Timothy E. Fulop is the opinion that “Calvin’s views on discipline constituted a moderate position between the Lutherans and the Anabaptists on the practice of church discipline and between Zwingli and the Anabaptists on the state’s role in discipline.” “The Third Mark of the Church? - Church Discipline in the Reformed and Anabaptist Reformations,” *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol. 19, no.1 (Jan., 1995): 27. For the austerity of Anabaptists’ church discipline, see Kenneth Davis, “No Discipline, No Church: An Anabaptist Contribution to the Reformed Tradition,” *Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 13, no.4 (win., 1982): 43-58.

<sup>728</sup> Calvin, *Tracts and Treatises*, 2:181.

<sup>729</sup> Castellio, *Concerning Heretics*, tr. by Roland Bainton (1935; rpt., New York: Octagon, 1965), pp. 271-72, 279.

<sup>730</sup> *Refutatio Errorum Michaelis Serveti*, CO 8: 472-473.

<sup>731</sup> *Institutes* 4.12.10.

<sup>732</sup> ‘Draft Ecclesiastical Ordinances’ in *Theological Treatises*, pp. 70-71.

<sup>733</sup> Robert White, “Oil and Vinegar: Calvin on Church Discipline,” *Scottish Journal of Theology*, Vol. 38, no.1 (1985): 40.

<sup>734</sup> *Comm.* on Col. 3:16, CO 52, 124. “...mutuam doctrinam et admonitionem... ”

<sup>735</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Thess. 5:11, CO 52,171; *Comm.* on 1 Cor. 14:3, CO 49, 517.

of a tree and its branches. “As the root conveys sap to the whole tree, so all the vigour which we possess must flow to us from Christ.” He stated it in three ways. First, all the life which runs from Christ is dispersed through the members. The second is that on account of the limited share of each, the mutual communion among all the members is definitely necessary. The third is that the health of the body can be maintained only through mutual love. Accordingly, the man “who desires his own separate growth” is wrong.<sup>736</sup> This mutual participation in each other’s gifts within the Church is necessary for living a full Christian life because “God does not give the Spirit to every one in a detached way.”<sup>737</sup> Accordingly, for our sanctification, we must cleave to each other in the mutual distribution of gifts. Our mutual communion compensates our deficiency in the gifts of the Holy Spirit for our holy life. Through our participation in the Church, gifts are offered to us “according to the measure of grace.”<sup>738</sup>

### 2.2.6.2 Prayer

Calvin expounded prayer in his *Institutes* 3.20.1-52 in detail.<sup>739</sup> Calvin held that prayer was “the chief exercise of faith,” “by which we daily receive God’s benefit.”<sup>740</sup> That is to say, prayer is a means to receive grace for our sanctification. He also recognized prayer as a means of sanctification in the sense that “all things which God made are made holy to us through the word of God and prayers.”<sup>741</sup> John Kesley also claims that Calvin saw prayer “as a means for the Holy Spirit to increase and strengthen faith.”<sup>742</sup> His claim seems pertinent, given that Calvin described prayer as the only answer to doubt or questioning when we meet with overwhelming discouragements.<sup>743</sup>

In view of the efficiency of prayer to sanctification, Calvin admitted that prayer strengthened us: “If you feel in yourself more weakness than is desirable, have recourse to him (God) who has permitted that those who trust him shall be like a tree planted by the rivers.”<sup>744</sup> In prayer we lay open before God “our infirmities which we would be ashamed to confess before man.”<sup>745</sup> As proper prayer accompanies humility and the confession of

---

<sup>736</sup> *Comm.* on Eph. 4:16, CO 51, 203. “Fallitur ergo si quis seorsum crescere appetit.”

<sup>737</sup> *Comm.* on 2 Cor. 13:14, CO 50, 156. “...quia Deus non singulis seorsum largitur spiritum... .”

<sup>738</sup> *Comm.* on 2 Cor. 13:14, CO 50, 156. “...pro gratiae mensura cuique distribuit...”

<sup>739</sup> Calvin defined prayer as our “conversation with God” (*Institutes* 3.20.4), or “an expression and manifestation of internal feeling before him who is the searcher of the heart.” (*Institutes* 3.20.29).

<sup>740</sup> Title to *Institutes* 3.20.

<sup>741</sup> *Sermons on the Epistle to Timothy & Titus* by John Calvin, (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth & Trust, reprinted in 1983, first published in 1579), p. 366 b, n. 20.

<sup>742</sup> John Kesley, “Prayer and Ethics; Reflection of Calvin and Barth,” *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 82, no. 2 (Missoula, Scholars Press, 1989): 172.

<sup>743</sup> LC to Madeloiselle de..., January 12, 1549; LC 2, 233, 205.

<sup>744</sup> Letter to the Duchess of Ferrara, July 20, 1558; LC 3, 384, 129.

<sup>745</sup> Calvin’s Introduction to his *Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, p. xxxviii.

sin and the claim for forgiveness, prayer helps our sanctification.<sup>746</sup> Prayer based on the command and promise of God reinforces our faith and hope in God.<sup>747</sup> Proper prayer contributes to our sanctification by allowing God to accomplish his good plan for us.<sup>748</sup>

Calvin dwelt on the Lord's Prayer in connection with sanctification. Through prayer we gain the power to struggle with "the innumerable assaults of temptations" and to overcome "the guilt of their transgressions."<sup>749</sup> When we pray in order that God's name be hallowed, "our own hallowing in turn also comes about."<sup>750</sup> Our petition that God's Kingdom should come draws "us back from worldly corruptions, which so separate us from God that his Kingdom does not thrive within us." It "ought to instruct us in bearing the cross" and "to kindle zeal for mortification of the flesh."<sup>751</sup> By the third petition "that God's will may be done on earth as in heaven," we come to "renounce the desires of our flesh." "By this prayer we are formed to self-denial so God may rule us according to his decision" and "create new minds and hearts in us."<sup>752</sup> As a result, by the inner teaching of the Holy Spirit, "we may learn to love the things that please God and to hate those which displease him." The sixth petition to deliver us from evil helps us not to "be puffed up in prosperity" or not to "cast down in adversity."<sup>753</sup> In this way, the prayers of Christians ought to "look to the public edification of the church" and "the advancement of the believers' fellowship."<sup>754</sup>

Accordingly, given that prayer reinforces our faith and supports a new mood of Christian obedience, we can say that Calvin considered prayer as a means of sanctification.

## 2.2.7 The Relation to Other Doctrines

### 2.2.7.1 Justification and Sanctification<sup>755</sup>

According to the logical order of soteriology, justification precedes sanctification. Calvin

---

<sup>746</sup> *Institutes* 3.20.8, 9.

<sup>747</sup> *Institutes* 3.20.13.

<sup>748</sup> *Comm.* on Ps. 119:38, CO 32, 231.

<sup>749</sup> *Institutes* 3.20.28.

<sup>750</sup> *Institutes* 3.20.35.

<sup>751</sup> *Institutes* 3.20.42.

<sup>752</sup> *Institutes* 3.20.43.

<sup>753</sup> *Institutes* 3. 20. 46; Letter to Monsieur De Falais 16<sup>th</sup> of November, 1546 in LC 2, 178, 82. "Meanwhile, we must beseech him (God) that he would uphold us in steadfast courage, never permitting us to fall away because of lengthened on-waiting."

<sup>754</sup> *Institutes* 3.20.47.

<sup>755</sup> This part is connected with forensic and factual sanctification. See 2.2.4.2 on this thesis; Alister E. McGrath insisted that Calvin for the first time clearly distinguished between justification and sanctification, and there are strong grounds that the concept of forensic justification was influenced by the humanism of Erasmus. A. E. McGrath, "Humanist elements in the early Reformed doctrine of justification," *Archiv-fur-Reformations-geschichte* 73 (1982): 5-20.



however put sanctification before justification in his *Institutes* (1559). Some have examined this reasoning. H. Jackson Forstman views the reason as Calvin's attempt to "acquit the new movement of the charge of antinomianism."<sup>756</sup> Wilhelm H. Neuser holds that Calvin emphasised sanctification as the progress of faith, while "Luther did not accentuate sanctification, i.e., progress in faith," though both of them "agreed on certainty of faith."<sup>757</sup> Jesse Couenhoven is of the opinion that for Calvin, Christianity is essentially not a set of dogmas but a way of life and practical piety was put before theological understanding.<sup>758</sup> Jonathan H. Rainbow insists that the preaching and teaching of Calvin as a pastor were primarily "aimed at moving believers to holy life" rather than convincing people to believe the doctrine of justification.<sup>759</sup> Those arguments elucidate the reason why in contrast to Luther, Calvin emphasised sanctification rather than justification.<sup>760</sup>

Göhler stressed that the formal characteristic of Calvin's theology is the link of all doctrines without any *Zentrallehre*, and in which the *doppelte Gnade* of justification and sanctification is an undividable.<sup>761</sup> His view is legitimate given Calvin's claim that "the grace of justification is not separated from regeneration, although they are things distinct."<sup>762</sup> As Christ cannot be divided into parts, justification and sanctification are so united in Him that they are inseparable.<sup>763</sup> In this regard, Jonathan H. Rainbow's argument that for Calvin, "justification and sanctification are not root and branch but two branches from a common root" is germane.<sup>764</sup> For Calvin, justification and sanctification are both direct consequences of a believer's incorporation into Christ.<sup>765</sup> Through union with Christ,

<sup>756</sup> H. Jackson Forstman, *Word and Spirit: Calvin's Doctrine of Biblical Authority* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1962), p. 61. See 2.2.7 'Good Works and Sanctification' pertaining to whether Calvin was an antinomian or not.

<sup>757</sup> William. H. Neuser, "Calvin's Conversion to Teachableness," in *Calvin and Christian Ethics: Fifth Colloquium on Calvin & Calvin Studies*, ed. Peter De Klerk (Grand Rapids: Calvin Studies Society, 1987), p.70.

<sup>758</sup> Jesse Couenhoven, "Grace as Pardon and Power: Pictures of the Christian Life in Luther, Calvin, and Barth," *Journal of Religious Ethics*, Vol. 28, no. 1 (2000): 72.

<sup>759</sup> Jonathan H. Rainbow, "Double Grace: John Calvin's View of the Relationship of Justification and Sanctification," *Ex Auditu* 5 (1989): 100.

<sup>760</sup> Emil Doumergue compares Reformed with Lutheran as follows: "The Lutherans fought especially, against the false sanctity of Judaistic works; the 'Reformed' Church especially against the deification of creation –paganism. The Lutherans pursued a specifically religious interest; the 'Reformed' Church a moral interest. The Lutheran Reformation created a theology; the 'Reformed' Reformation created a church. Lutheran theology is more objective; 'Reformed' theology is more subjective" [Emil Doumergue, Vol. 4, book I, Chapter I, p.30, in *Jean Calvin, les hommes et les choses de son temps*, 7 vols. (Lausanne, 1899-1917)]. Quoted by T. H. L., "The Approach to Calvin," *The Evangelical Quarterly* 16 (1944): 166.

<sup>761</sup> A. Göhler, *Calvins Lehre von der Heiligung* (München, 1934), p. 81f.

<sup>762</sup> *Institutes* 3.11.11.

<sup>763</sup> *Institutes* 3.11.6; *Comm.* on Isa. 59:20, CO 37.351.7-3.

<sup>764</sup> Jonathan H. Rainbow, *op. cit.*, *Ex Auditu* 5 (1989): 103

<sup>765</sup> A. MacGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, 2 Vols. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 2: 37.



a believer is all at once justified and then commences sanctification.

We are justified in order to worship God in the holiness of life.<sup>766</sup> “Christ justifies no one he does not sanctify.”<sup>767</sup> Briefly, sanctification is the aim of justification.

In terms of a *double lavement* (twofold cleansing), Calvin explicated justification and sanctification. This *double lavement* means forensic i.e., positional purification imputed to us in our justification and an actual purification given by the process of sanctification.<sup>768</sup> Justification is what Christ has done for us (substitution), sanctification is what Christ does in us through the power of the Spirit.<sup>769</sup> Justification is God’s declaration that we are righteous before God’s judgment. Sanctification is the consecration and dedication of both our body and soul to God, as Christ consecrated and dedicated Himself to Father in the sacrifice of the Cross.<sup>770</sup>

### 2.2.7.2 Predestination, Election, Calling, and Sanctification

Predestination is defined as “the eternal decree of God, by which he determined what he wished to make of every man. God does not create everyone in the same condition but ordains eternal life for some and eternal damnation for others.”<sup>771</sup> The crucial function of the doctrine of predestination is to explicate the reason why some reply to the Gospel, and others do not.<sup>772</sup> Calvin allotted merely four chapters for the elucidation of predestination (3.21-24). It reflects an intention to connect it with Christian life that Calvin located the doctrine of predestination at the end of soteriology. Calvin explicated the relevance of the doctrine of predestination to the Christian life as follows:

This great subject...eminently adapted to the service of the godly: because it builds us up soundly in the faith, trains us to humility and lifts us up into an admiration of the unbounded goodness of God towards us. ...there “is not a more effectual means of building up faith than giving our open ears to the election of God, which the Holy Spirit seals upon our heart while we hear, showing us that it stands in

---

<sup>766</sup> *Comm.* Rom. 6:2, CO 49, 104. “...in hunc finem nos iustificari, ut deinde vitae puritate Deum colamus.”

<sup>767</sup> *Institutes* 3.16.1.

<sup>768</sup> *Serm.* on Gal. 2:17-18, CO 50, 438. “Ainsi ces deux graces (c’est à sçavoir nostre iustice et la remission de nos pechez) sont inviolablement coniointes avec ce renouvellement qui est fait par l’esprit de sanctification. Voilà donc deux graces inseparables: comme quand nous disons que le soleil est chaud, il ne laisse pas de luire...”

<sup>769</sup> *Institutes* 3.11.6.

<sup>770</sup> *Comm.* on 2Cor. 7:1, CO 50, 84. “Ergo ut te rite sanctifices Deo, et corpus et animam illi in solidum dicare oportet.”

<sup>771</sup> *Institutes* 3.21.5.

<sup>772</sup> Letter to Melancthon, 28<sup>th</sup> Nov. 1551, LC 2, 305, CO 14, 417.

the eternal and immutable good will of God towards us.<sup>773</sup>

“[P]redestination does not hammer “ethical activity” but “provides the true motivation for moral living.”<sup>774</sup> Namely, our gratitude of election promotes zeal and diligence to live holy,<sup>775</sup> because the goal of election is our sanctification. “If the object of election be holiness of life, it should rather awaken and stimulate us to a cheerful practice of it, than be used as a pretext for slothfulness.”<sup>776</sup> “Holiness, purity, and every excellence that is found among men are the fruit of election.” The eternal election of God is the source and cause of faith and sanctification.<sup>777</sup> Our sanctification “flows from the fountain of divine election.”<sup>778</sup>

In relation to assurance, predestination enables Christians to be assured of salvation, because the eternal election of God cannot be moved or altered by any storms of the world, by any assaults of Satan, by any changes, or by any fluctuations or weaknesses of the flesh.<sup>779</sup> Accordingly, Calvin’s doctrine of predestination renders believers to overcome moral scepticism and desperate doubt of salvation. It helps us struggle continuously for our sanctification. This is the strong point of Reformed Theology in contrast to Catholic uncertainty of salvation.<sup>780</sup> Augustine held that believers are discouraged from feeling confident about their salvation, and there can never be certainty that one is of the elect until one finds oneself safely in heaven, because God’s predestination is mysterious and seemingly arbitrary. Contrary to him, Calvin’s doctrine of predestination functions to provide the Christian with unshakeable certainty of salvation.<sup>781</sup> Due to God’s eternal predestination, the believer can rest assured that nothing can separate him from God’s love revealed in Christ.<sup>782</sup>

To sum up, predestination results in calling, justification, and sanctification<sup>783</sup> because

<sup>773</sup> De Aeterna Dei Praedestinatione, CO 8:260.

<sup>774</sup> *Institutes* 3.23.12.

<sup>775</sup> *Comm.* on Is.41:8, CO 37, 39. “...docemur vocationem nostram sufficere nobis debere, ut ab inquinamentis huius mundi cohibeamur.”

<sup>776</sup> *Institutes* 3.23.12.

<sup>777</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Cor. 1:2. CO 49, 308. “...Paulus causam sanctificationis dicat esse vocationem Dei...”

<sup>778</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Cor. 1: 2, CO 49, 308. “...sanctitatem nostrum ex fonte divinae electionis fluere...”

<sup>779</sup> *Comm.* on Lk. 10:20. CO 45, 316. “...aeterna electio, quae extra nos est, clarius demonstrat, in mera Dei bonitate fundatam esse salutem nostram.”

<sup>780</sup> The Catholic Church is of the opinion that the ordinary believer is not in a position to know “with the certitude of faith which cannot be subject to error” that he is in the grace of God, that even the ‘just’ man cannot be sure of his predestination to eternal salvation. H. Jedin, *A History of the Council of Trent*, Vol. 2 (Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson, 1961), p.308.

<sup>781</sup> Cf. *Institutes* 3.22.10. *Institutes* 4.1.3.

<sup>782</sup> Mark E. Vanderschaaf, “Predestination and certainty of salvation in Augustine and Calvin,” *Reformed Review*, Vol. 30, no.1 (New Brunswick: New Brunswick Theological Seminary & Holland: Western Theological Seminary, 1976): 1-7.

<sup>783</sup> OS 1:86-87.

the aim of election is sanctification.<sup>784</sup>

### 2.2.7.3 Regeneration, Repentance, Conversion, and Sanctification

For Calvin, regeneration, conversion, repentance, and sanctification are almost similar terms. Interestingly, David K. Winecoff explicates the subtle difference between sanctification and repentance in Calvin as follows:

Sanctification possibly refers to the process of becoming holy viewed as a whole both inwardly and outwardly. Repentance refers chiefly to the change of heart involved. Therefore, repentance is our response to Christ; whereas, sanctification is our whole participation in Christ.<sup>785</sup>

His opinion that repentance is mainly related to a change of heart is rather doubtful for a number of reasons. The first reason is that Calvin defined repentance as “the true turning of *our life* to God.”<sup>786</sup> The second is that Calvin stated, “no one can embrace the grace of the gospel without betaking himself from the errors of *his past life* into the right way and applying his whole efforts of his practice of repentance” (Italics are my emphasis).<sup>787</sup> The reason that Calvin stressed the importance of a change of heart in repentance was to object to the hypocrisy of the Roman Catholic Church, which emphasised external confession.

Winecoff analyzes that Calvin’s definition of sanctification is similar to the concept of regeneration, which is defined as “participation in Christ.” His analysis seems pertinent.<sup>788</sup> Calvin interpreted repentance as regeneration. In *ordo salutis*, Calvin held that initial regeneration is prior to faith. Faith flows from regeneration and not in the reverse order.<sup>789</sup> Regeneration is “the beginning of the spiritual life.”<sup>790</sup> Calvin in this sense is said to distinguish regeneration from sanctification, though for Calvin, repentance, conversion, and sanctification are almost synonymous.

### 2.2.7.4 Faith<sup>791</sup> and Sanctification

---

<sup>784</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Cor. 1: 2, CO 49, 308. “sanctitatem nostram...esse vocationis nostrae scopum.”

<sup>785</sup> David K. Winecoff, “Calvin’s Doctrine of Mortification,” *Presbyterion: Covenant Seminary Review* 13 (Saint Louis: Covenant Theological Seminary, Fall, 1987): 89.

<sup>786</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.5-6.

<sup>787</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.1

<sup>788</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.9.

<sup>789</sup> *Institutes* 3.1.4. “[F]aith itself has no other source than the Spirit.”

<sup>790</sup> *Institutes* 2.3.6.

<sup>791</sup> For Calvin, faith is defined as “a firm and certain knowledge of God’s benevolence towards us, founded upon the truth of the freely given promise in Christ, both revealed to our minds and sealed upon our hearts through the Holy Spirit” (*Institutes*, 3.2.7). *Fiducia* is the believer’s response to certain knowledge of God. *Fiducia* signifies trust or confidence. Trust emphasises the trustworthiness of the object of one’s belief; confidence points to the boldness of the one who believes. Thus, “the word ‘faith’ is very often used for

In the relationship between repentance and faith, Calvin held that the former is different from the latter, but the two are inseparable from each other and need be distinguished.<sup>792</sup> Repentance is “a turning unto God, when we frame ourselves and all our life to obey him; but faith is a receiving of the grace offered us in Christ.”<sup>793</sup> Calvin assumed a rather subtle approach as to which should be thought of as first. In his *Institutes* 3.3.1, Calvin stressed, “Repentance not only always follows faith, but also is produced by it.” He condemned the view that repentance precedes faith. In his commentary on John 1: 13, Calvin stated it in detail as follows: The Evangelists claimed that because “faith does not proceed from ourselves, but is the fruit of spiritual regeneration,” no man can believe without renewal by the Spirit of God. In contrast, Calvin thought they reversed the natural order and insisted that because regeneration is an effect of faith, regeneration follows faith. On the other hand, he acknowledged that both views perfectly agree for the following reason. Faith is “a work of the Holy Spirit, who dwells in none but the children of God.” Accordingly, faith is said to be “a part of our regeneration.” Since faith generates from “the illumination of our minds by the Holy Spirit,” faith is said to follow regeneration.<sup>794</sup> When we receive faith, God “regenerates us by some method that is hidden and unknown to us,” “after we have received faith, we perceive, by a lively feeling of conscience, not only the grace of adoption, but also newness of life and the other gifts of the Holy Spirit.” Briefly, in our hidden consciousness, the first regeneration precedes faith, but in our consciousness, faith precedes sanctification.

This faith is the only means by which God “leads us into the light of the Gospel.”<sup>795</sup> “God communicates himself to us in his Son, and offers himself to be enjoyed in him” by faith.<sup>796</sup> Repentance and forgiveness of sins as “both kinds of grace” are attained “by faith.”<sup>797</sup> Faith generates the real presence of the living Christ within the believer. By faith, Christ “ingrafts us into his body, and makes us not only partakers of all his benefits, but also of himself.”<sup>798</sup> It is “the sacred bond” to engraft us into Christ.<sup>799</sup> Faith enables us to

---

confidence” (*Institutes*, 3.2.15).

<sup>792</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.5; *Comm.* on Acts 20:21. “I grant, indeed, that they cannot be separate; because God doth illuminate no man with the Spirit of faith whom he doth not also regenerate unto newness of life.”

<sup>793</sup> *Comm.* on Acts 20:21, CO 48, 462-63. *Poenitentia enim est conversio ad Deum, quum nos totamque vitam nostram in eius obsequium componimus: Fides autem gratiae nobis in Christo exhibitae receptio est.*”

<sup>794</sup> *Comm.* on Jn. 1:13, CO 47, 13. “Quod enim spiritus mentes nostras illustrat, id iam ad renovationem nostri pertinet. Hoc modo ex regeneratione, tanquam ex fonte manat fides.

<sup>795</sup> *Institutes*, 3.1.4.

<sup>796</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Jn. 4:14, CO 55, 355. “...scilicet in filio se nobis communicat, ac fruendum offert.”

<sup>797</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.19. cf. In Richard Ngun’s quotation of Calvin’s *Institutes* there are some errors, for example, note no. 5, *Institutes* 4.6.17 must be changed to 3.3.19, and no.1, *Institutes* 3.1.1 to 3.1.4. Richard Ngun, “A Survey of the Role of the Law in Sanctification among Selected Calvinists,” *Stulos Theological Journal*, Vol. 8, no 1/2 (Bandung: Bandung Theological Seminary, 2000), p.46.

<sup>798</sup> *Institutes*, 3.2.24.

<sup>799</sup> *Institutes* 3.22.10.

possess the good things in Christ<sup>800</sup> that “is not in man’s possession.”<sup>801</sup> It also enables us to have a personal relationship with the living God by means of lifting us up to God’s presence in Christ.<sup>802</sup> This relationship transforms the life of believers. Our “holiness is the true evidence of our faith.”<sup>803</sup> Faith generates strength to practise God’s will. Faith engrafts us into the death of Christ in order that we might “derive from it a secret energy, as the twig does from the root.”<sup>804</sup> Faith cleanses our hearts “to dedicate ourselves wholly to God’s service.”<sup>805</sup> Calvin attacked monasticism for its passivity on the grounds of his conviction that action is the crucial product of spiritual life.<sup>806</sup> In that sense, faith is obedience<sup>807</sup> and “the sum of all piety.”<sup>808</sup> It is the “main hinge on which religion turns.”<sup>809</sup>

To sum up, faith precedes sanctification as repentance, though in our unconsciousness, the initial regeneration precedes faith.

### 2.2.7.5 Perseverance and Sanctification

Perseverance can be defined as the continuity of faith and sanctification during our life in spite of every temptation. Because our life is one unceasing battle with Satan, the Christian is asked to endure the trial of faith to the end.<sup>810</sup>

Calvin regarded perseverance as the gift of God because it is impossible without the help of the Spirit.<sup>811</sup> God’s Spirit nourishes “the very inclination to obedience that he first engendered, and strengthened its constancy to persevere to the very end.”<sup>812</sup> God works “in frail vessels” and manifests “his strength in the infirmity of his followers.”<sup>813</sup> God’s grace helps “the weakness of human will to move it unwaveringly and inseparably.”<sup>814</sup> Both the conversion of the human will to good and “its continuation in good” depend

---

<sup>800</sup> Serm. on Eph. 1:17-19; SEC, 110.

<sup>801</sup> *Comm.* on Hab. 2:4, CO 43, 529. “...fides quasi precario mutuatur quod non est penes hominem.”

<sup>802</sup> Serm. on Eph. 3:14-19; SEC, 295.

<sup>803</sup> Serm. Eph. 1:17-19; SEC, 101.

<sup>804</sup> *Comm.* on Gal. 2:20, CO 50, 199. “Itaque postquam docuit nos cruci affixos una cum Christo, hoc quoque nobis vitale esse subiicit.”

<sup>805</sup> Serm. on Eph. 1:17-18; SEC, 102.

<sup>806</sup> Cf. W. J. Bouwsma, ‘The Spirituality of John Calvin’, p. 330.

<sup>807</sup> Jesse Couenhoven, “Grace as Pardon and Power: Pictures of the Christian Life in Luther, Calvin, and Barth,” *Journal of Religious Ethics*, Vol. 28, no. 1 (2000): 73.

<sup>808</sup> *Institutes* 3.15.7.

<sup>809</sup> *Institutes* 3.11.1.

<sup>810</sup> Serm. on Deut. 20:2-9, CO 27, 673.

<sup>811</sup> *Institutes* 2.3.11. “Perseverance would without any doubt, be accounted God’s free gift.”

<sup>812</sup> *Institutes* 2.3.9.

<sup>813</sup> Letter to the women detained in prison at Paris at Geneva, September 1557; LC 3, 446, 363.

<sup>814</sup> *Institutes* 2.3.13.

exclusively upon God's will, not upon human merit.<sup>815</sup> The effective calling of God makes perseverance certain.<sup>816</sup>

On the other hand, Calvin admitted also that perseverance requires human effort because men willingly "fall away unless they are strengthened to persevere."<sup>817</sup> Christians must live in constant fear and humble trembling because nothing is so evanescent as faith and nothing fleet away so easily as love.<sup>818</sup> The human duty of perseverance is related to prayer. For example, David prayed, "Unite my heart to fear thy name." The believers in persecution were asked to pray for two things: "that they might be not tempted beyond their power," and that God should reinforce them with such courage so that they will not be not so distressed "by whatever may happen to them as to fall away from God."<sup>819</sup> Nevertheless, Calvin ascribed our efforts to God's Spirit in the sense that "it is God who works in us to will and to accomplish" for his pleasure (Phil. 2:13). He stressed, "The will is left nothing to claim for itself."<sup>820</sup> In this manner, Calvin attributed all merits in relation to perseverance only to God and not to man.

To sum up, for Calvin, it is possible for us to persevere because believers are efficiently disposed by God so that they might willingly pursue Him with staunch intention. It needs our prayer so that God might accomplish his promise of our salvation, though it is the gift of God.

## 2.2.8 Good Works and Sanctification

### 2.2.8.1 Good Works and Sanctification

First, the relationship between good works and faith will be observed. Calvin argued that only good works by faith are accepted by God, because without faith, "what seem to be good works are turned into sins."<sup>821</sup> After people received Christ by faith, their works are counted righteous "because whatever fault is otherwise in them is buried in Christ's purity."<sup>822</sup> In this sense, faith is the foundation of good works.

In his commentary on Mt 3:8, Calvin stressed that good works are called fruits of repentance in the sense that "*repentance* is an inward renewal of the man, which manifests

---

<sup>815</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.14.

<sup>816</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Jn. 2:19, CO 55, 322. "...ubi efficax est Dei vocatio, illic certam perseverantiam fore."

<sup>817</sup> *Institutes* 2.3.9; 2.3.11. "If they mean that after we have by the Lord's power once and for all been brought to obey righteousness, we go forward by our own power and are inclined to follow the action of grace, I do not gainsay it."

<sup>818</sup> Serm. on Lk. 1: 73-78, CO 46:187.

<sup>819</sup> Letter to the Church of Anger, 19<sup>th</sup> April 1556: LC 3, 432, 261.

<sup>820</sup> *Institutes* 2.3.11.

<sup>821</sup> *Institutes* 3.18.5.

<sup>822</sup> *Institutes* 3.17.10.



itself in the outward life, as a tree produces its fruit.”<sup>823</sup> “*Repentance* is an inward matter, which has its seat in the heart and soul, but afterwards yields its fruits in a change of life.” The repentance is “not attested by words” but “proved by the conduct.” Good works are the fruit of fulfilling one’s vocation.<sup>824</sup> Briefly, good works are the fruits of repentance. In his Commentary on Luke 3:10, Calvin claimed that we must distinguish between the pious and hypocrites by good works as follows.<sup>825</sup> A hypocrite pretends he is repentant by performing ceremonies to worship God. However, it is not “*the fruits worthy of repentance.*” The fruit worthy of repentance is to perform the duties of charity and of the second Table of the Law. Though God does not disregard “the outward profession of godliness and of his worship,” he regards this as “a surer mark of distinction.” This distinction leads us to fewer mistakes. Hypocrites are “either cruel to their neighbours, or addicted to falsehood and dishonesty.” Their discrepancy in life proves that they did not repent sincerely. To justly deal with men and to relieve the poor and to be generous to the wretched, and to “give liberally what the Lord has bestowed upon them” is a testimony of the piety of men. In other words, good works are the evidence to distinguish the sanctified from hypocrites who confess their faith by their words, but refuse by their behaviour.

Calvin understood the motive of our good works as our thankfulness for God’s grace in saving us from sin and reconciling us to himself. He also regarded the image of God in man as the reason why we do good work for our neighbours.<sup>826</sup> Our good works for our neighbours sometimes include exercising of the lawful judgment “to guard the weak from being unjustly injured.”<sup>827</sup> God promised his reward for good works to relieve the weakness of our flesh by some comfort.<sup>828</sup> He wants us to be disciplined by good works and to ponder on the awarding of “those things which he has promised.”<sup>829</sup> God delights in glorifying “those whom he has sanctified” by his reward as the gift of grace.<sup>830</sup> In order to goad our sloth, God has promised us that our suffering to the glory of his name “will not be in vain.”<sup>831</sup> For Calvin, God’s promise of reward for our good works motivates our continual sanctification.<sup>832</sup>

To sum up, good works are the end of justification by faith and the external evidence of

---

<sup>823</sup> *Comm.* on Mt. 3:8; Lk 3:8, CO 45, 118. “...poenitentia interior sit hominis renovatio, quae in externam vitam emergit, sicut ex se fructus producit arbor.”

<sup>824</sup> *Institutes* 3.14.9.

<sup>825</sup> *Comm.* on Lk. 3:10, CO 45, 119-120.

<sup>826</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.6.

<sup>827</sup> *Comm.* on Gen.18:19. CO 23, 259. “...dare operam ne debiles iniuste laedantur.”

<sup>828</sup> *Institutes* 3.18.4.

<sup>829</sup> *Institutes* 3.18.3.

<sup>830</sup> *Institutes* 3.18.3-4.

<sup>831</sup> *Institutes* 3.18.7.

<sup>832</sup> *Institutes* 3.18.3.



our sanctification.<sup>833</sup> Sanctification as repentance is proved by good works. Good works are a secondary evidence of our assurance. The reward of good works motivates our continual sanctification.

### 2.2.8.2 Assurance of Election and Good Works

In order to attain assurance of our election, Calvin appealed to the saints to focus our eyes only on Christ in whom the Father is well pleased.<sup>834</sup> Stas Cohen claims, “[Z]ealous activity on behalf of works is a sign of election.”<sup>835</sup> Thus, practically speaking, “to act as though called - by virtue of zealous activity in pursuit of good works - is to (hope to) be elect.”<sup>836</sup> Theodore Beza holds, “The testimony that one has been justified and sanctified is two-fold: good works and the witness of the Holy Spirit.”<sup>837</sup> Conversely, Calvin asserted, “For if they begin to judge it (the certainty of election) by good works, nothing will be more uncertain or more feeble; for indeed, if works be judged of themselves, by their imperfection they will no less declare God’s wrath than by their incomplete purity they testify to his benevolence.”<sup>838</sup>

Richard Baxter stated that “the most obedient will have the most assurance: and for the middle sort, their assurance will rise or fall, ordinary with their obedience...,”<sup>839</sup> and “we can be assured of our adoption” “through the fruit of the Spirit”<sup>840</sup> on the basis that “by their fruit you will recognize them” (Mt 7: 16). His statements are contrary to Calvin’s view. Though it is biblical, Calvin viewed it as “a very uncertain test” to take the fruits of life as standard of austere faith in his exposition of this passage,<sup>841</sup> because “the worst impostors” frequently pretended to lead a faithful life. “[T]hough only those predestined to

---

<sup>833</sup> *Institutes* 1.25.21.

<sup>834</sup> *Institutes* 3.24.5.

<sup>835</sup> Cf. This inclination came from Theodore Beza who wrote, “...[T]hat I am elect, is first perceived from sanctification begun in me, that is, by my hating of sin and my loving of righteousness.” Theodore Beza, *A Little Book of Christian Questions and Responses*, tr. by Kirk M. Summers (Allison Park, Pennsylvania: Pickwick Publications, 1986), pp. 96-7; John Knox, *The Works of John Knox*, 6 Vols., ed. by David Laing (Edinburgh: Johnstone and Hunter, 1846-64), 3:385. For more detail, see John S. Bray, “The Value of Works in the Theology of Calvin and Beza,” *Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol.4, no. 2 (1973): 77-86.

<sup>836</sup> Stas Cohen, “John Calvin on Predestination and Election: A Kantian Aid,” *Journal of Religious Studies*, Vol. 14, no.1-2 (Punjabi University, 1988):156, 153-154. There are many faults in his citation of the *Institutes*. His expression of “Election is in Christ” is not showed at *Institutes* 3.25.5, and 3.21.7 does not support his statement that “election manifests itself by clear and positive signs in the lives of the elect, by the calling and righteousness which expresses it in concrete reality.” *Institutes*, 3.21.7 explicates only his particular election of individuals among a nation. Also, ‘righteousness’ has to be replaced by ‘justification’

<sup>837</sup> Theodore Beza, *Tractationes* I, pp. 200-201; III, pp. 433-435.

<sup>838</sup> *Institutes* 3.14.19.

<sup>839</sup> Richard Baxter, *The Practical Works of the Rev. Richard Baxter*, 23 Vols., with a life of the author and a critical examination of his writings by the Rev. William Orme (London: James Duncan, 1830), Vol.9:34.

<sup>840</sup> *Ibid.*, p.53.

<sup>841</sup> *Comm.* on Mt. 7:16, CO 45, 226. “...valde incertum esset hoc examen.”

salvation receive the light of faith and truly feel the power of the Gospel, yet experience shows that the reprobate are sometimes affected by almost the same feeling as the elect, so that even in their own judgment they do not in any way differ from the elect (cf. Acts 13:48).<sup>842</sup> Though Calvin's view is logical and realistic, this leads us to doubt if Calvin's rejection of "by their fruit you will recognize them" is biblical.

Jeremy Talor (1613-1667) also held that "the performance of our duty is the best consignation to eternity, and the only testimony God gives us of our election" on the grounds that "[w]e know we are translated from death to life, by our love unto, the brethren" (1 Jn. 3:13).<sup>843</sup> His viewpoint seems to be biblical, but contrary to Calvin's. Calvin held that love does not justify us but is "a sure sign of regeneration since it is the necessary fruit of the Holy Spirit." In this sense, for Calvin, faith precedes love. Love is "not a foundation on which it (faith) rests."<sup>844</sup> Faith rests on Christ who is "a faithful guardian."<sup>845</sup>

However, Calvin did not deny that love is a secondary evidence for our election. In his commentary on 1 Jn. 4:17, Calvin recognized our works as a secondary support for our assurance. As "the effect of divine adoption," the newness of life testified by good works "serves to confirm confidence" as a secondary prop, while grace is primary support.<sup>846</sup> Love is only "accessory or an inferior aid, a prop to our faith."<sup>847</sup> Though the confidence of faith relies upon the grace of Christ alone, pious and holy life distinguishes true faith from false faith.<sup>848</sup> Calvin concluded, though the fruit of love cannot be separated from faith, "no one should hence conclude that we must look to our works in order that our assurance may be certain." In order that "we may cheerfully and joyfully go forth to meet Christ, we must have our faith fixed on his grace alone."<sup>849</sup>

Calvin also rejected the allowance of assurance to be directly bound to the sacraments not only because a superstitious reliance on the sacraments would cause a false sense of security but also because one's participation in the sacraments could be construed as a

---

<sup>842</sup> *Institutes*, 3.2.11.

<sup>843</sup> Jeremy Taylor, "Of Certainty of Salvation," in *The Whole Works of the Right Rev. Jeremy Taylor*, 15 vols., with a Life of the Author and a Critical Examination of his writings by Reginald Heber (London: J. Moyes. 1928), 3: 180.

<sup>844</sup> *Comm.* on 1Jn. 3:19, CO 55, 341-42. "...non fundamentum quo nititur."

<sup>845</sup> *Comm.* on Jn. 10:28, CO 47, 250. "...fidelis custos..."

<sup>846</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Jn. 4:17, CO 55, 357-58. "...vitae novitatem, quia divinae adoptionis est effectus, valere ad confirmandam fiduciam: sed tanquam secundarium (ut ita loquar) adminiculum."

<sup>847</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Jn. 3:19, CO 55, 341-42. "Est igitur caritas accessio vel adminiculum inferius ad fidei fulturam."

<sup>848</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Jn. 2:3, CO 55, 311. "Certitudo itaque fidei in sola Christi gratia residet: sed pietas et sanctitas vitae veram fidem a ficta et mortua Dei notitia discernit."

<sup>849</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Jn. 4:17, CO 55, 358. "...nos autem ut laeti et alacres obviam Christo prodeamus, in sola eius gratia fidem nostrum esse defixam oportet."

human meritorious act.<sup>850</sup> Calvin based his assurance only on God's promised Word.

Briefly, for Calvin, our assurance of election is primarily based on the inner calling of God<sup>851</sup> and our faith in Christ. Good works are a secondary evidence of our election.

### 2.2.8.3 A Legalist or an Antinomian?<sup>852</sup>

Ford Lewis Battles insisted that Calvin steered *via media* between a Spiritualist interpretation including Anabaptist, Libertine and a Papist interpretation.<sup>853</sup> The former is generally ascribed to antinomianism, the latter to legalism.

In a narrow sense, a legalist can be defined as one who holds that the obedience of the Law is essential for our salvation, an antinomian as one who states that our salvation is attained only by faith without our good works. From this viewpoint, as Holmes Rolston III writes,<sup>854</sup> Calvin was not a legalist, given his notion that our salvation is not by our good works but by our faith.<sup>855</sup> Still, he was not an antinomian, given his insistence that our justification is not without good works and our faith cannot be separated from our good works.<sup>856</sup> For him, true faith essentially accompanies good works,<sup>857</sup> As Holmes Rolston III observes, "Calvin is no antinomian" because he stressed the importance of the use of the law for Christian sanctification.<sup>858</sup> The following statement of Calvin's shows us his

---

<sup>850</sup> Cf. William Balke, "Revelation and Experience in Calvin's Theology," in *Towards the Future of Reformed Theology: Tasks, Topics, Traditions*, ed. by David Willis & Michael Welker (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999), p.364-365.

<sup>851</sup> Institutes 3.24.6. "The fact that, as we said, the firmness of our election is joined to our calling is another means of establishing our assurance." In other words, A warm wholehearted response to the preaching of the Gospel is a sign of election.

<sup>852</sup> For John Cotton's antinomian controversy, see Malcolm H. MacKinnon, "Part I: Calvinism and the infallible assurance of grace," *The British Journal of Sociology* 39 (Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul for the London School of Economics and Political Science, 1988): 159; Robert A. Pyne, "Antinomianism and Dispensationalism," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 153 (Jan. 1996):145. For further study, see Charles Francis Adams, *The Antinomian Controversy* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1976).

<sup>853</sup> Ford Lewis Battles, *Calculus Fidei: Some Ruminations on the Structure of the Theology of John Calvin* (Grand Rapids: Calvin Theological Seminary, 1978), p. 2; Donald K. McKim, "John Calvin: A Theologian for an Age of Limits," in *Reading in Calvin's Theology*, ed. by Donald McKim (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984), pp. 292-293.

<sup>854</sup> Holmes Rolston III, "Responsible Man in Reformed Theology: Calvin versus the Westminster Confession," *Scottish Journal of Theology*, Vol. 23, no. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970): 143.

<sup>855</sup> Institutes 3.11.13 and 18.

<sup>856</sup> Institutes 3.6.1.

<sup>857</sup> Institutes 3.16.1. "

<sup>858</sup> Holmes Rolston III, *op. cit.*, p. 143; cf. "Antinomianism so stresses Christian freedom from the condemnation of the law that it underemphasises the need of the believer to confess sins daily and to pursue sanctification earnestly. It may fail to teach that sanctification inevitably follows justification. Roman Catholics in effect charged the Reformation with antinomianism in claiming that the doctrine of justification by faith alone would lead to moral laxity." S. B. Ferguson, & J. Packer, *New dictionary of theology*

subtle balance between legalism and antinomianism. “[W]e dream neither of a faith devoid of good works nor of a justification that stands without them” “[H]aving admitted that faith and good works must cleave together, we still lodge justification in faith, not in works.”<sup>859</sup> In this manner, Calvin avoided both legalism and antinomianism.

In a broad sense, antinomianism can be said to be the view that for Christian life, we do not need the Law as early Luther did,<sup>860</sup> while legalism means that we must literally be obedient to the Law. Pierre Marcel’s explication of legalism and antinomianism may be helpful to us. “Legalism, with its interest concentrated on the moral life, makes justification depend on sanctification, religion on morality, our relation to God on our relation to our neighbor. Conversely, antinomianism giving pre-eminence to the demands of the religious life puts justification first, and often never reaches the point of sanctification.”<sup>861</sup> Since Calvin clearly distinguished between the two and emphasised sanctification on the basis of justification, he was neither a legalist nor an antinomian.

On the other hand, *New Dictionary of Theology* defines legalism or moralism as follows:<sup>862</sup> Legalism stresses human responsibility to the extent that “obedience becomes more than the fruit or evidence of faith. Rather obedience comes to be seen as a constituent element of justifying faith.” It is inclined to “undermine Christian assurance and joy.”<sup>863</sup> Calvin may be called a legalist in the sense that he so stressed Christian responsibility. Still, though Calvin accentuated excessive self-examination, it did not “undermine Christian assurance and joy.” Accordingly, strictly speaking, Calvin cannot be called a legalist even by this definition. He believed a Christian could be sure that he is elected by looking to Christ. Calvin can be said to avoid these two extremities by insisting on the use of the Law for Christian life, though he is closer to a legalist rather than an antinomian.

---

(electronic ed.). Downers Grove (IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 2000, c1988), p.379.

<sup>859</sup> *Institutes* 3.16.1.

<sup>860</sup> Early Luther held that “the one who has been justified by Christ, who has died to sin and been raised in righteousness, has no need for the law. Rather, he or she knows and does spontaneously, that is, without instruction or encouragement - what the law previously required.” David J. Lose, “Luther and Calvin on Preaching to the Human Condition,” *Lutheran Quarterly*, ns. 10 (Autumn, 1996): 291; *LW* 25: 326. Notably, Reinhard Hütter observes that while early Luther strenuously taught Antinomianistic thought “because people in those days were so oppressed, terrified, miserable, anxious, and afflicted that there was no need to inculcate the law,” late Luther criticized the Antinomians for their dissolute life, e.g., slothful, adulterate, blasphemous, and selfish life caused by peaceful time when there was no hangman, the pope. Reinhard Hütter, “(Re)Forming Freedom: Reflection after ‘Veritas Splendor’ on Freedom’s Fate in Modernity and Protestantism’s Antinomian Captivity,” *Modern Theology*, Vol. 17, no. 2 (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2001): 140-141; *WA* 39/1, 571ff.

<sup>861</sup> Pierre Marcel, “The Relation between Justification and Sanctification in Calvin’s Thought,” *The Evangelical Quarterly* 26 (London, 1954): 132.

<sup>862</sup> S. B. Ferguson, & J. Packer, *New Dictionary of Theology* (electronic ed.). Downers Grove (IL: Inter-Varsity Press. 2000, c1988), p.379.

<sup>863</sup> *Ibid.*

To sum up, Calvin was neither a legalist nor an antinomian, though he was closer to a moralist than an antinomian in the sense that he accentuated self-examination in light of the law.

### 2.2.9 The Sphere of Sanctification: Calvin's Practice

While Luther emphasised the liberation of the troubled individual conscience within a works-orientated catholic piety, Calvin understood some problems in connection with church structures, disciplines and the transformation of social structure which are appropriate to the needs of urban societies.<sup>864</sup> For the purpose of the reformation of cities from a catholic atmosphere to a protestant one, Calvin stressed the obedience of all spheres, i.e., "all things including the church, the state, society, and economics must be reformed according to the Word of God."<sup>865</sup> He energetically and audaciously criticized "corruption in the church, tyranny in the polity, and inequitable wealth in the economy."<sup>866</sup>

William J. Bouwsma views Calvin's thought as his response to the thoroughly "real and quite particular problems of his own time" rather than "as a set of timeless abstractions."<sup>867</sup> For example, Calvin condemned Copernicus' theory that the earth revolves around the sun.<sup>868</sup> He thought his theory was as a result of being possessed by the devil.<sup>869</sup> In Calvin's day, those who robbed, stole or committed murder received capital punishment.<sup>870</sup> In accordance with the Caroline Laws, pornography, immorality and heresy were also punishable by death.<sup>871</sup> In our times, religious crimes are not regarded as deserving of severe punishment. Accordingly, we admit both to the universal validity of his thoughts and its limitation due to his historical situation.

---

<sup>864</sup> A. E. McGrath, "Justification and the Reformation: The Significance of the Doctrine of Justification by Faith to Sixteenth-Century Urban Communities," *ARG* 81 (1990).

<sup>865</sup> John C. Koedyker, "Theocracy is not Dead: Calvin and Khomeini," *Reformed Review* Vol. 34, no. 2 (1981), p. 74.

<sup>866</sup> Nicholas Wolterstorff, "The Wounds of God: Calvin's theology of social injustice," *The Reformed Journal* Vol. 37, no. 6 (June, 1987), p. 21.

<sup>867</sup> William J. Bouwsma, "The *Quest* for the Historical Calvin," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 77 (1986): 47.

<sup>868</sup> Richard Stauffer, "Calvin et Copernic," *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 179 (1971): 37ff; Christopher B. Kaiser, "Calvin, Copernicus, and Castellio," *Calvin Theological Journal*, Vol.21, no.1 (1986): 5; Calvin's *Eighth Sermon on 1 Corinthians 10-11*. Though Kaiser sides with Calvin by his insistence that Calvin's antigeodynamic remark was anti-Castellian, not anti-Copernican, the fact that Calvin did not know of the rotating and revolving of the earth must be recognized. Of course, Calvin's view is biblically and theologically based.

<sup>869</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>870</sup> Jansie van der Walt, *Calvin and His Times*, Wetenskaplike Bydraes of the Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education Series F: Institute for Reformational Studies F2 Brochures Number 32 (Potchefstroom: PUP, 1985), p.120.

<sup>871</sup> *Ibid.*, p.126.

### 2.2.9.1 The Sanctification of the Church

The sanctification of the church in Calvin will be dealt with in terms of communal sanctification, the abolition of papacy, the purity and unity of the church, for the sanctification of the church has communal character, and papacy was regarded as anti-Christ, and the purity and unity of the church was regarded as the fruits of sanctification.

In regard of the communal character of sanctification, Calvin pointed out that the Holy Spirit always works communally rather than individually because he lies in the body of Christ. Implanting into Christ always means our assimilation into his community. Accordingly, Calvin radically ruled out all religious individualism.<sup>872</sup> In this respect, Calvin is distinguished from all mystics pursuing individual spirituality. Calvin's emphasis on communal sanctification is more reinforced in K. Barth's doctrine of sanctification.<sup>873</sup> Furthermore, the church should serve a bigger community, her society. The church takes responsibility for the common public sincerity and compassion of the entire society.<sup>874</sup> Christian community should take care of people in need of their love, e.g., the disabled, refugees, the homeless, those suffering racial discrimination, and so on.

Considering the need for the abolition of the papacy, Calvin argued: The papacy neglected the gifts of the Spirit and the Word. The bishops were lacking in carrying out their apostolic functions of setting a good example and of preaching and teaching the Word of God. The Pope is an Antichrist because he deprived Christ of His glory and authority.<sup>875</sup> The "papacy itself was directly contrary to church order."<sup>876</sup> The Roman pontiffs "no more become vicars of Christ because of the see which they occupy than an idol...set in God's temple "is to be taken for God."<sup>877</sup> Accordingly, Calvin viewed popery as abominations which ought to be cleaned from the Christian realm. The abolition of popery is the way to the true order of Christ's church, in other words, the way to the sanctification of the church.

On the purity and unity of the church, Calvin unfolded his view as follows: On the essential issues of faith and doctrines, the church must keep purity, but on unessential issues, she must pursue unity.<sup>878</sup> We should maintain unity as far as the declaration of the Word, the duly administration of the sacraments, and the exercise of church discipline are maintained. This could be an answer to '5.2.1.2.3.3 Separatism' and will be reflected in

---

<sup>872</sup> William Balke, "Revelation and Experience in Calvin's Theology" in *Towards the Future of Reformed Theology: Tasks, Topics, Traditions*, ed. by David Willis & Michael Welker (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999), p.359.

<sup>873</sup> See 4.2.10.3 on this thesis.

<sup>874</sup> *Institutes*, 4. 12.5.

<sup>875</sup> *Institutes* 4.7.25.

<sup>876</sup> *Institutes* 4.7.26; 4.12.6.

<sup>877</sup> *Institutes* 4.7.29.

<sup>878</sup> Letter to the Bretheren of Wezel, 13<sup>TH</sup> March 1554; LC 3, 366, 31.



‘5.3.2.4.2 Self-Denial for Unity and Cooperation.’ Church discipline is connected with the order of the church, without which the church cannot be sustained.<sup>879</sup> In order to keep the church, Calvin established ministers, teachers, elders and deacons.<sup>880</sup> When they faithfully practise their offices, the church will be healthy and regulated.

### 2.2.9.2 Political Sanctification

For Calvin, political sanctification can be said to be the submission of the power of all rulers to Christ that only Christ “may tower over all.”<sup>881</sup> It is to make worldly rulers serve the people as the representatives of God according to his will.

With respect to the origin of the authority of the state, Calvin regarded it not as derived from the will of the people but primarily given by God.<sup>882</sup> He called magistrates “vicars of God” on earth, and regarded the calling of the civil magistrate as “the highest gift of God to preserve the safety of men.”<sup>883</sup> The authority of a ruler is divinely legitimated and he can receive the peculiar gift of the Holy Spirit for ruling in accord with the will of God.<sup>884</sup> His authority is limited to the positive Law, which is based on the Law of nature whose core is fairness.<sup>885</sup> The Law of nature is related to the order of creation, which stems from the Creator God. It establishes the boundaries of all positive Laws.<sup>886</sup>

With reference to the duty of the state to citizens, civil power is “to adjust our life to the society of man; to form our social behavior to civil righteousness, to reconcile us with one another, and to promote general peace and tranquility.”<sup>887</sup> The state should protect the poor and the needy, support students, manage the salaries of teachers, suppress cruelty, theft and violent behaviour, and build hospitals and boarding houses. For this purpose, the administration needs law, justice and military force. Therefore, people should accept the authority of the state and obey it as part of their obedience towards God. People should honour and obey the rulers, pay their taxes, pray for rulers, and render military and other service as needed. Calvin criticized the Anabaptists for their denial of the authority of the state, private property, and all social hierarchies.<sup>888</sup>

In terms of the duty of the state to the church, Pilgram Marpeck stated, “Earthly power in all its works has no place in the kingdom of Christ...and that all who seek to support the

---

<sup>879</sup> *Institutes* 4.3.10.

<sup>880</sup> *CO* 10/1, 15-17; *Institutes* 4.3.4-9.

<sup>881</sup> *Institutes* 4.20.5

<sup>882</sup> *CL*, 169, 171.

<sup>883</sup> *Institutes* 4.20.6; 4.20.14.

<sup>884</sup> *CL*, 12.

<sup>885</sup> Josef Bohatec, *Calvin und das Recht* (Graz: Hermann Böhlhaus. 1934), p.24.

<sup>886</sup> *Ibid.*, p.101.

<sup>887</sup> *Institutes*, 4.20.2.

<sup>888</sup> *Institutes* 4.20.2; Calvin, *Briève instruction*, *CO* 7, 81, 83, 90, and 91.



kingdom of Christ through authority will be punished and destroyed.”<sup>889</sup> In contrast, Calvin averred that if any state does not obey the church of God, God’s curse will fall upon it.<sup>890</sup> He maintained that the duty of the state is “to cherish and protect the outward worship of God, to defend sound doctrine, piety, and the position of the church.”

Calvin understood the need of coercion and its strength to transform the city. Eugene P. Heideman holds the view that “in his recognition of the need for coercive action, Calvin emphasised the unity of the Old Testament teaching with the New.”<sup>891</sup> To put it in detail, in the purpose of coercive power, he followed the Old Testament while he did the New Testament in the strength of coercive power. As in the times of David, in our times the church and the civil government have the same goal “in defending good men from the wicked, giving aid and comfort to the oppressed, and punishing criminals.”<sup>892</sup> The primary distinction between Old Testament times and the present is in the toleration of ruler of evil people. Calvin stressed that the authorities should be clement.<sup>893</sup> Such clemency stems from Christ’s atonement for sinners. Violent penalty is the ultimate means against the evildoer. In this respect, Calvin asked the city council to be clement to Servetus, who was an anti-Trinitarian. His execution was entirely by the city council.<sup>894</sup> The punishments of his times were much more severe than those of our times.<sup>895</sup> Heideman confesses that it is difficult to judge whether the execution of about ten people a year is higher than the cities surrounding Geneva.<sup>896</sup>

The role of the church for the state is to help rulers realize that “they are deputies of God” and “must render account of the administration of their charge” before God on the last day<sup>897</sup> to pray for them to be faithful to their mission,<sup>898</sup> to cooperate with the rulers by obeying their command, and to refuse it when the command of the state is against

---

<sup>889</sup> Donald J. Ziegler, “Marpeck versus Bucer; a sixteenth century debate over the uses and limits of political authority” in *Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies 2* (St. Louis: Foundation for Reformation Research, 1971): 106.

<sup>890</sup> *Comm.* on Dan. 2:44-45, CO 40, 607.

<sup>891</sup> Eugene P. Heideman, “Theocracy in the Reformation,” *Reformed Review*, Vol. 34, no. 2 (Holland, Michigan: A Theological Journal of Western Theology Seminary, 1981), p. 85.

<sup>892</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>893</sup> *Institutes* 4.20.10.

<sup>894</sup> Chaunu, Pierre and François Dosse, *L’instant éclaté. Entretiens* (Paris: Aubier -Histoires, 1994), p.116.

<sup>895</sup> For the reason of Calvin’s severe punishments, Höpfl interprets it as stemming from his fear of the menace of the Anabaptists and apostates, which was regarded as an anarchistic disorder. In order to prevent this schism and keep order, Geneva needed an austere law applied by magistrates [Harro Höpfl, *The Christian Polity of John Calvin* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), p. 212]. Suzanne Selinger suggests that Calvin’s coldness and harshness against dissent and disorder, and his despising of the human body might stem from the early loss of his mother [Suzanne Selinger, *Calvin against Himself: An Inquiry in Intellectual History* (Hamden, Ct.: Archon [The Shoestring Press], 1984), pp.56-58].

<sup>896</sup> Eugene P. Heideman, *op. cit.*, pp. 85-86.

<sup>897</sup> *Institutes* 4.20.6.

<sup>898</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Tim. 2:2, CO 52, 266.

God.<sup>899</sup>

### 2.2.9.3 Social Sanctification

#### 2.2.9.3.1 Family and Sex

In these modern days, divorce and sexual debauchery have been increasing by degrees. Calvin's view of husband and wife and sexual purity would be useful to solve these problems to some extent because his view is based on the biblical principle, though our context and his context are quite different.

Calvin viewed the family as a creation ordinance established by God, with Christ as its head.<sup>900</sup> In the order of God, the husband is the head of the wife but both of them should be obedient to the Law of God, viz., Christ. Calvin believed the whole human community is based on the divinely ordered monogamy in which two persons become one body and soul.<sup>901</sup> The purpose of marriage is to produce progeny and to control free-floating urges.<sup>902</sup> Wives should rule "their own house in a sober and orderly manner" rather than wander about in public places. They ought to be chaste, and at the same time modest, so as to be subject to the dominion of their husbands. Calvin warned, "Those who excel in other virtues sometimes act haughtily, so as to be disobedient to their husbands."<sup>903</sup> Husbands should take pains with their work for the family and support their wives at home, and encourage them and help them care for their infants, remembering that enduring all this is acceptable as a sacrifice to God.<sup>904</sup> Calvin considered the ruling of fathers in the family as the "servitude" of love.<sup>905</sup> Their authority depends upon God's command. Accordingly, children submit to their parents in the Lord. If a father commands unrighteous things, they can deny it.

From the viewpoint of sexual purity, Calvin deemed fornication, lasciviousness and libertinism to be punished by the community because they endanger the marriage relationship. Sexual corruption infringes the principle set by God in the original creation.<sup>906</sup> Given that adulterers and whores are banished from the kingdom of God, they

---

<sup>899</sup> *Institutes* 4.20.31.

<sup>900</sup> Sermon on Deut.24:1-4, CO 28, 148; G. Joseph Gatis, "The Political Theory of John Calvin," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 153 (1996): 454.

<sup>901</sup> *Comm.* on Gen. 2:18, CO 23, 46.

<sup>902</sup> *Comm.* on Gen.1:28, CO 23, 28-29.

<sup>903</sup> *Comm.* on Titus 2:4, CO 52, 420. "...quae aliis virtutibus pollent, interdum ferociendi inde occasionem arripiunt ut maritis parum sint morigerae."

<sup>904</sup> Sermon on 1 Tim. 2:13-15. *Sermons on the Epistle to Timothy & Titus by John Calvin* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth & Trust, reprinted in 1983, first published in 1579), p.232.

<sup>905</sup> Sermon on Eph. 5:18-21; SEC, p.561.

<sup>906</sup> *Comm.* on Lev. 18:20, CO 24, 644..

should not be tolerated in the Church.<sup>907</sup> In his commentary on John 8:11, Calvin alluded that an adulteress should be punished by death. “They who infer from this that adultery ought not to be punished with death must, for the same reason, admit that inheritances ought not to be divided because Christ refused to arbitrate in that matter between two brothers.” Christ “does not overturn political order, or reverse the sentences and punishments appointed by the laws.”<sup>908</sup> In any event, nowadays, we cannot agree with Calvin’s austere punishment for adultery. His literal application of punishments in the Old Testament cannot be adequate for contemporary church discipline. The penalties in the Old Testament should be relieved in the light of Christ’s atonement.

### 2.2.9.3.2 Female Liberalism

J. D. Douglass considers Calvin as an advocator for female rights on the ground of “his argument that both “father” and “mother” are metaphors for God in Scriptures which God chose to describe diverse aspects of the divine nature.”<sup>909</sup> For example, commenting on Is 42:13-14, Calvin threw light upon the image of God as a woman in labour, and commenting on Is 46:3, she depicted Israel borne by God and carried from the womb.<sup>910</sup> In fact, Calvin was more open to women’s public role in the church than other Reformers. He believed that there were women in the public office of deacon in the early church.<sup>911</sup> Marie Dentièrè criticized Paul’s argument for subordinating women to men because of Eve’s sin and creation order, quoting the Galatians’ teaching that male or female became one through baptism in Christ (Gal. 3:28).<sup>912</sup> Conversely, Henri Blocher refuted the thesis of Douglas and Dentièrè on the basis of Calvin’s commentary on 1 Timothy 2 that “the eternal and inviolable appointment of God” is presented as an order of creation which determines that woman should be subject to man. Calvin accepted that “women may perform the ministry of the word with authority” in an emergency regiment, but he did not approve their participation in “the constant and ordinary system of government.”<sup>913</sup> Calvin’s concern was not with female emancipation in the political sphere but in a more religious dimension. The reason why Calvin preferred the masculine imagery for God is not only that it is biblical but also that it implied the separation from the leading goddesses of the nature religions which have prevailed all over the world.<sup>914</sup> This view of Northrop

---

<sup>907</sup> Letter to the protector Somerset; LC 2, 229, 197.

<sup>908</sup> *Comm.* John 8:11, CO 47, 191.

<sup>909</sup> Jane Dempsey Douglass, “Calvin’s Teaching What Still Remains Pertinent?” *The Ecumenical Review* 39 (Ja, 1989): 27

<sup>910</sup> *Church Ordinances*, 37. 19, 68-70.

<sup>911</sup> Cf. *Institutes*, 4.3. 9.

<sup>912</sup> *Ibid.*, 378-380; Jane D. Douglass, *Women. Freedom and Calvin*, Philadelphia (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1985), pp. 100-103.

<sup>913</sup> Henri Blocher, “Response: Authentic Humanum,” *The Ecumenical Review* 39 (Ja., 1989): 36.

<sup>914</sup> Northrop Frye, *The Great Code: the Bible and Literature* (Toronto: Academic Press Canada, 1982), pp.

Frye is very noteworthy.

### 2.2.9.3.3 Vocation

Calvin criticized the sharp distinction between clergy and laity, which was drawn by the medieval church. What is important is not whether one serves within a special area, but whether in the field where he is working he serves God heartily through his activity in the respect of God's calling.<sup>915</sup> God has given all human beings "excellent talents," which they should use to further his kingdom.<sup>916</sup> With such recognition, to act in his area is his sanctification in society. Work is understood as worship in the daily life of the world in overcoming all impediments and temptations.<sup>917</sup> Calvin asserted the equal value of all work that serves human society, e.g., raising children within the family, teaching, public or private administrative duties, and so on.<sup>918</sup>

He regarded occupational calling as a remedy for being human. The Lord assigned each person "a sort of sentry post so that he may not needlessly wander about throughout life."<sup>919</sup> Those who are ignorant of it incline to trespass on the others, or to be enslaved by ambition and wander in a maze.<sup>920</sup> Calvin believed that God gives us the ability to play the role he has assigned us as in the case of Jeremiah.<sup>921</sup> It is moderation to enable Christians to pursue a calling.<sup>922</sup> We must one day render account of it before God.

### 2.2.9.3.4 Economy

Economics is very important in the sphere of sanctification because human greed for money is the root of every sin. André Biéler is of the opinion that Calvin's social ethics could be an example for theology and Christian ethics for all time because it is based on a strict knowledge of biblical revelation and a clear analysis of social and economic reality.<sup>923</sup> Conversely, Max Weber asserted that Calvin is connected with the development

---

107ff.

<sup>915</sup> Robert D. Knudsen, "Calvinism as a Cultural Force," in *John Calvin: His Influence in the Western World*, ed. by W. Stanford Reid (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1982), p.22; *Institutes* 3.10.6.

<sup>916</sup> *Institutes* 2.2.16.

<sup>917</sup> Cf. *Comm.* on Mt. 20:1-16, CO 45, 547-48.

<sup>918</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Tim. 5:10, CO 52, 310.

<sup>919</sup> *Institutes* 3.10.6.

<sup>920</sup> *Comm.* on Ps. 131:1, CO 32, 340. "...vel in alienas functiones involant...quosunque vero ambitio sollicitat, necesse est in labyrintho vagari."

<sup>921</sup> *Comm.* on Jer. 1:6, CO 37, 477.

<sup>922</sup> *Comm.* on Jn 4:1, CO 47, 77. "Hanc porro mediocritatem vere colent, quicunque in suam vocationem erunt intenti."

<sup>923</sup> A. Bieler, *Gottes Gebot und der Hunger der Welt - Calvin, Prophet des industrie-llen Zeitalters. Grundlage und Methode der Sozialethik Calvins*, tr. by A. Dobli (Zurich: EVZ Verlag, 1966). Original edition: *Calvin, prophète de l'ère industrielle* (Geneva: Editions Labor et Fides S.A., 1961).

of capitalism, and his theory has been adopted by many Marxists “as a means of discrediting both religion and capitalism.”<sup>924</sup> W. Stanford Reid contends that Calvin “is a critic of an existing (capitalistic) system, rather than an advocate or founder of a new” capitalism.<sup>925</sup> Max Weber’s view that ascribed capitalism’s development only to Calvin’s teaching of “predestination and certainty of salvation” is not germane, for other elements affected it.<sup>926</sup> Calvin’s economic thought will be considered in more detail.

Contrary to Luther who condemned usury,<sup>927</sup> Calvin permitted the charging of interest at the rate of 5.0-6.6 percent for a loan for production<sup>928</sup> He viewed it as a means of realizing equitable relations as charity on the part of all. It is the rule that everyone’s rights should be safely preserved.<sup>929</sup> Charity should spontaneously be accomplished for their brethren.<sup>930</sup> The poor serve as a type of barometer of the faith and charity of the Christian community.<sup>931</sup> Calvin established the office of deacons to take care of the needy and poor, which is interrelated with the work of city officials.<sup>932</sup> The love of money as an end in itself was censured by Calvin because it led us to squeeze out the cash and eventually

---

<sup>924</sup> W. Stanford Reid, “John Calvin: the father of capitalism?,” *Themelios*, Vol.8, No. 2 (January, 1983): 19ff; see the following resources for a complex debate of this issue. Max Weber, *Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus*. 1904-1905, tr. Parsons, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (London: George Allen & Unwin. 1978), pp. 55-79ff; 109-111. André Biéler, *La Pensée économique et sociale de Calvin* (Geneva: George, 1961), p. 337. W. Fred Graham, *The Constructive Revolutionary: John Calvin and His Socio-Economic Impact* (Atlanta: John Knox Press. 1978). p.193. W. Stanford Reid, “John Calvin: the father of capitalism?” *Themelios*, Vol.8, no. 2 (January, 1983), pp.23-25. W. Stanford Reid, “John Calvin, Early Critic of Capitalism (1),” *The Reformed Theological Review* 43 (1984): 78.

<sup>925</sup> W. Stanford Reid, “John Calvin, Early Critic of Capitalism (1),” *The Reformed Theological Review* 43 (1984): 77.

<sup>926</sup> W. Stanford Reid, “John Calvin: the father of capitalism?” *Themelios*, Vol.8, no. 2 (January, 1983), p.23-25.

<sup>927</sup> LW 45, 273, 280, 281, 289.

<sup>928</sup> Concerning interest rate, several directives were suggested. For example, “Money lending for interest should not be made into a profession unto itself. No interest may be charged to the poor or economically distressed. Interest-bearing capital investments may be carried out only when they do not restrict the capacity to help the needy. Interest agreements may be finalized only according to natural fairness and the Golden Rule of Christ (Matt. 7:12).”<sup>928</sup> Briefly, interest was allowed within a limit that would not do injury to any one. Hans-Helmut Esser, “The Contemporary Relevance of Calvin’s Social Ethics,” in *Towards the Future of Reformed Theology: Tasks, Topics, Traditions*, ed. David Willis & Michael Welker (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999), p.383; see CO 28, 115-123 for more detail.

<sup>929</sup> *Sermons on the Ten Commandments*, ed. and tr. by Benjamin Wirth Farley (Grand Rapids: Baker Book house, 1980), p.191.

<sup>930</sup> *Comm.* on Ex.16:17, CO 24, 171. “...dum aequalitatem statuit...ut divites sponte et liberaliter fratrum inediae succurant, non autem ex necessitate vel tristitia.”

<sup>931</sup> Sermon. 95 on Deut. 15:11-15, CO 27, 338.

<sup>932</sup> Cf. J. D. Douglass, “Calvin’s Relation to social and Economic Change,” *Church and Society*, Vol. 74, no. 4 (1984), p.78; W. F. Graham, *The Constructive Revolution: John Calvin and his Socio-Economic Impact* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1971), pp. 98-104.

cannot satisfy.<sup>933</sup> The “insatiable desire for gain” was regarded as a “deadly plague.”<sup>934</sup> Calvin considered the lust for excessive possessions and severe poverty as detrimental to our spiritual life.<sup>935</sup>

On economic injustice, Calvin warned again a self-chosen revolutionary liberation from poverty. He acknowledged that various states ranged between rich and poor, but did not try to compel everyone into egalitarianism. Poverty should be solved by trade and the right to associate. He warned about the lavish and merciless waste of wealth. For Calvin, the two provisions for economic justice are “not dealing in violence, extortion, or fraud with respect to goods,” and not being extravagant or treacherous or wasteful.<sup>936</sup> For Calvin, moderate inner asceticism was the important kernel in Christian ethics. His solutions for social problems in a city that was experiencing radical social change have affected the world for over four centuries.

Calvin’s view of economy can be an answer to ‘2.1.2.2.4 Materialism’ and will be applied to ‘6.3.2.2 Simple and Moderate Life.’

## 2.3 Conclusion

### 2.3.1 Abstract

Calvin used the terms, sanctification, regeneration, repentance, and conversion almost identically. Regeneration is accentuated as an aspect of divine initiation, and repentance as an aspect of human participation. Sanctification is defined as the restoration to the image of God by the regeneration of the Holy Spirit. The image of God is defined as true knowledge, righteousness, and holiness. It comprises proper relationships with God, neighbours, and nature. Regretfully, it was lost by Adam’s fall, which was caused through his unfaithfulness and pride. On the contrary, Christ assumed our humanity in humility and faithfulness. By his redemption, Christ restored the image of God in us, though it is still incomplete in this world until the Lord comes again. Christ progresses our sanctification by his Spirit. The Holy Spirit generated faith in us and by our faith, united us with Christ. In our union with Christ, we are continually sanctified. After the fall of Adam, nobody could be reconciled with God by himself. Thus, the instantaneous initial regeneration of the Holy Spirit is necessary for our sanctification.

---

<sup>933</sup> *Comm.* on Mt. 28:11-15, CO 45, 800. “Homines ergo lucro addicti, imo quaestum undique captantes...rationem novam excogitant emungendae pecuniae.”

<sup>934</sup> *Comm.* on Mt. 6:19, CO 45, 203. “Pestis haec capitalis passim regnat in mundo, ut homines inexplebili habendi cupiditate insaniant.”

<sup>935</sup> *Institutes* 3.20.46.

<sup>936</sup> *Sermons on the Ten Commandments*, ed. and tr. by Benjamin Wirth Farley (Grand Rapids: Baker Book house, 1980), p. 168.



Our sanctification consists of mortification and vivification through our participation in the death and resurrection of Christ. Calvin did not recognize any human role in sanctification for fear that it should effect justification by human works. This reflects the context in which he lived in the struggle with the Roman Catholic Church. Still, he acknowledged human responsibility in sanctification. It was ascribed to prayer, watchfulness, obedience, and discipline. These were also the gifts of the grace of God in the sense that God disposed men to do so. Our forensic sanctification is based on the sanctification of Christ. Christ assumed human nature in his incarnation. As our high priest, Christ sanctified his soul and body and offered it as a sacrifice. His offering cleansed our filth and guilt once and forever. By his sanctification, we are forensically sanctified before God. We are reconciled with God in our union with Christ. This union is the presupposition of our sanctification. It is accomplished by the Holy Spirit. He generates our faith and by faith we receive Christ. In Christ, we are sanctified. The Spirit regenerates us in our hidden consciousness and gives us faith, and induces us to repent of our sins. He leads the whole process of sanctification. Thus, sanctification is called his work rather than ours.

The Holy Spirit sanctifies by means of the Word and the Sacraments. Calvin interpreted the Word in light of the resurrected Christ and analysed our situation with the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The Word is neither applied literally nor mechanically, but it is organically applied by the Holy Spirit. Thus, Christians need the help of the church, which offers them the interpretation and application of the Bible. Preachers should exclaim both the Old Testament and the New Testament as Paul did. It is useful for our sanctification. The law contributes to our sanctification as a goad to overcome our indolence. Repentance can lead men to Christ because in Him forgiveness is promised. Though the law points out our sins, it cannot give us life and forgiveness. The gospel provides us with God's life. The law is fulfilled in Christ, who is the true interpreter of the law. The Decalogue is regarded as a standard of righteousness to reform our society. It is interpreted in the light of the Holy Spirit, Christ's instruction and the teaching of the Apostles. The Old Testament should be interpreted by the light of the New Testament. Calvin rebuked those who neglected the meeting of the church because God put all grace in the church, the Body of Christ. The church is the instrument of God's grace in Christ.

The sacraments are the signs of invisible grace, which is effective in the presence of Christ by the Spirit. It needs preaching to explain its meaning. It is a comfort for the poor and correction for the wicked. To protect the honour of the church and the Lord, the impious were prohibited from participating in the Lord Supper's Supper. By excommunication, the church purifies its members and reinforces the faith in Christ. Infant baptism was supported by Calvin for the reason that it strengthens the faith of believers and their infants. Baptism signifies our participation in the death and resurrection of Christ.



It indicates the mortification of our flesh and sinful desires, and the longings for our resurrection. It endorses our union with Christ.

Our repentance progresses in three stages: self-denial, bearing the cross, and meditation on the future, which are the stages in the process of our mortification and vivification. Self-denial is to mortify our desires by our participation in the death of Christ. It is based on the principle that we do not belong to ourselves but to God. We must not desire any other thing but that which God gives us. We must be happy with the joy of Christ. The enticement of this world is so great that God uses suffering so that it might not captivate us. In the comparison between heavenly life and the suffering of this world, we reject the inheritance of this world and long for the life to come. Christian life is to expect the glory of resurrection in Christ. Though our good works are incomplete, God will reward us with good things for our good works. Our assurance is based on God's calling and his promise in Christ. Accordingly, we must put our assurance on Christ, not on good works. Our good works are a secondary evidence to distinguish us from the wicked and to detect hypocrites who confess their faith by mouth, yet deny it by their behaviour. Our sanctification is rather visible. It is manifested as the fruit of the Holy Spirit, which are visible to others.

The sphere of sanctification is the whole arena of this world in the sense that Christ rules over the world. Calvin struggled to reform the entire city of Geneva in accordance with the law of God. He is therefore called a theonomist. He was not a theocrat in the strict sense because he did not want the government of the church over the city. Polity, economy, education, and religion were reformed in conformity with the will of God.

## **2.3.2 Assessment**

### **2.3.2.1 Positive Assessment**

1 Calvin maintained the balance between the Word and the Spirit in the means of sanctification. He avoided the two extremities of the Roman Catholic Church and the Spiritualists. He rejected both the legalism of the Roman Church and the antinomianism of the Spiritualists. He stressed the work of the Spirit through the Word. The Spirit works with His Word for our sanctification. This can be an answer to '5.2.1.2.4.1 Antinomianism,' '5.2.1.2.4.2 A Legalistic Tendency,' '5.2.1.2.4.3 Mysticism,' '5.2.1.2.4.4 Spiritual Enthusiasm' in Korean context. Calvin's view will be reflected in '5.3.1.3 Maintaining the Balance between Antinomianism and Legalism' and '5.3.3.3 Maintaining the Balance between Institutionalism and Individualism.'

2 He stressed the spheres of sanctification from individual life and the church to culture and the world. He was convinced that the whole world should be sanctified by God's will. His view that the role of church is to co-operate with the state and to watch it is valid. His emphasis on the creation order of husband and wife, and sexual purity may to some extent

hold good in our days. This view of Calvin can be an answer to ‘5.2.1.2.3.2 Evasion from Reforming the World and Compromising with It’ and will be reflected in ‘5.3.3 Sanctification in Political, Social Life.’

3 For the first time, he clearly distinguished between justification and sanctification, in contrast to the Roman Catholic Church, which included sanctification in justification.<sup>937</sup>

4 He stressed the sovereign work of God in our sanctification. At the same time, he excluded human merit in our sanctification, though he emphasised human duty as our response to God’s initiative work for our sanctification. This could be an answer to 5.2.1.2.4.2 A Legalistic Tendency and will be reflected in ‘5.3.2.1 The Balance between the Grace of God and Human Responsibility.’

5 He saved the assurance of our salvation by means of the doctrine of predestination. God’s calling and our faith in Christ is the sign of our election.

6 He derived the doctrine of sanctification from the Bible rather than philosophy or experience. This could be an answer to ‘2.1.2.3.1 Minjung Theology’ and will be reflected in ‘5.3.4.1 Preserving the Truth of the Bible.’

7 He influenced Geneva and Western Europe through his life in accordance with his doctrine.<sup>938</sup> This can be a counter example to “5.2.1.2.2.1 The Discrepancy between Faith and Life.”

8 He maintained a balanced attitude between theocracy and anarchy in the relationship between state and church. His efforts to accomplish God’s will in the city of Geneva by means of the lawful progress were notable. His method can be a countermeasure to Minjung theology which accepted the Marxist analysis of the socioeconomic structures (see 5.2.1.2.3.1).

9 He maintained the balance between individual pietism and communal faith life. The Christian is not saved by the institutional device of the church as the Roman Catholic Church insisted, but needs to learn the sound teaching of the Bible by the pastors of the Church and be disciplined by the program of the Church. His view will be reflected in ‘5.3.3.3 Maintaining the Balance between Institutionalism and Individualism.’

10 He maintained a balanced view between invisibility and visibility of sanctified life. The reality of our sanctification is hidden in the resurrection of Jesus Christ. However it is visible in the world by our good works and the fruit of the Holy Spirit. Though it is

---

<sup>937</sup> I concur with Otto Gründler. “We have noted...Calvin’s sensitivity to the distinction between the objective givenness of his theme and its subjective appropriation while refusing to separate the two.” This is one of “the originality of Calvin.” “John Calvin: Ingrafting in Christ,” in *The Spirituality of Western Christendom*, introduction by Jean Leclercq, ed. by E. Rozanne Edler (Kalamazoo in Michigan: Cistercian Publications, Inc., 1976), pp. 186-87.

<sup>938</sup> John H. Leith states that “John Calvin’s influence in Geneva and western Europe has been attributed to the fact that he was never corrupted by money” at his article, “John Calvin and Stewardship,” *Journal-for-Preachers*, Vol. 9, no. 1 (1985): 2.

imperfect, it shows the evidence of our adoption by God. Our good works function as an evidence of our sanctification. Our faith is the primary evidence and good works are the secondary evidence.

11 He had room for neither asceticism nor quietism and stressed on human freedom to enjoy earthly things. He urged believers to enthusiastically participate in this world fulfilling their occupational calling.<sup>939</sup> His view could be a countermeasure to the ascetic influence of Taoism and Buddhism (see 5.2.1.2.5.3 and 5.2.1.2.5.4).

12 He maintained the balance between this life and the next life. He emphasised that while a Christian must be faithful to his/her occupational calling, he/she should also meditate on the next world. Thus he avoided the two extremities.<sup>940</sup> This can be a countermeasure to the fatalistic view of Buddhism on sanctification.

13 He emphasised both instantaneousness and gradualness in the nature of sanctification, whereby, he maintained the balance between God's extraordinary grace for sanctification and incessant human cooperative efforts with the means of grace. His view can be a corrective proposal to "5.2.1.2.4.3 A Bias to Gradualness of Sanctification."

### 2.3.2.2 Negative Assessment

1 Calvin's definition of sanctification is too broad. It includes regeneration, repentance, conversion, and sanctification. Though the theologians of his times generally worked in this manner, his conception needs a more clear distinction because "great confusion arises from this ambiguity of terms." According to Charles Hodge's definition, "μετάνοια is repentance, change of mind, turning to God, and conversion, which is what man is called upon to do; ἀναγέννησις, regeneration is the act of God."<sup>941</sup> Regeneration is "not the whole work of sanctification, nor the first stages of that work comprehended in conversion," but it is "the instantaneous change from spiritual death to spiritual life." It is "the beginning of new life" and being "born again" to "a new creature."<sup>942</sup> It is the act of God and "an act of his almighty power" not that of man.<sup>943</sup> It comprises the change of the whole soul; "the mind is illuminated, the eyes of understanding are opened; the heart is

---

<sup>939</sup> R. H. Bremmer, "Enkele karakteristieke trekke van Calvljns teologie," *Gereformeerde Theologiese Tijdschrift* 44 (1943): 552

<sup>940</sup> J. H. van Wyk, "John Calvin on the Kingdom of God and Eschatology," *In die Skriflig*, Vol. 35, no.2 (2001): 190.

<sup>941</sup> Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology* III (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1977), p.4. In the Bible, born again is translated from ἀναγέννησις (1Pet 1:3). This word is used to describe the initial act of renewal. Regeneration is from παλιγγενεσία (Mat 19:28; Tit 3:5). Renewal is from ἀνακαινώσεως (Rom. 12:2 ; Tit. 3:5), which denotes a making anew or renewing. J. D. Douglas, ed., *The New Bible Dictionary*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Downers Grove: Inter Varsity Press, 1980), p.1015.

<sup>942</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.

<sup>943</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 31.

renewed; the will is conquered.”<sup>944</sup> Though Calvin sometimes admitted that regeneration is “the beginning of the spiritual life,”<sup>945</sup> he generally identified regeneration with sanctification. Briefly, Hodge insisted that repentance and conversion are human work, while regeneration is God’s work. Sanctification is “the work of God’s free grace, whereby we are renewed in the whole man after the image, and are enabled more and more to die unto sin and live unto righteousness.”<sup>946</sup> Hodge’s definition of sanctification is very similar to Calvin’s definition of repentance. Hodge understood that sanctification is the whole process, while regeneration is the beginning of new life.

According to the *Westminster Confession* (Chapter 13), sanctification is defined as the work of God’s grace, by which the regenerated “are further sanctified really and personally, through the virtue of Christ’s death and resurrection, by his Word and Spirit dwelling in them, the dominion of the whole body of sin is destroyed, and the several lusts thereof are more and more weakened and mortified, and they more and more quickened and strengthened in all saving graces, to the practice of true holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.”<sup>947</sup> This definition is also very similar to Calvin’s one of repentance.<sup>948</sup> The *Westminster Confession* classified repentance and sanctification into the two terms. Repentance is a human act but sanctification is the work of God. Repentance is a human act, by which a sinner, “out of the sight and sense, not only of the danger holy nature and righteous law of God, and upon the apprehension of holy nature and righteous law of God, and upon the apprehension of his mercy in Christ to such as are penitent, so grieves for and hates his sins, as to turn from them all unto God, purposing and endeavouring to walk with him in all the ways of his commandments.”<sup>949</sup> This definition of repentance stressed human, active participation in repentance due to God’s grace from the Gospel, while Calvin regarded repentance as wholly the work of God’s grace. To sum up, Calvin comprised regeneration, conversion, sanctification as repentance in view of the *Westminster Confession*. Calvin’s definition of sanctification needs a more concrete differentiation in order to avoid confusion.

2 Calvin’s teaching on the image of God is rather narrow. Though Calvin denied that the image of God includes human dominion, in accordance with Chrysostom and Hodge, we may regard our dominion over creatures as the image of God in the sense that the

---

<sup>944</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 36.

<sup>945</sup> *Institutes* 2.3.6.

<sup>946</sup> Charles Hodge, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

<sup>947</sup> “Chapter XIII Of Sanctification,” in *The Westminster Confession of Faith: Being an account of the Preparation and Printing of Its Seven Leading Editions To which is appended a Critical Text of the Confession with Notes Thereon by S. W. Carruthers* (8<sup>th</sup> ed. Manchester: R. Aikman & Son, 1923), p.115.

<sup>948</sup> “Some (Reformers) defined repentance as consisting, 1st, of mortification, or dying unto sin; and, 2nd, of vivification, or living unto God. This corresponds to our view of sanctification.” A. A. Hodge, *Outlines of Theology* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1880), Chap. 32, Q. 10.

<sup>949</sup> *The Westminster Confession of the Faith*, “Chapter XV Of Repentance unto Life,” *op. cit.*, p.115.

image of God relates no less to our right relationship with creatures than to our right relationship with God. In addition, Calvin's view that the image of God lies in the human soul rather than the human body needs to be corrected. Firstly, God prohibited the killing of human beings. It implies that the human body has the image of God because man is a unity of soul and body. Secondly, the Bible says that our body is God's holy instrument for his righteousness and the temple of the Holy Spirit.

3 His dualistic anthropology was strongly influenced by Platonism rather than by the Bible. The Bible teaches the unity of both soul and body.<sup>950</sup>

4 Calvin's standpoint that Christ "has presented us to his Father in his own person"<sup>951</sup> can be legitimate only when his humanity comprises, represents and substitutes our corrupt humanity. However, Christ's humanity represented and substituted our corrupt humanity but did not comprise it, in the sense that his humanity was sinless and ours is sinful. That as our Head, Christ comprises us in his Body happens when he engrafts us into his Body through the work of the Holy Spirit, after his incarnation and redemption. His incarnation can never be said to embrace our corrupt nature, for then, his atoning sacrifice cannot be perfectly accomplished. Accordingly, the sanctification of Christ must be understood as our forgiveness by his atonement through his High Priesthood. It is not true that we were sanctified when Christ consecrated himself because we are his Body and he is our Head. Our factual sanctification as human beings is accomplished through the work of the Holy Spirit and not by Christ's sanctification for his atoning sacrifice. Though we are consecrated as a royal priesthood in Christ,<sup>952</sup> our human nature is not sanctified in Christ's incarnation and sacrifice. The expression that Christ is our sanctification means that in our union with Christ, his holiness became ours. That he presented us to his Father can mean our sanctification in the respect that we were united with him spiritually and sat at the right hand of God with him. This sanctification implies the elevation of our state as God's children, not the sanctification of our nature in the sense that our corrupt nature is transformed into sinless humanity. Hence, the sanctification of Christ is connected only with forensic sanctification of our status but not factual of the inner transformation of our nature.

5 In the relationship between the Law and the Spirit, the dynamic role of the Spirit needs to be stressed more, though Calvin admitted that the Spirit "also convinced [us] without the Word, for we know how powerful are the secret instincts of the Spirit."<sup>953</sup> A Christian needs the help of his pastor in order to do God's will in his particular situation, but no pastors can exactly know God's will in any individual and particular situation. The

---

<sup>950</sup> J. H. van Wyk, "John Calvin on the Kingdom of God and Eschatology," *In die Skriflig*, Vol. 35, no.2 (2001): 202.

<sup>951</sup> Jn.17:19.

<sup>952</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Pet. 2: 9; CO 55, 240.

<sup>953</sup> *Comm.* on Mt. 15:23; CO 45, 816.

complex problems of our times cannot be solved only by the interpretation of the Decalogue. It depends upon the wisdom of the Holy Spirit more than ever before. Pastors can present only the general principle, i.e., the love and justice of God in accordance with the Bible. Hence, we should emphasise more often the dynamic guidance of the Holy Spirit in concordance to the Bible and open its possibility to the saints. My view of this issue will be reflected in “6.3.1.2 Harmony between Spirituality and Rationality.”

6 Pertaining to occupational calling, the situation of our times is very different from Calvin’s times when vocations were relatively stable. Modern society is “no longer a static, but a mobile system” governed by an unavoidable mobility between occupations.<sup>954</sup> Job changes accompanying endemic unemployment, which happens because rapid industrial development demotes many jobs and promotes other jobs, and makes no sense as static occupational calling. We had better adapt ourselves to changing society and make use of it as a good chance for fundamental evangelical mission work than wish to stay in a stable job by reason of occupational calling.

7 In Calvin’s theology, the cosmic dimension of sanctification, i.e. the renewal of the universe as the new heaven and the new earth is underexposed. As Wurth claims, “The kingdom enters into the earthly reality by transforming, renewing, sanctifying, and purifying it.”<sup>955</sup> In his *Institutes* 3.25.1-12, Calvin referred to the final resurrection, but he did not deal with the new heaven and the new earth. As J. H. van Wyk points out, Calvin never mentioned it as an independent theme; he did not write his commentary on Rev. 21:1 or he did not refer to it in *Institutes*.<sup>956</sup> Still, van Wyk’s view must be compensated by the statement that Calvin dwelled on the new heaven and the new earth in his commentary on 2 Peter 2:10-14. According to P. F. Theron, Calvin tackled eschatology in his commentary on *the Harmony of the Gospels, the Epistle to the Hebrews, De Scandalis, and Psychopannychia*.<sup>957</sup> The Lord’s Prayer,<sup>958</sup> Calvin’s sermon on Isaiah 53:4-6 and commentary on Micah 4:3, and Calvin’s letter to Farel in 1538 may be added to it.<sup>959</sup>

---

<sup>954</sup> Klaus Bockmuehl, “Protestant Ethics: The Spirit and the Word in Action,” *Evangelical Review of Theology* 12 (1988):100.

<sup>955</sup> G. B. Wurth, “Calvijn en het koninkrijk Gods,” in *Vier redevoeringen over Calvijn* (Kampen: Kok, 1959), pp. 62, 67-68. Quoted by J. H. van Wyk, “John Calvin on the Kingdom of God and Eschatology” of *In die Skriflig*, Vol. 35, no.2 (2001): 203.

<sup>956</sup> Conversely, Timothy George is of the opinion that Calvin was preoccupied with the theme of the Kingdom of God. *op. cit.*, p. 213.

<sup>957</sup> P. F. Theron, “The kingdom of God and the theology of Calvin”: Response to the paper by prof. J. H. van Wyk of *In die Skriflig* Vol. 35, no.2 (2001): 208-209, footnote no.3; Timothy George is of the opinion that Calvin’s motif of the Kingdom of God set forth in his early writings from about 1535 to 1539. “John Calvin and Menno Simons: Reformation Perspectives on the Kingdom of God,” in *Calvianism: Ideas and Influence of Jean Calvin*, ed. Robert V. Schnucker, Volume X of Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies (Ann Arbor in Michigan: Edward Brothers, 1988), pp. 196-197.

<sup>958</sup> *Institutes* 3.20.42.

<sup>959</sup> Cf. Timothy George gathered the fragments of Calvin’s thoughts of the Kingdom of God from his entire



Beizer contends that “Calvin never tried to translate the kingdom of God into a programme of social ethics.”<sup>960</sup> His contention seems rather germane in the sense that Calvin did not pursue literal theocracy. Nonetheless, Calvin is said to have struggled for the kingdom of God in the city of Geneva, given that he transformed the city in accordance with the law of God. In any event, for Calvin, the theme of the kingdom of God was not yet completely developed.

8 Calvin’s insistence that evil rulers are raised by God in order to punish the wickedness of people is unsound.<sup>961</sup> We know evil rulers have oppressed the righteous and the good in history, though Calvin presented Nebuchadnezzar as an instrument of God to punish Israel’s sin against God. The doctrine of God’s absolute and secret providence should not be applied to the justification of evil rule. We must pray and act against evil rulers according to the guidance of the Spirit rather than unconditionally endure their oppression. This is my countermeasure to “5.1.1.2.3.2 Evasion from Reforming the World and Compromise with It.” It will be reflected in “5.2.2.3.3 Participation in Social Justice.”

9 Calvin thought that obstinate believers in false religions deserve to be repressed by the sword.<sup>962</sup> The important distinction between Calvin’s times and our times is not to use coercion in order to convert unbelievers to God. Gary Scott Smith criticizes Calvin’s idea that the state should “enforce observance of the Christian faith” and punish religious sinners. In that sense the New Testament does not support such an attitude but “directs believers to use persuasion in their attempt to win others to Christ.”<sup>963</sup> Smith’s critique that “Calvin did not distinguish sharply enough between the way which God related to Israel in the Old Testament (especially through the theocracy) and the church in the New Testament” is notable.<sup>964</sup> The view that Gentiles are “to be won for evangelical doctrine through the working of the government”<sup>965</sup> is not convincing in today’s society. Mission should not depend on the sword but the conversion of the Holy Spirit and Christian service. Furthermore, the government of our times, with a few exceptions, does not compel anyone to adhere to or support any particular religion. Heideman’s view that we have “to pursue for our times the search for a theocracy which surpasses that which Calvin recognized” is remarkable in the sense that this world is under the sovereignty of God.<sup>966</sup> Accordingly,

---

writings. *Calvianism: Ideas and Influence of Jean Calvin*, pp.195-214.

<sup>960</sup> F. Beizer, *Hoffnung und Vollendung* (Mohn: Gütersloh, 1993), p.117.

<sup>961</sup> *Institutes* 4.20.25.

<sup>962</sup> *Institutes* 4.20.3; 4.20.10; Hans-Helmut Esser considers this attitude of Calvin as medieval *corpus christianum*. Hans-Helmut Esser, *op. cit.*, p.376.

<sup>963</sup> Gary Scott Smith, “The Reformation: Luther, Calvin, and the Anabaptists” in *Building a Christian World View*, Vol.2, *The Universe, Society and Ethics*, ed. by W. Andrew Hoffecker (Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1988), p.239.

<sup>964</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>965</sup> *Ibid.*; cf. *Institutes* 4.20.2.

<sup>966</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 88.



though theocracy may be almost impossible, given our political situation to support the religious freedom and pluralism, we should do our best to accomplish the kingdom of God in our society<sup>967</sup> by moving towards politico-social sanctification.

---

<sup>967</sup> John C. Koedyker stresses that “theocracy is not dead in Iran today.” He compared Calvin with Khomeini in his article. See John C. Koedyker, “Theocracy is not Dead: Calvin and Khomeini,” *Reformed Review*, Vol. 34, no. 2 (1981): 74-80.

## CHAPTER 3 JOHN WESLEY AND SANCTIFICATION

### 3.1 Introduction

#### 3.1.1 General Evaluation of Wesley

Some evaluations state that Wesley's theology is based on experience and the Bible rather than theoretical theology. William Hordern considered Wesley as one of the great theologians, though Wesley's theology is based on his experience rather than any theoretical system.<sup>1</sup> According to Ralph Del Colle, for Wesley, sanctification as Christian experience is a subjective aspect of our salvation while justification is its objective aspect.<sup>2</sup> Particular stress is laid on entire sanctification. Dr. G. Croft Cell viewed Wesley as "a principal founder and first conspicuous exemplar of a theology of experience."<sup>3</sup> He noted that Wesley brought Christianity back to the "religion as experience" of the early church. In this religion, "experience and reality come to the same thing."<sup>4</sup> Howard A. Snyder viewed Wesley's theology as dynamic in the sense that it focused on human transformation.<sup>5</sup> Reinhold Niebuhr also held that Wesley's conception of perfection contained the largest number of biblical elements as compared to other perfectionist teachings, in the sense that he viewed perfection as deliverance from sin, not from finiteness, and understood its process as existential, not contemplative.<sup>6</sup> Kenneth J. Collins claims that Wesley's theology is essentially biblical rather than theological.<sup>7</sup>

Some theologians understood Wesley as a balanced theologian of the doctrine of sanctification. For example, Albert Outler described John Wesley as "the most important Anglican theologian of the 18<sup>th</sup> century because of his distinctive composite answer to the

---

<sup>1</sup> William Hordern, "Recent Trends in Systematic Theology," *Canadian Journal of Theology* 7 (1961): 87.

<sup>2</sup> Ralph Del Colle, "John Wesley's Doctrine of Grace in Light of the Christian Tradition," *International Journal of Systematic Theology*, Vol. 4, no. 2 (2002): 177.

<sup>3</sup> George Croft Cell, *The Rediscovery of John Wesley* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1935), p.347. Also, noteworthy is Piette's mention that Wesley's "theology of experience has exerted an uncontested influence upon the theories of liberal Protestant theology from Friedrich Schleiermacher to William James," in the sense that it shows the relationship between Wesley's theology and liberal theology. Piette, *La Réaction de John Wesley dans l'Évolution du Protestantisme*, Preface (1925, Second ed., 1927). Quoted by Cell, *ibid.*, p.75.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 73.

<sup>5</sup> Howard A. Snyder, *The Radical Wesley: Patterns for Church Renewal* (Illinois Inter-Varsity Press, 1980), p.4.

<sup>6</sup> Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, Vol. II (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943), pp. 173-174.

<sup>7</sup> Kenneth J. Collins, "A Hermeneutical Model for the Wesleyan *Ordo Salutis*," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 19 (1984): 23.

age-old question of ‘the nature of the Christian life.’”<sup>8</sup> He viewed Wesley’s message as “faith working by love leading to holiness.”<sup>9</sup> He deemed it Wesley’s distinct position in history “to grasp the vital unity of both Pardon and Participation.”<sup>10</sup> Colin W. Williams held that Wesley stressed sanctification by faith, not sanctification by faith and merit like the Roman Catholics.<sup>11</sup> Kenneth J. Collins notes that Wesley maintained a balance between inward religion and outward religion, i.e., the practice of piety as good works, “law and gospel, faith and holy life, grace and works, grace as both favour and empowerment, justification and sanctification, instantaneousness and process, the universality of grace and its limited actualization, divine initiative and human response, initial and final justification.”<sup>12</sup> Donald G. Bloesch is of the opinion that Wesley renewed and complemented Evangelical theology which had been biased towards justification by his emphasis on sanctification.<sup>13</sup>

On the other hand, Wesley’s emphasis on Christian holy life gave him the reputation of a theologian who was close to Roman Catholicism,<sup>14</sup> or Arminianism or Pelagianism, or enthusiasm, though such assessments have their distinctive nuances. George C. Cell deemed Wesley’s perfection the “synthesis of the Protestant’s ethics of grace and the Catholic ethics of holiness.”<sup>15</sup> Kenneth J Collins also regards “the dual emphasis of forgiveness and renewal, the appreciation of the insights of both Protestantism and

---

<sup>8</sup> Albert Outler, “The Place of Wesley in the Christian Tradition,” in *The Place of Wesley in the Christian Tradition*, ed. by Kenneth E. Rowe (Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, 1976), p. 14.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* p. 29.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* p. 30.

<sup>11</sup> Colin W. Williams, *John Wesley’s Theology Today* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959), pp. 176-178.

<sup>12</sup> Kenneth J. Collins, *Scripture Way of Salvation: The Heart of John Wesley’s Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), p.207; cf. A. Outler mentioned that Wesley “proceeded to develop a theological fusion of faith and good works, scripture and tradition, revelation and reason, God’s sovereignty and human freedom, universal redemption and conditional election, Christian liberty and an ordered polity, the assurance of pardon and the risks of falling from grace, original sin and Christian perfection.” A. Outler, ed., *John Wesley* (London: Oxford, 1964), preface, iv; cf. Francis Young holds that in Wesley’s theology, “the individual and the community, the personal and the corporate, like Law and Gospel, Old Testament and New Testament, rationalism and emotionalism, were welded inseparably together.” Francis Young, “The Significance of John Wesley’s Conversion Experience,” in *John Wesley: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. by John Stacey with an introduction by Frank Baker (London: Epworth Press, 1988), p.43.

<sup>13</sup> Donald G. Bloesch, *Essentials of Evangelical Theology*, Vol.1 (Sanfrancisco: Harper & Row Co., 1978), p.2.

<sup>14</sup> Woodrow W. Whidden mentions that “Wesley’s troubling qualifiers in regard to “imputed righteousness” certainly make it appear that he was headed back to Rome,” in his article, “Wesley on Imputation: A Truly Reckoned Reality or Antinomian Polemical Wreckage,” *The Asbury Theological Journal* Vol. 52, no. 2 (1997): 65; Collins notes that Wesley’s emphasis on the necessity of repentance and its fruits antecedent to justification “made him look like a Roman Catholic in the eyes of the Calvinists.” K. J. Collins, *John Wesley: A Theological Journey* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2003), p.222, 217.

<sup>15</sup> George C. Cell, *The Rediscovery of John Wesley* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1935), p.361.

Catholicism” as “one of Wesley’s most distinctive Soteriological fingerprints.”<sup>16</sup> Luke L. Keefer, Jr. has noted that Wesley “walked a narrow ledge between Calvinism and Pelagianism in regard to sin, free will, and the nature of saving faith.”<sup>17</sup> He has claimed that Wesley’s Arminianism is Anglicized and personalized, and is integrative rather than systematized, and is pastorally motivated.<sup>18</sup> Robert A. Mattke mentioned that Wesley “charted a course between Pietism on the one hand and Anglicanism on the other.”<sup>19</sup> Woodrow W. Whidden points out Wesley suffered from suspicions that he was a Pelagian, synergist, Roman moralist, or legalist.<sup>20</sup> To advocate himself, Wesley claimed that his theology was “within a hair’s breadth” “both from Calvinism and Antinomianism.”<sup>21</sup>

Maddox points out that such phenomena as “outcries, convulsions, and trances,” as the side-effects of Wesley’s early form of awakening sermons between 1739- 1744, opened him to “accusations of enthusiasm.”<sup>22</sup> Kenneth J. Collins also mentions that Wesley was often designated as an “enthusiast” or fanatic by his eighteenth-century detractors.<sup>23</sup> B.B. Warfield claimed that it was John Wesley who “infected the modern Protestant world with this notion of ‘entire instantaneous sanctification.’”<sup>24</sup> Collin W. Williams noted that Wesley’s doctrine of perfection based on conscious sin “led easily to a failure to take seriously the depth of unexamined prejudices and inward sins.”<sup>25</sup>

As observed above, we can see that Wesley was an influential theologian who emphasised sanctification. At the same time, such observations insinuate that it is worthwhile to study whether Wesley’s teaching of sanctification is really biblical or not, in which aspect his doctrine is different from Calvin’s, what characteristics his doctrine of sanctification has, and whether other theologians’ critiques of Wesley’s doctrine of sanctification are pertinent or not.

---

<sup>16</sup> Kenneth J. Collins, *Scripture Way of Salvation: The Heart of John Wesley’s Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), p.101.

<sup>17</sup> Luke L. Keefer, “Characteristics of Wesley’s Arminianism,” *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 22 (1987): 90.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 88-97.

<sup>19</sup> Robert A. Mattke, “The Baptism of the Holy Spirit as Related to the Work of Entire Sanctification,” *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 5-1 (1970): 24.

<sup>20</sup> Woodrow W. Whidden, “Wesley on Imputation: A Truly Reckoned Reality or Antinomian Polemical Wreckage,” *The Asbury Theological Journal* Vol. 52, no. 2 (1997): 63.

<sup>21</sup> Works 8, 284 - 285. “A. Indeed it does; as it were, within a hair’s breadth: So that it is altogether foolish and sinful, because we do not quite agree either with one or the other, to run from them as far as ever we can.”

<sup>22</sup> Randy L. Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley’s Practical Theology* (Nashville, Kingwood Books, 1994), p. 161.

<sup>23</sup> Kenneth J. Collins, *Scripture Way of Salvation: The Heart of John Wesley’s Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), p.131.

<sup>24</sup> Benjamin B. Warfield, *Perfectionism* 2:562.

<sup>25</sup> C. W. Williams, *John Wesley’s Theology Today* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960), p.180.

### 3.1.2 Wesley's Response to the Theological Trends of His Times

J. Ernest Rattenbury noted that “Catholic and Lutheran, Anglican and Moravian influences were all blended in Wesley.”<sup>26</sup> His notion is similar to Cell’s evaluation that Wesley maintained a balance between Catholic and Lutheran theology, Legalism and Moravian mystic quietism.<sup>27</sup> We may add to it that Wesley avoided the extremities of both formalism and enthusiasm. His doctrine of sanctification is said to be formed under the influence of German Pietism, but he rejected passive, quietistic antinomianism and accentuated participation in Christ rather than union with Christ, or Christ as our pattern. Wesley certainly was a man of the Anglican Church, and generally acceded to her doctrine, but rejected her formal law and institutions. Wesley’s relationship with the Anglican Church is dealt with mainly at ‘3.2.10.1 The Church: Unity and Schism.’

#### 3.1.2.1 Formalism

Wesley suggested the depiction of a good Christian held by most Anglican leaders in the eighteenth century as typical of a formal Christian. They understood a religious man as

one that is honest, just and fair in his dealings; that is constantly at church and sacrament; and that gives much alms, or (as it is usually termed) does much good.<sup>28</sup>

For Wesley, such a man is not a real Christian but an altogether Christian. He exclaimed to nominal Christians, “Away with names! Away with opinions!”<sup>29</sup> He deemed such a formal Christian to be produced by a lifeless formal religion having “the form of godliness, but not the power.”<sup>30</sup>

In regard to the difference between formal religion and authentic religion, Wesley explicated it as follows. *First*, in contrast to formal religion, which laid stress on “any ritual observances,” indeed, in any outward thing whatever” or “orthodoxy or right opinions” belonging to the understanding,<sup>31</sup> true religion laid emphasis on the fruit of the Spirit springing from God and inward change.<sup>32</sup> *Secondly*, while love in formal religion is obligatory, love in true religion is relational, which generates from the experience of God’s

---

<sup>26</sup> J. Ernest Rattenbury, *The Conversion of the Wesleys* (London: The Epworth Press, 1938), p.173.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Wesley observed that “a good Methodist would be a happy mixture of the Mystic and the Pharisee.” George Croft Cell, *The Rediscovery of John Wesley* (New York: Hendry Holt and Company, Inc., 1935), pp. 347-348.

<sup>28</sup> Journal Nov. 25, 1739: *Works* 1, 250; 7, 263.

<sup>29</sup> The Almost Christian 1, 10-11: *Works* 1, 136. For the characteristics of an altogether Christian, see Letters to the Rev. Dr. Middleton, 4, 1, 3-14: *Works* 10, 67-71.

<sup>30</sup> The Character of a Methodist: *Works* 8, 346.

<sup>31</sup> *NT Note* on Eph. 6:18.

<sup>32</sup> *Works* 10, 67-71; A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion I, 1, 3: *Works* 8, 47.

love.<sup>33</sup> *Thirdly*, while faith in formal religion is defined as only “a speculative, rational,” “cold, lifeless assent,” faith in true religion is defined as “a divine evidence or conviction” accompanying the experience of God’s love and forgiveness,<sup>34</sup> and offering a spiritual sense of God like “the eye of the soul” to see what is invisible in God, “the ear of the soul” to hear the voice of God, “the palate of the soul” to taste the powers of the world to come.<sup>35</sup> *Fourthly*, formalism presupposes that grace is automatically, mechanically given to us through an institution, in other words, it is inherent in the means of grace, but Wesley understood that the Spirit works in a relational and personal way.<sup>36</sup>

Briefly, Wesley rejected formalism because it could not offer the presence of God nor emphasise the experience of God’s presence and the fruit of the Spirit. This was connected with the transformation of Christian life and became the characteristics of his doctrine of entire sanctification.

### 3.1.2.2 Arminianism

David Bennett holds that “Wesley certainly thought of himself as an Arminian from the time of his controversial sermon on free grace in 1740 to his publication of the Arminian Magazine in January 1778.”<sup>37</sup> Rather different from Bennet, Luke L. Keefer Jr. notes, “The Methodists would call themselves Arminians, but they were more the cousins of Arminius than they were his direct descendants” because Wesleyan Arminianism “was Anglicized and personalized.”<sup>38</sup> Keefer’s approach seems more probable than Bennett’s, but both of them agree with each other on the point that Wesley followed Arminius’ fundamental thoughts.<sup>39</sup>

In his sermon on Free Grace in 1740, Wesley rejected limited grace and atonement for the elect,<sup>40</sup> double predestination, especially reprobation from eternity.<sup>41</sup> Instead of these positions, he supported the view of free grace in all and for all,<sup>42</sup> and conditional election

---

<sup>33</sup> See ‘3.2.4.5.1.3 Love.’

<sup>34</sup> *Works* 7, 326.

<sup>35</sup> *Works* 7, 349-54.

<sup>36</sup> See ‘3.2.7 The Means of Sanctification.’

<sup>37</sup> David Bennett, “How Arminian was John Wesley?,” *The Evangelical Quarterly*, Vol.72, no.3 (2000): 237.

<sup>38</sup> Luke L. Keefer, “Characteristics of Wesley’s Arminianism,” *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 22 (1987): 90, 91.

<sup>39</sup> Bennett, *op. cit.*, p. 248; Keefer, *ibid.*, p. 91.

<sup>40</sup> Sermon CXXVIII Free Grace: *Works* 7, 380-381; Cameron “Arminius-Hero, or Heretic,” *Evangelical Quarterly*, Vol. 64, no.3 (July, 1992): 221-223; see ‘3.2.1.3.1 Atonement.’

<sup>41</sup> Sermon CXXVIII Free Grace: *Works* 7, 374-379. He suggested the four reasons of his objection; first, it makes all preaching vain, secondly, it “tends to destroy the comfort of religion, the happiness of Christianity,” thirdly, it “tends to destroy our zeal for good works,” fourthly, it has a “tendency to overthrow the whole Christian Revelation.”

<sup>42</sup> Sermon CXXVIII Free Grace 2: *Works* 7, 373.

“according to the foreknowledge of God.”<sup>43</sup>

In The Question “What is an Arminian? Answered by A Lover or Free Grace,” he sided with Jacobus Arminius in regard to original sin and justification by faith.

No man that ever lived, not John Calvin himself ever asserted either original sin or justification by faith, in more strong, more clear and express terms, than Arminius has done.<sup>44</sup>

Still, almost similar to Calvinism, he admitted the total depravity of natural humanity,<sup>45</sup> but it does not mean that people cannot do good deeds at all, because prevenient grace recovers human conscience to some extent.<sup>46</sup> For Wesley, justification by faith is different from Calvinism in the sense that he regarded good works as a necessary condition for final justification.<sup>47</sup>

Wesley compared Arminianism with Calvinism on three points. Calvinists hold to absolute double predestination from eternity and limited atonement for the elect, while Arminians hold to conditional predestination based on one’s faith in Christ, and Christ’s unlimited atonement for all that died in Adam.<sup>48</sup> Secondly, the former holds the saving grace of God to be absolutely irresistible, while the latter holds that although it is sometimes irresistible, “in general any man may resist” it.<sup>49</sup> Thirdly, for the former, predestination is absolutely unconditional, but for the latter, it is conditional.<sup>50</sup> Carl Bangs notes that on perseverance, Wesley was more negative than Arminius, in the sense that the former claimed all the saints may fall away, while the latter held the elect could not fall away because “election to salvation comprehends within its limits not only faith but likewise perseverance in faith,”<sup>51</sup> though believers may fall away.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> Sermon CXXVIII Free Grace 29: *Works* 7, 385.

<sup>44</sup> *Works* 10, 359.

<sup>45</sup> Man is “by nature...earthly, sensual, and devilish.” Sermon VI. The Righteousness of Faith, 2, 5: *Works* 5, 72; cf. James Arminius, *The Writings of James Arminius*, Nichols, tr. from *the Latin*. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1956), 2: 192. “...the Free Will of man towards the True Good is not only wounded, maimed, infirm, bent, and [attenuatum] weakened; but it is also [captivatum] imprisoned, destroyed, and lost...it has no powers whatever except such as are excited by Divine grace.”

<sup>46</sup> Predestination Calmly Considered: *Works* 10, 229 f.; also see ‘3.2.1.4.1 Prevenient Grace.’

<sup>47</sup> See ‘3.2.4.2 Positional Sanctification: Justification.’

<sup>48</sup> *Works* 10, 359-360; *Works* 1, 426-427. See 3.2.8.1 Predestination and Sanctification in this thesis.

<sup>49</sup> *Works* 10, 360; cf. J. Arminius, *The Writings of James Arminius*, Nichols, tr. from *the Latin*. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1956), 2: 721. “All unregenerate persons have freedom of will, and a capability of resisting the Holy Spirit, of rejecting the proffered grace of God.”

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>51</sup> J. Arminius, *Nine Questions in Writings*, 1: 385.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.* “Believers are sometimes so circumstanced as not to produce...(any) confidence or trust in God and Christ”; Carl Bangs, *Arminius: A Study in the Dutch Reformation* (Grand Rapids: F. Asbury Press, 1985), p. 349.



To summarise, Wesley was considerably influenced by Jacobus Arminius' thoughts.<sup>53</sup> He adapted Arminianism adequately to his situation in his pastoral perspective. Particular issues will be separately dealt with in relevant aspects.

### 3.1.2.3 Rationalism and Deism

From the late 17<sup>th</sup> century, the Anglican Church began to experience the effect of rationalism in religion. A leader of this movement, John Locke understood morality as the primary content of religion and considered reasonableness as the test of truth.<sup>54</sup> Rationalism had developed in reaction to the sufferings and "the brutalities of the crusades." In England, rationalism conversed with Deism and strengthened its power still more.

Edward Herbert of Cherbury (1583-1648) alleged that natural religion is universal to all mankind.<sup>55</sup> In his book *Christianity Not Mysterious* (1696), John Toland overtly removed the prophecies and the miracles from the Bible. By the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century, whatever is outside reason was regarded as superstition. At the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, the English people already refused to consider "mystic inner light" as "a correct method of imparting knowledge."<sup>56</sup> Deism extolled reason to the skies and supernaturalism was considered utterly doubtful. Deists did "not receive Scripture as the oracles of God."<sup>57</sup> Tindal's *Christianity As Old As Creation* "encapsulated the prevailing spirit of believing in God but not His word."<sup>58</sup> The pulpit of the church was filled with indifference, irreligion, secular philosophy, and a pessimistic spirit.<sup>59</sup> The weakening of the Gospel resulted in the moral corruption of all the classes of England, especially, drunkenness, adultery, and debauchery.<sup>60</sup>

Accordingly, it is not surprising that in such a situation, Wesley' theology was oriented to the emphasis on experience of the religion and the renovation of Christian life in the society of England.

### 3.1.2.4 Moravian Mystic Quietism

According to A. Outler, Wesley was influenced by three mystical traditions: the voluntaristic mysticism represented by à Kempis, Law, and Catniza; the quietistic

---

<sup>53</sup> For the relationship between the Anglican Church and Arminius, see Keefer, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

<sup>54</sup> Mbennah & Vorster, *op. cit.*, p. 173.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 174.

<sup>57</sup> Sermon LXX. The Case of Reason Impartially Considered 3-4; *Works* 6, 351.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 174-175.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 175.

<sup>60</sup> R. G. Tuttle Jr. *John Wesley: His life and theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978), p. 31-32.

mysticism by Molinos, Guyon, de Sales; the mysticism of early and eastern spirituality,<sup>61</sup> by Clement, Origen, Ephrem, and Macarius.<sup>62</sup>

Among these mysticisms, Wesley objected to Moravian quietistic mysticism. Though he agreed with the Moravians when they “combined their evangelical doctrine of faith with a strong mystical ethic,” he criticized them and broke the relationship with them when they inclined to quietistic antinomianism and drifted towards moral laxity.<sup>63</sup> As Collins puts it,<sup>64</sup> some of the quietists in Wesley’s age were influenced by the Lutheran tradition,<sup>65</sup> which held that those justified by faith in Christ were free from the law, and certainly from keeping commandments, since they were not under the law but under grace. The quietists claimed that because faith by and large is given only through hearing the preached word, not through using such means of grace as the Lord’s Supper, prayer, fasting and reading Scripture,<sup>66</sup> “one must do nothing but quietly attend the Voice of the Lord.”<sup>67</sup> Wesley considered such a view as overt antinomianism.<sup>68</sup> In contradiction to their claim that without assurance, nobody may use the ordinances of God, especially the Lord’s Supper, he contended that such men may use the means of grace whenever they meet any chance.<sup>69</sup>

After 1738, Wesley objected to all kinds of teachings that encouraged the contemplative, solitary, or passive life.<sup>70</sup> Instead of the hermitic ideal, he enthusiastically pursued social holiness. He also rejected their claim that darkness in the way to perfection

---

<sup>61</sup> A. Outler, *John Wesley*, pp. 251-252 and 275.

<sup>62</sup> Michael J. Christensen, “Theosis and Sanctification: John Wesley’s Reformulation of A Patristic Doctrine,” *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 31-2 (1996): 91.

<sup>63</sup> Robert G. Tuttle. *John Wesley: His Life and Theology*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978), pp.332-333.

<sup>64</sup> Kenneth J. Collins, *Scripture Way of Salvation: The Heart of John Wesley’s Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), p.161.

<sup>65</sup> Wesley saw Luther as “the real spring of the grand error of the Moravians”: Nehemiah Curnock, ed., *The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley* (London: Epworth, 1909-1916), II: 467. Hereafter, it is written Journal II: 467; cf. According to Gordon Rupp, Luther “disposed of antinomians and mystical quietists in phrases more violent than had any place in John Wesley’s genteel vocabulary.” *The Righteousness of God* (New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1953), p. 46. Also see Leo George, *John Wesley’s Concept of Perfection*, (Ph. D diss., University of Iowa. An Arbor, UMI, 1959), p. 110. We may say late Luther opposed antinomianism, while early Luther was antinomianistic.

<sup>66</sup> Journal Dec. 22, 1747, section 9: *Works* 2, 79. “...as for fasting, abstinence, and self-denial, you with the Moravians, trampled it under foot”; for more, see *Works* 2, 27-28.

<sup>67</sup> Nicholas von Zinzendorf, *Sixteen Discourses on The Redemption of Man by the Death of Christ, Preached at Berlin* (London: Printed for James Hutton, 1742), pp. 20-21; Rogers Charles Allen, *The Concept of Prevenient Grace in the Theology of John Wesley* (Ph. D. diss., Duke University. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1967), p. 267.

<sup>68</sup> Also See ‘3.2.9.3 An Antinomian or A Legalist?’

<sup>69</sup> Answer to the Rev. Mr. Church: *Works* 8, 377 and 404. “I could not agree, either that none has any faith, so long as he is liable to any doubt or fear; or that, till we have it, we ought to abstain from the ordinances of God.”

<sup>70</sup> *Works* 7, 515.

was necessary because he thought darkness resulted only from sin.<sup>71</sup> For Wesley, the term of communion with Christ was preferred to that of mystical union with Him because the latter can imply that human nature is swallowed into divinity.<sup>72</sup>

To sum up, as Michael Christensen aptly notes,<sup>73</sup> while Wesley accepted some elements of the Patristic tradition and voluntaristic mysticism in his thought of sanctification, he criticized quietistic mysticism for passivity, solitude and an antinoministic tendency.

### 3.1.2.5 German Pietism

As Kenneth J Collins aptly puts it, German Pietism grew out of the reaction against the tendency towards formality and impersonality due to the scholasticism of the sixteenth and seventeenth century orthodoxy, and against the moral anomy due to religious wars such as the Thirty Years War.<sup>74</sup> Wesley was primarily influenced by the writings of Johann Arndt (*Wahres Christenthum*),<sup>75</sup> Philip Jacob Spener (*Pia Desideria*),<sup>76</sup> and August Hermann Francke (*Pietas Hallensis, Nicodemus*).<sup>77</sup> From the *True Christianity* of Arndt, Wesley learned three themes<sup>78</sup>: one is that there are the different developmental stages of Christian life; the second is that true religion lies in inward renewal rather than external change<sup>79</sup>; the last one is that purity of doctrine is maintained by holy life, not by exhaustive dispute.<sup>80</sup> He also seems to have taken a hint from Francke's writings in writing his sermons on *The Almost Christian*, and *Scriptural Christianity*, especially in distinguishing almost

---

<sup>71</sup> *Works* 2, 249; Susanna Winkworth, tr., *Theologia Germanica* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1907), p. 38. "Christ's soul must need descend into hell, before it ascended into heaven, so must also the soul of man." Kenneth J. Collins, "John Wesley's Critical Appropriation of Early German Pietism," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 22 (1992): 76.

<sup>72</sup> Kenneth J. Collins, "John Wesley's Critical Appropriation of Early German Pietism," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 22 (1992): 77.

<sup>73</sup> Michael J. Christensen, "Theosis and Sanctification: John Wesley's Reformulation of A Patristic Doctrine," *Wesleyan Theological Journal*, Vol. 31, no.2 (1996): 71.

<sup>74</sup> Kenneth J. Collins, *op. cit.* pp. 58-60.

<sup>75</sup> See Journal August 8, 1738. "But at twenty-two, meeting with Arndt's 'True Christianity,' I found I myself was not a Christian": *Works* 1, 139.

<sup>76</sup> Though Wesley probably never read Spener himself, he is said to be indirectly influenced by Spener, because Francke owed Spener who owed Arndt, Wesley read Arndt and Francke. Wesley's society and the principles to run it are very similar to Spener's *collegia pietatis* and the principles to run it. Collins, *op. cit.*, 66-67.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 60-72.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. K. J. Collins, "The Motif of Real Christianity in the Writings of John Wesley," *The Asbury Theological Journal* 49 (Spr., 1994): 49-62.

<sup>79</sup> Wesley stressed a similar theme in his sermon on "The Way to the Kingdom": *Works* 1, 77-78 and "The Circumcision of the Heart": *Works* 1, 202-212.

<sup>80</sup> Journal From November 19, 1751: *Works* 1, 247.

Christians from altogether Christians, and nominal Christianity from real Christianity.<sup>81</sup>

On the other hand, J. Steven O'Malley focuses on the influence of Rhineland spirituality on Wesley. This spirituality "began with the Dominican mysticism of Johan Tauler (1300-1361) and proceeded to the distinctive Reformed spirituality of Gerhard Tersteegen (1697-1769)."<sup>82</sup> It contributed to Wesley's spiritual formation, as a corrective to the increasingly legalistic piety of Halle, which emphasised "penitential struggle" as the precondition of one's climactic "*Durchbruch*" into the assurance of pardon and adoption in Christ,<sup>83</sup> and to "immediate and complete" sanctification of Zinzendorf.<sup>84</sup> Tersteegen's piety influenced Wesley's mature thought of perfection, though Moravian piety offered him assurance of immediate transformation at the beginning of his theological journey.<sup>85</sup>

Admitting such similarities, Collins does not regard Wesley as one of the Pietists for the reason that Wesley did not emphasise mortification so much, nor view perfection as union with God.<sup>86</sup> Rather, Wesley is considered as an English evangelist in that he was closely connected with Anglicanism and the Apostolic Fathers. Though Wesley stressed Christian piety, he may be viewed as an evangelist rather than a Pietist because he worked for the expansion of the Gospel and focused on Christ. He emphasised Christ our Redeemer, while criticizing the bias of Pietism to Christ our Pattern.

### 3.1.2.6 Enthusiasm

Wesley was accused of religious enthusiasm by the Anglicans when he preached instant conversion and emphasised the experience of the work of the Holy Spirit.<sup>87</sup> In reply to this critique, he newly defined enthusiasm according to his own perspective distinctive from theirs.

In 1750 Wesley understood enthusiasm as "a disorder of the mind", "a species of

---

<sup>81</sup> Francke noted, "Nothing is a more fatal hindrance of man's salvation, than the false conceit that he is already a Christian." August Herman Francke, *Nicodemus in A Christian Library: Consisting of Extracts from and Abridgments of the Choicest Pieces of Practical Divinity Which Have Been Published in the English Tongue*, John Wesley, ed. and comp. 30 Vols. (London: J. Kershaw, 1826; reprint of 1<sup>st</sup> ed. 50 Vols. London, 1749-1755), 29: 482; he also noted, "There is not true faith without holiness of heart and life...the true boldness of faith is known by its continually working by love." *Ibid.*, 29: 492; see Collins, *op. cit.*, p. 71. Given that Francke's warning of almost Christian and his definition of true truth are very similar to Wesley's, Wesley seems to have been affected by Francke's writings.

<sup>82</sup> J. Steven O'Malley, "Pietistic Influence on John Wesley: Wesley and Gerhard Tersteegen," *Wesleyan Theological Society* 31 (1996): 49.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 51.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 70.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>86</sup> Collins, *op. cit.*, p. 78; Cf. A. Outler was also of the opinion that Wesley "was never the typical Pietist." A. Outler, ed., *John Wesley* (London: Oxford, 1964), preface, iii.

<sup>87</sup> W. Stephen Gunter, *The Limits of "Love Divine": John Wesley's Response to Antinomianism and Enthusiasm* (Nashville, TN: Kingswood, 1989), pp.271.

madness.”<sup>88</sup> They drew right conclusions from a wrong hypothesis. For example, they imputed “something to God which ought not to be imputed to him.”<sup>89</sup> Wesley suggested three types of enthusiasm. The first type is “those who imagine they have the grace which they have not.” They imagine they were saved without deep repentance.<sup>90</sup> Despite their pride, ungodliness, and passion, they think themselves to be Christians.<sup>91</sup> The second type is “those who imagine they have such gifts from God as they have not” e.g., healing power or prophecy.<sup>92</sup> A little later, their gifts are usually proved false. They think their prayer and preaching are influenced by the Spirit, or they are particularly directed by the Spirit without any rational or scriptural ground.<sup>93</sup> Wesley strongly criticized them in particular for considering the dreams of their own imagination to be revelations from God,<sup>94</sup> because most of them are “absurd, self-inconsistent dreams of a heated imagination,”<sup>95</sup> though they may be from God, or nature, or the devil. For Wesley, God’s direction in an individual is discerned commonly by law and testimony.<sup>96</sup> A general rule to discern whether a vision or dream comes from God is to observe whether it corresponds to the will of God for our sanctification. More details are judged by our rationality and experience.<sup>97</sup> The third type of enthusiasm is “those who think to attain the end without using the means by the immediate power of God.” They think they can understand the Bible without reading and meditating on it, or they can speak to the congregation without preparation.<sup>98</sup> This attitude caused Anglican clergy to criticize the Methodists for “deprecation of learning.”<sup>99</sup> The fourth type is those who imagine “those things to be owing to the providence of God which are not owing thereto.”<sup>100</sup> They ascribed the governing of God to his providence. Wesley deemed it “a plain breach of the third commandment.” He concluded that enthusiasm produced pride, which “dries up the springs of faith and love, of righteousness and true holiness” and accompanied “unadvisableness” and “stubbornness.”<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>88</sup> Sermon XXXVII. The Nature of Enthusiasm 11: *Works* 5, 469.

<sup>89</sup> *Works* 5, 470.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>91</sup> *Works* 5, 471.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 472.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 472-473.

<sup>94</sup> *Works* 7, 211; also see “Plain Account of Christian Perfection, Q 33 and its Answer”: *Works* 11,428 “Do not easily suppose dreams, voices, impressions, visions, or revelations to be from God”; *Works* 5, 478. Do not trust “in visions or dreams; in sudden impressions, or strong impulses of any kind.”

<sup>95</sup> *Works* 7, 211.

<sup>96</sup> Sermon XXXVII. The Nature of Enthusiasm, 22: *Works* 5, 474.

<sup>97</sup> Sermon XXXVII. The Nature of Enthusiasm, 23, 24: *Works* 5, 474.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 475.

<sup>99</sup> W. Stephen Gunter, *The Limits of “Love Divine”: John Wesley’s Response to Antinomianism and Enthusiasm* (Nashville, TN: Kingswood, 1989), p. 30.

<sup>100</sup> Sermon XXXVII. The Nature of Enthusiasm, 23, 24: *Works* 5, 474.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.* p. 476.

In his Journal of Oct. 29, 1762, Wesley manifested his opinions of enthusiasm in a similar tone. He also showed his abhorrence of Maxfield's contentions that "a justified person is not in Christ, or born of God, or sanctified, or a temple of the Holy Spirit"; a man saved from sins needs "no self-examination, no times of private prayer."<sup>102</sup> In his "Farther Thoughts Upon Christian Perfection," Wesley complained that enthusiasts claimed the instantaneous attainment of perfection, but renounced any responsible growth before perfection.<sup>103</sup> Rejecting their view that perfect sanctification is a requisite for final salvation, Wesley designated it a privilege of all Christians as a gift of God's grace.<sup>104</sup>

In conclusion, though admitting as pertinent some elements of enthusiasm like "instantaneous conversion," "the direct witness of the Spirit," and "the experiential proof of conversion,"<sup>105</sup> Wesley objected to other elements because of their irrationality and faulty presuppositions.<sup>106</sup> Briefly, enthusiasm was considered as a dreadful enemy of sanctification. This will be reflected in '5.3.1.2 Harmony between Spirituality and Rationality' and '5.3.1.3 Maintaining a Balance between Antinomianism and Legalism.'

### 3.1.3 Wesley's Conversion: Experience at Aldersgate

It is worthwhile to observe Wesley's experience at Aldersgate because it became an important turning point in his theological journey, determining his understanding of justification by faith and the instantaneousness of sanctification. There have been claims and diverse opinions about its meaning by many theologians.

Albert C Outler claimed, "Aldersgate was not the time when John Wesley became a 'real Christian.'"<sup>107</sup> Theodore W. Jennings Jr. held that Aldersgate was not a decisive turning point in Wesley's life because "there is no change in his doctrine or practice that is in any way associated with May, 1738."<sup>108</sup> He contended, "In his later years Wesley never spoke of Aldersgate."<sup>109</sup> He indicated the time of Wesley's conversion as 1725.<sup>110</sup> But his contention was strongly refuted by Kenneth J. Collins. According to Collins, Wesley referred to Aldersgate at least five times in his later years.<sup>111</sup> Randy Maddox also criticized

---

<sup>102</sup> *Works* 3, 119-121.

<sup>103</sup> "Farther Thoughts Upon Christian Perfection, Q.9": *Works* 11,417.

<sup>104</sup> Sermon LXXXIX. The More Excellence Way, 8: *Works* 7, 29. "I do not affirm that all who do not walk in this way are in the high road to hell."

<sup>105</sup> Letters XXIV "To the Rev. Samuel Wesley, May 10, 1739: *Works* 12, 36-37. Wesley referred to some ecstatic phenomenon; Cf. W. Stephen Gunter, *The Limits of "Love Divine": John Wesley's Response to Antinomianism and Enthusiasm* (Nashville, TN: Kingswood, 1989), p.136; see also foot note no.75 and 76.

<sup>106</sup> Sermon CXXXII. Preached on Monday, April 21st 1777: *Works* 8, 426.

<sup>107</sup> Albert C. Outler, "Beyond Pietism: Aldersgate in Context," *Motive* (May 1963): 12.

<sup>108</sup> Theodore W. Jennings. Jr., "John Wesley Against Aldersgate," *Quarterly Review* 8 (Fall 1988), p. 5.

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 19.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 20.

<sup>111</sup> Kenneth J. Collins, "The Continuing Significance of Aldersgate: A Response to 'John Wesley Against



the predominant interpretation of Aldersgate that Wesley was converted in 1738 “from a pre-Christian moralist into a true Christian believer.”<sup>112</sup> John Cobb mentions that Wesley was a Christian prior to Aldersgate.<sup>113</sup> Ralph Del Colle views Wesley’s experience on Aldersgate Street on 24 May 1738 as his second conversion, one which “consolidated his understanding of the doctrine of justification by faith.”<sup>114</sup> Wesley was firstly converted to a life of devoting himself to God in 1725.<sup>115</sup> The time when he became a Christian is considered as long before 1725, given that he was born and raised in a Christian family.<sup>116</sup> Colle contends that the experimental foundation for his later doctrine of Christian perfection was his first conversion rather than the experience in 1738. However, his claim seems rather implausible because the conversion without the proper understanding of the gospel cannot be called real Christian conversion. Furthermore, Wesley’s view of Christian perfection also underwent a significant change after justification by faith in Christ.

Strange as it sounds, Wesley called himself an honest heathen even in 1766. “[I do not love God. I never did]. Therefore [I am only an] honest heathen, a proselyte of the Temple, one of the ‘fearers of God.’”<sup>117</sup> Wesley’s statement confuses us because it means that he is not a Christian even after his experience at Aldersgate (1938).

For a more reasonable conclusion, Wesley’s own testimony of his experience at Aldersgate must be considered. In January 1738, he suffered from unbelief, which stemmed from not fixing his faith on its right object, Christ. Until then, Wesley had had “only faith in God, not faith in or through Christ,”<sup>118</sup> It seems to mean that he was lacking in assurance of justification by faith in Christ rather than totally ignorant of Christ. On 24<sup>th</sup> of May in 1738 he experienced in living faith accompanied by assurance.<sup>119</sup>

In the evening I went very unwillingly to a society in Aldersgate-  
Street, where one was reading Luther’s preface to the Epistle to the

---

Aldersgate,” *Quarterly Review* 8 (1988): 95. Connecting Wesley’s experience at Aldersgate with justification by faith, he presents Wesley’s statements -letter to John Newton in 1765, the letter to Dr. Erskine in 1765, his Sermon “The Lord Our Righteousness” in 1765, and his notions of justification by faith in 1772 and in 1778 - as the evidence according to which Wesley several times referred to Aldersgate, even in his later years.

<sup>112</sup> Randy Maddox, ed., *Aldersgate Reconsidered* (Nashville: Kingswood Books, 1990), p.13.

<sup>113</sup> John B. Cobb, Jr., *Grace and Responsibility: A Wesleyan Theology for Today* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995), p. 64.

<sup>114</sup> Ralph Del Colle, “John Wesley’s Doctrine of Grace in Light of the Christian Tradition,” *International Journal of Systematic Theology*, Vol. 4, no. 2 (2002): 173.

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 173: also see Frank Whaling, ed., *John and Charles Wesley* (New York: Paulist Press, 1981), p. 103.

<sup>116</sup> Ralph Del Colle, *op. cit.*, pp. 173-174.

<sup>117</sup> Telford, *Letters*, 5:16 (Charles Wesley, June 27, 1776); Kenneth J. Collins, *Scripture Way of Salvation: The Heart of John Wesley’s Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), p.144.

<sup>118</sup> *Works* 1, 100-101.

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.*, p.102.



Romans. About a quarter before nine, while he was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone for salvation: And an assurance was given me that he had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death.<sup>120</sup>

Wesley understood “peace and victory over sin” to be “essential to faith in the Captain of our salvation.”<sup>121</sup> He depicted the difference between his state before this experience and his state after it. “I was striving, yea, fighting with all my might under the law, as well as under grace. But then I was sometimes, if not often, conquered; now, I was always conqueror.”<sup>122</sup> Of course, it was not the level of perfect sanctification but that of assurance of justification.

In a letter to his brother Samuel on October 30, 1738, he confessed that he was not a Christian until May 24<sup>th</sup> in 1738 in the sense that sin had dominance over him.

By a Christian, I mean one who so believes in Christ, as that sin hath no more dominion over him: And in this obvious sense of the word, I was not a Christian till May the 24th last past. For till then sin had the dominion over me, although I fought with it continually; but surely, then, from that time to this it hath not<sup>123</sup>

Since his experience at Aldersgate, by the grace of God, he attained freedom and victory over sin.<sup>124</sup> This implies that Wesley thought himself as an almost Christian of the eighteenth-century England Church before May 24, 1738.

For some time Wesley set the standpoint of a real Christian too high. A real Christian was ascribed to those having the fruit of the Holy Spirit, which implies that a real Christian was equal to an entirely sanctified Christian. On October 30, 1738, he called “those who have not yet received joy in the Holy Ghost, the love of God, and the plerophory of faith (πληροφορία πίστεως)” Christians in an imperfect sense, including himself (parenthesis is my addition).<sup>125</sup> In his Journal on January 4, 1739, he confessed, “I affirm, I am not a Christian now...But that I am not a Christian at this day, I as surely know, as that Jesus is the Christ. For a Christian is one who has the fruit of the Spirit of Christ, which are love, peace, joy. But these I have not.”<sup>126</sup> At the latter, he once again confessed, “Though I have

---

<sup>120</sup> *Works* 1, 103.

<sup>121</sup> *Works* 1, 103.

<sup>122</sup> *Works* 1, 103-104.

<sup>123</sup> *Works* 12, 33.

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>125</sup> *Works* 12, 34.

<sup>126</sup> *Works* 1, 170-171. Robert G. Tuttle regarded this as “indicative of a rather irresponsible Arminian

constantly used all the means of grace for twenty years, I am not a Christian,” for “I have not the fruit of the Spirit of Christ.”<sup>127</sup> This means that he was justified by his faith in Christ, but he was not entirely sanctified. To put it in another way, he equated a real Christian with an entirely sanctified Christian.

Those statements of Wesley’s caused Theodore W. Jennings, Jr. to underestimate the meaning of Aldersgate because there was no particular change in Wesley’s spiritual condition, as though he was not yet a Christian before Aldersgate.<sup>128</sup> In his journal on January 4, 1739, “a Christian” means a real Christian, i.e., a perfect Christian or a mature Christian. However, because at that time Wesley knew Jesus as his Christ who forgave his sins, he was already a Christian, though he was not entirely sanctified. Therefore, the claim of Theodore W. Jennings, Jr. that Wesley’s experience at Aldersgate does not have any particular significance in his conversion seems impertinent. Jennings seems to miss the change in Wesley’s conception of a Christian. Later, Wesley admitted those who lack assurance are a Christian who could be saved.<sup>129</sup> In a letter to Thomas Church on June 17, 1746, Wesley stated, “From 1738 to this time...the word of God ran as fire among the stubble,” in contrast to the former periods when he did not see so much fruits of his labour. This fact shows us that we cannot undervalue the experience at Aldersgate in Wesley’s life or Methodist history. Since that day, the fire of assurance totally enveloped him and his societies.

Before his experience at Aldersgate, Wesley had the faith of a son, not the faith of a son.<sup>130</sup> Since then he came to have the faith of a son, that is, assurance of justification by faith, and liberation from the dominion of sin. Of course, even before Aldersgate, he was not a nominal Christian nor a son, but only a devoted servant. Tuttle points out that for Wesley, “Aldersgate was indeed a watershed between law and grace.”<sup>131</sup> His assessment of Aldersgate seems reasonable, given that after the experience Wesley became assured of justification by faith. Theodore W. Jennings contends that Wesley was justified before Aldersgate but lacked perfection.<sup>132</sup> However, Wesley seems to have had the faith of a

---

doctrine held during the first few years following Aldersgate which convinced Wesley that if he did not at that moment feel love for and acceptance by God as the all-consuming fire, he was not a Christian.” *John Wesley: His Life and Theology*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978), p.196. Note no.9.

<sup>127</sup> *Works* 1, 172.

<sup>128</sup> Wesley had suffered from lack of the fruit of the Spirit even since the experience at Aldersgate. Theodore W. Jennings, Jr, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-17. Jennings referred to Journals or letters in May 24, 1738: Oct. 14, 1738: Nov. 23-24, 1738: Jan. 4, 1739: July 31, 1739.

<sup>129</sup> *Works* 7, 199.

<sup>130</sup> Sermon on Faith: *Works* 7, 195ff.

<sup>131</sup> Robert G. Tuttle. *John Wesley: His Life and Theology*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978), p.200.

<sup>132</sup> Theodore W. Jennings, Jr., “John Wesley Against Aldersgate,” *Quarterly Review* (1988): 10. “[W]hat Wesley lacked was not faith, but what he (lacked) was later to call ‘perfection.’”

servant without assurance of justification by faith in Christ, seeing that he confessed, “I still fixed not this faith on its right object: I meant only faith in God, not faith in or through Christ.”<sup>133</sup> Those having the faith of a servant who accepted God will receive the adoption of sons by their continual progress in faith.<sup>134</sup> Perhaps this state can be explained with the centurion, Cornelius in Acts 10-11. Though he did not know Jesus Christ, he had the faith of a servant and was accepted by God. Though such a statement was misunderstood as justification by works in the sense that Cornelius was accepted by God due to his pious works, it does not support that good works justify us, for Cornelius was saved by faith in Christ, and received the Spirit. Likewise, before Aldersgate, Wesley did not realize justification by faith in Christ and forgiveness attained through Christ’s blood. His spiritual condition, which lacked assurance of justification, was due to the teaching of William Law, who taught that justification follows after sanctified life.<sup>135</sup> In a word, Wesley came to understand justification by faith at Aldersgate.

To sum up, prior to the experience at Aldersgate, Wesley understood justification and sanctification in a Pelagian fashion, which means salvation by human efforts. Until then he had the faith of a servant,<sup>136</sup> but through the experience at Aldersgate, he came to realize justification by faith in Christ and had the faith of a son and found sanctification on justification by faith.<sup>137</sup> Secondly, he came to be assured that conversion can be accomplished “in an instant.”<sup>138</sup> Before that day, he was not convinced of it, though he often preached on “instantaneous conversion” and “inward assurance of salvation.”<sup>139</sup> Thirdly, the statements where Wesley confessed, “I am not a Christian” even after Aldersgate do not indicate that he lacked assurance of justification, but that he lacked assurance of his entire sanctification. He had assurance of justification and the faith of a son since Aldersgate, but not assurance of perfection in relation to a real Christian. The confusion of W. Jennings can be cleared by parallelism and trans-parallelism of K. J.

---

<sup>133</sup> *Works* 1, 101.

<sup>134</sup> “I now see clearly that even prior to Aldersgate I had the faith of a servant,” ... a divine conviction which enables one “to fear God and work righteousness.” Robert G. Tuttle. *John Wesley: His Life and Theology*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978), p.196: *Works* 7, 199.

<sup>135</sup> “Only if he does everything he possibly can for his own salvation, can he expect to be accepted by God.” William Law, *A Practical Treatise upon Christian Perfection of The Works of the Rev. William Law*. Vol. 3 (London, 1726, reprinted in 1893), p. 240. Cited by Lindstörn, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

<sup>136</sup> Cf. W. Stephen Gunter, *The Limits of “Love Divine”: John Wesley’s Response to Antinomianism and Enthusiasm* (Nashville, Tennessee: Kingswood Books, 1989), p.270. “The years prior to Aldersgate had been characterized by *legalism*” (my emphasis).

<sup>137</sup> Cf. Gordon Stanley Dicker, *The Concept Simul Iustus Et Peccator in Relation to the Thought of Luther, Wesley and Bonhoeffer, and Its Significance for A Doctrine of the Christian Life* (Th. D. diss., Union Theological Seminary, An Arbor: UMI, 1971): 79-80.

<sup>138</sup> W. Stephen Gunter, *op. cit.*, p.269.

<sup>139</sup> *Ibid.*

Collins.<sup>140</sup> Christians can be divided into two groups, namely the justified and the entirely sanctified, or Christians who are assured of the fruit of the Spirit and Christians without its assurance.. Faith can also be distinguished between justifying faith and sanctifying faith, or the faith of a servant and the faith of a son.

### 3.1.4 The Structure of Wesley's Theology and Sanctification

#### 3.1.4.1 The Theological Methods and Characteristics of Wesley

Some theologians including Randy L. Maddox claim that for Wesley, the sources of doctrine were Scripture, reason, tradition, and experience.<sup>141</sup> They often appeal to two or three of them jointly. Scripture is the primary source, and the others are secondary sources.<sup>142</sup> Maddox sees tradition as the initial source of Wesley's theology. Where traditional doctrine differed from his experience, he sought to revise it according to the Bible and reason.<sup>143</sup> Maddox called Wesley's method a "hermeneutic spiral" in the sense that the characteristics of Wesley's theology can be said to be salvation, experience, and a creative synthesis of the two. This configuration is similar to Wesley's structure of salvation, which is composed of initial justification by faith, sanctification as our experience of salvation from the power of sin, and final justification by faith and works. Donald W. Dayton notes that Wesley's emphasis on reason was influenced by the Enlightenment and his stress on tradition was influenced by the Catholic Church.<sup>144</sup> Dayton's notion seems relevant, seeing that Wesley was raised in the background of German Pietism and his time related to the Enlightenment. Albert Outler described Wesley's theology as "an integral and dynamic theology in which Eastern notions of synthesis (i.e., dynamic interactions between God's will and man's) were fused with the classical Protestant *sola fide* and *sola scriptura* and with the Moravian stress upon inner feeling" (italics are my emphasis).<sup>145</sup>

Granted the importance of experience in Wesleyan theology, it may be worthwhile to observe Wesley's view on experience in more detail. Theodore Runyon mentions that for

---

<sup>140</sup> See '3.1.4.2 The Structure of Wesley's Soteriology' on this thesis (p. 17). For the applied example of his theory in this thesis, see '3.2.1.3.1 Atonement.'

<sup>141</sup> Randy L. Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley's Practical Theology* (Nashville, Kingwood Books, 1994), p.36; William James Abraham, "The Wesleyan Quadrilateral," *Wesleyan Theology Today* (Nashville, Kingwood Books, 1985), pp. 119-126; Colin W. Williams, *John Wesley's Theology Today* (London: The Epworth Press, first published in 1960), pp.26-38. Williams presented Scripture, tradition, reason, and experience as the sources of Wesley's theology.

<sup>142</sup> *Ibid.*, p.46.

<sup>143</sup> *Ibid.*, p.47.

<sup>144</sup> Donald W. Dayton, "Law and Gospel in the Wesleyan Tradition," *Grace Theological Journal* 12 (1991): 235.

<sup>145</sup> Albert C. Outler, ed., *John Wesley* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 14:

Wesley, “experience is the presence and activity of the Other which transforms the self in relation.”<sup>146</sup> It has a sacramental function that communicates a transcendent reality. Ralph Del Colle notes that for Wesley, experience was always a necessary medium for the application of revealed truth. Though experience itself is not a source of authority, it is “sufficient to confirm a doctrine” grounded in the Bible.<sup>147</sup> His view seems pertinent in the light of Wesley’s statement that “we cannot know his love to us, till his Spirit witnesses it to our spirit. Till then we cannot believe it.”<sup>148</sup> In this respect, Wesley criticized the Quakers for regarding Scripture as a “secondary rule, subordinated to the Spirit.”<sup>149</sup> In contradiction of their view, spiritual experience is subordinate to the authority of the Bible.<sup>150</sup> Wesley’s view of experience is different from nineteenth-century subjectivism in the sense that for the former, experience is based on the Bible, but for the latter it is found on human thought rather than on the Bible.<sup>151</sup>

As has been observed above, Wesley’s methodology was based on tradition, experience, reason and the Bible. His emphasis on experience distinguishes him from other theologians, which has something to do with sanctification having to be attainable in this world.

### 3.1.4.2 The Structure of Wesley’s Soteriology

Wesley’s soteriology sheds light on his doctrine of sanctification. The core of Wesley’s theology is said to be soteriology, seeing that he deemed human salvation “the greatest of all blessings” which God grants to us.<sup>152</sup>

W. E. Sweetland considered Wesley’s view of salvation under the three terms: “justification by faith, the new birth, and Christian perfection.”<sup>153</sup> His analysis, however, is insufficient because he did include repentance, which is very important in Wesley’s soteriology. Ralph Del Colle admitted that Wesley distinguished the stages in the salvific process more explicitly than Luther and Calvin.<sup>154</sup> For Wesley, there are three processive

---

<sup>146</sup> Theodore, Runyon, “The Role of Experience in Religion,” *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion* 31(1992):187.

<sup>147</sup> Ralph Del Colle, “John Wesley’s Doctrine of Grace in Light of the Christian Tradition,” *International Journal of Systematic Theology*, Vol. 4, no. 2 (2002), p. 177.

<sup>148</sup> Sermon XI. The Witness of the Spirit. Discourse II, 3, 5: *Works* 5, 127.

<sup>149</sup> *Ibid.*: also see Robert W. Burton and Robert E. Chiles, eds., *John Wesley’s Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1982), p. 35.

<sup>150</sup> Cf. G. C. Cell, *The Rediscovery of John Wesley* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1935), p.135-136.

<sup>151</sup> Cf. Theodore, Runyon, “The Role of Experience in Religion,” *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion* 31(1992):193.

<sup>152</sup> Sermon I, Salvation by Faith, 3: *Works* 5, 8.

<sup>153</sup> William Ernest Sweetland, *A Critical Study of John Wesley as Practical Thinker and Reformer* (Ph D. diss., Michigan State University, Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1955), pp. 58-63.

<sup>154</sup> Ralph Del Colle, “John Wesley’s Doctrine of Grace in Light of the Christian Tradition,” *International Journal of Systematic Theology*, Vol. 4, no. 2 (2002): 176.

stages of salvation: repentance, faith, and holiness.<sup>155</sup> Repentance is compared to the “porch of religion”, faith “the door” and holiness “religion itself.”<sup>156</sup> They correspond respectively to prevenient grace, justifying grace and sanctifying grace.<sup>157</sup> Colle’s analysis seems more germane than that of Sweetland in virtue of his comprehensive analysis of Wesley’s soteriology. He embraced repentance and various graces in his configuration. In view of faith, Robert G. Tuttle classified dialectically the developmental stages of Wesley’s theology. The stage of thesis is ‘pre-1738’: “faith initiated solely by (human) inward and outward works” (parenthesis my addition). The stage of antithesis is ‘1738-1764’: “faith initiated solely by God’s Grace.” The stage of synthesis is ‘post-1764’: “faith initiated by grace and confirmed by works.”<sup>158</sup> In the synthesis stage, Wesley stressed faith working by love. His analysis is clearer than Colle’s, though it seems rather simple because it centred on faith only. As Clarence Bence puts it, the structure of Wesley’s soteriology is teleological.<sup>159</sup> Perfection as the final stage of salvation functions as the main impetus for its realization, as well as being the goal of the Christian life. God’s grace promotes our sanctification from repentance before justification, via justification, the new birth, repentance after justification, to entire sanctification.

Peculiarly and remarkably, Kenneth J. Collins suggests “parallelism and trans-parallelism” as a hermeneutical structure for the Wesleyan *Ordo Salutis*. According to Collins, parallelism means that in Wesley’s soteriology, there is “parallel structure with an emphasis on similarity” and trans-parallelism means that there are “parallel structures with an added emphasis on contrast due to Soteriological change.” For example, for Wesley, the atonement, the law, repentance, faith, and the witness of the Spirit have both similar and different meaning with respect to both justification and sanctification.<sup>160</sup> Collins’ hermeneutical methodology is significant because it offers us an important key to understanding Wesley’s diverse statements on a particular topic.<sup>161</sup>

### 3.1.4.3 The Position of Sanctification in His Theology

For Wesley, the aim of religion was to find “the way to heaven.” This signifies that his theology centres on soteriology. Salvation is accomplished by the attainment of

---

<sup>155</sup> Barth presented justification-faith, sanctification-love, and calling-hope, and Calvin stressed justification-faith and sanctification-repentance.

<sup>156</sup> Cf. Collin W. Williams, *John Wesley’s Theology Today* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960), pp. 39-40.

<sup>157</sup> Colle, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

<sup>158</sup> Robert G. Tuttle. *John Wesley: His Life and Theology*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978), p.334. Note no.10.

<sup>159</sup> Clarence L Bence, *John Wesley’s Teleological Hermeneutics*, (Ph. D. diss., Michigan State University, Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1982), pp.18-19.

<sup>160</sup> Kenneth J Collins, “A Hermeneutical Model For the Wesleyan *Ordo Salutis*,” *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 19 (1984): 23-37, especially 30-31.

<sup>161</sup> See 3.1.3 Wesley’s Conversion: Experience at Aldersgate on this thesis.



holiness.<sup>162</sup> As this holiness is attained by way of repentance, justification and regeneration, it is fair to delineate the whole process of salvation as a search for sanctification. As W. Stephen Gunter aptly puts it, holiness is the central theme comprising his entire theology.<sup>163</sup> In this regard, he is said to move the centre of theology from justification to sanctification.

## 3.2 Wesley's Doctrine of Sanctification

### 3.2.1 The Concept of Sanctification

#### 3.2.1.1 Anthropological Presupposition

##### 3.2.1.1.1 Human Nature as the Image of God

Wesley depicted the image of God in three ways. First, the natural image of God is “a picture of his own immortality; a spiritual being, endued with understanding, freedom of will, and various affections.”<sup>164</sup> Secondly, the political image of God implies “the governor of this lower world having “dominion over the fishes of the sea, and over all the earth.” Thirdly, the moral image of God is “righteousness and true holiness” (Eph 4:24). Wesley added love to the moral image of God. Since God is love, “man at his creation was full of love; which was the sole principle of all his tempers, thoughts, words, and actions.” The moral image was related to purity. As God is spotless purity, man was “pure from every sinful blot.”<sup>165</sup>

In his sermon on the New Birth, Wesley did not refer to the knowledge of God and his works as the moral image of God. In “The Doctrine of Original Sin,” Wesley comprised the knowledge of God and his works in the right state of his intellectual powers as the image of God.

[T]his image consisted, not only in his rational and immortal nature, and his dominion over the creatures, but also in knowledge, actual knowledge, both of God and of his works; in the right state of his

---

<sup>162</sup> Sermon XLV. The New Birth 1, 1: *Works* 6, 66.

<sup>163</sup> W. Stephen Gunter holds that for Wesley “heart holiness is the comprehensive frame of reference within which his entire theology developed.” W. Stephen Gunter, *The Limits of “Love Divine”: John Wesley's Response to Antinomianism and Enthusiasm* (Nashville, TN: Kingswood, 1989), p. 202.

<sup>164</sup> Sermon XLV: *Works* 6, 66. Barry E. Bryant concludes that Wesley was influenced by Molina, Arminius, Plaifere, and Goad on human free will. “Molina, Arminius, Plaifere, Goad, and Wesley on Human Free-Will, Divine Omniscience, and Middle Knowledge,” *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 27 (1992): 101.

<sup>165</sup> Sermon XLV. The New Birth 1, 1: *Works* 6, 66.



intellectual powers, and in love, which is true holiness.<sup>166</sup>

For Wesley, it is not clear whether the knowledge of God belongs to the moral image of God or the natural image of God. In his sermon on the Fall of Man, Wesley depicted the natural image of God in man before the fall as follows:

[Man is] a spirit like his Creator, a being endued not only with sense and understanding, but also with a will exerting itself in various affections. To crown all the rest, he was endued with liberty; a power of directing his own affections and actions; a capacity of determining himself, or of choosing good or evil.<sup>167</sup>

He understood original righteousness as keeping the moral image of God in which Adam was created.

His reason was clear; and sense, appetite, and passion were subject to it. His judgment was uncorrupted, and his will had a constant propensity to holiness. He had a supreme love to his Creator, a fear of offending him, and a readiness to do his will.<sup>168</sup>

For Wesley, the image of God is not mutable because God was pleased to put him under the state of trial.<sup>169</sup> “He was free to stand or fall.”<sup>170</sup> The human ability to cooperate with God’s grace belongs to God’s grace. Accordingly, Wesleyan Arminianism does not totally abolish grace.

### 3.2.1.2 Hamartiological Presupposition

There have been many critiques of Wesley’s doctrine of sin. Newton Flew held that “undeniable defects in Wesley’s doctrine (of perfection) spring from an inadequate analysis of the nature of sin.”<sup>171</sup> Umphrey Lee ascribed Wesley’s conclusion of Christian attainability of perfection in this life to a mistaken conception of sin.<sup>172</sup> Along a similar line, Frederic Greeves noted that Wesley’s definition of sin as conscious sin led him to “identify perfection with the absence of conscious sin,” which involved the danger to “encourage a pharisaic type of self appraisal.”<sup>173</sup> Then, with those views in mind, Wesley’s doctrine of sin as presupposition of sanctification will be analysed in detail from

---

<sup>166</sup> ‘The Doctrine of Original Sin,’ *Works* 9, 293.

<sup>167</sup> Sermon LVII. On The Fall of Man: *Works* 6, 215.

<sup>168</sup> ‘Of Original Righteousness’: *Works* 6, 339.

<sup>169</sup> Sermon XLV. The New Birth: *Works* 6, 67.

<sup>170</sup> The Doctrine of Original Sin, Part VI, 2: 416

<sup>171</sup> R. Flew, *The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1934), p. 332.

<sup>172</sup> Umphrey Lee, *John Wesley and Modern Religion* (Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1936), pp. 185-187.

<sup>173</sup> F. Greeves, *The Meaning of Sin* (London: Epworth, 1956), p. 168.

his own work.

### 3.2.1.2.1 Original Sin and Its Result

#### 3.2.1.2.1.1 Original Sin

Wesley regarded Adam's sin as original sin. In spite of God's warning that "Thou shalt not eat thereof," Adam ate the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. As a result, he fell from his high status. His disobedience implies rebellion against his Creator. Since that time Adam "would be governed by his own will, and not the will of Him that created him." He would seek his happiness in the world and in the works of his hands rather than in God.<sup>174</sup> Wesley viewed Adam's sin as intentional sin by his own will. Adam "chose to do his own will, rather than the will of his Creator." "He 'was not deceived,' but knowingly and deliberately rebelled against his Father and his King."<sup>175</sup>

Wesley understood original sin as the corruption of human nature due to Adam's fall.

The sinfulness of that state into which man fell consists in the guilt of Adam's first sin; the want of that righteousness wherein he was created; and the corruption of his nature, whereby he is utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all that is spiritually good, and wholly inclined to evil, and that continually; which is commonly called original sin, and from which do proceed all actual transgressions.<sup>176</sup>

He delineated original sin as corruption of human nature far from original righteousness:

Original Sin — is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man,—whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit.<sup>177</sup>

He viewed human irregular desire, i.e., lust as a part of original sin.<sup>178</sup> We never can

---

<sup>174</sup> Sermon LVI: *Works* 6, 67.

<sup>175</sup> Sermon LVII. On The Fall of Man, 2, 6: *Works* 6, 223.

<sup>176</sup> 'The Original Sin': *Works* 9, 264.

<sup>177</sup> A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion: *Works* 8, 52. While Wesley regarded the absence of original righteousness as the result of original sin, James Arminius viewed absence of original righteousness as "original sin itself," in the sense that it "alone is sufficient to commit and produce any actual sins whatsoever." James Arminius, *The Writings of James Arminius*, 3 Vols., tr. by J. Nichols (London: James Nichols, 1828), 2: 375; also see Vern A. Hannah, "Original Sin and Sanctification: A Problem for Wesleyans," *Wesleyan Theological Journal*, Vol. 2, No.2 (1983): 48-49.

<sup>178</sup> 'The Original Sin': *Works* 9, 274.

recover the moral image of God until we are “created anew in Christ Jesus.”<sup>179</sup>

### 3.2.1.2.1.2 The Result of Original Sin

As the first result of original sin, Adam was separated from God and lost the life of God, in other words, at that moment he died in a spiritual sense, though his body did not immediately die. “The love of God was extinguished in his soul.” He was so under the power of servile fear that he fled from the presence of God.<sup>180</sup> He lost the knowledge as well as the love of God. He became impious and miserable. He lost “the moral image of God, and, in part, the natural.”<sup>181</sup> In place of the image of God, he was immersed in “pride and self-will,” which are “the very image of the devil”; and in “sensual and desire,” which are “the image of the beasts that perish.”<sup>182</sup> In spite of the fall, Adam retained “the spiritual nature and immortality of the soul” and “a degree of dominion over the creatures.”<sup>183</sup> To put it another way, he has the natural image and the political image of God.

As the second result, original sin brought death to Adam’s posterity.

Not only after, but before, and ‘until the law,’ given by Moses, ‘sin was in the world;’ and men were deemed sinners, and accordingly punished with death, through many generations... from Adam to Moses...death could not then be inflicted on mankind for any actual sin, because it was inflicted on so many infants, who had neither eaten of the forbidden fruit nor committed any actual sin whatever, and therefore had not sinned in any sense, ‘after the similitude of Adam’s transgression.’<sup>184</sup>

As the third consequence, all of Adam’s posterity comes into the world deprived of the moral image of God.<sup>185</sup> In regard to the relationship between Adam’s sin and the guilt of his posterity, on the one hand, Wesley explicated it by the principle of representatives of his offspring. Since Adam was “a public person,” “a federal head” and “a legal representative” of all his posterity,<sup>186</sup> humankind descending from him through ordinary reproduction “sinned in him, and fell with him in his first transgression.”<sup>187</sup> Wesley drew

---

<sup>179</sup> Sermon LXXVI. On Perfection 1, 7: *Works* 6, 458.

<sup>180</sup> Sermon XLV. The New Birth: *Works* 6, 67.

<sup>181</sup> Sermon LVII. On The Fall of Man 2, 6.: *Works* 6, 222.

<sup>182</sup> Sermon XLV. The New Birth: *Works* 6, 67-68.

<sup>183</sup> The Original Sin: *Works* 9, 381.

<sup>184</sup> Original Sin: *Works* 9, 256.

<sup>185</sup> ‘Of Original Righteousness’: *Works* 9, 339.

<sup>186</sup> The Original Sin’: *Works* 9, 404.

<sup>187</sup> ‘The Original Sin’: *Works* 9, 262.

its support out of Romans 5:12-20, and 1 Corinthians 15:21, 22, which read: “all men die in Adam” and “by his offense, judgment is come upon all men to condemnation.”<sup>188</sup> On the other hand, he stated it in terms of hereditary nature. “[I]n Adam all died, all human kind, all the children of men who were then in Adam’s loins.” Consequently, “everyone descended from him comes into the world spiritually dead, dead to God.”<sup>189</sup> Psalm 51:5 reads: we are shaped in iniquity and are conceived in sin in our mother’s wombs.

Fourthly, original sin has led us to eternal death because it is the root of our personal sins.<sup>190</sup> From Rom. 5:18 and Eph. 2:3 say that “we are children of wrath, liable to death eternal.”<sup>191</sup> Such a statement of Wesley must be treated with caution because for him, man is not sentenced to eternal death by original sin itself.<sup>192</sup> His statement means that only when we submit to the instigation of original sin, we are punished with eternal death.<sup>193</sup> Without the grace of God, man cannot overcome the temptation of Satan goading his corrupt nature. Natural man voluntarily participates in actual sin stemming from original sin; he became filled with the guilt of original sin. This guilt drives him to Christ.

### 3.2.1.2.2 Actual Sin: Voluntary Sin

Wesley viewed actual sin as a voluntary transgression of the known law of God.<sup>194</sup> Sin is “every voluntary breach of the law of love and nothing else, if we speak properly. Accordingly, for Wesley, in order for sin to be committed, “the will must be engaged and it must give its assent.”<sup>195</sup> All unconscious mistakes and errors are not sins because they lack wilful intention.<sup>196</sup> Man is ultimately punished only through his own fault. Though his sin “springs from the infection of his nature,” he is not condemned because of Adam’s

<sup>188</sup> ‘The Original Sin’: *Works* 9, 262.

<sup>189</sup> Sermon XLV. The New Birth: *Works* 6, 68.

<sup>190</sup> 4.2.1.4.1 Prevenient Grace on this thesis.

<sup>191</sup> Minutes of Some Late Conversations: *Works* 8, 277.

<sup>192</sup> *Works* 9, 332. cf. “I believe none ever did, or ever will, die eternally, merely for the sin of our first father.” *Works* 9, 315.

<sup>193</sup> Predestination Calmly Considered: *Works* 10, 236.

<sup>194</sup> Sermon XIX. Privilege of Those that are Born of God, II, 2: *Works* 5, 227. Wesley seemed to adopt Arminius’ concept of sin as “a voluntary transgression of the law.” J. Arminius, *Writings* 2: 258. “[S]in is a voluntary transgression of the law, which the sinner, since he could avoid, commits of his own fault”; cf. Carl Bangs, *Arminius: A Study in the Dutch Reformation* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985): 197, foot note no.17.

<sup>195</sup> Wesley’s view of actual sin is similar to Arminius’, who concluded “that man did not sin on account of any necessity through a preceding decree of predestination.” J. Arminius, *Writings* 1: 220. Mbennah and Vorster hold that Arminius seems to have drawn it from Article 14 of the Belgic Confession. Man “wilfully subjected himself to sin..., giving heed to the words of the devil.” Emmanuel D. Mbennah and J. M. Vorster (Potchefstroom Univ. for Christian Higher Education), “The Influence of Arminian conception of Predestination on the 18<sup>th</sup>-century Wesleyan revival,” *Studia historiae ecclesiasticae*, Vol.24, no.1 (1998): 170.

<sup>196</sup> Kenneth J. Collins, *Scripture Way of Salvation: The Heart of John Wesley’s Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), p.118.

sin.<sup>197</sup> This is Wesley's distinction from Calvin and Barth with respect to Hamartiology. This definition of sin led Wesley to fail to take seriously the depth of unexamined prejudices and inward sins. In contrast to Wesley, Reformed theology regards human corruption from Adam's sin as sin.

Wesley viewed actual sin as the fruit springing from original sin. "Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, and blasphemies" (Matt 15: 19).<sup>198</sup> As our actual sins are like the hairs on our head, it will be of little significance to count all of them, though some remarkable sins will be dealt with in '4.2.1.2.2.1 Sin in Believers'. The important thing is that for Wesley, actual sins are not unavoidable, for "whoever is born of God does not commit sin" and "cannot sin" (1 John 5:18).<sup>199</sup>

In his sermon on "the Wilderness State," Wesley classified sin into three categories; sin of commission, sin of omission, and inward sin. First, sin of commission often darkens the soul in a moment especially in case it is "a known, wilful or presumptuous sin like drunkenness, or uncleanness."<sup>200</sup> This case does not frequently happen. Secondly, sin of omission consists in failing to rebuke a brother in fault and sin,<sup>201</sup> sidestepping the ordinances of God, i.e., any means of grace, and habitually neglecting public, family, and private prayer. This is the want of striving and spiritual sloth.<sup>202</sup> This kind of sin does not instantly quench the fire of the Spirit but gradually and slowly, whereas sin of commission immediately does so. The former may be compared to 'withdrawing the fuel from it' while the latter may be likened to 'pouring water upon a fire.' Thirdly, inward sin as 'a root of bitterness' consists of pride, anger, and foolish desire as any inordinate affection.<sup>203</sup> They deprive believers of peace, joy, and the influence of the Spirit, and darken the heart.<sup>204</sup> Though Christians may mortify inward sin "by the Spirit" day by day, they cannot drive it out by justifying grace.<sup>205</sup> Wesley claimed that the body of sin as the old man including "all evil tempers, words, and actions" might be destroyed when believers are entirely sanctified.<sup>206</sup> When Jesus said, "Be clean," the leper was cleansed and "then only the evil root, the carnal mind, is destroyed; and inbred sin subsists no more."<sup>207</sup> His claim will be

---

<sup>197</sup> The Doctrine of Original Sin: *Works* 9, 286. "...They were not led captive (to Satan) through Adam's sin, but their own wickedness" (my addition).

<sup>198</sup> Original Sin: *Works* 9, 274.

<sup>199</sup> Sermon XL. Christian Perfection 2, 5: *Works* 5, 7.

<sup>200</sup> Sermon XLVI. The Wilderness State: *Works* 6, 80-81.

<sup>201</sup> Sermon XLVI. The Wilderness State: *Works* 6, 81-82..

<sup>202</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.86-87.

<sup>203</sup> Sermon XLVI. The Wilderness State: *Works* 6, 82, 85.

<sup>204</sup> Sermon XLVI. The Wilderness State: *Works* 6, 82-83.

<sup>205</sup> Sermon XIV. The Repentance of Believers 1, 20: *Works* 5, 165.

<sup>206</sup> NT Note on Rom. 6:6.

<sup>207</sup> Sermon XIV. The Repentance of Believers 1, 20: *Works* 5, 165.

criticized later.

Wesley explicated the relation between inward sins and outward sins as follows.

Of pride cometh contention, vain boasting, seeking and receiving praise of men, and so robbing God of that glory which he cannot give unto another. Of the lust of the flesh, come gluttony or drunkenness, luxury or sensuality fornication, uncleanness; variously defiling that body which was designed for a temple of the Holy Ghost: Of unbelief, every evil word and work.<sup>208</sup>

Pride, the lust of the flesh, and unbelief are inward sins, while consequential sins are outward sins. Similarly, in ‘The Doctrine of Original Sin’, Wesley stated that the root of sin is pride, self-will, unbelief, and heart-idolatry.<sup>209</sup> In his sermon on ‘the Deceitfulness of Man’s heart,’ he viewed it as self-will, pride, love of the world, independence of God, atheism and idolatry.<sup>210</sup> These sins can be included in inward sins.

For Wesley, sanctification means deliverance from actual sin, including sin of commission, sin of omission, and inward sin. For Wesley, sin of commission and outward sin is removed at justification, and sin of omission and inward sin is overcome by entire sanctification. The latter is equal to sin in believers.

### **3.2.1.2.2.1 Sin in Believers as Pride, Self-Will, and the Desire of the World**

According to Wesley, sin remains in a believer’s heart, because the flesh still lusts against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh.<sup>211</sup> Even a believer is fleshly as long as he remains immature in Christ according to 1 Cor. 3:1-4. The angel of the church of Ephesus was exhorted to repent his sin, though he was praised by the Lord for his efforts.<sup>212</sup> Believers are equally assured that sin is in them, although Christ is in them and they are the children of God. Christ is and dwells “in the heart of every believer, who is fighting against all sin,” even though his heart is not yet fully purified as the temple of God.<sup>213</sup>

Some people including Count Zinzendorf claimed that there is no sin in a believer. They stated their opinion as follows.

Scripture says, Every believer is born of God, is clean, is holy, is sanctified, is pure in heart, has a new heart, is a temple of the Holy

---

<sup>208</sup> Sermon VII. The Way to the Kingdom. II, 3: *Works* 5, 83.

<sup>209</sup> *Works* 9, 433.

<sup>210</sup> *Works* 7, 337.

<sup>211</sup> Sermon XII. Sin in Believers: *Works* 5, 147.

<sup>212</sup> Sermon XII. Sin in Believers: *Works* 5, 148.

<sup>213</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 149.

Ghost. Now, as ‘that which is born of the flesh is flesh,’ is altogether evil, so ‘that which is born of the Spirit is spirit,’ is altogether good. Again: A man cannot be clean, sanctified, holy, and at the same time unclean, unsanctified, unholy. He cannot be pure and impure, or have a new and an old heart together. Neither can his soul be unholy, while it is a temple of the Holy Ghost.<sup>214</sup>

In opposition to this view, Wesley refuted their views by these four statements. First, the opinion ‘that which is born of the Spirit is spirit, is altogether good’ means that every man who is “born of the Spirit,” is a spiritual man, but he is not altogether good and spiritual. For example, the saints at Corinth were spiritual but not altogether spiritual. They were still partially fleshly and were babes in Christ. Secondly, it is not true that “a man cannot be clean, sanctified, holy, and at the same time unclean, unsanctified, unholy.” On the contrary, he may be so as the Corinthians were so. Though they were washed and sanctified, and cleansed from “fornication, idolatry, drunkenness” (1 Corinthians 6:9, 10, 11), they were yet not inwardly cleansed “from envy, evil surmising, and partiality.”<sup>215</sup> Thirdly, that “they had not a new heart and an old heart together” is true, but their new hearts were “not entirely, renewed” yet. Though their carnal mind was nailed to the cross, it was “not wholly destroyed.” Fourthly, it is true that they were holy because they were the ‘temples of the Holy Ghost,’ but it is equally certain that they were partially carnal and unholy.<sup>216</sup>

In view of justification, the Corinthians were already new creatures but in view of sanctification, they were not yet wholly new.<sup>217</sup> The tempers and affections of the old man, i.e., Φρόνημα σάρκοϋ remains manifest, though it cannot rule over the justified.<sup>218</sup> They are delivered from guilt by means of the blood of Christ and from the power of sin by the Holy Spirit who dwells in them, but they still feel “the flesh lusting against the Spirit.”<sup>219</sup>

Wesley stated that sin in believers cannot rule over them, whereas sin in unbelievers can. Unbelief as the absence of faith is in the latter, whereas unbelief as little faith is in the former. Little faith signifies faith often mixed with doubt or fear. It can exist in believers like the case of Jesus’ disciples: “O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?”<sup>220</sup> Though a believer feels the urge to sin, if he does not engage in it, but follow the Spirit, he will not lose God’s favor as the child of God.

In his sermon on “the Repentance of Believers,” Wesley stated inward sin in believers

---

<sup>214</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 150.

<sup>215</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 150.

<sup>216</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 150-151

<sup>217</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>218</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 153.

<sup>219</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 152.ó

<sup>220</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 155.



as “pride,” “self-will contrary to the will of God,” “the desire of the flesh,” “the desire of the eye,” and “the pride of life.”<sup>221</sup>

#### 3.2.1.2.2.1.1 Pride and Self-Will

Pride is to think oneself higher than ought to be himself. It is difficult to conquer pride. Pride delights in the honour coming from men. It is a desire for and a love of praise. It stems from *fear of dispraise* linked to *evil shame* and *fear of man*, “which brings a thousand snares upon the soul.” Even those that seem strong in faith are subjected to “a degree of all these evil tempers.”<sup>222</sup>

A believer may be self-willed even against the will of God, in contrast to Jesus who always subjected himself to the will of his Father.<sup>223</sup> A self-willed person wants what is pleasing to his nature, though he knows it does not please God, whereas he avoids something that is painful, even though it is the will of God for him. Self-will is “a species of idolatry” which is directly opposed to the love of God. To stay in faith is to strive against self-will with all might.

#### 3.2.1.2.2.1.2 Inordinate Affection

A person who is born again can say, “Whom have I in heaven but thee, and there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee!” But it is not possible always to remain in the same mood. Without continually watching and praying, lust will return to him. The assault of *inordinate affection*, i.e., a strong proclivity to anything but God will return. Without awareness, the *desire of the eye*, which is the desire of “gratifying his imagination with something great, or beautiful, or uncommon” may overwhelm him.<sup>224</sup> It is very difficult for a believer to conquer curiosity, one of the desires of inordinate affection.

Wesley suggested that the inordinate affection in believers show itself as envy, revenge, and covetousness. Envy often befalls a person who was faced with people more excellent than him. Resentment generates in persons when are injured or affronted; especially by “those whom we peculiarly loved,” and “whom we had most laboured to help.” Injustice or ingratitude often excites a desire of revenge instead of “overcoming evil with good.”<sup>225</sup> Covetousness is a feeling contrary to the love of God. It can be explicated with the terms, *filaoguria* (the love of money) or *pleonexia* (the desire to have more). It may bind the freedom of God’s children. Such inordinate affections as envy, covetousness, a root of bitterness, and revenge still remain in the hearts of the justified.<sup>226</sup> Wesley understood the

---

<sup>221</sup> Sermon XIV. Repentance of Believers, 1.3-6: *Works* 5, 158-159.

<sup>222</sup> Sermon XIV. Repentance of Believers, 1.7: *Works* 5, 159.

<sup>223</sup> Sermon XIV. Repentance of Believers, 1.4: *Works* 5, 158.

<sup>224</sup> Sermon XIV. Repentance of Believers, 1.5: *Works* 5, 159.

<sup>225</sup> Sermon XIV. Repentance of Believers, 1.8: *Works* 5, 160.

<sup>226</sup> Sermon XIV. Repentance of Believers, 1.9: *Works* 5, 160.

latter part of the seventh chapter to the Romans as the state of the justified, but not the entirely sanctified. All these sins remaining in believers are the objects of repentance to acquire entire sanctification.<sup>227</sup>

### 3.2.1.2.2.1.3 Inward Sin Clinging to Words and Actions

Wesley mentioned that inward sins cling to all our words and actions.

In regard to our words, he explicated it as follows. All uncharitable conversation which does not spring from brotherly love, for instance, “all backbiting, all tale-bearing, all whispering, all evil-speaking,” and repeating the faults of persons not present are unquestionably the sin to grieve the Spirit. Believers “shall give an account in the day of judgment” of every idle word.<sup>228</sup> Wesley also described as sin all actions which are not to the glory of God.<sup>229</sup> If believers feel wrong tempers of various kinds when they do good things for our neighbours, it is a sign that our good works are contaminated with sin. The omission of good works of piety and mercy are regarded as sin in believers, as the Bible says: “To him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin” (James 4:17). While the works of piety are communion, hearing God’s word, prayer and the like,<sup>230</sup> the works of mercy are believers’ good works for their neighbours. Wesley noted that there are so many inward defects in their love towards neighbours and in holy temper towards God. This fact shows them the need to confess with Job, “I am vile: I abhor myself, and repent as in dust and ashes.”<sup>231</sup>

### 3.2.1.2.2.1.4 Schism

For Wesley, schism means “a separation *in* a Church” (his emphasis), or “a *causeless* separation from *the Church of Christ*” (my emphasis),<sup>232</sup> not just a separation from a particular national Church like the Church of England.<sup>233</sup> On the basis of 1 Cor 12: 24-25, Wesley defined schism in a Church as

an alienation of affection in any of them towards their brethren; a division of heart, and parties springing therefrom, though they were still outwardly united together; though they still continued

---

<sup>227</sup> Sermon XIV. Repentance of Believers, 1.10: *Works* 5, 161.

<sup>228</sup> Sermon XIV. Repentance of Believers, 1.11: *Works* 5, 161.

<sup>229</sup> Sermon XIV. Repentance of Believers, 1.13: *Works* 5, 162.

<sup>230</sup> Sermon XIV. Repentance of Believers, 1.14: *Works* 5, 163.

<sup>231</sup> Sermon XIV. Repentance of Believers, 1.15: *Works* 5, 163.

<sup>232</sup> The former is based on Cor 1:10, the latter Cor 12: 25.

<sup>233</sup> A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion, 3, 20: *Works* 8, 236; Sermon LXXV. On Schism 1,1: *Works* 6, 402. “[I]t is not a separation from *any Church*, (whether general or particular, whether the Catholic or any national Church), but a separation *in a Church* (my emphasis).

members of the same external society.<sup>234</sup>

Wesley's definition of schism is similar to that of Calvin, who thought the essence of unity is engrafting into the body of Christ in sound doctrines rather than in visibly united instruments.<sup>235</sup>

He regarded schism as "evil in itself." "To separate ourselves from a body of living Christians...is a grievous breach of the law of love."<sup>236</sup> The cause of schism is want of love. When love grows cold, schism befalls us. Schism is "naturally productive of the most mischievous consequences" and "opens a door to all unkind tempers." It leads us to "evil surmising," "severe and uncharitable judging," "offence," "anger and resentment," "bitterness, malice, and settled hatred." Briefly, it is "a prelude to hell eternal." Accordingly, schism is the main object to be overcome by sanctification.

### 3.2.1.2.2.2 Sin against the Holy Spirit and Sin unto Death

Wesley viewed sin against the Holy Spirit as apostasy.<sup>237</sup> Believers generally do not commit this sin. At the time of persecution, the Jews asked apostatized Christians to express in the public assembly that "Jesus was a deceiver of the people" and that he had suffered the penalties which he justly deserved. Such confession was "crucifying the Son of God afresh, and putting him to an open shame," and "counting the blood of the covenant an unholy thing, treading under foot the Son of God, and doing despite to the Spirit of grace." In spite of the seriousness of their sin, some apostates recovered their faith and God's mercy on them, whereas others miserably died in their sin. From Wesley's viewpoint, those who have fallen from sanctifying grace can recover their state again.<sup>238</sup> However, to continue in sin on the pretext of God's mercy "leads to utter, irrecoverable destruction." To make the grace of God an excuse to sin is "the sure way to the nethermost hell."<sup>239</sup>

Sin unto death was viewed as "a sin which God determined to punish by the death of the sinner."<sup>240</sup> In this case, because God decided the penalty of the sinner, the prayer for him is useless. But it does not signify eternal death. Rather, though his body is destroyed, his soul may be saved from hell. They were cut off due to the seriousness of their sin. Nonetheless, they are convinced by the mercy and justice of God on them.

---

<sup>234</sup> On Schism 1,7: *Works* 6, 404.

<sup>235</sup> Cf. Frank Baker, *John Wesley and the Church of England* (London: Epworth Press, 1970, second edition 2000), p. 162. "They do not divide themselves at all from the living body of Christ."

<sup>236</sup> Sermon LXXV. On Schism 1,11: *Works* 6, 406.

<sup>237</sup> Sermon LXXXVI. A Call to Backsliders: *Works* 6, 523.

<sup>238</sup> Sermon LXXXVI. A Call to Backsliders: *Works* 6, 525.

<sup>239</sup> Sermon LXXXVI. A Call to Backsliders: *Works* 6, 527.

<sup>240</sup> Sermon LXXXVI. A Call to Backsliders: *Works* 6, 520.

Accordingly, for Wesley, these two sins calls for repentance and sanctification.

### 3.2.1.2.3 The Seat of Sin

For Wesley, the seat of sin is the soul, not the body, which is corrupt but is not sinful because it is not personal but material.

A sinful body? ...But there is no authority for it in Scripture: The word sinful body is never found there. And as it is totally unscriptural, so it is palpably absurd. For no body, or matter of any kind, can be sinful: Spirits alone are capable of sin. ...It cannot lodge in the skin, nor in the muscles, or nerves, or veins, or arteries; it cannot be in the bones, any more than in the hair or nails. Only the soul can be the seat of sin.<sup>241</sup>

As our body is corruptible, it is “the most dangerous enemy” tempting us to sin, while our soul lives in our body. In glorification, our body will be changed to “fit instruments for the soul.”<sup>242</sup> The body is “purified and refined” from corruption at the resurrection. Because our body is morally neutral, it cannot be the seat of sin, but the soul is the seat of sin.

### 3.2.1.3 Christological Presupposition: Objective Aspect of Sanctification

#### 3.2.1.3.1 Atonement

Wesley viewed the doctrine of atonement as a proper distinction between Deism and Christianity.<sup>243</sup> The atonement of Christ is “the meritorious cause” of entire sanctification, as well as of justification.<sup>244</sup> His view of atonement can be described “as a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction.”<sup>245</sup> The terms ‘full’ signifies that Christ’s sacrifice is not partial but complete. ‘Perfect’ implies that his sacrifice needs no addition or repetition. Because the suffering of Christ purchased human redemption, there is nothing further to pay for it. ‘Sufficient sacrifice and oblation’ also involves that Christ’s

---

<sup>241</sup> Sermon LXXVI. On Perfection 2, 9: *Works* 5, 418.

<sup>242</sup> Sermon CXXXVII. On The Resurrection of The Dead (1732), 7, 2, 4: *Works* 7, 483.

<sup>243</sup> *Works* 10, 205. For the relationship between them, see William Ernest Sweetland, *A Critical Study of John Wesley as Practical Thinker and Reformer* (Ph. D. diss., Michigan State University, Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1955), pp. 58-63.

<sup>244</sup> John Wesley, *Explanatory Notes upon the New Testament* 3 Vols. (Bristol: published by William Pine, 1765), 1 Chron 21: 26; Lev 25: 25; Num 15:2; John Wesley, *Explanatory Notes upon the New Testament* (London: Epworth Press, 1954), Rom 9: 25; 1 Thess. 1:10; Heb 2:10; 13:10. Cited by Ole E. Borgen, “John Wesley: Sacramental Theology No Ends without the Means,” in *John Wesley: Contemporary Perspective* (London: Epworth, 1988), p. 67, footnote no. 5; also see Kenneth J. Collins, “A Hermeneutical Model for the Wesleyan *Ordo Salutis*,” *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 19 (1984): 23.

<sup>245</sup> Sermon LIX. God’s Love to Fallen Man: *Works* 6, 234.

sacrifice is so great and inestimably valuable as to bring reconciliation of God and humanity. 'For the sins of the whole world' implies that propitiation was asked because God was offended by human sin and got 'angry with all mankind.'<sup>246</sup> Christ became "our substitute as to penal sufferings."<sup>247</sup> He paid the ransom for humankind by his death.<sup>248</sup>

In his comment on Col. 1:14 in *NT Notes*, Wesley stated that "The voluntary passion of our Lord appeased the Father's wrath, obtained pardon and acceptance for us, and, consequently, dissolved the dominion and power which Satan had over us through our sins." This implies that he understood atonement as our forgiveness and our liberation from the dominion of Satan and sin. He synthesized the Western tradition that the atonement of Christ results in absolving our guilt with the Eastern tradition that it liberated us from the dominion of Satan and sin. The atonement of Christ brought us not only a liberty from the law but also from the law.<sup>249</sup> Christ enabled us to accomplish the law by giving his Spirit. Maddox is of the opinion that for Wesley, the cross of Christ causes us to obey God as our response to his love towards us.<sup>250</sup> In this sense, Christ's atonement becomes the basis of sanctification.<sup>251</sup>

Wesley explicated the continual sanctification of Christ in relation to the daily service in the Old Testament.

This daily service, a lamb offered upon the altar every morning, and every evening, typified the continual intercession which Christ ever lives to make in the virtue of his satisfaction for the continual sanctification of his church: though he offered himself once for all, yet that one offering thus becomes a continual offering.<sup>252</sup>

Christ continually sanctifies us by means of his intercession at the right hand of God the Father. For Wesley, believers continuously need Christ's atonement even in the best deed of the entirely sanctified, on account of their omissions, short-comings, mistakes in judgment and practice, and defects of various kinds.<sup>253</sup> This statement is worth noting because it denotes that Wesley's doctrine of entire sanctification does not imply an

---

<sup>246</sup> Letters DCCXI to Miss Bishop: *Works* 13, 35.

<sup>247</sup> Preface To A Treatise On Justification: *Works* 10, 319.

<sup>248</sup> Sermon CXXVIII, Free Grace, 21: *Works* 7, 381.

<sup>249</sup> *Works* 10, 202-203.

<sup>250</sup> Randy L. Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley's Practical Theology* (Nashville, Kingwood Books, 1994), p. 109.

<sup>251</sup> Cf. Leo George Cox, *John Wesley's Concept of Perfection* (Ph. D diss. University of Iowa, 1959. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1980), p. 55.

<sup>252</sup> *John Wesley's Notes on the Whole Bible the Old Testament* by John Wesley (SAGE Software Albany, OR USA Version 1.0 © 1996), p. 325.

<sup>253</sup> Plain Account of Christian Perfection: *Works* 9, 496; cf. A Letter to the Author of "The Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists compared."41: *Works* 9, 52.

absolute perfection, which renders Christ's intercession unnecessary.

On the other hand, Wesley proclaimed unlimited atonement because if Christ died for all, then all may be saved. "The grace or love of God, whence cometh our salvation, is FREE IN ALL and FREE FOR ALL" (his emphasis).<sup>254</sup> The benefit of atonement is not limited by predestination.<sup>255</sup> Though "Christ's death was an objective satisfaction to God's justice," God's forgiveness is subjectively accomplished when man believes in Christ's atonement.<sup>256</sup>

### 3.2.1.3.2 The Threefold Offices of Christ

As High Priest, Christ accomplished atonement for his people and has been making intercessions to God for them in order to restore them to God's favour, pardon and peace by destroying the root of pride, self-will, and the love of the world.<sup>257</sup> The Christian is restored to the image of God in virtue of Christ's continual mediation.<sup>258</sup> Wesley rejected the substitutionary imputation of Christ's obedience and viewed his exemplary life of service as a means of effective edification of fallen humanity in order to emphasise human responsibility.<sup>259</sup> As Prophet, Christ reveals the law of God to his people. He came to "establish, illustrate, and explain," not to destroy the law.<sup>260</sup> In virtue of Christ's administration of Prophethood, we know our sin and the need of its pardon and repent our sin in the light of his law, which leads us to a holy life. As King, Christ breaks the power of sin and Satan, gives laws to those he has redeemed and restores them to the image of God, and reigns in them.<sup>261</sup> Wesley sometimes described Christ as Physician, who cuts off our rotten part in order to heal our wounds and makes us participate in his holiness.<sup>262</sup>

As we observed above, for Wesley, the threefold offices of Christ is necessary for our sanctification.

### 3.2.1.3.3 The Imputation of Christ's Righteousness

---

<sup>254</sup> Robert W. Burton & Robert E. Chiles, eds., *John Wesley's Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1982), p. 146.

<sup>255</sup> Cf. Arther Skevington Wood, *The Contribution of John Wesley to the Theology of Grace* (Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship, Inc, 1975), p. 216.

<sup>256</sup> Leo George Cox, *op. cit.* p. 52.

<sup>257</sup> Sermon LXII. "The End of Christ's Coming" 3.1-2: *Works* 5, 275.

<sup>258</sup> Father Thoughts on Christian Perfection, Q.9: *Works* 11:417.

<sup>259</sup> *NT Notes*, John 9:5. "I am the light of the world — I teach men inwardly by my Spirit, and outwardly by my preaching, what is the will of God: and I show them, by my example, how they must do it."

<sup>260</sup> *NT Notes*, Mt 5:17.

<sup>261</sup> *NT Notes*, Rev 12:10-11.

<sup>262</sup> Sermon XLVIII, "Self-Denial," 1, 13: *Works* 5, 109.



In his “Thoughts on the Imputed Righteousness of Christ,” Wesley regarded the righteousness of Christ as an expression that does not exist in the Bible.<sup>263</sup> Instead of the righteousness of Christ, he stressed the righteousness of God, which means “his ways of justifying sinners” by faith in Christ.<sup>264</sup> For Wesley, that Jesus Christ is made of God unto our righteousness and sanctification (1 Cor 1:30) means no more than that he is “the sole Author” of justification and sanctification.<sup>265</sup>

It is not Christ’s obedience to God but their faith in Christ’s atonement to be counted to believers for righteousness (Gen 15:6; Rom.4:5; Heb 11:7; Rom 9:30).<sup>266</sup> Paul’s statement that “the result of one act of righteousness was justification that brings life for all men” and “through the obedience of the one man the many will be made righteous”(Rom. 5:18-19) does not mean that the righteousness of Christ as his obedience to God became the righteousness of believers.<sup>267</sup> It means that believers are forgiven and accepted before God by their faith in Christ’s perfect atonement, which was prepared through his whole obedience. The righteousness of believers is their faith in Christ<sup>268</sup> and their obedience to God in the Spirit, not Christ’s obedience. A Christian is called holy not because he is simply united with the holy Christ, but because he is made really holy in Christ through his cooperation with God’s grace. For Wesley, the righteousness of believers means that God is reigning over them in the Spirit and as its result, the fruit of the Spirit, which are described in terms of the affection of the heart, i.e., “humbleness, meekness, gentleness, long-suffering, patience, deadness to the world; and every right disposition of heart towards God and towards man.”<sup>269</sup> It can be depicted with one word, love.

The more serious reason why Wesley abhorred the imputation of Christ’s righteousness is that the antinomians made Christ “the minister of sins” by using the expression as a means to justify and cover their sins.<sup>270</sup> His anxiety can be explicated by the following syllogism. Since the moment when one believes that Christ’s obedience is his righteousness, he cannot add anything to Christ’s obedience. This causes his moral

---

<sup>263</sup> Thoughts on the Imputed Righteousness of Christ 1: *Works* 10, 312.

<sup>264</sup> Thoughts on the Imputed Righteousness of Christ 3: *Works* 10, 313.

<sup>265</sup> Thoughts on the Imputed Righteousness of Christ 8: *Works* 10, 314.

<sup>266</sup> Thoughts on the Imputed Righteousness of Christ 9: *Works* 10, 314; Remarks on Mr. Hill’s Farrago Double-Distilled III, 24: *Works* 10, 427.

<sup>267</sup> Thoughts on the Imputed Righteousness of Christ 11: *Works* 10, 314-315.

<sup>268</sup> “I continually affirm, to them that believe, faith is imputed for righteousness.” Remarks on Mr. Hill’s Farrago Double-Distilled III, ‘Of Imputed Righteousness’ 24: *Works* 10, 426-427; “[H]is faith is counted to him for righteousness” A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion: *Works* 8, 57. This thought of Wesley is similar to Arminius’. “For the word, ‘to impute,’ signifies that faith is not righteousness itself, but is graciously accounted for righteousness...on account of Christ, whom God hath appointed as the propitiation through faith in his blood. I affirm, therefore, that faith is imputed to us for righteousness, on account of Christ and his righteousness.” J. Arminius, *Writings* 2: 474.

<sup>269</sup> *Works* 1, 642-643.

<sup>270</sup> Thoughts on the Imputed Righteousness of Christ 13: *Works* 10, 315.



dissolution. By corollary, it makes Christ “a minister of sins.”<sup>271</sup>

To sum up, Wesley’s objection to the imputation of Christ’s righteousness is orientated towards faith in Christ and obedience to God as the believers’ responsible role in sanctification.

### **3.2.1.3.4 The Imitation of Christ**

According to Ralph Del Colle, Wesley envisioned “Christ as ‘our grand Exemplar.’” Wesley’s view is congruent with the conventional Catholic view of following Christ.<sup>272</sup> Colle’s view seems relevant given Wesley’s notion that humility is the mark of those who “tread in his steps” to imitate Christ’s exemplar.<sup>273</sup> Justification should issue in sanctification, i.e., discipleship as following Christ in the Holy Spirit. Christ’s example was delineated in the Gospels in detail. Regretfully, Colle does not refer to the difference between Christ and us. Christ’s life as a person can be our example, but his life as the Son of God cannot be our example, for it is his unique life as Redeemer.

Wesley linked repentance, which is regarded as an important stage of sanctification, with the imitation of Christ. Repentance is “not only to be sorry for our sins, and to cease to do evil, but also to learn to do well; to be more and more Christians; daily endeavouring to be more religious than we were before; continually pressing forward to perfect ourselves in holiness, to tread more and more in the steps of Christ” (emphasis is mine).<sup>274</sup> Before his experience at Aldersgate, Wesley understood sanctification as following Christ’s example rather than regeneration, which generates at the same time with justification. Since then, he came to understand sanctification as God’s gift after sincere repentance, which involves justification as positional sanctification, the new birth, and entire sanctification.

### **3.2.1.4 Soteriological Presupposition: Grace**

#### **3.2.1.4.1 Preventive Grace and Human Recovery**

Wesley could neither agree with the limited atonement and unconditional election of Calvinism, nor with Roman Catholicism’s view that human depravity was not so total that some freedom was preserved in natural man.<sup>275</sup> He rejected the latter because it underestimated the result of original sin and weakened the gratuity of God’s restoring

---

<sup>271</sup> Thoughts on the Imputed Righteousness of Christ 14: *Works* 10, 315.

<sup>272</sup> Ralph Del Colle, “John Wesley’s Doctrine of Grace in Light of the Christian Tradition,” *International Journal of Systematic Theology*, Vol. 4, no. 2 (2002): 188-189.

<sup>273</sup> Sermon XVII. The Circumcision of the Heart, 1, 5: *Works* 5, 204.

<sup>274</sup> Telford, ed. *Letters* I, 152f, 159.

<sup>275</sup> Letter to Dr. John Robertson, 24 Sept. 1753: *Works*, 26:517-518.

grace.<sup>276</sup> The former was also refused because it abolished human responsibility to God's grace by rendering participation in it to be automatical, regardless of the human will. Leo G. Cox points out the difference between Wesleyans and Calvinists regarding the doctrine of grace as follows. For Wesleyans, common grace and special grace are the same in kind but different in degree, namely, preventing grace comprises all kinds of graces of God, whereas for Calvinists, they are completely different.<sup>277</sup> For Wesley, prevenient grace given to man is not limited only to the time of regeneration, but can be ascribed to all stages of man regardless of regeneration. Rogers Charles Allen seems to have been missing this point when he contended that prevenient grace is "bestowed upon man in his new birth."<sup>278</sup> This misunderstanding seems to have resulted from his missing that the baptism described in Philippians 2:12-13<sup>279</sup> signified infant baptism.<sup>280</sup> Later, Allen admitted that human reason to understand the truths of the gospel belongs also to "unregenerate man assisted by the grace of the Spirit."<sup>281</sup> Anyway, the point is that the grace of the Spirit as preventing grace is given to everybody, not to particular people only.

For Wesley, God's grace always prevents (comes before) the total corruption of man, which makes human response possible. Its ground is John 1: 9, which reads, "the true light, which enlightens everyone, was coming into the world" and the Anglican Thirty-Nine Articles, which reads, "Wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us...." Prevenient grace based on the salvific grace of Christ is applied to all people regardless of being Christians or non-Christians,<sup>282</sup> when they "cometh into the world."<sup>283</sup> Roger C. Allen was missing this point when he claimed that prevenient grace "is not a grace which precedes regeneration, or which somehow enables man to fulfill the conditions of regeneration." It is freely given, not merited. As Kenneth J Collins aptly puts it, prevenient grace restoring human facilities to some extent is irresistible to all men, whereas sanctifying grace is

---

<sup>276</sup> Randy L. Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley's Practical Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994), p. 83.

<sup>277</sup> Leo G. Cox, "Prevenient Grace-A Wesleyan View," *Journal of Evangelical Society* 12 (summer, 1969): 144.

<sup>278</sup> Rogers Charles Allen, *The Concept of Prevenient Grace in the Theology of John Wesley* (Ph. D. diss. Duke University, Ann Harbor: University Microfilms, 1967), p. 129.

<sup>279</sup> Wesley's *Explanatory Notes Upon the New Testament* (Bristol: W. Pine, 1765), pp. 85-86; Allen, *Ibid.*

<sup>280</sup> This becomes clear when we consider Wesley's expression "in baptism before we can remember, and so know no time when we had it not...the grace of God preventing us, growing up with us, and accompanying us all along, through all the stages of our life." *NT* "Philippians 2:12-13," pp. 84-85; Allen, *op. cit.*, p. 128. Also see 3.2.7.3.1 Baptism on this thesis.

<sup>281</sup> Allen, *op. cit.*, p. 178.

<sup>282</sup> Kenneth J. Collins, *Scripture Way of Salvation: The Heart of John Wesley's Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), p.39.

<sup>283</sup> Predestination Calmly Considered, 45: *Works*, 10, 230.

resistible.<sup>284</sup>

In terms of pardon and power, Wesley explicated the prevenient grace of God in the following way. Pardon is prevenient grace in a narrow sense, which is “God’s saving work in fallen humanity prior to justification.”<sup>285</sup> It provided forgiveness of inherited guilt from original sin. Accordingly, “no infant ever was, or ever will be, ‘sent to hell for the guilt of Adam’s sin;’ seeing it is cancelled by the righteousness of Christ, as soon as they are sent into the world.”<sup>286</sup> In virtue of the merit of Christ, “all men are cleared from the guilt of Adam’s actual sin.”<sup>287</sup> Accordingly, infants are saved in the case of death in infancy. As a result, present human culpability results from the rejection of “God’s restoring work in our lives” rather than any guilt from original sin.<sup>288</sup> This is the reason why men suffer eternal death on account of actual sin rather than original sin.

Power is prevenient grace in a broad sense, which signifies the prior empowering of God’s grace to make it possible for man to act virtually from the beginning of faith to the high level of sanctification.<sup>289</sup> Prevenient grace as power confers on people a measure of free will and some power of discernment. The human will and intelligence are supernaturally recovered to fallen man.<sup>290</sup> Grace empowers man to discern what is good and what is evil, and with the will to do what is good. Accordingly, even to men before justification, actual sins are not unavoidable in virtue of prevenient grace.<sup>291</sup> Furthermore, it enables us to recognize the need of God’s offer of salvation and to respond to such an offer.<sup>292</sup> The primary end of prevenient grace is to lead men to repentance and salvation in Christ.<sup>293</sup> Accordingly, the final dimension of prevenient grace is God’s specific approach to individuals to invite them to closer relationship. If men receive this overture of grace, they begin to experience cooperative and progressive transformation.<sup>294</sup>

---

<sup>284</sup> Kenneth J. Collins, *op. cit.*, p.44.

<sup>285</sup> Randy L. Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley’s Practical Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994), p. 84.

<sup>286</sup> Letter DXXXIV, to John Mason: *Works* 11, 453.

<sup>287</sup> *Works* 8, 277.

<sup>288</sup> Randy L. Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley’s Practical Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994), p. 87.

<sup>289</sup> “The end and design of grace being purchased and bestowed on us, is to destroy the image of the earthly, and restore us to that of the heavenly. And so far as it does this, it truly profits us: and also makes way for more of the heavenly gift, that we may at last be filled with all the fullness of God.” *Wesley’s notes on NT*, 2 Pet 3: 18.

<sup>290</sup> Predestination Calmly Considered: *Works* 10, 229 f.

<sup>291</sup> *Works* 9, 338.

<sup>292</sup> Sermon LXXXV. On Working out our own Salvation, 2.1: *Works* 6, 509. In contrast to Wesley, Arminius held that “man hath a will to turn to God before grace prevents him.” Outler, *Sermons* 2:157. no. 3.

<sup>293</sup> Leo G. Cox, “Prevenient Grace-A Wesleyan View,” *Journal of Evangelical Society* Vol. 12, p. 145.

<sup>294</sup> Randy L. Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley’s Practical Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994), p. 90.

Wesley understood conscience in its connection to the prevenient grace of God. He depicted the loss of the image of God and the re-inscribed law in the human heart as follows.

But it was not long before man rebelled against God, and, by breaking this glorious law, well nigh effaced it out of his heart; the eyes of his understanding being darkened in the same measure as his soul was “alienated from the life of God.” And yet God did not despise the work of his own hands; but, being reconciled to man through the Son of his love, he, in some measure, re-inscribed the law on the heart of his dark, sinful creature.<sup>295</sup>

The re-inscribed law engraved in the heart refers to human conscience.<sup>296</sup> Wesley claimed that God has showed natural law, i.e., conscience, to the heathens by his prevenient grace as he gave his written law to the Jew. Thus people know that there is one God in the world.<sup>297</sup> Their conscience implies “some discernment of the difference between moral and evil with an approbation of the one, and disapprobation of the other by an inward monitor excusing or accusing” which lies in “every human heart.” They sometimes have “some desire to please God, as well as some light concerning what does really please him, and some convictions when they are sensible of displeasing him.”<sup>298</sup> Still, this grace is not natural, but is infused by God. It is neither a premise for natural theology nor a saving knowledge because natural men do not have any knowledge of faith in Christ, the Son of God, his atonement, and our sanctification by his Spirit in the image of God yet.<sup>299</sup> If they

---

<sup>295</sup> Sermon XXXIV. The Original, Nature, Property, and Use Of The Law: *Works* 5, 436.

<sup>296</sup> In his sermon on ‘the Mount,’ Wesley delineated it as the remaining part of the letter written in the human heart by God’s finger (*Works* 5, 311-312). In his sermon on ‘The Heavenly Treasure in Earthen Vessels,’ he saw conscience as the remainder of the image of God (Sermon CXXIV. 1.1-2: *Work* 7, 345: *John Wesley’s Notes* on Rom. 1: 19-21) but in his Note on Rom. 2:14 he regarded it as God’s prevenient grace superadded to man in a strict sense. In his Sermon CV ‘on Conscience’ (1.5), he claimed, “properly speaking, it is not natural, but a supernatural gift of God (*Works* 7, 187). Accordingly, it is difficult for us to judge whether Wesley considered conscience as the residue of the image of God or the prevenient grace superadded by God, though Lindström claimed that for Wesley, conscience is prevenient grace rather than a certain residue of the image of God (Lindström, *op. cit.*, p.46, 48). In my opinion, both of them seem germane, given that he stated, “[W]hether this is natural or superadded by the grace of God” (Jackson, ed., *Works* 7, 345). If we consider his whole theological tone against Roman Catholicism on original sin, we can conclude that Wesley preferred the latter. The point lies in that conscience as a moral image of God was totally obliterated after the fall, but God recovered it in measure by re-inscribing his law in the human heart.

<sup>297</sup> *John Wesley’s Notes* on Rom. 1: 19-21.

<sup>298</sup> Sermon CXXIV. The Heavenly Treasure in Earthen Vessels 1.1-2: *Work* 7, 345. Prevenient grace as human conscience is similar to common grace in Calvin, which has a braking effect on human evil ascribed to the first use of the Law in Calvin. The difference between them is that for Wesley, prevenient grace enables man to accept the Gospel, while for Calvin, special grace does it.

<sup>299</sup> Sermon LXXXV. On Working Out Our Own Salvation, 2: *Works* 6, 506.

refuse the prevenient grace, they do not glorify him as God, nor are they thankful. They worship him like the idols.<sup>300</sup> If they accept it, they feel the need of the Gospel and by means of grace they will be able to respond to it when the Gospel is offered to them. They can refuse the Gospel because God's grace is resistible. "No man sins because he has not grace, but because he does not use the grace which he hath."<sup>301</sup>

In this manner, the doctrine of prevenient grace enables Wesley to counteract the doctrine of unconditional election and reprobation without human agreement. He thought unconditional election and reprobation unbiblical because it abolishes human responsibility for eternal destruction. Prevenient grace recovers the human will and discernment to be able to choose the Gospel when they hear the Gospel. This grace is resistible.<sup>302</sup> God does not compel grace upon those who reject God's activity in their life.<sup>303</sup> Consequently, he chooses his own destiny and bears responsibility for it. This absolves God from the blame for sin and destruction by his predestination, but weakens the sovereignty of God over human destiny. Which is more biblical: Calvin's doctrine of double predestination or Wesley's doctrine of prevenient grace? In my view, Wesley's opinion is supported by Ezekiel 18:1-31, Matthew 25:1-46, James chap. 1-2,<sup>304</sup> and Revelation chap. 2-3, and 20: 4, 11-15, which stress the human responsibility for salvation, i.e., that human destiny depends mainly upon human deeds. Calvin's viewpoint is upheld by Isaiah 10:23, 24-27; 41:4, 42:9, 13; 45:7; 46:10; 48:5; 49:1, Romans 8:30; 9:1-16; 19-23; 11:1-12, Acts 4:28; 9:15; 13:18, 27:24; 28:23-28, Galatians 4:21-25, and Ephesians 1:4-5, which lay emphasis mainly on the sovereignty of God in human destiny. Though both of them have their own biblical ground, Wesley's view of prevenient grace shows synergistic tendencies of salvation.<sup>305</sup>

#### 3.2.1.4.2 Various Graces in the *Ordo Salutis*

Dr. L. M. Starkey mentions that for Wesley, the grace of God is identical with "the power of the Holy Spirit in human life."<sup>306</sup> His view seems probable given that in his sermon on

---

<sup>300</sup> John Wesley's Notes on Rom. 1: 19-21.

<sup>301</sup> Sermon LXXXV. On Working Out Our Own Salvation, 3.4: *Works* 6, 512..

<sup>302</sup> Wesley was persuaded that "there are no men living that have not many times 'resisted the Holy Ghost,' and made void 'the counsel of God against themselves' ... 'that every child of God has, at some time, life and death set before him.'" The General Spread of the Gospel, 12: *Works* 8, 281.

<sup>303</sup> Randy L. Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley's Practical Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994), p. 88.

<sup>304</sup> Cf. Donald W. Dayton, "Law and Gospel in the Wesleyan Tradition," *Grace Theological Journal* 12 (1991): 236. "Wesley is able to move from Galatians to James in the New Testament without feeling the tension that caused Luther to appropriate the former as the hermeneutical centre of this theology while marginalizing the latter as "a right strawy epistle."

<sup>305</sup> Cf. Lindström, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

<sup>306</sup> Lycurgus M. Starkey, Jr., *The Work of the Holy Spirit*, (New York: Abingdon Press, 1963), p. 63; also see Leo G. Cox, "Prevenient Grace - A Wesleyan View," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, Vol.12

“The Good Steward,” Wesley defined God’s grace as “the power of his Holy Spirit, which alone worketh in us all that is acceptable in his sight”<sup>307</sup> and in “Instructions for Children,” he regarded grace as “the power of the Holy Ghost enabling us to believe and love and serve God.”<sup>308</sup>

For Wesley, salvation begins with prevenient grace and proceeds with convincing grace, which leads us to repentance and “which brings a larger measure of self-knowledge, and a farther deliverance from the heart of stone.” Convincing grace as a term connected with repentance is a sincerity, i.e., willingness, which is “a constant disposition to use all the grace given.”<sup>309</sup> Thereafter, repentance leads us to justification and sanctification.<sup>310</sup> In this process, the constellation of grace correlates with the *ordo salutis*. Justifying grace guides us to justification, and regenerating grace leads us to the new birth, entirely sanctifying grace conducts us to entire sanctification. Put another way, justifying grace correlates with “Christ for us,” prevenient grace with “Christ enlightening us,” and sanctifying grace with “Christ in us.” The final “goal of all prevenient, justifying, and sanctifying grace” is Christian perfection, namely, entire sanctification.<sup>311</sup>

### 3.2.1.5 The Definition of Sanctification<sup>312</sup>

Michael J. Christensen understands that for Wesley, entire sanctification is “an experience of grace, subsequent to salvation, with the effect that the Holy Spirit takes full possession of the soul, sanctifies the heart, and empowers the will so that one can love God and others.”<sup>313</sup> His understanding of Wesley’s concept of sanctification is probable, but it skips over the conception of sanctification as the recovery of the image of God.

According to Wesley, sanctification is a gift freely given by God.<sup>314</sup> It is not an outward thing like doing no harm and doing good, but an inward thing that is depicted as “the life of God in the soul of Man”, “a participation of the divine nature”, “the mind that was in Christ” and “the renewal of our heart, after the image of Him that created us.”<sup>315</sup>

---

(summer, 1969): 145.

<sup>307</sup> Sermon LI, “The Good Steward” 1, 8: *Works* 5,139.

<sup>308</sup> John Wesley, *Instruction for Children*, 8<sup>th</sup> edition (Bristol: William Pine, 1767), p.10: Maddox, *op. cit.*, p.120.

<sup>309</sup> *Works* 8, 288-289.

<sup>310</sup> *Works* 1, 509.

<sup>311</sup> Ralph Del Colle, “John Wesley’s Doctrine of Grace in Light of the Christian Tradition,” *International Journal of Systematic Theology*, Vol. 4, no. 2 (2002), p. 187.

<sup>312</sup> Also see ‘4.2.4.5 Entire Sanctification’ and ‘4.2.5.2.1 Perfection.’

<sup>313</sup> Michael J. Christensen, “Theosis and Sanctification: John Wesley’s Reformulation of A Patristic Doctrine,” *Wesleyan Theological Journal*, Vol. 31, no.2 (1996): 71.

<sup>314</sup> “Now surely sanctification is one of ‘the things which are freely given us’”: *Works* 10, 493.

<sup>315</sup> Journal Sept. 13, 1739: *Works* 1, 225.



The new birth is almost equated with sanctification, except that the former is the beginning of the latter.<sup>316</sup>

In view of a process of transformation, Wesley described sanctification as follows.

We are enabled “by the Spirit” to “mortify the deeds of the body” of our evil nature; and as we are more and more dead to sin, we are more and more alive to God. We go on from grace to grace, while we are careful to abstain from all appearance of evil,” and are “zealous of good works,” as we have opportunity, doing good to all men; while we walk in all His ordinances blameless, therein worshipping him in spirit and in truth; while we take up our cross, and deny ourselves every pleasure that does not lead us to God.<sup>317</sup>

In the light of salvation, Wesley viewed entire sanctification as “a full salvation from all our sins, — from pride, self-will, anger, unbelief.”<sup>318</sup> Salvation is completed in entire sanctification beyond initial justification. In terms of the circumcision of the heart, he defined it as “salvation from *all sin* and loving God with an *undivided heart*”<sup>319</sup> (italics are his emphasis).

In connection with love, Wesley posited entire sanctification as “neither more nor less than pure love; love expelling sin, and governing both the heart and life of a child of God.”<sup>320</sup> In “Thoughts on Christian Perfection,” he similarly stated, “Pure love reigning alone in our hearts and life - this is the whole of scriptural perfection.”<sup>321</sup> It is love “excluding sin” and “filling the heart.”<sup>322</sup> To describe sanctification as pure love is a salient characteristic of Wesley.

Sanctification was also defined as the renewal in the image of God in his conversation with others.

Q. 1. What is it to be sanctified?

A. To be renewed in the image of God, in righteousness and true holiness.<sup>323</sup>

Linking the image of God with real religion, Wesley described sanctification as “recovery not only to the favor but likewise to the image of God, implying not barely deliverance

---

<sup>316</sup> Journal Sept. 13, 1739: *Works* 1, 225.

<sup>317</sup> Sermon XLIII, Scripture Way of Salvation 1, 8: *Works* 6, 46.

<sup>318</sup> Sermon XLIII. Scripture Way of Salvation 1, 9: *Works* 6, 46.

<sup>319</sup> Telford, ed., *Letters* IV, “To John Newton,” May 14, 1765.

<sup>320</sup> Letter CCCLXXXVII to Mr. Walter Churchery, of Brecon, London, Feb. 21, 1771: *Works* 12, 432.

<sup>321</sup> Plain Account of Christian Perfection: *Works* 11, 401.

<sup>322</sup> Sermon XLIII. Scripture Way of Salvation 1.9: *Works* 6, 46.

<sup>323</sup> Minutes of Some Late Conversations between the Rev. Mr. Wesleys and Others, Conversation I, “On Tuesday Morning June 26th, was Considered the Doctrine of Sanctification”: *Works* 8, 279.



from sin, but the being filled with the fullness of God.”<sup>324</sup> Religion was also depicted as “a uniform following of Christ, an entire inward and outward conformity to our master...our grand Exemplar.”<sup>325</sup> Here religion can be understood as equal to entire sanctification.

In a letter to Joseph Benson, Wesley combined deliverance from sin, a recovery of God’s image, and pure love in the conception of sanctification. Sanctification is “an entire deliverance from sin, a recovery of the whole image of God, the loving God with all our heart, soul, and strength.”<sup>326</sup> This may yet be the clearest definition of sanctification.

### 3.2.2 The Motive and the Goal of Sanctification

Wesley understood the will of God as the motive of our sanctification. “It is his will that we should be inwardly and outwardly holy; that we should be good, and do good, in every kind and in the highest degree whereof we are capable.”<sup>327</sup> Our sanctification is based on God’s unchangeable will.<sup>328</sup>

Sanctification is the goal of the Christian life, which is described as “the recovery to humanity of the perfection that was a part of man’s nature in creation,” but was distorted and obscured by the Fall.”<sup>329</sup> According to Theodore Runyon, Wesley was influenced by Gregory of Nyssa with respect to sanctification as recovery of the image of God.<sup>330</sup> In other words, for Wesley the goal of sanctification is the recovery of the image of God.

For Wesley, we can say that the aim of the Christian sanctified life is to give glory to God. “You do everything in the spirit of sacrifice, giving up your will to the will of God, and continually aiming...merely at the glory of God.”<sup>331</sup> The labour of love is done “to the glory of God.”<sup>332</sup> The sanctified Christian “in his whole life and conversation, whether he eats or drinks, or whatsoever he does,” does all to the glory of God.”<sup>333</sup> The actions and words of sanctified man spring from “the abundance of a loving heart” and “aim at the glory of God.”<sup>334</sup>

---

<sup>324</sup> Sermon LXII. The End of Christ’s Coming, 3, 5: *Works* 6, 276.

<sup>325</sup> Frank Whiling, ed., *John and Charles Wesley* (New York: Paulist Press, 1981), p. 300.

<sup>326</sup> Letter CCCCLVII to Mr. Joseph Benson, London, Dec. 28, 1770: *Works* 12, 415.

<sup>327</sup> Sermon XXXVII. ‘The Nature of Enthusiasm,’ 3, 23: *Works* 5, 474.

<sup>328</sup> Sermon XLVI, 2.1: *Works* 6, 80.

<sup>329</sup> Theodore, Runyon, “The Role of Experience in Religion,” *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion* 31(1992):192.

<sup>330</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.192-193.

<sup>331</sup> Sermon LXXXIX. The More Excellent Way,3.3: *Works* 7, 31.

<sup>332</sup> Sermon XCVIII. On Visiting the Sick, 2.1: *Works* 7, 120.

<sup>333</sup> Sermon CVII. On God’s Vineyard, 1.9: *Works* 7, 206; Sermon CXXXIII. Preached of Occasion of the Death of the Rev. MR. John Fletcher, 1.4: *Works* 7, 432.

<sup>334</sup> Sermon CXIV. The Unity of the Divine Being, 23: *Works* 7, 272.

### 3.2.3 God's Role and Human Role in Sanctification

Generally, Wesley emphasised the priority of God's grace, but did not neglect the cooperating role of the believers.

#### 3.2.3.1 The Role of God in Sanctification

In a letter to the Bishop of Gloucester, Wesley explicated the role of the Spirit of sanctification as illustration, rectification, and direction. By enlightening our understanding and illuminating the Bible,<sup>335</sup> the Spirit reveals the deep will of God to us.<sup>336</sup> The Holy Spirit also renews a person in all the parts and faculties of his soul. He changes "an aversion of our wills and a depravation of our affections" into "an affinity of our wills and affections to the will of God."<sup>337</sup> He leads, directs, and governs us "in our actions and conversations" in order that we might walk in the Spirit. He "establishes our faith, and perfects our obedience, by enlightening the understanding and rectifying the will,"<sup>338</sup> and comforts believers and helps our infirmities.

As far as love and purification of affection are concerned, Wesley depicted the role of the Spirit as follows. The Spirit "sheds the love of God abroad in their hearts, and the love of all mankind, thereby purifying their hearts from the love of the world from the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life." He saves men "from anger and pride, from all vile and inordinate affections, from evil words and works, from all unholiness of conversation." He makes men be "zealous of all good works."<sup>339</sup>

In a letter to a Roman Catholic, he comprehensively delineated the role of the Spirit in sanctification as "the immediate cause of all holiness in us." The Spirit enlightens our understandings, rectifies our wills and affections, renews our natures, unites our persons to Christ, assures us of the adoption of sons, leads us in our actions, purifies and sanctifies our souls and bodies.<sup>340</sup> The Spirit offers us a new inner acceptance and peace through his witness to our soul.<sup>341</sup> In prayer, the Spirit makes intercession for the saints according to the will of God when we do not know what we should pray for as we ought.<sup>342</sup>

To sum up, the Holy Spirit works in us for our sanctification through illuminating our

---

<sup>335</sup> Letter to The Right Reverend The Lord Bishop of Gloucester: 'The Operation of the Holy Ghost': *Works* 9, 149.

<sup>336</sup> *Ibid.* p.165.

<sup>337</sup> *Ibid.* p.165.

<sup>338</sup> Letter to The Right Reverend The Lord Bishop of Gloucester: 'The Operation of the Holy Ghost': *Works* 9, 149.

<sup>339</sup> Sermon IX. The Spirit of Bondage and Adoption: *Works* 5, 108.

<sup>340</sup> Letter to a Roman Catholic, 8: *Works* 10, 82.

<sup>341</sup> Cf. Melvin E. Dieter, "Wesleyan Theology," in *John Wesley: Contemporary Perspective* (London: Epworth, 1988), p. 170.

<sup>342</sup> *Ibid.* pp.165-166.

intelligence, rectifying our willing, purifying our affection and renewing our soul. Through his work, we recover and participate in his image.<sup>343</sup>

### 3.2.3.2 The Human Role in Sanctification

With regard to God's grace and human responsibility in our salvation, Randy L. Maddox is of the opinion that for Wesley "God will not effect holiness apart from our responsive participation, while we can not attain holiness apart from God's grace." It seems germane, given Wesley's following two statements. "It is God that worketh in us both to will and to do of his own good pleasure." Therefore "work out your own salvation with fear and trembling."<sup>344</sup>

In the first sentence, the role of God in sanctification is indicated. Wesley claimed, "It is God that works in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure."<sup>345</sup> In his sermon "Salvation by Faith," he declared, "Whatever righteousness may be found in man, this also is the gift of God."<sup>346</sup> These statements testify that Wesley's emphasis on human works did not intend salvation by human merits without God's grace. This expression removes all thoughts of merit. This makes it clear that "it is God that works both inward and outward holiness" and who breathes into us "every good desire," and brings "every good desire to good effect."<sup>347</sup>

Wesley analyzed the second sentence in more detail. The original word which is rendered into *work out* implies "doing a thing thoroughly."<sup>348</sup> 'Your own' means that "you yourselves must do this, or it will be left undone for ever." For Wesley, 'salvation' begins with preventing grace and proceeds by convincing grace.<sup>349</sup> Human working out salvation is accomplished by cooperating with God's grace. The phrase, 'with fear and trembling' means to serve the master with a single heart. It is not to serve God "with eye service, as men-pleasers," but to do "the will of God from the heart" as his servants. 'With fear' (μετὰ φόβου) means that "everything be done with the utmost earnestness of spirit, and with all care and caution." 'With trembling' (μετὰ τρόμου) signifies that everything "be done with the utmost diligence, speed, punctuality, and exactness."<sup>350</sup> His analysis shows us that we should work out our salvation with all our earnestness and diligence in God's grace.

Wesley also explicated the human role in terms of good works and evil works. The human role in sanctification is "to cease to do evil" and "to learn to do well." The former is

---

<sup>343</sup> Sermon XII. 'The Witness of Our Own Spirit' 15: *Works* 5, 141.

<sup>344</sup> Sermon LXXXV. Working out our own Salvation": *Works* 6, 598

<sup>345</sup> Sermon LXXXV. Working out our own Salvation," 1.1: *Works* 6, 598.

<sup>346</sup> Sermon I. Salvation by Faith, 1: *Works* 5, 7.

<sup>347</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>348</sup> Sermon LXXXV. Working out our own Salvation," 2.1.: *Works* 6, 509.

<sup>349</sup> Sermon LXXXV. Working out our own Salvation," 2.1: *Works* 6, 509.

<sup>350</sup> Sermon LXXXV. Working out our own Salvation," 2.2: *Works* 6, 510.

to avoid “every evil word and work” and to abstain from “all appearance of evil.” The latter is to be “zealous of good works, of works of piety, works of mercy.”<sup>351</sup> The human role includes self-denial and bearing the cross daily, and watching out the remains of sin believers.<sup>352</sup> It is related to obeying the moral law, not as “the condition of obtaining, but of continuing in the favour of God.”<sup>353</sup>

Wesley understood the relation between the above two sentences as “the closest connection.” “First God works; therefore you can work. Secondly, God works, therefore you must work.”<sup>354</sup> First, original sin cannot be an excuse for their actual sins because prevenient grace empowered them to avoid them. As far as they cooperate with the work of God in them, they can evade actual sin. For Wesley, the following two sentences are absolutely true. “Without me ye can do nothing.” “I can do all things through Christ that strengtheneth me.”<sup>355</sup> Secondly, we must work because God works in us. Wesley found its ground in the statement of Augustine, which reads “*Qui fecit nos sine nobis, non salvabit nos sine nobis*”: “He that made us without ourselves, will not save us without ourselves.”<sup>356</sup> Wesley warned that “God will not save us unless we labour by every possible means to ‘make our own calling and election sure.’”<sup>357</sup> The more grace we received, the more are our obligations to sanctification.<sup>358</sup>

As we have observed above, Wesley connected the indicative with the imperative in a logical way. The difference between Calvin and Wesley lies in the fact that for Wesley, our role in sanctification absolutely affects God’s salvation, while for Calvin, the role of the elect in sanctification is almost automatically done by God’s sovereign grace. Thus for Calvin, the human role in sanctification inclines to be weak, while for Wesley, assurance of our salvation is prone to be weak. Nonetheless, in practice, Calvin strengthened the human role in sanctification by the third use of the Law and the emphasis of discipline and prayer.

For Wesley, grace is resistible because God wants to redeem man as a free acting being. Man works with God for his salvation. But human cooperating power stems from God.<sup>359</sup> Therefore, it is all to the glory of God. Wesley considered human cooperation with the initiative of God’s grace in sanctification as harmonious to God’s wisdom, justice, and

---

<sup>351</sup> For the list of the works of piety and mercy, see 1.2.10.5.1 (p. 107).

<sup>352</sup> Sermon LXXXV. Working out our own Salvation,” 2.4: *Works* 6, 511.

<sup>353</sup> Letter CCCLXX. To Miss Jane Hilton, June 19, 1771: *Works* 12, 368.

<sup>354</sup> Sermon LXXXV. Working out our own Salvation,” 3.3: *Works* 6, 511.

<sup>355</sup> Sermon LXXXV. Working out our own Salvation,” 3.5: *Works* 6, 512.

<sup>356</sup> Sermon LXXXV. Working out our own Salvation,” 3.7: *Works* 6, 513.

<sup>357</sup> Sermon LXXXV. Working out our own Salvation,” 3.7: *Works* 6, 513.

<sup>358</sup> Kenneth J. Collins, *Scripture Way of Salvation: The Heart of John Wesley’s Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), p.155.

<sup>359</sup> Predestination Calmly Considered: *Works* 10, 230.

mercy in that human responsibility justifies God's judgment.<sup>360</sup> Wesley realized that the balance between God's grace and the human response is important, for its loss causes either quietism or enthusiastic pride.<sup>361</sup>

### 3.2.3.3 Monergist or Synergist?

As John Allan Knight aptly pointed out, after the controversy with the Calvinistic Methodists in 1770, Wesley generally emphasised "freedom and man's works more than faith and God's grace."<sup>362</sup> As a result, he was criticized for his legalism by the Calvinistic Methodists. However, the critique that Wesley was a legalist seems unreasonable because he consistently recognized the absolute initiative of God's grace in sanctification. Of course, Wesley was not a monergist who holds that God alone accomplishes all things in relation to human salvation. He can be said to be a synergist in the sense that he expected final salvation through human good works as the result of the cooperation with God's grace.<sup>363</sup>

### 3.2.4 The Stages of Sanctification

It is not easy to say that Wesley strictly divided the whole process of sanctification into the following stages, because he admitted that a Christian could slide back to a previous stage. Accordingly, these stages are not fixed, but changeable. Nonetheless, the structure of his doctrine of sanctification can be classified into these stages.

#### 3.2.4.1 The State before Justification

##### 3.2.4.1.1 The Sleeping State

In his sermon on "the Spirit of Bondage and of Adoption," Wesley compared the state of a natural man to "a state of sleep."<sup>364</sup> A natural man cannot see spiritual things since his eyes are covered with spiritual darkness. He is totally ignorant of God and his law, holiness and happiness in Christ. His indolent state is "a kind of peace consisting with an earthly,

---

<sup>360</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 232 f.

<sup>361</sup> Randy L. Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley's Practical Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994), p. 92.

<sup>362</sup> John Allan Knight, "John Fletcher's Influence on the Development of Wesleyan Theology in America," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 13 (1978): 21; cf. Kenneth J Collins, "A Hermeneutical Model For the Wesleyan *Ordo Salutis*," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 19 (1984): 23. Here, Collins mentions Wesley's sermon "On Working Out Our Own Salvation" as one exception contrary to Knight's claim.

<sup>363</sup> Leo G. Cox called Wesley's synergism a synergism born of monergism in the sense that "God *works*, therefore man is enabled to work." *John Wesley's Concept of Perfection* (Ph. D. diss., University of Iowa, An Arbor: UMI, 1959), p. 341.

<sup>364</sup> Sermon IX. The Spirit of Bondage and of Adoption: *Works* 5, 99.

devilish mind.”<sup>365</sup> Though he stands on the edge of the pit, he does not fear it. Though he might hear of God, he does not know God as He is. He thinks God to be merciful to him in spite of his sins. He is ignorant of God’s wrath against those who do not obey his law. He imagines that Christ came to destroy the Law and the Prophets in order to deliver men “in, not from their sins.”<sup>366</sup> He is also utterly ignorant of himself. Though he may have some knowledge of the Bible, he feels a kind of joy from the desires of the flesh, the desire of the eye, and the pride of life.<sup>367</sup> Free from holiness and the mind of Christ, he commits sin day by day. He remains a willing servant of sin, content with the bondage of corruption; inwardly and outwardly unholy. He neither conquers sin nor strives to conquer the sin in him.<sup>368</sup>

In this state he is “unable to do anything acceptable to God,”<sup>369</sup> for he does not have any power to do such good. He can just wait to receive the power.<sup>370</sup> Nonetheless, the prevenient grace of God in all can sufficiently lead us to Christ, unless we refuse it.

### 3.2.4.1.2 Awakening: Repentance before Justification

Wesley distinguished between repentance antecedent to justification and the repentance consequent upon it. In the former, he viewed repentance antecedent to justification as legal repentance. It is “the very first motion of the soul towards God.”<sup>371</sup> It occurs when an awakened by the Holy Spirit starts with a new spiritual journey in his life with sincere resolution. This repentance means “conviction of sin, producing real desires and sincere resolutions of amendment.” It relates to actual sin rather than inward sin. The fruits meeting for repentance are “forgiving our brother (Matt 6:14, 15), ceasing from evil, doing good...in general obeying him according to the measure of grace which we have received (Matt 7:7; 25:29).”

With respect to the relationship between faith and repentance, while Calvin considered faith in God’s mercy as the presupposition for evangelical repentance and deemed legal repentance useless for our salvation, Wesley thought legal repentance to come before justification by faith. For Wesley, legal repentance and its fruits, if opportunity permits, are “necessarily previous to faith”<sup>372</sup> because “no man ever yet truly believed the gospel who

---

<sup>365</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>366</sup> *Ibid.* p.100.

<sup>367</sup> *Ibid.* p.100.

<sup>368</sup> *Ibid.* p.101.

<sup>369</sup> The Principles of a Methodist Written in 1740. ‘Of the Effect of Justification,’ 29: *Works*, 8, 373.

<sup>370</sup> A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion: *Works* 8, 53.

<sup>371</sup> Wesley, *NT Notes*, Matt. 3:8.

<sup>372</sup> A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion. Part I. 2. 4: *Works* 8, 52. “[O]ur Church inculcates justification by faith alone, she nevertheless supposes repentance to be *previous to faith*, and fruits meet for repentance” (my emphasis); Part I. 2. 10: *Works* 8, 56, 57.



did not first repent” and “none was ever yet truly ‘convinced of righteousness,’ who was not first ‘convinced of sin.’”<sup>373</sup> In this sense, repentance is remotely necessary for initial justification because “it is necessary to the increase or continuance of faith,” while faith is proximately necessary to justification.<sup>374</sup>

To maintain the efficiency of legal repentance for justification, he linked legal repentance to the faith of a servant,<sup>375</sup> and evangelical repentance to the faith of a son. Those with faith of a servant are “not anywise to be despised,” for they are accepted by God. Nevertheless, they should continually press on “from faith of a servant to faith of a son” until they attain “the adoption of sons.”<sup>376</sup>

In regard to the process of repentance before justification, Wesley vividly explicated it as follows. Generally, after perceiving the curse of the law, an awakened man struggles against sin with all his understanding and all his will power, but he realises his inability to overcome his sin. The more he endeavours to be delivered, the more he realizes the chains of sin, for Satan grabs him. Generally, he is particularly disposed to some outward sin and is always prone to some inward sin. “The more he frets against it, the more it prevails.”<sup>377</sup> Again and again, he repents and sins. At last, he groans, “O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?” as in the expression of St. Paul.<sup>378</sup> In the light of Wesley’s delineation above, Collins’ analysis that for Wesley, repentance before justification consists of conviction of sin or self-knowledge, poverty of spirit, and the rejection of self-righteousness seems quite relevant.<sup>379</sup> Poverty of spirit is a consequence of self-knowledge through the law in the illumination of the Spirit. The poor in spirit confess, “In me dwelleth no good thing; but whatsoever is evil and abominable.”<sup>380</sup> Such a confession is connected with the rejection of self-righteousness, which leads him to the stage of justification by faith in Christ.

By corollary, repentance antecedent to justification is of some significance because it is remotely necessary for justification by the faith of a son. Wesley did not consider the fruits of repentance before justification as good works because they stem from his fear of God’s punishment rather than “from faith and the love of God,”<sup>381</sup> and are contaminated with unholy elements by the power of the Satan and sin. Since justification by faith, the fruits of

---

<sup>373</sup> A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion. Part I. 2.10: *Works* 8, 56.

<sup>374</sup> A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion. Part I. 2.11: *Works* 8, 57,58.

<sup>375</sup> Sermon CX. The Discoveries of Faith, 12: *Works* 7, 232.

<sup>376</sup> Sermon CX. The Discoveries of Faith, 12: *Works* 7, 236.

<sup>377</sup> Sermon IX. The Spirit of Bondage and of Adoption: *Works* 5, 104.

<sup>378</sup> *Ibid.* p.105. I do not agree to the statement of Wesley’s. It will be debated at the assessment of his doctrine of sanctification.

<sup>379</sup> Kenneth J. Collins, *Scripture Way of Salvation: The Heart of John Wesley’s Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), p.56.

<sup>380</sup> Sermon XXI Sermon on the Mount, 1.4: *Works* 5, 253.

<sup>381</sup> A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion, Part I, 1, 3: *Works* 8, 47.

repentance are regarded as good works.

### 3.2.4.2 Positional Sanctification: Justification

Wesley defined justification as the act of God the Father in which the believers in Christ are declared to be righteous by “the remission of the sins which are past.”<sup>382</sup> This definition can be expressed in three ways. *Firstly*, justification is based on the atoning work of Christ. In order to be justified, one must believe in the person and work of Christ. *Secondly*, justification entails the remission of sins and restores the sinner to a right relationship with God. This relationship is marked, not by alienation and fear but by faith, hope, and love as a child of God.<sup>383</sup> Man can be justified while he remains under the dominion of sin, in other words, justification can be apart from the fruits of the new birth. Good works and virtues are the results of justification, but not its cause. *Thirdly*, justification is the forgiveness of past sins. This was intended by Wesley against a libertine interpretation, which makes justification an “insurance for sin rather than freedom from its guilt.”<sup>384</sup>

For Wesley, the doctrine of imputation is another way to explicate the efficaciousness of the atonement. Imputation is related to justification as forgiveness and acceptance, but not to sanctification. He thought that the imputation of Christ’s righteousness should not be abused as a veil for unrighteousness.<sup>385</sup> “Without holiness no man shall see the Lord.” Imputed righteousness, i.e., justification is the ground of acceptance by God, whereas inherent righteousness, i.e., sanctification is its fruit.<sup>386</sup> As justification means only forgiveness and acceptance, it is not based on the imputation of Christ’s active righteousness, but on faith in Christ’s atonement. Our own righteousness is founded on our faith in Christ. Though Wesley held that faith is the only necessary condition for justification,<sup>387</sup> it does not mean that repentance and good works are unnecessary for final justification. It means that we cannot be justified without faith in Christ because he is the meritorious cause of justification.<sup>388</sup> Our inherent righteousness as our obedience to God’s

---

<sup>382</sup> Sermon I. Salvation by Faith, 2.3: *Works* 5, 10.

<sup>383</sup> *NT Note* on 1 John 2:13-14: Rom. 5:1.

<sup>384</sup> Kenneth J. Collins, *op. cit.*, p.90.

<sup>385</sup> Randy L. Maddox also stated, “Wesley was convinced that the imputation of Christ’s active righteousness to the believer encouraged antinomianism.” *Responsible Grace*, p.166.

<sup>386</sup> Cf. W. Stephen Gunter, *The Limits of “Love Divine”: John Wesley’s Response to Antinomianism and Enthusiasm* (Nashville, TN: Kingswood, 1989), pp.116-117. “There is a proper place for inherent righteousness...as the *fruit* of it; not in the place of imputed righteousness, but as consequent upon it” (his emphasis).

<sup>387</sup> Sermon V. Justification by Faith, 4.5: *Works* 5, 62. It is “the only thing that is immediately, indispensably, absolutely requisite in order to pardon.”

<sup>388</sup> Answer to the Rev. Mr. Church 2, 9: *Works* 8, 393; cf. Earl P Crow Jr., “Wesley and Antinomianism,” *The Duke Divinity School Review* 31 (Winter 1966): 17.

commandments is necessary for our final justification.

Wesley emphasised that justification is generally instantaneous.<sup>389</sup> The instantaneous element of justification implies the sovereignty of God's grace in human salvation. He admitted that the grace is "irresistible at that moment" when God brings men to faith and convinces them of their sin and reveals Himself to them as in the case of Paul.<sup>390</sup> Yet he believed that "both before and after those moments," the grace may be resistible. In the process, "it does not act irresistibly."<sup>391</sup> He did not deny that "in some souls, the grace of God is so far irresistible that they cannot but believe and be finally saved." But he denied that all those "in whom it does not thus irresistibly works" "must be damned."<sup>392</sup> From his view, God's grace does not always work "irresistibly in every believer."<sup>393</sup> Wesley's depiction that a sinner is justified when he "casts himself wholly on the mercy of God in Christ"<sup>394</sup> implies that he did not deny the human active role in justification, though he emphasised God's initiative.

By justifying grace, man who has attained favour "in the sight of God" has the power of the Holy Spirit ruling in his heart, and has received the "Spirit of adoption" and cries "Abba, Father!"<sup>395</sup> Accordingly, justification can be said to be positional sanctification. In this state, he sees "the light of the glorious love of God in the face of Jesus Christ." Since he sees all his sins laid on His body on the cross, he cries "My Lord and my God." Now, he clearly realizes God in Christ. This state ends both the guilt and power of sin. He confesses, "I am crucified with Christ: Nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: And the life which I now live in the flesh," (even in this mortal body,) "I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me."<sup>396</sup> His remorse, sorrow, and anguish turn into joy. The bondage of sin and Satan is broken and the fear of God's wrath and hell vanishes. Now he does not devote himself "as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin but as instruments of righteousness unto God."<sup>397</sup>

Still, even after being justified, he was born again "in the imperfect sense," i.e., he has power over all sins, but "not a total freedom from them." Subsequently, he does not yet

---

<sup>389</sup> Letter to John Smith, Sep. 28, 1745, III, 11, 12: *Works* 12, 60. "I believe it is generally given *in an instant*." "This first sowing of the first seed of faith, you cannot conceive to be other than *instantaneous*" (my emphasis).

<sup>390</sup> Rev. J. Wesley's Journal, Aug. 22, 1743: *Works* 1, 427; *Works* 10, 204. "...when the power of the Highest wrought upon them in an eminent manner...And at that time it is certain they had no power to resist the grace of God."

<sup>391</sup> *Works* 1, 407.

<sup>392</sup> *Works* 1, 427.

<sup>393</sup> Predestination Calmly Considered 4: *Works* 10, 205.

<sup>394</sup> Sermon V, Justification by Faith 4, 6: *Works* 5, 62.

<sup>395</sup> Sermon IX. The Spirit of Bondage and of Adoption: *Works* 5, 106.

<sup>396</sup> *Ibid.* p.107.

<sup>397</sup> *Ibid.*

have “in the full and proper sense” a perfectly pure heart. If he is exposed to diverse temptations without a firmer gift, he may and will fall again from the state of justification, i.e., the state to control the motion of sin. Collins contends that for Wesley, “If believers continue in the practice of sin,” they cannot remain justified because justification is the remission of past sins.<sup>398</sup> This statement makes justification unstable like the Roman Catholic view of justification, which warns saints of the possibility to lose infused righteousness. As Ralph Del Colle aptly points out, Wesley’s view of justification is closer to the Tridentine rather than to Calvin in the sense that Wesley understood justification as the actualisation of inherent righteousness, not as the imputation of Christ’s righteousness.<sup>399</sup> The only distinction between the Tridentine and Wesley lies in that the former regarded repentance and good works as the merit of final justification, whereas the latter regarded it as a condition and God’s gift. Though we can say that the former viewed the beginning of sanctification as infused righteousness, whereas the latter saw it as regeneration,<sup>400</sup> it is only a difference in conception, not in an actuality. For Reformed Scholasticism, the formal cause of justification is declared to be the death of Christ, whereas for Wesley, it is ascribed to “the universally offered grace of God.” The former results in universal atonement in the case of Barth or particular election in the case of Calvin, the latter enables man to cooperate with God’s grace to be justified.<sup>401</sup>

To sum up, for Wesley, initial justification depends upon faith in Christ but final justification depends upon faith, repentance and good works. In contrast to the Reformers, he did not consider Christ as the formal cause of justification, but its meritorious cause, similarly to the Tridentine.<sup>402</sup> Initial justification can be lost to those who continue to remain in sin. It is an instantaneous gift of God and sometimes irresistible, but not always.

---

<sup>398</sup> Kenneth J. Collins, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

<sup>399</sup> Ralph Del Colle, “John Wesley’s Doctrine of Grace in Light of the Christian Tradition,” *International Journal of Systematic Theology*, Vol. 4, no. 2 (2002), p. 184-185.

<sup>400</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>401</sup> Woodrow W. Whidden, “Wesley on Imputation: A Truly Reckoned Reality or Antinomian Polemical Wreckage,” *The Asbury Theological Journal*, Vol. 52. No. 2 (1997): 67.

<sup>402</sup> *Ibid.*; cf. According to Peter Toon, The Council of Trent said that of justification, the *final* cause is the glory of God, the *efficient* cause is a merciful God, the *meritorious* cause is Christ, the *instrumental* cause is the sacrament of baptism, and the *formal* cause is the justice of God. Peter Toon, *Foundations for Faith: An Introduction to Christian Doctrine Justification and Sanctification* (Westchester: Crossway Books and London: Marshall Morgan & Scott, 1983), pp. 68-69. In applying this scheme to Wesley, we can make the following suggestions. The *meritorious* cause is Christ’s atonement, the *formal* cause is God’s grace, the *material* cause is sacraments, the *indirectly conditional* cause is good works, and the *directly conditional* or *instrumental* cause is faith. Given that Reformed theology ascribed the formal cause to Christ’s works, Wesley can be said to maintain a balance between Catholicism and Reformed Theology. Cf. Whidden, *op. cit.* p. 67; Mbennah & Vorster, *op. cit.*, p. 181. Justification “was attained *meritoriously* through the sacrificial work of Christ. Justification was appropriated *instrumentally* by faith alone; and that justification is *declaratively* demonstrated by good works.”

It is generally consequent on repentance and its fruits and concurrent with the new birth.

### 3.2.4.3 Initial Sanctification: The New Birth

For Wesley, the time of the new birth was identified with the moment of justification. The new birth and justification are given to every believer “in one and the same moment.” At the same time “his sins are blotted out, and he is born again of God.”<sup>403</sup>

In regard to the necessity of the new birth, Wesley referred to John 3:3, which reads “Truly, truly, I tell you, no one can see the kingdom of God without being born from above.” Wesley underlined that as long as pride, self-will, and idolatry reign in the heart, there can be no room for happiness.<sup>404</sup>

With respect to the relationship between regeneration and sanctification, he understood regeneration as the entrance of sanctification.

This [regeneration] is a part of sanctification, not the whole; it is the gate to it, the entrance into it. When we are born again, then our sanctification, our inward and outward holiness, begins; and thenceforward we are gradually to “grow up in Him who is our Head.”<sup>405</sup> ([ ] is my addition).

In his sermon on God’s Vineyard (1787), Wesley stated, “The new birth is the first point of sanctification, which may increase more and more unto the perfect day.”<sup>406</sup> It is “planting all good dispositions,” while entire sanctification is “deliverance from all evil disposition.” Regeneration is not “the whole gradual process of sanctification” but the porch of sanctification.<sup>407</sup> After the new birth, Christian sanctification becomes mature in Christ.

In terms of the direction of change, he delineated regeneration as follows. Regeneration is inward change “from darkness into marvellous light,” “from the image of the brute and the devil into the image of God,” from the earthly, sensual and devilish mind to “the mind which was in Christ Jesus.”<sup>408</sup> In a letter to Richard Morgan,<sup>409</sup> Wesley described regeneration as “a renewal of our minds in the image of God; a recovery of the divine likeness; a still-increasing conformity of heart and life to the pattern of our most holy Redeemer.” This definition is almost identical with that of sanctification except for the fact that new birth in a narrow sense is the commencement of sanctification, not entire

---

<sup>403</sup> Sermon XIX. 1: *Works* 5, 223.

<sup>404</sup> Sermon VII. The Way to The Kingdom 1, 5: *Works* 7, 78.

<sup>405</sup> Sermon XLV. 4. 3: *Works* 6, 74.

<sup>406</sup> Sermon CVII. On God’s Vineyard, 1,7: *Works* 7, 205.

<sup>407</sup> Sermon CVII. 1. 7: *Works* 7, 205.

<sup>408</sup> Sermon XIV, The Repentance of Believers. 3. 2: *Works* 5, 169.

<sup>409</sup> Baker, ed., *Letters*, 25:369 (to Richard Morgan, Sr. Jan. 15, 1734).

sanctification.<sup>410</sup>

In his sermon “The New Birth” (1760), Wesley described the nature of the new birth as “the change wrought in the whole soul by the almighty Spirit of God when it is ‘created anew in Christ Jesus.’”<sup>411</sup> It refers not to the entirety of the process of sanctification but to the total change of its beginning.<sup>412</sup>

From the viewpoint of the recovery of God’s image, he defined the new birth as “to recover from his fall, to regain that image of God wherein he was created.” It is inward universal change and “birth from above” figured out by baptism and the beginning of the total renovation, i.e., the “sanctification of spirit, soul, and body.”<sup>413</sup> Initial sanctification involves freedom from the guilt and power of sin, but not freedom from its being, i.e., inward sin. Inward sin cannot reign over him, but is not yet abolished. Accordingly, the regenerated needs continual repentance of inward sin remaining in him. Kenneth J. Collins understands Wesley’s new birth as inward sanctification.<sup>414</sup> His view seems reasonable given that Wesley described new birth as inward change.

On the perfection of the new birth, Wesley noted that the regenerated are already so perfect as not to commit sin though they were depicted as babes in Christ.<sup>415</sup> “This is the glorious privilege of every Christian, yea though he be but a baby in Christ.”<sup>416</sup> While he abides in faith, love, the spirit of prayer, and thanksgiving, the regenerated not only do not, but also cannot commit outward sin as a voluntary transgression of the written law of God.<sup>417</sup> In “Minutes of Some Late Conversations,” he answered that a new born Christian who has justifying faith has “power over all outward sin and power to keep down inward sin.”<sup>418</sup> However, as Maddox points out,<sup>419</sup> it is rather doubtful how he can avoid outward sin while he has inward sin.

With regard to the relationship between the new birth and baptism by water, Wesley stated that the new birth is not equated with baptism. “It does not always accompany baptism and they do not constantly go together.”<sup>420</sup> Baptism may be an outward sign where there is no new birth as inward grace.

---

<sup>410</sup> Cf. Similarly to my opinion, in his *Responsible Grace*, Maddox describes, “if taken in its strongest sense, it could equate the New Birth and entire sanctification!” Maddox, *op. cit.*, p. 159.

<sup>411</sup> Sermon XLV. The New Birth, 2.5: *Works* 6, 71:

<sup>412</sup> The Doctrine of Original Sin: *Works* 9, 459.

<sup>413</sup> Sermon III. Awake, Thou That Sleepest, 1. 2: *Works* 5, 26.

<sup>414</sup> Kenneth J. Collins, *Scripture Way of Salvation: The Heart of John Wesley’s Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), p.104.

<sup>415</sup> Plain Account of Christian Perfection 12: *Works* 11,375.

<sup>416</sup> Plain Account of Christian Perfection 12: *Works* 11,376.

<sup>417</sup> Sermon XIX. Privilege of Those that are Born of God, II, 2: *Works* 5: 226.

<sup>418</sup> Minutes of Some Late Conversations, Answer to Q.7: *Works* 8, 276.

<sup>419</sup> Randy L. Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley’s Practical Theology* (Nashville, Kingwood Books, 1994), p. 182.

<sup>420</sup> Sermon XLV. The New Birth 4, 2: *Works* 6, 74.



### 3.2.4.4 Repentance after Justification by Faith in Christ

Contrary to repentance before justification by faith in Christ, repentance consequent to justification has “no guilt, no sense of condemnation, no consciousness of the wrath of God” because they are in Christ.<sup>421</sup> It is a confidence of the carnal mind, i.e., “proneness to evil, a heart bent to backsliding” and “the still continuing tendency of the flesh to lust against the spirit.”<sup>422</sup> The former is called legal repentance, whereas the latter is called evangelical repentance, which is described as a change of heart from “all sin to all holiness.”<sup>423</sup> While legal repentance is related to outward sin, evangelical repentance is concerned with inward sin, i.e., the carnal nature, and it aims at the more spiritually mature.<sup>424</sup> Inward sin has an effect on Christians’ words and actions. Even their most noble works may be motivated by their carnal nature. Hence, they still need evangelical repentance.

The conviction of “utter helplessness” is an important distinctive aspect of this repentance.<sup>425</sup> It means that before justification, believers are totally helpless in doing good as they are even after justification. Not by their own strength but only by the gift of God can they do good works. Even by justifying grace, they are unable to remove such inward sins as “pride, self-will, love of the world, anger, and general proneness to depart from God.”<sup>426</sup> At this stage, although they may, by the Spirit, mortify the deeds of the flesh, struggle with both outward and inward sin, and they may weaken their enemies day by day, they cannot drive them out. Even by all the grace which is given at justification believers cannot exterminate them.<sup>427</sup> “Though we watch and pray ever so much, we cannot wholly cleanse either our hearts or hands.” Only another blessing of the Lord can clean their hearts, and abolish the evil root of the carnal mind. “If there be no such second change, if there be no instantaneous deliverance after justification,” believers must remain guilty till death.<sup>428</sup> Accordingly, they are continually to repent after having been justified. God can save them from all sin remaining in their our hearts, the sin clinging to all their words and actions, from sins of omission, and can supply whatever is required for salvation. God promised this to them both in the Old and the New Testament.<sup>429</sup> This mean there remains another stage before them, namely, entire sanctification.

Considering the relationship between repentance and faith, Wesley compared both in

---

<sup>421</sup> Sermon XIV. Repentance of Believers, 1.16: *Works* 5, 163.

<sup>422</sup> Sermon XLIII. 3. 6: *Works* 6,50.

<sup>423</sup> Wesley, NT Note, Mt. 3:8.

<sup>424</sup> Sermon XIII On Sins in Believers, 3.2: *Works* 5, 147.

<sup>425</sup> Sermon XIV. Repentance of Believers, 1.16: *Works* 5, 163.

<sup>426</sup> Sermon XIV. Repentance of Believers, 1.17: *Works* 5, 164.

<sup>427</sup> Sermon XIV. Repentance of Believers, 1.19-20: *Works* 5, 164-165.

<sup>428</sup> Sermon XIV. Repentance of Believers, 1.20: *Works* 5, 165.

<sup>429</sup> Sermon XIV. Repentance of Believers, 2.2: *Works* 5, 166.

three facets. First, while by repentance we feel sin remaining in our hearts and cleaving to our words and actions, by faith we receive the power of God in Christ purifying our hearts and cleansing our hands. Secondly, while by repentance we have an abiding conviction that there is no help in us, by faith we receive not only mercy but “grace to help” us in every time of need. Thirdly, while repentance says, “Without him I can do nothing,” faith says, “I can do all things through Christ strengthening me.”

In conclusion, for Wesley, repentance after justification by faith in Christ is necessary for “our continuance and growth in grace” i.e., gradual sanctification.<sup>430</sup>

### 3.2.4.5 Entire Sanctification

Entire sanctification will be examined from the viewpoint of the final stage of salvation according to Wesley’s teleological soteriology.<sup>431</sup>

For Wesley, the state of entire sanctification is the last and highest state of perfection attainable in this life. In the full and perfect sense, this is the state that is given unto those with a new and clean heart, where “the struggle between the old and the new man is over.”<sup>432</sup> In view of the broad or perfect sense of regeneration, entire sanctification can be defined as “total freedom from all the stirring and motions of sin.”<sup>433</sup> As Collins puts it, it entire sanctification is the state in which “the heart is not only delivered from the power of sin but also from its being.”<sup>434</sup>

From the viewpoint of affection, Wesley defined perfection as “the humble, gentle, patient love of God, and our neighbour, ruling our tempers, words, and actions.”<sup>435</sup> Perfection is the state that Jesus alone reigns in our heart as “the Lord of every motion.”<sup>436</sup> In this manner, entire sanctification is defined as purification of affection in our right relation towards God and people. It is almost identified with the fruit of the Spirit.

With respect to inward sin, Wesley defined entire sanctification as freedom from evil thoughts and evil tempers which compose inward sin.<sup>437</sup> Because in this stage, our evil nature is destroyed and only Christ lives in us, we are purified from pride, desire, anger and come to be humble, meek and gentle. We live not according to our self-will but the will of God.<sup>438</sup> Our heart has been cleaned of inward sin by the sanctifying grace of the

---

<sup>430</sup> Sermon XIV. Repentance of Believers, 3: *Works* 5, 157: cf. Randy L. Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley’s Practical Theology* (Nashville, Kingwood Books, 1994), p. 182.

<sup>431</sup> Other views of entire sanctification will be discussed in 1.2.7 The Nature of Sanctification.

<sup>432</sup> The Principles of a Methodist Written in 1740, ‘Of the Effect of Justification,’ 29: *Works*, 8, 373.

<sup>433</sup> The Principles of a Methodist Written in 1740, ‘Of the Effect of Justification,’ 29. 2: *Works*, 8, 373.

<sup>434</sup> Kenneth J. Collins, *Scripture Way of Salvation: The Heart of John Wesley’s Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), p.108.

<sup>435</sup> *Works* 11, 446.

<sup>436</sup> Sermon LXXXIII. On Patience: *Works* 6, 490.

<sup>437</sup> Plain Account of Christian Perfection 12: *Works* 11,377.

<sup>438</sup> Plain Account of Christian Perfection 12: *Works* 11,377.

Holy Spirit. After gradual mortification, we experience “a total death to sin and an entire renewal in the love and image of God, so as to rejoice evermore, to pray without ceasing, and in everything to give thanks.”<sup>439</sup>

Considering whether it is real moral transformation in us or our right relationship with Christ, Colin W. Williams claims that for Wesley, “the perfect Christian is holy, not because he has risen to a required moral standard, but because he lives in this state of unbroken fellowship with Christ.”<sup>440</sup> His view seems germane in the light of justification,<sup>441</sup> but in the light of sanctification his opinion seems imperfect given that Wesley emphasised total, real change in our tempers, thoughts, words, and action.<sup>442</sup> Though such changes result from our right relationship with Christ, entire sanctification does not exclude the change of our action and life as our congruity to the perfect will of God.<sup>443</sup> Wesley did not identify entire sanctification with “a full conformity to the perfect law,” nor exclude fulfilling “the law of love” as our real change in terms of moral standard.<sup>444</sup>

In relation to purity of intention, entire devotion, the circumcision of the heart, the recovery of God’s image, and love of God and man, Wesley described entire sanctification inclusively:

In one view, it is purity of intention, dedicating all the life to God. It is the giving God all our heart; it is one desire and design ruling all our tempers. It is the devoting, not a part, but all our soul, body, and substance to God. In another view, it is all the mind which was in Christ, enabling us to walk as Christ walked. It is the circumcision of the heart from all filthiness, all inward as well as outward pollution. It is a renewal of the heart in the whole image of

---

<sup>439</sup> Plain Account of Christian Perfection 12: *Works* 11,401.

<sup>440</sup> Collin W. Williams, *John Wesley’s Theology Today* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960), pp. 170 and 175: Later, he again emphasised it, “The Christian who is perfect is free from sin, not according to the objective standards of justice, but according to the measure of personal relationship with Christ” (p. 178).

<sup>441</sup> Preface to a Treatise on Justification: *Works* 10, 322. “The terms of acceptance for fallen man (justification) were a full satisfaction to the divine justice and a *complete conformity to the divine law*” (my addition and emphasis).

<sup>442</sup> As the mark of sanctification, our love of God is shown through our “conformity to his will; obedience to all the commands of God, internal and external; obedience of the heart and of the life; in every temper, and in all manner of conversation.” Sermon XVIII. The Marks of the New Birth 3, 5: *Works* 5, 220.

<sup>443</sup> A Plain Account of Christian Perfection 25: *Works* 11, 436. “If we suffer persecution and affliction in a right manner, we attain a larger measure of conformity to Christ”...“True resignation consists in a thorough conformity to the whole will of God.”

<sup>444</sup> Plain Account of Christian Perfection 25 Q 13 and its Answer: *Works* 11, 419. “...notwithstanding that defect (of perfection) and its consequences, *they* (the entirely sanctified) *fulfill the law of love*. Yet as, even in this case, *there is not a full conformity to the perfect law*, so the most perfect do, on this very account, need the blood of atonement” (my emphasis and addition).

God, the full likeness of Him that created it. In yet another, it is the loving God with all our heart, and our neighbor as ourselves.<sup>445</sup>

On the other hand, Wesley stressed the instantaneousness of the second blessing, which is a work of grace distinct from the new birth.<sup>446</sup> This second blessing comes at a certain instant after gradual mortification after justification.<sup>447</sup> However, he never called it the baptism of the Holy Spirit.<sup>448</sup> This second blessing causes the inner assurance of entire sanctification.<sup>449</sup> It will be dealt with in more detail at ‘instantaneousness and gradualness’ in this thesis.

In regard to the possibility of loss of entire sanctification, he admitted its possibility.

“Q. 30. Can they fall from it?”

“A. I am well assured they can.”<sup>450</sup>

Wesley stated that even those who have “both the fruit of the Spirit, and the witness” can lose both and “there is no such height or strength of holiness as it is impossible to fall from.”<sup>451</sup> In a letter to Charles Wesley, he wrote that even the perfectly sanctified “can fall, once more, such that not only may inbred sin infect the heart, but the power of actual sin may dominate the soul as well.”<sup>452</sup> By his experience, he confessed, “To retain the grace of God is much more difficult than to gain it. Hardly one in three does this.”<sup>453</sup> This possibility made him urge upon those who were totally sanctified to be always on the watch for sin. Nonetheless, Wesley affirmed that the grace of God is powerful enough to uphold the entirely sanctified, lest they should fall from perfection.

In God’s grace, those who lost perfection can recover it again.

“Q. 31. Can those who fall from this state recover it?”

“A. Why not? We have many instances of this also. Nay, it is an

---

<sup>445</sup> Plain Account of Christian Perfection 27: *Works* 11, 444.

<sup>446</sup> Letter to Thomas Olivers, 1757: letter to Samuel Bardsley, 1772: letter to Jane Salkeld, 1772: letter to Mrs. Barton, 1774: letter to Ann Bolton, 1775.

<sup>447</sup> Plain Account of Christian Perfection 12: *Works* 11,401.

<sup>448</sup> Robert A. Mattke, “The Baptism of the Holy Spirit as Related to the Work of Entire Sanctification,” *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 5-1 (1970): 24; Mildred B. Wynkoop, *Foundations of Wesleyan-Arminian Theology* (Kansas City, Missouri.: Beacon Hill Press, 1967), p.114.

<sup>449</sup> Cox, *op. cit.*, p. 237.

<sup>450</sup> *Works* 11, 426.

<sup>451</sup> *Works* 11, 426. cf. “There is no state under heaven from which it is not possible to fall” Telford, *Letters*, 4:266 (to Ann Foard, September 29, 1764): also see Ward & Heitzenrater, *Journal and Diaries*, 22:422 (July 25, 1774): and Telford, *Letters*, 5:190 (to Mrs. Bennis, June 13, 1770).

<sup>452</sup> Telford, *Letters*, 5:41 (to Charles Wesley, February 12, 1767).

<sup>453</sup> Letters DCCCXXII. To Adam Clarke, Nov. 26, 1790: *Works* 13, 104.

exceeding common thing for persons to lose it more than once.<sup>454</sup>

In regard to the way to keep perfection, Wesley noted several ways in connection with conscience. First, “watch the first risings of sin, and beware of the borders of sin. Venture not upon temptations or occasion of sin.”<sup>455</sup> Secondly, live before God, in the sensible presence of God. Thirdly, diligently examine your heart and life; morning and evening “examine whether you have done what you ought.” Fourthly, “let your whole life be a preparation for heaven.” Fifthly, “do not venture on sin” with the expectation that Christ will pardon your sin. This would be a most hideous maltreatment of Christ. Sixthly, do not be proud of anything in this world. Seventhly, mind your duty, not events. Eighthly, take for yourself “what advice you would give another.”<sup>456</sup> Ninthly, do nothing that you cannot pray for. Tenthly, think, speak, and do what Christ would do in your place.<sup>457</sup> For Wesley, to keep our conscience pure is the best way to maintain our holiness. Viewed negatively, the saints should be watchful against pride, enthusiasm, antinomianism, omission, and schism.<sup>458</sup> Viewed affirmatively, they should not desire “anything but God” and “be exemplary in all things” in order to keep perfection.<sup>459</sup>

For Wesley, entire sanctification is the final stage of the saints in this world. It is the end of justification and its result. It is God’s unchangeable will towards his people.

### 3.2.4.5.1 The Marks of the New Birth

In his sermon on “The Circumcision of the Heart” (1733), Wesley viewed the circumcision of the heart as “the distinguishing mark of a true follower of Christ.”<sup>460</sup> Its mark was depicted as “humility, faith, hope, and charity.”<sup>461</sup> Later, in his sermon the Marks of the New Birth (1748), humility and charity are replaced by “love.” They seem to be amalgamated in the term, love. Faith, hope, and love were regarded as the marks of regeneration and sanctification.<sup>462</sup> This scheme is similar to that of the individual sanctification of Karl Barth, who dealt with faith, hope, and love as three characteristics of Christian life.<sup>463</sup> Unity, purity, and stewardship are treated to in addition to them because they were seriously referred to by Wesley as crucial elements in Christian holy life.

---

<sup>454</sup> Plain Account of Christian Perfection: *Works* 11: 426-427.

<sup>455</sup> Sermon CV. On Conscience: *Works* 7, 193.

<sup>456</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 194.

<sup>457</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>458</sup> Plain Account of Christian Perfection: *Works* 11: 427-435..

<sup>459</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>460</sup> Sermon XVII: *Works* 5, 202.

<sup>461</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 203.

<sup>462</sup> Sermon XVIII. The Marks of the New Birth 1,1: *Works* 5, 213.

<sup>463</sup> See, Barth, *CD* IV/2, 731-836.

### 3.2.4.5.1.1 Faith<sup>464</sup>

Faith is “the foundation” of Christian life<sup>465</sup> because we become children of God through faith. Wesley defined Christian faith as follows:

The true, living, Christian faith, which whosoever hath, is born of God, is not only assent, an act of the understanding; but a disposition which God hath wrought in his heart; “a sure trust and confidence in God, that, through the merits of Christ, his sins are forgiven, and he reconciled to the favor of God.”<sup>466</sup>

It implies that faith is to renounce ourselves, i.e., to reject all confidence in the flesh to be “found in Christ.” This faith is accepted by him.<sup>467</sup>

A fruit of faith is freedom from the power of all kinds of sins including outward sins and inwards sin.<sup>468</sup> Faith in the blood of Christ purges the conscience from dead works and purifies “the heart from every unholy desire and temper.” Its fruit is to be free from sin and to become a servant of righteousness. The person justified by faith does “not commit sin” (1 John 3:1). To interpret it as “Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin *habitually*” is to add a human word, “habitually” to Scripture text.<sup>469</sup> If a Christian does not look after himself nor abide in the faith, he “may commit sin even as another man.” Conversely, as long as he looks after himself, the evil one cannot touch him.<sup>470</sup> In human transformation, not the pessimism of human nature, but the optimism of grace is the characteristics of Wesley’s theology.<sup>471</sup>

Another fruit of a living faith is peace. Since our sins were cleaned by faith in Jesus Christ, “we have peace with God” (Rom. 5:1.) This is the accomplishment of the promise which our Lord said: “Peace I leave with you; my peace I give unto you. Not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid” (John 14:27, KJV).<sup>472</sup> This is God’s peace to pass “all understanding.” It is a peace which this world cannot deprive them of. Being based upon a rock, that is Christ, even waves and storms cannot shake it. It keeps “the hearts and minds of the children of God” in any situation, i.e., in ease or in pain, in sickness or health, in abundance or want. As a result, in every state

---

<sup>464</sup> See also 3.2.8.2 Faith and Sanctification.

<sup>465</sup> Sermon XVIII. The Marks of the New Birth 1, 1: *Works* 5, 213.

<sup>466</sup> Sermon XVIII. The Marks of the New Birth 1, 3: *Works* 5, 213.

<sup>467</sup> Sermon XVIII. The Marks of the New Birth 1, 3: *Works* 5, 213.

<sup>468</sup> Sermon XVIII. The Marks of the New Birth 1, 4: *Works* 5, 214.

<sup>469</sup> Sermon XVIII. The Marks of the New Birth 1, 5: *Works* 5, 215.

<sup>470</sup> Sermon XIX. The Great Privilege of Those That Are Born of God, 2, 7: *Works* 5, 229.

<sup>471</sup> Kenneth J. Collins, *Scripture Way of Salvation: The Heart of John Wesley’s Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), p.119.

<sup>472</sup> Sermon XVIII. The Marks of the New Birth 1,7: *Works* 5, 216.



they are content, and believe that “in all things God works for the good of those who love him.” Peace in them enables them to stand fast, believing in the Lord in all the vicissitudes of life.<sup>473</sup>

To sum up, faith as a mark of the new birth is the foundation of Christian life and its characteristics are freedom and peace. This faith can be lost and in that case, he will slide back to an unholy life.

### 3.2.4.5.1.2 Hope

Wesley viewed hope as the second scriptural mark of the regenerated. A *lively* or *living* hope is contrary to a dead hope which is “the offspring of pride” and “the parent of every evil word and work.”<sup>474</sup> Every man with living hope is holy “as He that calleth him is holy.” Those who hope to see the Lord purify themselves according to His purity. This hope implies two testimonies. Firstly, the testimony of our own spirit that we walk “in simplicity and godly sincerity.” Secondly, the testimony of the Spirit of God that being led by the Spirit of God, “we cry, Abba, Father!”<sup>475</sup> As “joint-heirs with Christ” of God’s kingdom we participate in sufferings with Christ and deny ourselves, take up our cross daily, cheerfully endure persecution or reproach for his sake, “that we may also be glorified together.”<sup>476</sup> Expecting God’s reward for our patience empowers us with the power to endure our suffering.

While faith accompanies freedom and peace, hope accompanies joy. Though we are sad, the Spirit in us changes it into joy according to the Lord’s promise that when the Comforter is come, “your heart shall rejoice”, “your joy shall be full,” and “that joy no man taketh from you” (John 16:22). Because we stand in reconciliation with God, we rejoice in hope of the glory of God” (Rom. 5:2). In hoping to meet Christ, we rejoice with unspeakable joy and full of glory (1 Pet. 1:5, etc). It is like “the hidden manna, which no man knows, save he that receives it.” This joy overflows, even in severe suffering, because of the superfluous consolations of his Spirit.<sup>477</sup> The children of God are not afraid of any “want, pain, hell, and the grave,” for they know Him who has “the keys of death and hell.” In hope, they rejoice in the depth of affliction because they know God’s true comfort to be given to them on the judging day of God (Rev. 21:3, 4).

### 3.2.4.5.1.3 Love

Love is “a third scriptural mark” of the regenerated, and the greatest of all. A mark of a

---

<sup>473</sup> Sermon XVIII. The Marks of the New Birth 1,7: *Works* 5, 216.

<sup>474</sup> Sermon XVIII. The Marks of the New Birth 2.1: *Works* 5, 216.

<sup>475</sup> Sermon XVIII. The Marks of the New Birth 2.1-3: *Works* 5, 216-217.

<sup>476</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>477</sup> Sermon XVIII. The Marks of the New Birth 2.4: *Works* 5, 218.

faithful Christian is to love “the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.” In this love, he knows the meaning of “My Beloved is mine, and I am his” (Cant. 2:16).<sup>478</sup>

Love expels all kinds of sins in the regenerate.<sup>479</sup> It is the origin of every grace and holy and happy temper. From love flows “uniform holiness of conversation.”<sup>480</sup> Perfect love results in “rejoicing evermore, praying without ceasing, in everything giving thanks.”<sup>481</sup> Love is described as “the medicine of life, the never-failing remedy for all the evils of a disordered world, for all the miseries and vices of men.”<sup>482</sup>

As the marks of the new birth, Wesley classified the fruits of love into three categories. The first fruit of our love of God is the love of our neighbour as our body, which means every man around us regardless of our friends or enemies.<sup>483</sup> As Christ showed us his example, true love is to love to the extent to give our life for neighbours. Then “we know that “we have passed from death unto life because we thus “love the brethren” (1 John 3:14).<sup>484</sup> Our love towards people is “the sign or proof of the love of God”<sup>485</sup> The second fruit of the love of God is entire obedience to him, i.e., “conformity to his will; obedience to all the commands of God, internal and external; obedience of the heart and of the life; in every temper, and in all manner of conversation.”<sup>486</sup> The third fruit of love is change of temper. The regenerated man became “zealous of good works,” “hungering and thirsting to do good” for all people. With joy, they do good works for their neighbours with all their belongings and abilities, looking for recompense in heaven not in this world.<sup>487</sup>

In a letter to the Rev. Dr. Conyers Middleton, Wesley added a more concrete explanation of love towards neighbours, the change of Christian disposition, conversation and action. *First*, Christian love is not confined to “one sect or party” including his supporters. This love embraces “neighbours and strangers,” “friends and enemies,” not only “the good and gentle,” but also “the froward, the evil and unthankful.”<sup>488</sup> *Secondly*, this universal, unselfish love is productive of all right affections, i.e., “gentleness, tenderness, sweetness; of humanity, courtesy, and affability.”<sup>489</sup> It enables a Christian to rejoice in the virtues and happiness of all neighbours, to sympathize with their pains, and

<sup>478</sup> Sermon XVIII. The Marks of the New Birth 3, 2: *Works* 5, 219.

<sup>479</sup> Minutes of Some Late Conversations between the Rev. Mr. Wesleys and Others, Conversation V, “Wednesday, June 17<sup>th</sup>,” Answer to Q. 8: *Works* 8, 296. “But if the love of God fill all the heart, there can be no sin there.”

<sup>480</sup> A Letter to the Reverend Mr. Baily of Cork, 2.23.1: *Works* 9, 85.

<sup>481</sup> Sermon XLIII. Scripture Way of Salvation, 1, 9: *Works* 6, 46.

<sup>482</sup> *Works* 8, 3.

<sup>483</sup> Sermon XVIII. The Marks of the New Birth 3, 3: *Works* 5, 219.

<sup>484</sup> Sermon XVIII. The Marks of the New Birth 3, 3: *Works* 5, 220.

<sup>485</sup> Sermon XVIII. The Marks of the New Birth 3, 4: *Works* 5, 220.

<sup>486</sup> Sermon XVIII. The Marks of the New Birth 3, 5: *Works* 5, 220.

<sup>487</sup> Sermon XVIII. The Marks of the New Birth 3, 5: *Works* 5, 220.

<sup>488</sup> Letter to the Rev. Dr. Middleton, VI, I, 5: *Works* 10, 68.

<sup>489</sup> Letter to the Rev. Dr. Middleton, VI, I, 7: *Works* 10, 69.

to feel pity for their frailties. Love is the mother of all virtues.<sup>490</sup> Believers' dispositional change in love is formed by the actual and lasting work of the Holy Spirit, not by instantaneous emotion. *Thirdly*, in words, love urges believers to abstain from all expressions that are contrary to justice or truth, to refrain from every unloving word. Love makes those with whom they converse "wiser, or better, or happier than they were before." *Fourthly*, in action, it leads them into an earnest performance of all social offices which they belong to. Love not only prevents them from hurting or grieving any man, but also leads them into a uniform practice of justice and mercy.

To sum up, for Wesley, the third characteristic of sanctified life is to let love "be the constant temper of our soul," in other words, to let love rule our heart, words, action and relationship with both neighbours and with God.<sup>491</sup>

#### 3.2.4.5.1.4 Unity

For Wesley, to 'keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace' is the crucial duty of all Christians. Accordingly, the true members of the Church should do their best to "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." This unity needs such spirit as humbleness and meekness, patience, mutual tolerance, and love. Wesley especially considered love as "fundamental to the oneness of the body of Christ."<sup>492</sup> "The greater the love, the stricter the union."<sup>493</sup> Deficiency of love is always the real cause of separation. Unity also needs the peace of God to fill the heart.<sup>494</sup>

As solutions for disunity, he gave four directions. Firstly, behave in a kindly and friendly manner, rather than hurt one another; secondly, speak nothing harsh or unkind of each other; thirdly, determine on cherishing "no unkind thoughts, no unfriendly temper towards each other"; finally, provide each other with reciprocal help.<sup>495</sup> As the instrument of unity, he stressed love. For unity, a Christian should lead a life witnessing to the religion of love, have warmth and benevolence to all mankind, and desire all men to be virtuous and happy. Unity needs a single wish and prayer longing for a full revival of a pure religion of love. To avoid schism, our urging all men to sanctification needs to be done in love and good works, remembering God is love.<sup>496</sup>

In the Directions to the Stewards of The Methodist's Society in London (no. 9), he noted "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" as an important mark of the

---

<sup>490</sup> Letter to the Rev. Dr. Middleton, VI, I, 6: *Works* 10, 69.

<sup>491</sup> Cf. Sermon C. On Pleasing All Men, 2.1: *Works* 9, 144.

<sup>492</sup> Aelred Burrows O S B, "Wesley the Catholic," in *John Wesley: Contemporary Perspectives with an introduction by Frank Baker*, ed., by John Stacey (London: Epworth Press, 1988), p. 56.

<sup>493</sup> Sermon LXXV. On Schism 1, 11: *Works* 6, 406.

<sup>494</sup> Sermon LXXIV. Of the Church, 27: *Works* 6, 399.

<sup>495</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 57.

<sup>496</sup> Sermon CXXXII. Preached on Monday, April 21st 1777, 2, 10: *Works* 7, 430.

Methodists.<sup>497</sup> For unity's sake, he remained in the Church of England all his life.<sup>498</sup>

### 3.2.4.5.1.5 Purity and Simplicity

Wesley viewed simplicity and purity as “the two wings which lift the soul up to heaven.” Though not strictly distinguishing between them, he emphasised simplicity “in the intention,” and purity “in the affection.”<sup>499</sup> The purity of intention was deemed to be very important in all kinds of religious actions<sup>500</sup> in the sense that it makes our alms and devotions acceptable as “a proper offering to God.” For Wesley, simplicity was ascribed to always seeing God. It is to aim only at and to pursue God and to find out “happiness in knowing, loving, and serving God.” As a result, the souls of the simple become full of light of God's glorious love.<sup>501</sup> Purity was depicted as “desiring nothing more but God,” which means “crucifying the flesh with its afflictions and lusts” and “setting my affections on things above, not on things of the earth.”<sup>502</sup> He especially understood that only the purity of heart can offer us the deliverance from “covetousness” and “the love of money.”<sup>503</sup>

The way to attain purity is through “faith in the blood of Jesus,” the power of God's grace and love,<sup>504</sup> and the deepest humble spirit. The object of which we should purify ourselves is “every unholy affection” i.e., “filthiness of flesh and spirit,” “pride,” “anger,” and “every unkind or turbulent passion.”<sup>505</sup> In this sense, it is almost equated with sanctification. Purity involves humility that cleans us from “pride and vanity.”<sup>506</sup> Adultery is the main sin which defiles purity. As God requires inward purity and searches our heart, we should not imagine even committing adultery. In ordinary life, we should treat “the younger as sisters, with all purity.”<sup>507</sup> He was opposed to divorce without the cause of adultery, and regarded polygamy as clearly unbiblical.<sup>508</sup>

The blessing of the pure is the closest “fellowship with the Father and with the Son.” They see all things full of God by faith because God wants his presence to go continually

<sup>497</sup> *Works* 13, 516.

<sup>498</sup> Telford, *Letters* VIII, 58.

<sup>499</sup> Sermon LXXIX. On Dissipation, 17: *Works* 6, 449.

<sup>500</sup> Sermon XXIII. Upon Our Lord's Sermon on the Mount, Discourse IV, 2: *Works* 5, 295.

<sup>501</sup> Sermon LXXIX. On Dissipation, 18: *Works* 6, 450.

<sup>502</sup> Sermon XII. The Witness of Our Own Spirit, 16: *Works* 5, 141.

<sup>503</sup> “Seeing, if poverty of spirit were only freedom from covetousness, from the love of money, or the desire of riches, it would coincide with what he afterwards mentions; it would be only a branch of purity of heart.” Sermon XXI. Upon Our Lord's Sermon on the Mount, Discourse I, 1, 3: *Works* 5, 253.

<sup>504</sup> “The love of God has purified his heart from all revengeful passions, from envy, malice, and wrath, from every unkind temper or malign affection.” *The Character of A Methodist*, 10: *Works* 8, 343.

<sup>505</sup> Sermon XXIII. Upon Our Lord's Sermon on the Mount, Discourse III: *Works* 5, 272-279.

<sup>506</sup> *Works* 5, 203-204.

<sup>507</sup> Sermon LIII. On the Death of the Rev. Mr. George Whitefield (1770), 2, 5: *Works* 6, 176.

<sup>508</sup> Sermon XXIII. Upon Our Lord's Sermon on the Mount, Discourse III: *Works* 5, 277.

before them, and to shine the light of his face upon them. They see the Ruler looking after all, and “upholding all things by the word of his power.”<sup>509</sup> They see God protect and take care of them with his mercy and wisdom. In their private prayer, in participating in the Lord’s Supper, in worshipping him, they see him as it were, face to face.<sup>510</sup>

In terms of religion, purity is to keep us from heresy and superstition, enthusiasm, and bigotry.<sup>511</sup> The way to keep religion pure is to cling to the essential message of the Bible, i.e., the love towards God and man, and to observe the relationship between each part of Scripture from the perspective of the central message. For him, enthusiasm is overcome by rationality, and bigotry by love and good works.<sup>512</sup>

Briefly, purity is an important mark of the regenerate. It is an essential aspect of entire sanctification because it shows the distinction from the worldly spirit. It is almost synonymous with pure love as Christian perfection.

### 3.2.4.5.1.6 Stewardship

In a Sermon in 1768, Wesley considered a steward as the most congruent state of man.<sup>513</sup> Granted that sanctification implies the recovery of the image of God, we ought to regard stewardship as a mark of the sanctified, for Christ, the image of God called himself a steward.<sup>514</sup> Wesley suggested the following spiritual principles of stewardship.

First, viewing the sovereignty of God, a steward cannot use what he has at his will, but at his Lord’s will because all his things belong to the Lord, not to him. His soul, body, goods, and talents are entrusted to him on condition that he uses those according to the Lord. Accordingly, all his thoughts, behaviours and affections should be regulated according to His direction.<sup>515</sup> All worldly belongings are to be controlled by His will. Furthermore, all that God has given him, e.g., bodily strength, agreeable address, degrees, influence, esteem, and power are to be used for His glory.<sup>516</sup>

Secondly, viewing the time given to believers, as their life is short, they have to use all God has given them well. After death, they must give accounts of their stewardship before God. With death, all their belongings will vanish. Nonetheless, their souls will remain with all their faculties, e.g., memory, understanding and emotion.<sup>517</sup> Their spiritual faculties

---

<sup>509</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 281.

<sup>510</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>511</sup> Sermon CXXXII. Preached on Monday, April 21st 1777, 2,10: *Works* 7, 427.

<sup>512</sup> Sermon CXXXII. Preached on Monday, April 21st 1777, 2,13: *Works* 7, 430.

<sup>513</sup> Sermon LI. The Good Steward, 2: *Works* 6, 136.

<sup>514</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>515</sup> Sermon LI. The Good Steward, 1, 3: *Works* 6, 138.

<sup>516</sup> Sermon LI. The Good Steward, 1, 4-7: *Works* 6, 138-139.

<sup>517</sup> Sermon LI. The Good Steward, 2, 8: *Works* 6, 142.

will be stronger and clearer than before death. But they will no longer be stewards of their faculties after death.<sup>518</sup> After death, God's judgment of their stewardship waits them. According to the book of Revelation, it is the time of the general resurrection.<sup>519</sup> As they do not know the time of their death, they should fulfil their duty as stewards.

Stewardship is the lifestyle of the sanctified who realised the grace of God and his ruling over the hearts of the believers.

## 3.2.5 The Nature of Sanctification

### 3.2.5.1 Instantaneousness and Gradualness

Wesley admitted both the immediacy and gradualness of sanctification. "I endeavoured to show at large, in what sense sanctification is gradual, and in what sense it is instantaneous."<sup>520</sup> The instantaneousness of sanctification can be explicated as the new birth. As if "a child is born of a woman in a moment, or at least in a very short time," "a child is born of God in a short time, if not in a moment." He explicated instantaneous sanctification as follows.

Sanctification (in the proper sense) is "an instantaneous deliverance from all sin" and includes "instantaneous power then given, always to cleave to God."<sup>521</sup>

After instantaneous sanctification of the new birth as, the believer by slow degrees "grows up to the measure of the full stature of Christ."<sup>522</sup> Wesley delineated the gradualness and immediacy of sanctification in his sermon on 'Working on our own Salvation':

It begins the moment we are justified, in the holy, humble, gentle, patient love of God and man. It gradually increases from that moment, as "a grain of mustard seed, which, at first, is the least of all seeds," but afterwards puts forth large branches, and becomes a great tree; till, in another instant, the heart is cleansed from all sin, and filled with pure love to God and man. But even that love increases more and more, till we "grow up in all things into Him that is our head" till we attain "the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ."<sup>523</sup>

---

<sup>518</sup> Sermon LI. The Good Steward, 2, 11: *Works* 6, 143.

<sup>519</sup> Sermon LI. The Good Steward, 3,2: *Works* 6, 144.

<sup>520</sup> Journal, 5 December, 1762: *Works* 3,123.

<sup>521</sup> Letter CLXXVI.- To Miss Furly, afterwards Mrs. Downes, ST. IVES, *September* 15, 1762: *Works* 12, 96.

<sup>522</sup> Sermon XLV 'The New Birth' 4.3: *Works* 6, 75.

<sup>523</sup> Sermon LXXXV. On Working Out Our Own Salvation.2, 1: *Works* 6, 509.



Peculiarly, Wesley contended that sanctification is fulfilled *in another instant* (italics are my emphasis) after justification. That is to say, for Wesley, sanctification begins instantaneously at birth and continues gradually to the level of whole sanctification and *in any instant*, sanctification is fulfilled. Even after that, our sanctification grows to the measure of the fullness of Christ. Also in a letter to Miss Cooke, he admitted instantaneousness of sanctification. “And not only by a slow and insensible growth in grace, but by the power of the Highest overshadowing you, *in a moment*, in the twinkling of an eye so as utterly to abolish sin, and to renew you in his whole image!” (Italics are my emphasis).<sup>524</sup>

Wesley noted that the expectation of instantaneous sanctification promotes gradual sanctification. The more earnestly we expect the instantaneous change before death, “the more swiftly and steadily does the gradual work of God go on in their soul.” Such expectation makes us be more watchful against all sin and be more careful “to grow in grace and be more zealous of good works,” and be “more punctual in their attendance on all the ordinances of God.”<sup>525</sup>

In a chronological order, repentance before justification is gradual; justification and the new birth are instantaneous; repentance after justification is gradual; entire sanctification is instantaneous; growth to Christ’s level is gradual. Although for Wesley, these gradual stages in sanctification are ordinary and normal, entire sanctification can sometimes occur by faith in a moment.<sup>526</sup> Hence, Maddox’s statement that “the conception of sanctification as the progressive journey in responsive cooperation with God’s empowering was the most characteristic of Wesley”<sup>527</sup> seems insufficient because he neglects Wesley’s emphasis on the instantaneousness of sanctification. Rather, Cox’s expression seems more pertinent. Sanctification is “gradual with instantaneous stages, like the rocket that puts the satellite moon into orbit.”<sup>528</sup>

### 3.2.5.2 Perfection or Imperfection

#### 3.2.5.2.1 Perfection

---

<sup>524</sup> Letter DCCCV to Miss Cooke, BRISTOL, *September 24, 1785: Works 13, 94.*

<sup>525</sup> Minutes of Several Conversations between the Rev. Mr. Wesley and Others: From the Year 1744, to the Year 1789, Answer 7 to Q. 56: *Works 8, 329.*

<sup>526</sup> Letter DCCLXXXII. To Miss Hester Anne Roe Jan. 7, 1782: *Works 13, 83.* “If it be by works, then certainly these will need time, in order to the doing of these works. But if it is by faith, it is plain, a moment is as a thousand years. Then God says: (in the spiritual, as in the outward world,) Let there be light, and there is light.”

<sup>527</sup> Randy L. Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley’s Practical Theology* (Nashville, Kingwood Books, 1994), p. 190.

<sup>528</sup> Leo George Cox, *John Wesley’s Concept of Perfection* (University of Iowa: Ph. D dissertation, 1959), p. 155.

Wesley understood perfection in terms of love.

Q 3. What is implied in being a perfect Christian?

A. The loving the Lord our God with all our heart, and with all our mind, and soul, and strength (Deut 6:5, 30:6; Ezek 36:25-29).

In the state of perfection, God's love expels "the love of the world, together with pride, anger, self-will, and every other evil temper, and fills the heart." It takes up the whole capacity of the soul.<sup>529</sup> In its character, perfection is essentially a gift to be given by faith, though it requires our efforts in the sense that we should wait, utilizing the means of grace until the Spirit confers it to us.<sup>530</sup>

Wesley explicated the meaning of perfection with the following nine points. Firstly, it is to love the Lord our God with all our heart, soul and mind, and is to love our neighbours as ourselves. These comprise the whole of Christian perfection. Secondly, it is to possess the whole disposition of Christ's mind, all his affections, and all his tempers. Thirdly, it can appear as the one undivided fruit of the Spirit like "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, fidelity, meekness, temperance."<sup>531</sup> Fourthly, it is renewed after the image of God, i.e., in righteousness and true holiness. Fifthly, perfection is another name for universal holiness, inward and outward righteousness, and holiness of life arising from holiness of heart. Sixthly, perfection is the sanctification of our spirit, soul, and body. Seventhly, it is to present our souls and bodies as a living sacrifice unto God.<sup>532</sup> Eighthly, it implies that we offer up to God constantly "all our thoughts, and words, and actions" through Christ as a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving."<sup>533</sup> Ninthly, perfection is the salvation from all sins.

Wesley deemed perfection particularly to be "consistent with a thousand nervous disorders."<sup>534</sup> It signifies that perfection is purity in the motivation of our intention, in other words, doing in love. He did not consider unintentional mistakes as sin in its proper meaning.

Wesley presented many biblical passages to support the promise of perfection:

"He shall redeem Israel from all his sins." (Psalm 130:8)... "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: From all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. I will also save you from all your uncleannesses." (Ezek 36:25,

---

<sup>529</sup> Sermon XLIII 1.4: *Works* 5, 45.

<sup>530</sup> *Works* 11, 402; cf. '4.2.3 The Role of God and Human Role on this thesis.'

<sup>531</sup> Sermon LXXVI 'On Perfection' 1.6: *Works* 6, 413.

<sup>532</sup> Sermon LXXVI 'On Perfection' 1.8-10 *Works* 6, 413

<sup>533</sup> Sermon LXXVI 'On Perfection' 1.11; Wesley states shortly that in what sense Christians are not perfect in "Plain Account of Christian Perfection," 12, 1: *Works* 11:374.

<sup>534</sup> Letter CLXXVII to Miss Furly, St. Ives, September 15, 1762: *Works* 12, 207.

29)...“Having these promises, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God.” (2 Cor 7:1). ... “The Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul.” (Deut 30:6).<sup>535</sup>

Perfection is described as the abolition of the works of the devil to which all sins are ascribed and as the establishment of the righteousness of the law. The Son of God was manifested to save us from all sins caused by the devil. Christ wants to make his church entirely holy without any spot or wrinkle, and blemish (Eph 5:25, 27). God sent Christ that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us “walking not after the flesh but after the Spirit” (Rom 8:3, 4).

Wesley presented Matthew 5:8, 48 as the ground of perfection. “Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect” (Mt. 5:48). Mcneile pointed out that Luke used οἰκτίρμων (merciful, Luke 6:36) in place of Matthew’s τέλειοι(perfect).<sup>536</sup> Dr. Torrey claimed that ‘Be therefore *perfect*’ should be corrected to ‘show kindness to all men’ in the light of the context.<sup>537</sup> In contrast, Vincent Taylor held that Luke 6:36 and Matt. 5:48 might be different sayings.<sup>538</sup> Torrey’s claim seems quite probable in Luke’s context, but Matthew might have intentionally used τέλειός differently from Luke’s οἰκτίρμων, given that he stressed the sound obedience to the law through his entire gospel.<sup>539</sup>

On the other hand, Galatians 2:20 reads: “I am crucified with Christ; yet I live: and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me.” Wesley interpreted “I live not” to signify that the evil nature is destroyed, and “Christ liveth in me” to mean “all that is holy, just and good” live.<sup>540</sup> W. E. Sangster contends that it is unnatural to interpret Paul’s statement as that “all sin had been destroyed in him and nothing left but what is ‘holy, just and good.’”<sup>541</sup> It is a “metaphor” and an “aspiration” rather than “an achievement.” Sangster’s contention seems

<sup>535</sup> Minutes of Some Late Conversations between the Rev. Mr. Wesleys and Others, Conversation V, “Wednesday, June 17 th,” Answer to Q.4: *Works* 8, 294.

<sup>536</sup> Alan H. McNeile, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (London: Macmillan & New York: St Martin’s Press, 1<sup>st</sup> edition, 1915, reprinted in 1965), p. 73. “Lk. has the simpler εἰς ἑσέα οἰκτιρμων, which is perhaps nearer to the original.”

<sup>537</sup> Charles C. Torrey, *The Four Gospels. Our Translated Gospels* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, New York: D. Mckay Co., 193-), p. 291.

<sup>538</sup> Vincent Taylor, *Forgiveness and Reconciliation: A Study in New Testament Theology* (London: Macmillan and Co. limited & New York: St Martins’ Press, 1960), p. 155. “If these are different forms of the same saying, there is good reason to prefer the Lukan form, but it is also possible that the two are different sayings.”

<sup>539</sup> See Mt.19: 21; 5:8; 12:29-31; 22: 40. Cf. V. Taylor, *ibid.*, pp. 155-156.

<sup>540</sup> Plain Account of Christian Perfection 12: *Works* 11, 377.

<sup>541</sup> W. E. Sangster, *The Path to Perfection: An Examination & Restatement of John Wesley’s Doctrine of Christian Perfection* (first published 1943: London: Epworth Press, reissued 1984), p. 41.

germane to me given that his statement that “Let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God” is not already accomplished but still in progress (2 Cor 7:1). At any event, Wesley presented these passages as the biblical grounds that perfection could be accomplished in this life. By contrast, his brother Charles was convinced that perfection could be attained only at death.

Considering whether people are perfect or not, Wesley evaluated the perfected from three standpoints. Firstly, he examined whether “they feel no inward sin and to the best of their knowledge commit no outward sin.” Secondly, whether “they see and love God every moment, and pray, rejoice, give thanks ever more.” Thirdly, whether “they have constantly as clear a witness from God of sanctification as they have of justification.”<sup>542</sup> He regarded “a WILL steadily and uniformly devoted to God” as “essential to a state of sanctification rather than “a uniformity of joy, or peace, or happy communion with God,” for the latter may be influenced by the condition of the body (his emphasis).<sup>543</sup> All tempers, and words, and actions should have been kept holy for at least two or three years.<sup>544</sup> Given Wesley’s standpoints of perfection, Brunner’s notion that “the believer is always the unbeliever, the sinner”- “*Simul justus, simul peccator*”<sup>545</sup> is not applied to Wesley. For him, an entirely sanctified Christian is no longer a sinner in both the forensic state and the real one.

Wesley believed that perfection is possible before death<sup>546</sup> on the ground that God’s commands to be perfect are given to living people not the dead. As an answer to the question who had attained to perfect sanctification in this world, Wesley presented “St. John, and all those of whom he says this in his First Epistle.”<sup>547</sup> As Maddox puts it, “to the end of his ministry,” Wesley maintained the view that the Christian could attain perfection in this world.<sup>548</sup>

### 3.2.5.2.2 Imperfection

Wesley admitted the imperfection of sanctification in its absolute meaning on the grounds of his statement that “sin exists in the best of Christians till they obtain deliverance by the hand of death.”<sup>549</sup> In an absolute sense, man cannot reach perfect sanctification but he can

---

<sup>542</sup> Journal 12 March, 1760: *Works* 2, 530.

<sup>543</sup> Letter CCCCXXVII to Mrs. Elizabeth Bennis, London January 18, 1774: *Works* 12, 398.

<sup>544</sup> Minutes of Some Late Conversations, Answer to Q. 5, June 26<sup>th</sup>: *Works* 8, 279; Maddox, *op. cit.*, p. 189.

<sup>545</sup> Emil Brunner, *The Divine Imperative* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1942), p. 80.

<sup>546</sup> Minutes of Some Late Conversations, II, “Q. 4. But ought we to expect it sooner? A. Why not?”: *Works* 8, 285.

<sup>547</sup> Minutes of Some Late Conversations V, “Wednesday, June 17<sup>th</sup>,” Answer to Q.10: *Works* 8, 296.

<sup>548</sup> “The poor people appeared to be quite ripe for the highest doctrine of the Gospel: so I exhorted them, leaving the first principles, to ‘go on unto perfection.’” Journal, 30 May 1787: *Works* 4, 379; Randy L. Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley’s Practical Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994), p. 186.

<sup>549</sup> Footnote no. 16 of *The Works of John Wesley*, Vol. VII in *The SAGE Digital Library Collected Works*

do it in the biblical meaning, which implies relative perfection for fallen men.

Yet this sanctification (at least, in the lower degrees) does not include a power never to think a useless thought, nor ever speak a useless word. I myself believe that such a perfection is inconsistent with living in a corruptible body: For this makes it impossible “always to think right.” While we breathe, we shall, more or less, mistake.<sup>550</sup>

Wesley explicated the imperfection of entire sanctification as follows. Firstly, it is not the perfection of angels. They do not make mistakes. Human mistakes are natural because their understanding, will, and affections are variously disordered due to original sin.<sup>551</sup> Secondly, man cannot reach an Adamic pure perfect condition because he “is no longer able to avoid falling into innumerable mistakes” since the Fall. Thirdly, even the highest perfection which man can attain in this world “does not exclude ignorance and error, and a thousand other infirmities.”<sup>552</sup> Fourthly, such mistakes need the blood of Christ’s atonement lest we fall to eternal damnation. In this respect, even the most perfect Christian continually needs the merits of Christ.<sup>553</sup>

Wesley mentioned that there may be many degrees of sanctification in some tempers such as meekness.<sup>554</sup>

### 3.2.6 The Mode of Sanctification: Self-Denial

For Wesley, self-denial is not to physically abuse oneself, but to submit oneself to the will of God in place of one’s own will. It was deemed to be necessary for entire sanctification. It functions as our waiting for perfect sanctification “in universal obedience; in keeping all the commandments; in *denying ourselves*, and taking up our cross daily” (italics are mine).<sup>555</sup> Of course, they can be dealt with as the means of sanctification, but for the sake of convenience they will be dealt with as the mode of sanctification when comparing Wesley’s view with those of other theologians.

In 1733, Wesley emphasised the necessity of self-denial for sanctification. Any child of Adam cannot enter the kingdom of Christ without being sanctified in his whole being by “a constant and continued course of general self-denial,” because God’s will resists our

---

(SAGE Software Albany, OR USA Version 1.1 © 1996), p. 576.

<sup>550</sup> Letter CLXXVI.- To Miss Furly, afterwards Mrs. Downes, ST. IVES, *September* 15, 1762: *Works* 12, 96.

<sup>551</sup> Sermon LXXVI. On Perfection, 1.1: *Works* 6,412.

<sup>552</sup> Sermon LXXVI. On Perfection, 1.3: *Works* 6,412.

<sup>553</sup> Plain Account of Christian Perfection: *Works* 11, 395.

<sup>554</sup> Minutes of Some Late Conversations III, Answer to Q. 6. “Many degrees of outward holiness may: yea, and some degree of meekness, and several other tempers which would be branches of Christian holiness.”: *Works* 8, 290.

<sup>555</sup> Minutes of Some Late Conversations II, Answer to Q.9: *Works* 8, 286.

corruption “at all times and in all things.”<sup>556</sup> Accordingly, every minister must inculcate self-denial “in the clearest and strongest way,” “at all times and in all places.” It would be the way to “be pure from the blood of all men.”<sup>557</sup>

In the preface to “A Collection of Forms of Prayers for every Day in the Week” (1775), Wesley referred to self-denial in more detail.<sup>558</sup> Self-denial is founded on the command of Christ, “If any man will come after me, let him renounce himself, and follow me.” From this sentence, Wesley induced two implications: one is “a thorough conviction that we are not our own,” the other is “a solemn resolution to act suitably to this conviction.”<sup>559</sup> The former signifies that we are not the proprietors of ourselves, and therefore we have no right to dispose of our goods, bodies, souls, and everything. The latter means that we should not live for ourselves. This principle was also expressed in his sermon on “The Good Steward.” “A steward has no right to dispose of anything which is in his hands, but according to the will of his Lord.”<sup>560</sup> We are not to follow our own desires to please ourselves, nor let our own will be the principle guiding our action.

On the other hand, self-denial naturally leads the believer to his devotion to God. It is “to render unto God the things which are God’s” in order to glorify Him in his body, spirit, with all his power. This devotion results from an absolute conviction that he is God’s belongings.<sup>561</sup> God is the owner of all he has, not only by right of creation, but of purchase by his blood. Hence, he should devote himself to God. Whoever decides to live a life to devote himself to God should perceive the necessity of denying himself and taking up his cross daily.<sup>562</sup> Whenever he feels the will of God prevents him from indulging in his desire, he must choose between denying himself or the will of God.

Unlike Karl Barth, Wesley did not deal with “taking up the cross” as a section apart from self-denial, but incorporated the former in the latter. Whenever a Christian meets with the means of grace, he must choose to take up his cross or reject his Lord. Wesley distinguished “to take up our cross” from “to bear it.” The former is to voluntarily suffer it according to the will of the Lord even though we can avoid it, whereas the latter is to endure it with meekness and acquiescence when we cannot avoid it.<sup>563</sup> Both of them are ascribed to every Christian. The cross is given to him by God for his good as a token of God’s love. It is not only for God’s pleasure but also for his profit, namely, his

---

<sup>556</sup> Sermon XVII. The Circumcision of the Heart, 1, 7: *Works* 5, 210-211.

<sup>557</sup> *Works* 6, 113.

<sup>558</sup> *Works* 14, 270-272.

<sup>559</sup> *Works* 14, 271; Sermon XLVIII, Self-Denial, 2 and 3: *Works* 6, 104. “If we do not continually deny ourselves,” it is the same like the confession that Christ is not our Master.”

<sup>560</sup> *Works* 6, 137.

<sup>561</sup> Cf. Sermon XLVIII, Self-Denial, 2: *Works* 6, 107.

<sup>562</sup> *Works* 14, 271.

<sup>563</sup> Sermon XLVIII. Self-Denial 1, 11: *Works* 6, 109.



participation in God's holiness.<sup>564</sup> Because to take up the cross is for Christian spiritual health, the believer must endure it even though it means tearing his body apart.<sup>565</sup> The want of self-denial is partly due to the want of the means of grace. To avoid the cross is dangerous because it brings him to the senseless and sleeping state in sin, which becomes an abomination to the Lord. Subsequently, love becomes cold; the peace of God goes faint.<sup>566</sup> Grieving the Holy Spirit by evasion, he turns to "pride, anger, desire, self-will, and stubbornness." It leads him to spiritual sloth. The way to avoid spiritual withdrawal is to diligently use the means of grace, including the works of charity.<sup>567</sup>

For Wesley, a steady exercise of self-denial enables the faithful follower of Christ to advance in mortification, which means dying to the world and the things of the world. A continual self-denial enables him to confess, "I desire nothing but God" or "I am crucified unto the world; I am dead with Christ; I live not, but Christ liveth in me."<sup>568</sup> That Christ lives in me implies "the fulfilling of the law," which is the ultimate stage of Christian sanctification. In this respect, he is not so far from Calvin.

Christian perfection in terms of self-denial can be described as the state in which the believer is dead to the world and alive to God. His entire desire is unto God's name, and he has given God his whole heart, and delights in Him only. Burning with love towards all mankind, he speaks and acts only in order to fulfil God's will. It is God's grace to lead his soul to reach this state.<sup>569</sup> This state is compared to "the last round of the ladder to heaven." Not only do the entirely sanctified forget those things which are behind and "press towards the mark for the prize" of our calling but also "rejoice to suffer the loss of all things, and count them but dung" to win Christ.<sup>570</sup>

### 3.2.7 The Means or Ways of Sanctification

As Maddox appropriately points out, Wesley considered that the means of grace primarily contributed to sanctification.<sup>571</sup> Wesley's means of grace was noted in the following texts. First, he noted the means of grace like the communion of the saints, learning the Bible, and the Lord's Supper in Acts 2:42, 44.

Their constant practice set this beyond all dispute; for so long as

---

<sup>564</sup> Sermon XLVIII. Self-Denial 1, 13: *Works* 6, 109.

<sup>565</sup> *Works* 6, 110.

<sup>566</sup> *Works* 6, 111.

<sup>567</sup> *Works* 6, 112.

<sup>568</sup> *Works* 14, 272.

<sup>569</sup> *Works* 14, 272.

<sup>570</sup> *Works* 14, 272.

<sup>571</sup> Randy L. Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley's Practical Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994), p. 202.

“all that believed were together, and had all things common,” (Acts 2:44), “they continued steadfastly in the teaching of the Apostles and in breaking of bread, and in prayers” (Verse 42).<sup>572</sup>

Secondly, in his sermon on ‘The Means of Grace’, Wesley depicted “the works of piety” as the *ordinary channel* of conveying God’s grace, or the *chief means*, or the *instituted means*, or the *particular means* of grace (italics are my emphasis).<sup>573</sup>

The chief of these means are prayer, whether in secret or with the great congregation; searching Scriptures; (which implies reading, hearing, and meditating thereon;) and receiving the Lord’s supper, eating bread and drinking wine in remembrance of Him: And these we believe to be ordained of God, as the ordinary channels of conveying his grace to the souls of men.<sup>574</sup>

Thirdly, in his *Minutes of Some Late Conversation II*, Wesley noted the *general means* of sanctification as follows.

Q. 9. How should we wait for the fulfilling of this promise?

A. In universal obedience; in keeping all the commandments; in denying ourselves, and taking up our cross daily. These are the *general means* which God hath ordained for our receiving his sanctifying grace (my emphasis).<sup>575</sup>

In the *Minutes of Several Conversations*, he added to the general means of grace “watching against the world, the devil,” self and inherent sin, “denying ourselves,” “taking up our cross,” and “exercise of the presence of God”.<sup>576</sup>

Fourthly, in his *Minutes of Several Conversations*, he referred to the *prudential means* of grace as “particular rules” or “arts of holy living,” the small group like a class, band, “every society” and “the Leaders and Bands,” making “a conscience of executing every part” of ones’ own office.<sup>577</sup>

Fifthly, in his “Preface, A Collection of Hymns,” he recommended the hymnal to the

---

<sup>572</sup> Sermon XVI ‘The Means of Grace’ 1.1: *Works* 5, 185.

<sup>573</sup> On the works of piety, see *Works* 8, 286, 322-323.

<sup>574</sup> Sermon XVI ‘The Means of Grace’ 2.1: *Works* 5, 188; Cf. Henry Hawthorn Knight, *The Presence of God in the Christian life: A Contemporary Understanding of John Wesley’s Means of Grace* (Ph. D. diss. Emory University. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1987), p. 7.

<sup>575</sup> *Minutes of Some Late Conversations II*, Q.9 and Answer: *Works* 8, 286.

<sup>576</sup> *Works* 8, 323.

<sup>577</sup> *Works* 8, 323. cf. Henry Hawthorn Knight, *op. cit.*, p. 7. He involved “prayer meeting, covenant services, watch night services, love feasts,” “visiting the sick,” “doing all the good one can, doing no harm,” “reading devotional classics and all edifying literature,” in this group. These things will be included in the ‘Communion of the Saints’ and dealt with in ‘Good Works’ separately.

saints

as a means of raising or quickening the spirit of devotion, of confirming his faith, of enlivening his hope, and of kindling of increasing his love to God and man.<sup>578</sup>

We can analyze the characteristics of Wesley's classification of the means of grace as follows. Firstly, it is rather peculiar for him to regard "obedience, self-denial, and taking up our cross daily" as the *general means* of sanctification, though they may be ascribed to the human role in sanctification, or the modes of sanctification. Secondly, since fasting and prayer were noted by Christ, it is called the *ordinary channel*, or the *chief means*, or the *particular means* of grace. Thirdly, prayer is mentioned before any other means like Scripture, the Lord's Supper, communion, and fasting. But all days dedicated to saints were abolished and the church year was reconstructed around events connected with Christ, e.g., Advent, Easter, and Ascension/Pentecost. This implies that the prayer to saints as a means of grace was rejected by Wesley. The saints were honoured as exemplars, not intercessors.<sup>579</sup> Fourthly, hymns were regarded as the means that "both empower and shape Christian discipleship."<sup>580</sup> Fifthly, with the communion of saints, the works of mercy were viewed as the *real means* or *prudential means* of grace.<sup>581</sup> This can be particular to Wesley, viewing in the perspective of Reformed theology. Lastly, faith was considered as a means of sanctification. While other means are visible, faith is the invisible means. It is a gift given by the Spirit. In this point, faith is distinguishable from other visible means, thence it will be independently dealt with in 4.2.8. 2. 'Faith and Sanctification.'

Wesley stated some notions of the means of grace. First, the outward ordinances of God should advance inward holiness. Without inward holiness, the means are "unprofitable and void, are lighter than vanity." Without a devoted heart, they are "an utter abomination to the Lord."<sup>582</sup> Accordingly, they should be used "not for their own sake," but for our renewal "in righteousness and true holiness."<sup>583</sup> Secondly, unless the Spirit works in them and by them, they are "mere weak and beggarly elements." This implies that there is no intrinsic power in any means.<sup>584</sup> Thirdly, the Holy Spirit can also work in men without any means of grace in a particular situation. Convincing grace may occur either within the church or beyond its walls. The means of God's grace can be "varied,

---

<sup>578</sup> Preface, A Collection of Hymns, 8: *Works* 7, 75.

<sup>579</sup> Popery Calmly Considered, Section III, Of Divine Worship, 3: *Works* 8, 146.

<sup>580</sup> Randy L. Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley's Practical Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994), p. 208.

<sup>581</sup> Cf. Henry Hawthorn Knight, *op. cit.*, p. 7; also see 3.2.7.4 The Works of Mercy in this thesis.

<sup>582</sup> Sermon XVI 'The Means of Grace' 1, 4: *Works* 5, 186.

<sup>583</sup> Sermon XVI 'The Means of Grace' 5, 4: *Works* 5, 200.

<sup>584</sup> Sermon XVI 'The Means of Grace' 2, 3: *Works* 5, 188.

transposed, and combined together, in a thousand different ways” in diverse situations.<sup>585</sup> Fourthly, the means will never atone for our sins. It is wrong to imagine that there is some kind of power in means, or that by practising them, we “shall certainly be made holy,” or that “there is a sort of *merit* in using them.” Such a thought is to force God to give us holiness.<sup>586</sup>

To attain perfection, the saints are to wait for it in using the means of God’s grace “not in laying them aside.”<sup>587</sup> The human role in sanctification is to diligently use those means for our sanctification. Quietism says, “Stand still, and see the salvation of God.” Conversely, Wesley declares, “This was the *salvation of God*, which they *stood still* to see by *marching forward* with all their might!”<sup>588</sup> It is *after* all to Israel’s people who *prayed* to the Lord to help them, that Jahaziel said, “Ye shall not need to fight in this battle. Set yourselves: Stand ye still, and see the salvation of the Lord.”<sup>589</sup>

To sum up, the sure and general way to reach sanctification is to use “all the means which God has ordained, whenever opportunity serves.”<sup>590</sup>

### 3.2.7.1 Prayer

For Wesley, prayer is “a channel through which the grace of God is conveyed.”<sup>591</sup> He drew the example of prayer as a means of grace from Matt. 7: 7, 8, which read: “Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you: For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.”<sup>592</sup> Through prayer the Holy Spirit, the origin of all graces is received. Peculiarly, Wesley regarded prayer as God’s command given to both believers and unbelievers on the grounds of the case of Cornelius.<sup>593</sup> His view that Cornelius was an unbeliever seems rather doubtful because Cornelius was a believer in the God revealed in the Old Testament. For Wesley, an unbeliever is a non-Christian.

The attitude of prayer is our faith in God’s promise. If we wait for “the blessings of God in private prayer, together with a positive promise,” we shall obtain what we ask.<sup>594</sup> When we pray in faith, without doubt, God receives our prayer.

Wesley presented prayers implying entire sanctification as follows. In the Lord’s

---

<sup>585</sup> Sermon XVI ‘The Means of Grace’ 5, 3: *Works* 5, 200.

<sup>586</sup> Sermon XVI ‘The Means of Grace’ 2, 5: *Works* 5, 189.

<sup>587</sup> Sermon XVI ‘The Means of Grace’ 3, 1: *Works* 5, 190.

<sup>588</sup> Sermon XVI ‘The Means of Grace’ 4, 5: *Works* 5, 197.

<sup>589</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>590</sup> Sermon XVI ‘The Means of Grace’ 5, 3: *Works* 5, 200.

<sup>591</sup> Sermon XVI ‘The Means of Grace’ 4, 1: *Works* 5, 195.

<sup>592</sup> Sermon XVI ‘The Means of Grace’ 3, 1: *Works* 5, 190.

<sup>593</sup> Journal June 26, 1740: *Works* 1: 279.

<sup>594</sup> Sermon XVI ‘The Means of Grace’ 3, 5: *Works* 5, 192.

Prayer, “Deliver us from evil” or “from the evil one” implies that the evil one is the cause of our sin and his removal is our sanctification. Jesus’ prayer, “I in them, and thou in me...that they may be made perfect in one” (John 17: 21, 23) was for sanctification in our unity. Paul prayed for our comprehension of the vastness of “the love of Christ” and for us to “be filled with all the fullness of God.” (Eph 3:14, 16-19). Paul also prayed, “The very God of peace sanctify you wholly” and “our whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Thess 5:23). These show that prayer is one of the means for our entire sanctification.

Wesley showed us the example of prayer for sanctification:

“Grant us, Lord, we beseech thee, the Spirit to think and do always such things as be rightful” (*Ninth Sunday after Trinity*). “O God, ...grant that thy Holy Spirit may in all things direct and rule our hearts” (*Nineteenth Sunday after Trinity*). “Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love thee, and worthily magnify thy holy name” (*Communion Office*).<sup>595</sup>

He suggested that “wherever you can, appoint prayer-meetings, and particularly on Friday,”<sup>596</sup> for the negligence of those prayers causes the decay and the death of our life.<sup>597</sup>

### 3.2.7.2 The Word of God

#### 3.2.7.2.1 The Bible

Wesley viewed “searching Scriptures” as a means of grace. “All who desire the grace of God are to wait for it in searching the Scriptures.”<sup>598</sup> Jesus directed the Jews to read Scripture that they might believe him because Scripture testified to Christ. Searching the Scriptures contains hearing, reading, and meditating.

Wesley explicated the benefit of Scripture according to Paul’s statement. The holy Scriptures have true wisdom to lead us to salvation through faith in Christ (2 Tim. 3:15). They are is “the great means God has ordained for conveying his manifold grace to man.” All Scriptures are “profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.” They are given “that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished

---

<sup>595</sup> Letter to the Right Reverend The Lord Bishop of Gloucester: ‘The Operation of the Holy Ghost’: *Works* 9, 167.

<sup>596</sup> Minutes of Several Conversations between the Rev. Mr. Wesley and Others: From the Year 1744 to the Year 1789, Answer 4, 5 to Q. 56: *Works* 8, 328.

<sup>597</sup> Sermon XLVI The Wilderness State: *Works* 6, 81.

<sup>598</sup> Sermon XVI ‘The Means of Grace’ 3, 7: *Works* 5, 192.

unto all good works” (2 Tim.3: 16, 17).<sup>599</sup> Wesley showed us the example of David who waited for God’s grace through the Word. “I have waited for thy saving health, O Lord, and have kept thy law. Teach me, O Lord, the way of thy statutes, and I shall keep it unto the end.”<sup>600</sup> The bible that Paul referred to was the Old Testament. Accordingly, the Old Testament should be read lest we one day “wonder and perish by accounting only the New Testament.”<sup>601</sup> It is profitable not only to those who walk in the light, but also to those who seek him in darkness.<sup>602</sup>

### 3.2.7.2.2 The Commandments of God

Molther, an antinomian insisted that the believer’s only duty was to believe, “that there is no commandment in the New Testament but to believe...and that when a man does believe, he is not bound or obliged to do anything which is commanded there.”<sup>603</sup> His insistence was condemned for its antinomian tendency by Wesley. It was regarded as “shamelessly contrary to our Lord’s own words, “Whosoever shall break one of the least of these commandments shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven.” Wesley emphasised that believers are bound to keep Christ’s commandments on the basis of Christ’s words that “If ye love me, (which cannot be unless ye believe,)’ keep my commandments.”<sup>604</sup> To obey God’s commandment in our sanctification is the way to be perfect in love. “Be ye perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.” (Matt. 5:48). “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.” (Matt.22:37).<sup>605</sup>

### 3.2.7.2.3 Preaching

Wesley advised preachers to declare the law as well as the gospel, to both believers and unbelievers.<sup>606</sup> He looked upon the role of the sermon as communicating Christ in three offices. To preach Christ as Priest is to assure us of “God’s pardoning love”. To preach Christ as Prophet is to reveal “our remaining need of Christ”. To preach Christ as King is to guide our continual growth in the image of Christ.<sup>607</sup> In a Sermon on Mark 9:38, he

---

<sup>599</sup> Sermon XVI ‘The Means of Grace’ 3, 8: *Works* 5, 192.

<sup>600</sup> Sermon XVI ‘The Means of Grace’ 4, 4: *Works* 5, 196.

<sup>601</sup> Sermon XVI ‘The Means of Grace’ 3, 9: *Works* 5, 193.

<sup>602</sup> Sermon XVI ‘The Means of Grace’ 3, 10: *Works* 5, 194.

<sup>603</sup> Journal. June 22, 1740: *Works* 1, 275.

<sup>604</sup> Journal. June 23, 1740: *Works* 1, 277.

<sup>605</sup> Minutes of Some Late Conversations V, “Wednesday, June 17<sup>th</sup>,” Answer to Q. 7: *Works* 8, 295.

<sup>606</sup> Cf. Kenneth J. Collins, *Scripture Way of Salvation: The Heart of John Wesley’s Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), p.51.

<sup>607</sup> Cf. Randy L. Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley’s Practical Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994), p. 209.



argued that Christ's exorcism brought sinners to repentance, i.e., both an inward and an outward change in man.

### 3.2.7.2.4 Law and Gospel

#### 3.2.7.2.4.1 Law and Gospel as the Means of Repentance

Wesley emphasised the precedence of the law to the gospel in repenting sinners. He utterly rejected that preaching of the gospel, i.e., "the speaking of nothing but the sufferings and merits of Christ" answers all the ends of the law.<sup>608</sup> His experience taught him that "one in a thousand may have been awakened by the gospel." The way that God ordinarily uses to convict sinners is not the gospel, but the law. The gospel is not the means which God has ordained for repentance of the sinner or which our Lord himself used.<sup>609</sup>

He understood that Paul convicted sinners by the law. Paul "first reminds them that they could not be justified by the Law of Moses, but only by faith in Christ; and then severely threatens them with the judgments of God, which is, in the strongest sense, preaching the law."<sup>610</sup> Paul declared not only the love of Christ to sinners, but also Christ's coming from heaven in flaming fire. Preaching Christ is exclaiming both his forgiveness and his judgment.<sup>611</sup> Wesley considered to preach both the law and the gospel to be effective to lead the sinner to repentance. In this respect, he stands with Luther.

#### 3.2.7.2.4.2 The Three Uses of the Law

To Wesley, the law is the heart of God disclosed to humanity. "It is the streaming forth or out-beaming of his glory, the express image of his person."<sup>612</sup> The law of God is supreme, unchangeable reason.<sup>613</sup> It is "a copy of the eternal mind, a transcript of the divine nature."<sup>614</sup> With his view of the law, Wesley rebuked Luther for being "blasphemous in his treatment of the law."<sup>615</sup>

According to Wesley, the first use of the law is to convince man of his sins. Though doing it without the law, the Spirit ordinarily convicts sinners by the law. The word of God is "quick and powerful," "full of life and energy," "and sharper than any two-edged

---

<sup>608</sup> Sermon XXXV. "The Law Established Through Faith," 1.3: *Works* 5, 449.

<sup>609</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>610</sup> Sermon XXXV. "The Law Established Through Faith," 1.6: *Works* 5, 450.

<sup>611</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>612</sup> Sermon XXXIV "The Original, Nature, Properties and Use of the Law," 2.3: *Works* 5, 438.

<sup>613</sup> Sermon XXXIV "The Original, Nature, Properties and Use of the Law," 2.5: *Works* 5, 438.

<sup>614</sup> Sermon XXXIV "The Original, Nature, Properties and Use of the Law," 2.6: *Works* 5, 439.

<sup>615</sup> Donald W. Dayton, "Law and Gospel in the Wesleyan Tradition," *Grace Theological Journal* 12 (1991): 240.

sword.”<sup>616</sup> Thus it can pierce “through all the folds of a deceitful heart,” and make man perceive how wretched and poor he is before God. It kills the sinner and demolishes “the life and strength wherein he trusts,” and awakes him to the fact that he is spiritually dead unto God due to his sins and trespasses.<sup>617</sup> The second use of the law is to lead the sinner unto Christ “that he may live.” Like a strict schoolmaster, the law “drives us by force, rather than draws us by love”. Nevertheless, it is “the spirit of love which, by this painful means, tears away our confidence in the flesh.”<sup>618</sup> The third use of the law is “to keep us alive.”<sup>619</sup> It is the excellent means whereby the Spirit leads us to eternal life. As Maddox aptly points out, Wesley put more emphasis on the third use in Christian life because of his “conflict with antinomian understanding of the Christian life.”<sup>620</sup>

For Wesley, since human perfect obedience to the law became impossible owing to the fall, God desires that people avoid “voluntary transgressions of known laws.”<sup>621</sup> God re-inscribed the basic moral law through prevenient grace in order to preserve universal moral accountability.<sup>622</sup>

### 3.2.7.2.4.3 Christ’s Law and the Decalogue as the Moral Law

Concerning the relationship between the law of Christ and the moral law, Wesley viewed the law of Christ as stated in the Sermon on the Mount and understood the moral law as demonstrated in the Decalogue.<sup>623</sup> For him, the moral law was reinforced by the prophets and was not abolished by Christ.<sup>624</sup> There is no contradiction between the Decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount. The difference does not lie in separation but in developmental degree. The moral law is most clearly expressed in the Sermon on the Mount.<sup>625</sup>

In view of function, the moral law accuses man of his sins and leads him to both legal and evangelical repentance. Before justification, it condemns us totally, leads us to

---

<sup>616</sup> Sermon XXXIV. “The Original, Nature, Property, and the Uses of the Law” 4, 1: *Works* 5, 443.

<sup>617</sup> Sermon XXXIV. “The Original, Nature, Property, and the Uses of the Law” 4, 2: *Works* 5, 443.

<sup>618</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>619</sup> Sermon XXXIV. “The Original, Nature, Property, and the Uses of the Law” 4, 3: *Works* 5, 443.

<sup>620</sup> Randy L. Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley’s Practical Theology* (Nashville, Kingwood Books, 1994), p. 161.

<sup>621</sup> Letter to John Hosmer (7 June 1761): Telford, *Letters* 4:155.

<sup>622</sup> Leon Orville Hynson, *To Reform the Nation: Theological Foundations of Wesley’s Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), pp.77ff.

<sup>623</sup> Letters, XXVI. To an Evangelical Layman, Dec. 20, 1751: Wesley, *OT Notes*, Ex. 20:1-7.

<sup>624</sup> Sermon XXV “On the Mount, V,” 1.2: *Works* 5, 311.

<sup>625</sup> Sermon XXV “On The Mount V,” 1.4”: *Works* 5, 312. “Yet was it never so fully explained, nor so thoroughly understood, till the great Author of it himself condescended to give mankind this authentic comment on all the essential branches of it.” Collins understood this expression as Jesus’ explication of the law. but Collins’ opinion is not total relevant because ‘it’ indicates a religion rather than the law. Kenneth J. Collins, *Scripture Way of Salvation: The Heart of John Wesley’s Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), p.52.

repentance, and guides us to Christ. After justification, it accuses our inward sin and urges us to be cleaned of our sin by the blood of Christ. Furthermore, it makes us feel the necessity to go forward to perfection more enthusiastically by receiving grace upon grace.<sup>626</sup> In this sense, Wesley's view of the law is much closer to Calvin's than Luther's.

Christians are no longer under the moral law as the condition of acceptance by God, because they are justified by faith in Christ.<sup>627</sup> They obey the law of God "not from the motive of slavish fear, but on a nobler principle"; namely, "the grace of God ruling in his heart." God's grace causes all their works to be done in love. The saints are not now under angelic law, that is, the perfect law, but under the law of love, the law from above. The law of love as "the fulfilling of the law" is given to fallen men.<sup>628</sup>

### 3.2.7.3 The Sacraments

#### 3.2.7.3.1 Baptism

Wesley criticized the formally baptized at his time. Too many were baptized "gluttons and drunkards, the baptized liars and common swearers, the baptized railers and evil-speakers, the baptized whoremongers, thieves, extortioners." From his viewpoint, they were the children of the devil rather than the regenerated or the children of God.<sup>629</sup> They had to be truly born again.<sup>630</sup> His experiential observation caused him not to identify outward baptism with regeneration.<sup>631</sup> Baptism is an outward and perceptible sign, whereas regeneration is an inward and spiritual grace by the Spirit. Baptism as the sign is "distinct from regeneration, the thing signified."<sup>632</sup> Likewise, in his *Note* on John 3:5, he described baptism by the Spirit as "great inward change," and baptism by water as "the outward sign and means of it." Baptism is in an ordinary way necessary to salvation but in the absolute sense is not.<sup>633</sup>

Nevertheless, he recognized that if we participate in baptism, it may be the instrument of regeneration. Maddox holds that for Wesley, the function of baptism was "to initiate the graciously-empowered transformation of our lives." Maddox's viewpoint seems reasonable given that Wesley understood baptism as the instrument of regeneration. "By water then, as a means, the water of baptism, we are regenerated or born again."<sup>634</sup> With this line,

---

<sup>626</sup> Sermon XXXIV. The Original, Nature, Property, and Use of the Law, 4.4: *Works* 5, 444.

<sup>627</sup> Sermon XXXV. "The Law Established Through Faith," 3.3: *Works* 5, 455.

<sup>628</sup> Sermon LXXVI "on Perfection," 1.3.

<sup>629</sup> Sermon XVIII. The Marks of the New Birth 4,3: *Works* 5, 220.

<sup>630</sup> Sermon XVIII. The Marks of the New Birth 4, 5: *Works* 5, 225.

<sup>631</sup> Sermon XLV The New Birth, 4.1: *Works* 6, 73.

<sup>632</sup> Sermon XLV The New Birth, 4.1: *Works* 6, 73.

<sup>633</sup> *Works* X, 198.

<sup>634</sup> *Works* X, 192.

Wesley continued to baptize the Quakers who did not observe water baptism and joined the Methodist society.

On the other hand, with respect to infant baptism, Wesley did not deny its association with the new birth. “It is certain, our Church supposes that all who are baptized in their infancy are at the same time born again.”<sup>635</sup> “It is certain, by God’s word, that children who are baptized dying before they commit actual sin are saved.”<sup>636</sup> The baptized infants are asked for repentance and faith, when they are mature.<sup>637</sup> However, Wesley left room for the salvation of infants dying without baptism by noting that “where it (infant baptism) cannot be had, the case is different.”<sup>638</sup>

### 3.2.7.3.2 The Lord’s Supper

Wesley understood the Lord’s Supper as an ordinary means of receiving grace from God. It is “the outward, visible means, whereby God conveys into our souls all that spiritual grace,” for example, “righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.”<sup>639</sup> The way that this means conveys God’s grace to man is not automatic, but by the works of the Spirit.<sup>640</sup>

In his Journal (June 27, 1740), Wesley held that the Lord’s Supper played the role of causing the first deep conviction, namely the very beginning of our conversion to God.<sup>641</sup> For such a purpose, it was allowed “in the full sense of the word,” unbelievers.<sup>642</sup> For believers, it brings “sanctifying grace” for their growth.<sup>643</sup> In his Journal (July 28, 1740), he noted that “the Lord’s Supper was ordained by God, to be a means of conveying to men either preventing, or justifying, or sanctifying grace, according to their several necessities.” The only requirement for it is “a sense of our state, of our utter sinfulness and helplessness.”<sup>644</sup> It is meant for “all those who know and feel that they want the grace of God either to restrain them from sin or to show their sins forgiven or to renew their souls in the image of God.” Accordingly, “all who desire an increase of the grace of God are to wait for it in partaking of the Lord’s Supper.”<sup>645</sup> In his Journal (Nov. 13, 1763), Wesley

---

<sup>635</sup> Sermon XLV The New Birth, 4.2: *Works* 6, 74.

<sup>636</sup> Treatise on Baptism, 2, 1: *Works* 10, 191.

<sup>637</sup> Sermon XLV The New Birth, 4.2: *Works* 6, 74.

<sup>638</sup> Treatise on Baptism, 4, 2: *Works* 10, 193.

<sup>639</sup> Sermon XVI ‘The Means of Grace’ 3, 12: *Works* 5, 195.

<sup>640</sup> Edward H., Sugden, ed., *Wesley’s Standard Sermon*, 2 Vols. (London: Epworth Press, 1921), I: 259. Hereafter it is written as *StS* I: 259.

<sup>641</sup> *Works* 1, 279.

<sup>642</sup> Answer to the Rev. Mr. Church 3, 1: *Works* 8, 404. “Our Lord commanded those very men who were then unconverted, who had not yet ‘received the Holy Ghost,’ who, in the full sense of the word, were not believers, to do this in remembrance of him”; Letters VI, 124; *Works* 9, 50. “Because I believe, these (all the means of grace) do ordinarily convey God’s grace even to unbelievers” (my addition).

<sup>643</sup> Colin W. Williams, *John Wesley’s Theology Today*, p.164.

<sup>644</sup> *Works* 1, 280.

<sup>645</sup> Sermon XVI ‘The Means of Grace’ 3, 11: *Works* 5, 194.

confessed that the power of God was far more present at the Lord's Supper than in preaching.<sup>646</sup>

He viewed the Lord's Supper as "a memorial" that signifies the suffering of Christ and as "a means" that communicates the first-fruits of suffering in present graces, and as "an infallible pledge" that convinces us of glory to come.<sup>647</sup> In his sermon on 'The Means of Grace', he considered it not simply as a permission but "a command."<sup>648</sup>

On the qualification of the partakers in the sacraments, Wesley had a different opinion from the Moravians. They insisted that "a man cannot have any degree of justifying faith, till he is wholly freed from all doubt and fear; and till he has, in the full, proper sense, a new, a clean heart" and that "a man may not use the ordinances of God, the Lord's Supper in particular before he has such a faith as excludes all doubt and fear, and implies a new, a clean heart." In opposition to this, Wesley asserted that "man can have justifying faith, before he is wholly freed from all doubt and fear; and before he has, in the full, proper sense, a new, a clean heart" and that "a man may use the ordinances of God, the Lord's Supper in particular, before he has such a faith as excludes all doubt and fear, and implies a new, a clean heart."<sup>649</sup>

### 3.2.7.4 Works of Mercy<sup>650</sup>

Peculiarly, Wesley regarded works of mercy as the *real means* of grace.

Surely there are works of mercy, as well as works of piety, which are *real means* of grace. They are more especially such to those that perform them with a single eye. And those that neglect them, do not receive the grace which otherwise they might (*italics are my emphasis*).<sup>651</sup>

Wesley stressed charity again as a means of grace in the sense that "want of charity will make all those works an abomination to the Lord."<sup>652</sup> In his sermon on Zeal (1781), he again noted that all the works of mercy are the real means of grace.

In an exterior circle are all the works of mercy, whether to the souls or bodies of men. By these we exercise all holy tempers; by these

---

<sup>646</sup> *Works* 3, 156; StS I: 440.

<sup>647</sup> *The Poetical Works of John and Charles Wesley* (ed. by G. Osborn: London: Wesleyan Methodist Conference Office, 1869), p. 186: quoted by Colin W. Williams, *John Wesley's Theology Today*, p.159.

<sup>648</sup> Sermon XVI 'The Means of Grace' 3, 11: *Works* 5, 194.

<sup>649</sup> An Extract of The Rev. Mr. John Wesley's Journal from February 1, 1737-8, to his Return from Germany. Number II, Preface 10: *Works* 1, 82.

<sup>650</sup> For the list of works of mercy, see '3.2.9.2 Good Works and Sanctification.'

<sup>651</sup> Sermon XCVIII. On Visiting The Sick, 1: *Works* 7, 117.

<sup>652</sup> Sermon XXII. Upon Our Lord's Sermon On The Mount, Discourse II, 1,10: *Works* 5, 265.

we continually improve them, so that all these are *real means of grace*, although this is not commonly adverted to. Next to these are those that are usually termed *works of piety*; — reading and hearing the word, public, family, private prayer, receiving the Lord’s Supper, fasting or abstinence. Lastly, that his followers may the more effectually provoke one another to love, holy tempers, and good works, our blessed Lord has united them together in one body, the Church dispersed all over the earth.

In this context, it is clear that Wesley understood the means of grace as three circles. In the exterior circle, there are works of mercy; in the middle circle, there are works of piety; in the innermost core, the Lord and his church exists. Though works of piety and works of mercy are the means of sanctification, only the Lord sanctifies us. In this manner, Wesley saw the effective cause of sanctification as God’s grace, i.e., Christ’s work. In his reply to his detractors who accused him of moralism, Wesley held that “the lines in question do not refer to the condition of obtaining, but of continuing in the favor of God.”<sup>653</sup> As Collins aptly points out, good works are a means that communicates sanctifying grace.<sup>654</sup> For Wesley, the efficient, direct cause of sanctification is God’s gracious work. Good works are considered as fruits meet for repentance which God asks them as an indirect necessary condition for justification and sanctification.

The fact that Wesley considered works of mercy as a means of grace is connected with his emphasis on obedience to the Word of God in the Christian life. The works of piety such as reading the word of God, prayer, the Lord’s supper, and fasting are related to the love of God, while works of mercy are related to the love of the neighbours. Given the close relationship between the love of God and the love of neighbours, it is not surprising that Wesley regarded works of mercy as a means of grace, as well as works of piety. It is said that his distinctive contribution to Protestantism was to extend the means of grace to good works.

### 3.2.7.5 Church Discipline

Wesley saw discipline as necessary for continual spiritual growth.<sup>655</sup> In his Journal (Aug. 25, 1763), he regarded teaching and discipline as more durable than preaching, in the sense that without them preaching is simply begetting children for the murderer.<sup>656</sup> The general rules of church discipline are three marks: “avoiding all known sin, doing good after his

---

<sup>653</sup> Letter CCCLXX. To Miss Jane Hilton, June 19, 1771: *Works* 12, 368.

<sup>654</sup> Cf. Kenneth J. Collins, *Scripture Way of Salvation: The Heart of John Wesley’s Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), p.163.

<sup>655</sup> Thoughts Upon Methodism 1: *Works* 7, 258.

<sup>656</sup> *Works* 3, 144.



power, and attending all the ordinances of God.” He regarded the Methodist discipline as the most simple, rational one which is based on “common sense, particularly applying the general rules of Scripture.”<sup>657</sup> A Methodist preacher was asked to examine a Methodist society once a quarter. The blameable offence of any member could be easily discovered owing to such examination, and the offender was excluded or soon corrected. Generally, the exclusion of a member out of the society is done “in the most quiet and inoffensive manner.” But in case “the offence is great, and there is danger of public scandal,” it was publicly declared that they were no longer members of our society.<sup>658</sup> For Wesley, this removal was not identified with excommunication because Methodism was a voluntary society. He avoided the critique that Methodism’s excommunication was judgmental by mentioning that the goal of discipline was “not punitive but therapeutic.”<sup>659</sup> Considering the charge that the General Rules were a kind of works-righteousness, Wesley held that it was not to earn God’s favour but to nurture the reshaping of their character into Christ-likeness.<sup>660</sup>

As means of grace, he organized class meetings, bands, penitent bands, and select societies.<sup>661</sup> A class meeting consisted of a dozen members and contributed to their recognition of spiritual need and desire for God’s help. A spiritually mature leader inquired after their spiritual condition and provided comfort, encouragement, advice, and reproof in accordance with their situation. In contrast, the bands consisted only of people with some assurance of God’s pardoning presence. In order to induce those who committed known, wilful sin to repent, Wesley offered a penitent band.<sup>662</sup> The select society as the final substructure consisted of the most devoted Methodist Church in order to press them to pursue entire sanctification in serious reciprocal support. He asked them to shape an example of holiness and love for other societies.<sup>663</sup>

### 3.2.7.6 The Communion of the Saints

For Wesley, Christian fellowship was regarded as “essential in growing in grace.”<sup>664</sup> Besides individual communion between each other, Wesley offered several opportunities

---

<sup>657</sup> Sermon CVII. On God’s Vineyard 3, 1: *Works* 7, 209.

<sup>658</sup> Sermon CVII. On God’s Vineyard 3, 3: *Works* 7, 209.

<sup>659</sup> Randy L. Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley’s Practical Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994), p. 212.

<sup>660</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>661</sup> A Plain Account of the People Called Methodists, II-VIII: *Works* 253-261. Henry Hawthorn Knight called those thing *prudential means* of grace. See, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

<sup>662</sup> Ted Allen Cambel, *John Wesley and Christian Antiquity: Religious Vision and Cultural Change* (Nashville: Kingwood, 1991), p.87.

<sup>663</sup> Cf. Albert C. Outler, *John Wesley* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1964), p. 144.

<sup>664</sup> Ole E. Borgen, “John Wesley: Sacramental Theology No Ends without the Means,” in *John Wesley: Contemporary Perspective* (London: Epworth, 1988), p. 74.

to grow in grace. For example, the “love feast” in which participants shared non-consecrated bread and water with one another was used as a means of sanctification. During this service, the testimonies by believers were intended to model, encourage, and progress Christian sanctification. “Watch-night services” chosen by Wesley contributed to arousing the participants to residual sin and to assure them of “God’s support in renewed obedient response.”<sup>665</sup> “The Covenantal renewal” provided a setting for recovery of thanks, “a sense of pardon,” “full salvation,” “a fresh manifestation of his grace,” and “healing all their backsliding.”<sup>666</sup> The community surroundings of the service offered both a motivation for personal truthfulness and a circumstance of communal sustenance.

### 3.2.8 The Relation to Other Doctrines

#### 3.2.8.1 Predestination, Election and Sanctification

Wesley had a strong abhorrence of absolute double predestination because it was deemed to make “God worse than the devil; more false, more cruel, more unjust.”<sup>667</sup> If there were no middle area between salvation by works and absolute predestination, his choice was the former rather than the latter.<sup>668</sup> Not finding out any covenant in Scripture about election and reprobation, he exclaimed, “[I]f this (election and reprobation) were true, we must give up all Scriptures together” (my addition). “It is absolutely, notoriously false.”<sup>669</sup>

Apart from believing in Christ to the end, there is no other predestination for salvation. God’s unchangeable decree is well depicted in Mark 16:16, “He that believeth shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.” Wesley’s opinion of predestination can be summarised in a sentence. “Whosoever believeth unto the end, so as to show his faith by his works, I the Lord will reward that soul eternally. But whosoever will not believe, and consequently dieth in his sins, I will punish him with everlasting destruction.”<sup>670</sup> His view reflects that God’s grace is resistible and co-operant in every stage of Christian sanctification. So a Christian has the possibility to establish or to dissolve his relationship with God according to his choice.<sup>671</sup>

---

<sup>665</sup> Randy L. Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley’s Practical Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994), p. 210.

<sup>666</sup> Journal Jan.1, 1775: *Works* 8, 38-39.

<sup>667</sup> *Works* VII, 382-283.

<sup>668</sup> Remarks on Mr. Hill’s Review 7, 5: *Works* 10, 379.

<sup>669</sup> Predestination Calmly Considered, 39: *Works* 10: 225.

<sup>670</sup> Predestination Calmly Considered, 61: *Works* 10: 239. Wesley’s view is similar to Arminius’ one. “believers shall be saved, unbelievers shall be damned.” *The Works of James Arminius*, 3: 566; Charles M. Cameron, “Arminius-Hero, or Heretic,” *Evangelical Quarterly*, Vol. 64, no.3 (July, 1992): 220; cf. Mbennah, Emmanuel D. and Vorster, J. M., “The Influence of Arminian conception of Predestination on the 18<sup>th</sup>-century Wesleyan revival,” *Studia historiae ecclesiasticae*, Vol. 24, no.1 (1998): 172;

<sup>671</sup> *Works* 11:426.

In regard to the relationship between predestination and sanctification, Wesley affirmed, “Every one that believes is sanctified, whatever else he has or has not.” In other words, God’s predestination depends upon human belief in Christ. Arther Skevington Wood mentioned that Wesley avoided both extremities of “hyper-Calvinism and antinomianism.”<sup>672</sup> His view seems probable, given that Wesley objected to both double predestination and the antinomian belief neglecting gradual sanctification.

To summarise, for Wesley, predestination is universal, and election is conditional, while man’s sanctification depends upon his faith working by love in Christ.

### 3.2.8.2 Faith and Sanctification

By Wesley’s definition, faith is “a sure trust and confidence which a man hath in God, that through the merits of Christ his sins are forgiven, and he reconciled to the favor of God.”<sup>673</sup> It is not simple rational assent but “participation in the divine reality,” i.e., “the very righteousness of Christ.”<sup>674</sup> To put it in more detail, “faith in general is the most direct and effectual means of promoting all righteousness and true holiness; of establishing the holy and spiritual law in the hearts of them that believe.”<sup>675</sup>

Though not more meritorious than any other of our actions, our faith in Christ is *the means and instrument* whereby we embrace and receive the promises of pardon (my emphasis).<sup>676</sup> In this respect, Colin W. Williams’ assertion that “Wesley took the doctrine of sanctification out of the order of merit and so removed it from the legal order to the order of faith” is acceptable.<sup>677</sup> For Wesley, faith is only bestowed on those who earnestly long for it, actively manifesting the longing in repentance and the fruits meet for it.<sup>678</sup>

Wesley admitted faith as the instrument of sanctification as that of justification.

Q. 2. Is faith the condition, or the instrument, of sanctification?

A. It is both the condition and instrument of it.<sup>679</sup>

---

<sup>672</sup> Arther Skevington Wood, *The Contribution of John Wesley to the Theology of Grace* (Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship, Inc, 1975), p. 218.

<sup>673</sup> An Extract of the Rev. Mr. John Wesley’s Journal, April 22 in 1738: *Works* 1, 90.

<sup>674</sup> W. Stephen Gunter, *The Limits of “Love Divine”: John Wesley’s Response to Antinomianism and Enthusiasm* (Nashville TN: Kingswood, 1989), p. 274.

<sup>675</sup> Sermon XXXVI, 3, 2: *Works* 5, 465; also see Frank Baker, ed., *The Works of John Wesley* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1984ff), 2: 41.

<sup>676</sup> The Principles of A Methodist Father explained II. 3. (3): *Works* 8, 830.

<sup>677</sup> Collin W. Williams, *John Wesley’s Theology Today* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960), p.181.

<sup>678</sup> Cf. William Ragsdale Cannon, *The Theology of John Wesley: With Special Reference to the Doctrine of Justification* (Lanham and London: University Press of America, 1974), p. 248.

<sup>679</sup> Minutes of Some Late Conversations I: *Works* 8, 279. His statement is similar to James Arminius. “The external instrument is the word of God; *the internal one is faith* yielded to the word preached. For the word does not sanctify, only as it is preached, unless the faith be added by which the hearts of men are purified” (my emphasis). James Arminius, *The Writings of James Arminius* (3 Vols.), tr. from *the Latin* by J. Nichols

He emphasised faith as the only condition for sanctification as follows:

We are sanctified as well as justified by faith...Exactly as we are justified by faith, so are we sanctified by faith. Faith is the condition, and the only condition, of sanctification, exactly as it is of justification. It is the condition: None is sanctified but he that believes; without faith no man is sanctified. And it is the only condition: This alone is sufficient for sanctification. Every one that believes is sanctified, whatever else he has or has not.<sup>680</sup>

Justifying faith and sanctifying faith are different from each other in terms of emphasis. While the former is “a sure trust and confidence that Christ died for my sins,”<sup>681</sup> the latter is the conviction;

First, that God hath promised it (entire sanctification) in the Holy Scripture...secondly, that what God hath promised he is able to perform...thirdly, a divine evidence and conviction that he is able and willing to do it now.<sup>682</sup>

God can give people “*in a moment* such a faith in the blood of his Son, as translated them out of darkness into light, out of sin and fear into holiness and happiness”<sup>683</sup> (italics are my emphasis).

That faith is expanded to the means of sanctification as well as the means of justification can be said to be Wesley’s theological contribution.

### 3.2.8.3 Justification and Sanctification<sup>684</sup>

In contrast to the Church of England, which views justification as “the same thing with sanctification, or as something consequent upon it,” Wesley regarded justification as

---

(Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1956), 2: 120. Given the similarity between the two statements, Wesley’s view on faith as an instrument of sanctification seems to be influenced by Arminius’. With respect to the relationship between them, Luke L. Keeper, Jr. notes that Wesley “knew of Arminius through Hugo Grotius’ *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum*” (1725) and the works of Simon Episcopius (1741), who was “both the student of Arminius at Leiden University and the chief spokesman for the Remonstrant party at the Synod of Dort.” See his “Characteristics of Wesley’s Arminianism,” *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 22 (1987): 89.

<sup>680</sup> Sermon XLIII. Scripture Way of Salvation, 3, 3: *Works* 6, 49.

<sup>681</sup> Sermon V. Justification by Faith 4, 2: *Works* 5: 60.

<sup>682</sup> Sermon XLIII. Scripture Way of Salvation, 3, 14-16: *Works* 6, 52-53.

<sup>683</sup> Journal April 23, 1738: *Works* 1, 91. Wesley realized this from his experience at Aldersgate. See 3.1.3 “His Conversion at Aldersgate” in this thesis.

<sup>684</sup> Considering the change of Wesley’s viewpoint of the relationship between justification and sanctification according to his career, Randy, L. Maddox notes the following: Wesley confused justification with sanctification before 1739 and since then, he understood justification as a relational change, and sanctification as a real change. From 1771, he distinguished initial justification and final justification. *Responsible Grace*, pp.170.

“wholly distinct from sanctification, and necessarily antecedent to it.”<sup>685</sup> Harshly criticizing Luther for his ignorance of sanctification,<sup>686</sup> he also charged the Roman Church for confusing sanctification with justification.<sup>687</sup> For Wesley, sanctification is “in some degree, the immediate fruit of justification but, nevertheless, is a distinct gift of God,” and has a totally different nature from justification.<sup>688</sup> While justification implies “what God does for us through his Son,” sanctification “what he works in us by his Spirit.”<sup>689</sup> While the former is deliverance “from the accusation brought against us by the law”<sup>690</sup> and “pardon, the forgiveness of sins” on the basis of Christ’s atonement,<sup>691</sup> the latter is “a *real* as well as a *relative* change...inwardly renewed by the power of God.”<sup>692</sup> By the former we are delivered “from the guilt of sin,” and brought back “to the favor of God,” by the latter “from the power and root of sin,” and renovated “to the image of God.”<sup>693</sup>

Wesley explicated the new birth, which is a part of sanctification as its beginning, in comparison with justification.<sup>694</sup> “The being born of God was all one with the being justified; that the new birth and justification were only different expressions, denoting the same thing.” In accordance with his viewpoint, in 1762, Wesley criticized Thomas Maxfield for separating justification from the new birth.<sup>695</sup> The new birth and justification are given to every believer “in one and the same moment.” At the same time “his sins are blotted out, and he is born again of God.”<sup>696</sup> He depicted the distinction between them as follows.

Justification implies only a relative, the new birth a real, change. God in justifying us does something *for* us; in begetting us again, he does the work *in* us. The former changes our outward relation to God, so that of enemies we become children; by the latter our inmost souls are changed, so that of sinners we become saints.<sup>697</sup>

---

<sup>685</sup> Journal, Sept. 13, 1739: *Works* 1, 224.

<sup>686</sup> Sermon CVII, ‘On God’s Vineyard’ I, 5. “Who wrote more ably than Martin Luther on justification by faith alone? And who was more ignorant of the doctrine of sanctification, or more confused in his conceptions of it?”

<sup>687</sup> Sermon CVII, ‘On God’s Vineyard’ 1, 5: *Works* 7, 204.

<sup>688</sup> Sermon V. 2. 1 : *Works* 5, 56.

<sup>689</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>690</sup> Sermon V. 2. 2: *Works* 5, 56.

<sup>691</sup> Sermon V. 2. 5. *Works* 5, 57.

<sup>692</sup> Sermon XLIII.1.4: *Works* 8, 45.

<sup>693</sup> Sermon LXXXV. On Working out our own Salvation, 2,1: *Works* 6, 509.

<sup>694</sup> Sermon XIX. 2 : *Works* 5, 224.

<sup>695</sup> Journal Oct. 29, 1762: *Works* 3, 119. “...a justified man is not in Christ, is *not born of God*, is not a new creature...cannot grow in grace” (my emphasis).

<sup>696</sup> Sermon XIX. 1: *Works* 5, 223.

<sup>697</sup> Sermon XIX. 2: *Works* 5, 224.

Wesley placed justification before the new birth in the order of thinking. “We first conceive his wrath to be turned away, and then his Spirit to work in our hearts.”<sup>698</sup> The new birth is done by the incomprehensible work of the Holy Spirit.<sup>699</sup> Wesley allowed “that at the very moment of justification, we are *born again*: In that instant we experience inner change from the image of the devil to the image of God.”<sup>700</sup>

In regard to the similarities between justification and sanctification, Wesley stated, God not only justifies but also sanctifies “all them that believe in him.”<sup>701</sup> In justification the saints “were created” after the image of God and in sanctification they are “made righteous and holy” in it.<sup>702</sup> For Wesley, justification does not supersede sanctification, nor does sanctification supersede justification. “God has joined these together, and it is not for man to put them asunder.”<sup>703</sup> He emphasised that we should be careful of depreciating justification by exalting entire sanctification.<sup>704</sup> The blessings of justification should be mentioned before speaking of entire sanctification.

With respect to the relationship between final justification and sanctification, Wesley claimed that sanctification is prior to final justification, while repentance is antecedent to initial justification.<sup>705</sup> True holiness cannot precede faith.<sup>706</sup> Both inward and outward holiness subsequent on faith are “the ordinary, stated condition of final justification.”<sup>707</sup> He stated, “It is undoubtedly true, that nothing avails for our final salvation without *καὶ νῆ κτίσις* “a new creation,” and consequent thereon, a sincere, uniform keeping of the commandments of God.”<sup>708</sup> This statement seems almost like salvation by regeneration and works.<sup>709</sup> Wesley’s view that we should make an effort for sanctification seems pertinent in the sense that it awakens our responsibility for our salvation.<sup>710</sup>

---

<sup>698</sup> Sermon XLV.1: *Works* 6, 66.

<sup>699</sup> Sermon XLV. 2, 2. “...the precise manner how it is done, how the Holy Spirit works thus in the soul, neither thou nor the wisest of the children of men is able to explain”: *Works* 8, 68.

<sup>700</sup> Sermon. XIV.3.2: *Works* 5, 169.

<sup>701</sup> Sermon XX.2.12: *Works* 5, 241.

<sup>702</sup> Sermon XX.2.12: *Works* 5, 241.

<sup>703</sup> Sermon CVII. ‘On God’s Vineyard’ 1, 8: *Works* 7, 205.

<sup>704</sup> Minutes of Some Late Conversations II Q. 20 and, its Answer: *Works* 8, 284.

<sup>705</sup> A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion, Part I, 2, 2: *Works* 8, 50-51.

<sup>706</sup> A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion, Part I, 2, 2: *Works* 8, 51.

<sup>707</sup> A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion, Part I, 2, 8: *Works* 8, 56.

<sup>708</sup> A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Horne 2, 7: *Works* 9, 115.

<sup>709</sup> Cf. Gordon Stanley Dicker, *The Concept Simul Iustus Et Peccator in Relation to the Thought of Luther, Wesley and Bonhoeffer, and Its Significance for A Doctrine of the Christian Life* (Th. D. diss., Union Theological Seminary, An Arbor: UMI, 1971), p.68.

<sup>710</sup> Maddox also claims that for Wesley our growth “was not automatic- we must nurture a continuing responsiveness to God’s progressive empowering grace.” *op. cit.*, p.153.



As Tyron Inbody aptly puts it,<sup>711</sup> Wesley explicated the relationship between justification and sanctification in “the most subtle and complex” manner, compared with other theologians. According to this clear distinction between them, his view was closer to Calvin’s than Luther’s in which justification was deemed to comprise sanctification.<sup>712</sup>

### 3.2.8.4 Assurance and Sanctification

Colin W. Williams stated that for Wesley, assurance is not necessary for salvation.<sup>713</sup> His view was criticized by Kisker in the sense that for Wesley, salvation means both salvation from God’s wrath (justification) and salvation from sin (sanctification).<sup>714</sup> Scott Kisker made Williams’ statement clearer, “assurance is necessary for inward holiness” though it is not utterly necessary for justification.<sup>715</sup> Kisker’s view seems pertinent given that salvation implies justification and sanctification. Granted that salvation means only God’s acceptance of a sinner, Williams’ view will also be relevant, for Wesley noted that those without assurance of justification, who have the faith of a servant, are acceptable to God.<sup>716</sup> If we define salvation as freedom from both outward and inward sin, assurance accompanying the witness of both the Spirit and our spirit will be necessary to our salvation, for it comprises both justification and sanctification. Accordingly, in a broad sense of salvation, Kisker’s view is germane, but in a narrow sense, Williams’ is also relevant. Let us then examine Wesley’s statement on this issue.

Wesley described assurance as “the common privilege of real Christians” like entire sanctification.<sup>717</sup> Assurance can be identified with the evidence of things unseen.<sup>718</sup> In a letter to his brother Charles (1747), explicit assurance was described as “the proper Christian faith, which purifieth the heart and overcometh the world.”<sup>719</sup> In a letter to Mr. Tompson on 18 February 1756, it was stated that a man in a state of justification may not have a clear assurance.<sup>720</sup> In a letter to Dr. Rutherford in 1768, “disorder of body or

---

<sup>711</sup> “Wesley offered one of the most subtle and complex understandings of the relationship between justification and sanctification that has been offered in Western theology.” Tyron Inbody, “Where United Methodists and Presbyterians Differs on Sanctification,” *Journal of Theology* 105 (2001): 76.

<sup>712</sup> Gordon Stanley Dicker, *op. cit.*, p. 66. Some charged Wesley that “he had returned to the popish doctrine of salvation by faith and works.”

<sup>713</sup> Colin W. Williams, *John Wesley’s Theology Today* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960), p. 112.

<sup>714</sup> Scott Kisker, “Justified But Unregenerate? The Relationship of Assurance to Justification and Regeneration in the Thought of John Wesley,” *Wesleyan Theological Society*, Vol. 28, no.1-2 (1993): 55-56.

<sup>715</sup> *Ibid.* p. 52.

<sup>716</sup> *Works*, 12, 472. “The Spirit’s witnessing that we are accepted cannot be the faith whereby we are accepted.” “A conviction that we are justified cannot be implied in justifying faith.”

<sup>717</sup> Letter LI. To His Brother Charles: *Works* 12, 112.

<sup>718</sup> “I think a divine conviction of pardon is directly implied in the evidence, or conviction, of things unseen.” Letter DXLIX. To Mr. Richard Tompson, July 25, 1755: *Works* 12, 468.

<sup>719</sup> Letter LI. to His Brother Charles, Sep.22, 1745: *Works* 12, 112-113.

<sup>720</sup> Letter DLI: *Works* 12, 472. “YOU ask, 1. ‘Can a man who has not a clear assurance that his sins are

ignorance of the gospel promises” was considered as the cause of lack of assurance. In his sermon “On Faith” in 1788, assurance was depicted as the faith of a son.<sup>721</sup> For Wesley, in a narrow sense, the faith of a servant excludes justification, regeneration and assurance, but in a broad usage, it includes justification, regeneration but not assurance. Conversely, the faith of a child of God accompanies all of them.<sup>722</sup>

Considering the way to assurance of sanctification, Wesley equated it with the way that we gain assurance of justification.

Q. 16. But how do you know, that you are sanctified, saved from your inbred corruption?

A. I can know it no otherwise than I know that I am justified. ‘Hereby know we that we are of God,’ in either sense, ‘by the Spirit that he hath given us.’

We know it by the witness and by the fruit of the Spirit. And, First, by the witness. As, when we were justified, the Spirit bore witness with our spirit, that our sins were forgiven; so, when we were sanctified, he bore witness, that they were taken away.<sup>723</sup>

Assurance consists of two witnesses; one is the witness of our own spirit, the other is that of the Holy Spirit. The former is “the subjective side of this experience of grace” and the latter is “the objective ground of Christian assurance.”<sup>724</sup> Wesley declared that no one can be a Christian believer till he has these two witnesses.<sup>725</sup>

First, the witness of our own spirit is indirect. In his Sermon on ‘The Witness of the Spirit, Discourse One’, Wesley employed a syllogism. First, the Bible stated that “as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God”; secondly, “I am thus led by the Spirit of God”; in conclusion, therefore “I am a son of God.”<sup>726</sup> In ‘Witness of the Spirit,

---

forgiven, be in a state of justification?” I believe there are some instances of it”: in a letter to James Morgan in 1768, Wesley stated, “Some may fear and love God, and yet not be clearly conscious of His favour: at least, they may not dare to affirm that their sins are forgiven”:

<sup>721</sup> Albert Outler, ed., *The Works of John Wesley: Sermons*, Vol. 3 (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1985), p. 497.

<sup>722</sup> *Ibid.*, also see Kenneth J. Collins, *Scripture Way of Salvation: The Heart of John Wesley’s Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), p.142; Scott Kisker, “Justified But Unregenerate? The Relationship of Assurance to Justification and Regeneration in the Thought of John Wesley,” *Wesleyan Theological Society*, Vol.28, no. 1-2 (1993): 54.

<sup>723</sup> Plain Account of Christian Perfection: *Works* 11, 420.

<sup>724</sup> Outler, *Sermons*, 1:299.

<sup>725</sup> Sermon LV. On The Trinity, 17: *Works* 6, 205. “But I know not how anyone can be a Christian believer till ‘he hath’ (as St. John speaks) ‘the witness in himself’: till ‘the Spirit of God witnesses with his spirit that he is a child of God’-that is, in effect, till God the Father has accepted him through the merits of God the Son.”

<sup>726</sup> Sermon X. The Witness of the Spirit, Discourse One 1, 2: *Works* 5, 113.

Discourse Two’, he developed his theory in connection with the fruit of the Spirit by a similar syllogism.

The word of God says, every one who has the fruit of the Spirit is a child of God; experience, or inward consciousness, tells me, that I have the fruit of the Spirit; and hence I rationally conclude, “Therefore I am a child of God.”<sup>727</sup>

To put it simply, the witness of our own spirit is linked to our inward consciousness to perceive the fruit of the Spirit. Here inward consciousness means our conscience or reason or understanding.<sup>728</sup> The inward fruit of the Spirit like “love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, fidelity, meekness, temperance” are the immediate results of his testimony. The outward fruit of the Spirit are “the doing good to all men; the doing no evil to any; and the walking in the light, — a zealous, uniform obedience to all the commandments of God.”<sup>729</sup> They are equated with the testimony of our own spirit. This statement can be summarized as that the marks of the new birth are faith, hope, love, and obedience to the commandments of God.

Secondly, the witness of the Spirit offers us the assurance of the adoption of sons and an earnest of our everlasting inheritance, and creates a sense of the paternal love of God in us.<sup>730</sup> Our crying, “Abba, Father” is the witness of the Spirit of our adoption as the children of God.<sup>731</sup> His witness is necessary, especially when Satan tempts us into various doubts. Without His witness, the work of sanctification could not be discerned nor could it subsist.<sup>732</sup>

On dissimilarity and similarity between the witness of the Spirit of justification and sanctification, Wesley gave the following description. When we were justified, the Spirit bore witness that “our sins were forgiven,” while when we were sanctified, he did “that they were taken away.”<sup>733</sup> Like that of justification, the witness of the Spirit of sanctification is also “not always clear at first” or always the same afterward, rather

---

<sup>727</sup> Sermon XI. The Witness of the Spirit, Discourse Two, 2, 6: *Works* 5, 125.

<sup>728</sup> Sermon XII. The Witness of Our Own Spirit, 7: *Works* 5, 137. A good conscience requires four items: first, a correct understanding of his holy will, which is revealed in the Word of God, secondly, knowledge of ourselves, our hearts and lives, our inward tempers and outward conversation, thirdly, an agreement of our hearts and lives, including our tempers and conversation, thoughts, words, and works, with the written Word of God as the rule of our conscience, fourthly, an inward perception of this agreement with our rule. Collins refers to three items except the fourth element, inward perception of the agreement with our rule. Kenneth J. Collins, *op. cit.*, p.133.

<sup>729</sup> Sermon X. The Witness of the Spirit, Discourse One 2, 12: *Works* 5, 122.

<sup>730</sup> Letter to the Right Reverend The Lord Bishop of Gloucester: ‘The Operation of the Holy Ghost’: *Works* 9, 166.

<sup>731</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>732</sup> Plain Account of Christian Perfection: *Works* 11, 420.

<sup>733</sup> *Ibid.*

“sometimes stronger and sometimes fainter” and “sometimes is withdrawn.” Yet, generally, the witness of the Spirit of sanctification is “clear and steady” as that of justification.<sup>734</sup>

In terms of the degree of Christian maturity, Wesley explicated the witness on three levels:

“A babe in Christ (of whom I know thousands) has the witness sometimes. A young man (in St. John’s sense) has it continually. I believe one that is perfected in love, or filled with the Holy Ghost, may be properly termed a father.”<sup>735</sup>

He warned of two extremities. One is to “rest in any supposed testimony of the Spirit which is separate from the fruit of it.”<sup>736</sup> The other is to “rest in any supposed fruit of the Spirit without the witness.”<sup>737</sup> Though there may be a degree of human virtue before justification and sanctification, they cannot be identified with the fruit of the Spirit after those. Both the testimony of the Spirit and the fruit of the Spirit are necessary ingredients for assurance. To rest only on the witness of the Spirit results in enthusiasm or fanaticism, while to stress the fruit of the Spirit is inclined to formalism, legalism, or self-justification.

Still, Wesley’s emphasis on assurance by the witnesses of both the Spirit and our spirit seems quite subjective in contrast to “the objective assurance conveyed by the Word and Sacraments,” in the sense that it is difficult for us to discern them though the two witnesses are referred to by the Bible.<sup>738</sup>

### 3.2.8.5 Perseverance and Sanctification

In “Serious Thoughts upon the Perseverance of the Saints,” Wesley stoutly claimed the possibility of loss of our salvation in eight terms.<sup>739</sup> First, even the saint who has the witness and the fruit of the Spirit and lives by faith in Christ may fall away according to Ezek 18:4-26; 33:13.<sup>740</sup> Conversely, those who fell away may recover their faith and favour according to Psalm 89:30-35.<sup>741</sup> Secondly, one who has the faith and a good conscience may “so fall from God as to perish everlastingly” according to 1 Timothy 1:18, 19.<sup>742</sup> The biblical statement, “He that believeth shall be saved” was interpreted as the meaning that if he continues in faith, he shall be saved, but if he continues in unbelief,

---

<sup>734</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>735</sup> Telford, *Works*, 5:215 (to Joseph Benson, Dec. 28, 1770).

<sup>736</sup> Sermon XI. The Witness of the Spirit, Discourse Two 5, 3: *Works* 5, 133.

<sup>737</sup> Sermon XI. The Witness of the Spirit, Discourse Two 5, 4: *Works* 5, 133.

<sup>738</sup> Cf. Collin W. Williams, *John Wesley’s Theology Today* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960), p. 203.

<sup>739</sup> Serious Thoughts upon the Perseverance of the Saints, 2 and 5: *Works* 10, 285.

<sup>740</sup> Serious Thoughts upon the Perseverance of the Saints 5 and 6: *Works* 10, 286-287.

<sup>741</sup> Serious Thoughts upon the Perseverance of the Saints 7: *Works* 10, 286.

<sup>742</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 287.

“shall be damned.”<sup>743</sup> John 3:36 and 5:24 were interpreted in the same manner. Belief should be continually kept as Jesus said, “Verily I say unto you, if a man keeps my saying, he shall never see death” (John 8:51). Thirdly, those who are grafted into the good olive tree may so fall from God as to perish everlastingly according to Romans 11:17, 20-22.<sup>744</sup> That “the gifts and calling of God are without repentance” means the election of the Jewish, not individual Jews. God’s faithfulness implies this. God “will not suffer you to be tempted above what you are able to bear.” (1 Cor 10:13), if you put your trust in him and do not quench the fire of the Spirit, be not disobedient unto God (2 Thess 3:2, 3; 1Thess 5:19; 1Cor1:8, 9). “Unless you fulfil the condition, you cannot attain the promise.”<sup>745</sup> Wesley construed Paul’s exclamation as the description of Paul’s own perseverance only, not of Christians in general. “I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor height, nor depth, nor any creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord” (Rom 8:38, 39).<sup>746</sup> His interpretation seems implausible given that St. Paul used ‘us’, which surely includes the Roman saints of Rom 8:12. Fourthly, they who are branches of the true vine of Christ may fall from God “as to perish everlastingly,” unless they do bear its fruits, according to John 15:1-6.<sup>747</sup> Conversely, those who obey Him shall never perish according to (John 10:27-29).<sup>748</sup> In Jesus’ prayer, “Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are one”(John 17:11), “they” were interpreted as the twelve Apostles, not all believers.<sup>749</sup> Fifthly, “those who so effectually know Christ, as by that knowledge to have escaped the pollutions of the world, may yet fall back into those pollutions, and perish everlastingly” according to 2 Peter 2:20, 21.<sup>750</sup> At the same time, we may be kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation. Sixthly, “those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy may so fall as to perish everlastingly. Seventhly, those who live by faith may so fall from God as to perish everlastingly. Believers may draw back and it does not please God (Heb 10:38). The expression that “I will never leave thee nor forsake thee” should be related to “Let your conversation be without covetousness, and be content with such things as we have,” because the latter is the condition of the former. Eighthly, those who are sanctified by Christ’s blood “may so fall from God as to perish everlastingly” according to Heb 10:26-

---

<sup>743</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 288.

<sup>744</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 289.

<sup>745</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 290.

<sup>746</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 291.

<sup>747</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 291.

<sup>748</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 291-292.

<sup>749</sup> I do not agree with this view. See Paragraph 3.3.2.2 Negative Assessment no. 9 of this chapter.

<sup>750</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 292-293.

29, if he wilfully sin, tread under foot the Son of God.<sup>751</sup> He who is a child of God today may be a child of the devil tomorrow, if they do not continue to believe, for “the devil is the father of them that believe not.”<sup>752</sup>

Seeing what we observed above, Woodrow W. Whidden’s statement seems probable that for Wesley, “a wilful, habitual indulgence in sin of any type will sooner or later cause the loss of salvation,”<sup>753</sup> whereas an effort to pursue a holy life in God’s grace will result in conservation until the end. For Wesley, perseverance is totally conditional because it asks our sustained response to God’s promise. It seems a clear synergism that human efforts cooperate with God’s grace to accomplish His promise of salvation.

### 3.2.9 Good Works and Sanctification

#### 3.2.9.1 Good Works and Justification

In his Journal of 1739, Wesley noted initial justification by faith only, including no good works.

“Neither our own holiness nor good works, are any part of the cause of our justification; but that the death and righteousness of Christ are the whole and sole cause of it...I believe, *no* good work can be *previous* to justification nor consequently a condition of it; but that we are justified (being till that hour ungodly, and therefore incapable of doing any good work) by faith alone, faith without works, faith (though producing all, yet) including no good work (italics are my emphasis).<sup>754</sup>

Of course, without repentance and its fruits, a man cannot be justified. In this sense, they are necessary for justification, but because they are not regarded as good works until they are justified, only faith is viewed as necessary to present justification.<sup>755</sup>

In the relationship with final justification, good works are necessary for final justification. He mentioned, “nothing avail for our final salvation without *καινή κτίσις* a new creation, and consequent thereon, a sincere, uniform keeping of the commandments of God.”<sup>756</sup> In his Sermon on Scripture Way of Salvation in 1765, Wesley held, “if a man

---

<sup>751</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 294-296.

<sup>752</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 297-298.

<sup>753</sup> Cf. Woodrow W. Whidden, “Wesley on Imputation: A Truly Reckoned Reality or Antinomian Polemical Wreckage,” *The Asbury Theological Journal* Vol. 52, no. 2 (1997): 68.

<sup>754</sup> Journal, Sept. 13, 1739: *Works* 5, 224-225.

<sup>755</sup> A letter to the Rev. Dr. Horne in 1762: *Works* 9:111.

<sup>756</sup> A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Horne 2, 7: *Works* 9, 115.



willingly neglect them, he cannot reasonably expect to be justified at all.”<sup>757</sup> In his interpretation of the twenty fifth chapter of Matthew, Wesley again stated, “I still believe, no good works can be done before justification. Yet I believe, (and that without the least self-contradiction,) that final salvation is “by works as a condition.”<sup>758</sup> Though his statement is based on the Bible, it seems doubtful whether it may be harmonious with justification by faith in the perspective of Reformed theology.<sup>759</sup> In my opinion, we are justified by faith working with love, which means that faith produces good works.<sup>760</sup> Accordingly, the judgment by our good works according to Matthew chapter 25 does not contradict justification by faith, for we were forgiven by faith, and our works are considered as the fruit and evidence of our faith. The main point lies in the fact that Wesley regarded works as an indirectly necessary condition for final justification, beyond the simple evidence of living faith.

Such a view of good works caused the critique that Wesley turned too closely to Roman Catholicism. Especially, the Countess of Huntingdon charged that Wesley’s view was “popery unmasked.”<sup>761</sup> Wesley’s emphasis on good works was construed as “a foundation of justification other than Jesus Christ.”<sup>762</sup> In the face of this critique, he signed the declaration that it did not mean “to favour justification” by works but “by works as a condition.”<sup>763</sup> Anyway, Wesley’s view of good works seems to be more intensified than Calvin’s view. Calvin regarded good works as the fruits of justification<sup>764</sup> and did not say that “we can be saved without good works.” Dr. C. W. Suh also mentions that, “Only those who do God’s will receive eternal life.”<sup>765</sup> Calvin did not describe good works as a necessary condition for justification, but an evidence of election and assurance.<sup>766</sup>

Briefly, as Collins aptly puts it, for Wesley, good works do not produce the Christian

---

<sup>757</sup> *Works* 6, 48. Though this is true to initial justification and final one, as I explained above, repentance and its fruits before justification are not regarded as good works.

<sup>758</sup> Remarks on Mr. Hill’s Farrago Double-Distilled 6: *Works* 10, 432.

<sup>759</sup> For the difference between Wesley and Calvin on this issue, see 3.2.4.2 Positional Sanctification: Justification in this thesis.

<sup>760</sup> “But what is the faith to which he attributes justification? That ‘which worketh by love:’ which is the same with the ‘new creature,’ and implies in it the keeping the commandments of God. A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Horne 2, 7: *Works* 9, 115.

<sup>761</sup> Luke Tyerman, *The Life and Times of the Rev. John Wesley*, M. A, 3 of 3 Vols. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1871), p. 73. Quoted by Collins, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

<sup>762</sup> Earl Crow, *John Wesley’s Conflict with Antinomianism in Relation to the Moravians and Calvinists* (Ph. D. diss., The University of Manchester, An Arbor, UMI, 1964), p. 227.

<sup>763</sup> Minutes of Several Conversations Q.77 and the Answer: *Works* 8, 337; Tyerman, *Life*, 3:100: cf. *ibid.*

<sup>764</sup> Calvin, *Comm.* on 1Jn. 3:7.

<sup>765</sup> Chul-Won Suh, *The Creation-Mediatorship of Jesus Christ. A Study in the Relation of the Incarnation and the Creation* (Ph.D. diss. Amsterdam, 1982), p.93.

<sup>766</sup> *Institutes* 3.16.1, “We dream not of a faith which is devoid of good works, nor of a justification which can exist without them: the only difference is, that while we acknowledge that faith and works are necessarily connected, we, however, place justification in faith, not in works.”

life, but are the necessary fruits of the living faith that justifies us, and the indirect condition for justification.<sup>767</sup>

### 3.2.9.2 Good Works and Sanctification

For Wesley, our good works consist of two aspects. One is the works of piety and the other is the works of mercy. The former include all kinds of prayers, participating in the supper of the Lord and reading, meditating, hearing, and studying the Bible and “fasting or abstinence.”<sup>768</sup> The latter include “feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, entertaining the stranger, visiting those that are in prison, or sick, or variously afflicted,” and “the endeavouring to instruct the ignorant, to awaken the stupid sinner, to quicken the lukewarm, to confirm the wavering, to comfort the feebleminded, to succour the tempted, or contribute in any manner to the saving of souls from death.”<sup>769</sup>

On the relationship between good works and sanctification, Wesley explicated it as follows. First, both of them are not the same in the sense that sanctification is not an outward thing like “the doing no harm and the doing good.” Like the new birth, it is not an outward change “from a vicious to (what is called) a virtuous life either.”<sup>770</sup> Good works are the fruits flowing out from the new birth and justification.<sup>771</sup> Secondly, good works are necessary for sanctification, given that “if a man willingly neglect them, he cannot reasonably expect that he shall ever be sanctified; he cannot grow in grace, in the image of God,” nor “retain the grace,” nor “continue in faith, or in the favour of God.”<sup>772</sup>

Good works are “only necessary conditionally, if there be time and opportunity for them, otherwise a man may be sanctified without them.” Conversely, “faith is *immediately* and *directly* necessary to sanctification” (italics are his),<sup>773</sup> for the moment a man believes, “with or without those fruits, yea, with more or less of this repentance, he is sanctified.”<sup>774</sup> Without faith, repentance and its fruits, good works do “not at all avail” for sanctification.<sup>775</sup> In this sense, good works are “only remotely necessary” for sanctification, whereas faith is a direct, sufficient, and absolute condition for sanctification.

Wesley’s viewpoint of good works for sanctification differs from Calvin’s in two

---

<sup>767</sup> Kenneth J. Collins, *Scripture Way of Salvation: The Heart of John Wesley’s Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), p.162.

<sup>768</sup> Sermon XLIII, ‘The Scriptural Way to Salvation’ 3.9: *Works* 6, 51.

<sup>769</sup> Sermon XLIII, ‘The Scriptural Way to Salvation’ 3.10: *Works* 6, 51.

<sup>770</sup> Journal, Sept. 13, 1739: *Works* 1, 225.

<sup>771</sup> Cf. Kenneth J. Collins, *Scripture Way of Salvation: The Heart of John Wesley’s Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), p.162.

<sup>772</sup> Sermon XLIII, ‘The Scriptural Way to Salvation’ 3, 4: *Works* 6, 49.

<sup>773</sup> Sermon XLIII, ‘The Scriptural Way to Salvation’ 3.13: *Works* 6, 52: cf. Kenneth J. Collins, *Scripture Way of Salvation: The Heart of John Wesley’s Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), p.168.

<sup>774</sup> Sermon XLIII, ‘The Scriptural Way to Salvation’ 3.13: *Works* 6, 52.

<sup>775</sup> Sermon XLIII, ‘The Scriptural Way to Salvation’ 3.2 and 3: *Works* 6, 48-49.

respects. One is that for Calvin, good works are the secondary “evidence and support,” not the condition. The other is that they are evidence and support of “election and assurance,” not the necessary condition of sanctification.<sup>776</sup>

### 3.2.9.3 An Antinomian and Legalist (Moralist)?

The Reformed theologians have felt the fear that emphasis on good works could cause nomism and would abolish full trust in Christ. In contrast to them, Wesley seriously felt the threat of antinomianism in his time. Generally, antinomians stressed the abolition of the law and the uselessness of good works in our justification and sanctification because believers are justified and sanctified only by faith.

Peculiarly, antinomians denied the degrees of holiness, i.e., its increase or decrease. According to their opinion, because from the time when one is justified, he is wholly sanctified, his holiness does not increase nor decrease, “from that hour, to the day of his death.” To put it in another way, as entire justification and entire sanctification happen in the same moment, after that time, neither of them can increase or decrease.<sup>777</sup> “The moment we are justified, we are as pure in heart as ever we shall be. A newborn babe is as pure in heart as a father in Christ.”<sup>778</sup> Accordingly, we do not need to struggle in order to keep the Law for sanctification to increase our righteousness and holiness. A believer does good works freely, not because he is mandatory to grow in holiness.<sup>779</sup> Conversely, Wesley understood that he should continually increase in holiness through his constant obedience to the law in grace since justification. Justification is only positional sanctification and regeneration is the beginning of sanctification. Both of them are not enough for Christians.<sup>780</sup>

Christologically and soteriologically, antinomians denied the necessity of good works for salvation. They taught “that Christ had done, as well as suffered all; that his righteousness being imputed to us, we need none of our own; that seeing there was so much righteousness and holiness in him, there needs none more in us.” They also made void the law by Solifidianism and denied the need for private prayer and self-examination.<sup>781</sup> They regarded those who taught different things from theirs as “legal preachers.”<sup>782</sup> Wesley looked upon this as “a blow at the root” of all holiness and “the masterpiece of Satan.” His awareness of such a menace of antinomianism led him to mordantly refute them with these contentions. First, Christians “can neither be made nor

---

<sup>776</sup> Comm. on 1 Jn. 3:7 (p.53); cf. *Institutes* 1.25.21.

<sup>777</sup> Dialogue between an Antinomian and His Friend, *Works* 10, p. 275.

<sup>778</sup> Dialogue between an Antinomian and His Friend, *Works* 10, p. 276.

<sup>779</sup> Zinzendorf, *Sixteen Discourse*, pp. 61-62.

<sup>780</sup> See 3.2.4 The Stages of Sanctification.

<sup>781</sup> Plain Account of Christian Perfection, Answer to Q. 34: *Works* 11, 430-431.

<sup>782</sup> Albert C. Outler, ed., *John Wesley* (London: Oxford, 1964), p. 380.

called good or gentle”, “without having goodness or gentleness in him.”<sup>783</sup> Secondly, without real change, “neither fornicators, nor idolators, nor adulterers, . . . nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God.”<sup>784</sup> Along the same line, he also criticized Moravians for their antinomistic tendency, when they claimed, “No works; no law; no commandments,” following Luther.<sup>785</sup> For Wesley, “the gospel continually leads us to a more exact fulfilling of the law” instead of abolishing the law in our life.<sup>786</sup> Nobody can be a true Christian without refraining from all evil, using all means of grace, and doing good works to other people, when he meets the opportunity to do so.<sup>787</sup>

On the other hand, Wesley spoke against Calvinism for the reason that “it fostered antinomianism” by letting “people rest in their election.”<sup>788</sup> Of course, Calvinists urged believers to accomplish the commandments of God by the third use of the law. Nonetheless, because they neglected “the necessity of keeping the moral law for salvation,” Wesley regarded Calvinists as “moral antinomians.”<sup>789</sup> He seemed to miss Calvin’s view of good works. Calvin did not acknowledge salvation by faith without good works, though he did not claim good works as the condition of salvation.<sup>790</sup> Hence, Wesley’s charge against Calvinism seems rather improbable.

Is Wesley then a legalist? In a strict sense, a legalist may be said to be a person who claims that we must keep the Law in order to be justified or accepted before God.<sup>791</sup> The Calvinist Methodists charged Wesley with being a legalist, when Wesley stated that he that feareth God and worketh righteousness . . . is accepted of him.<sup>792</sup> K. J. Collins views this as the misunderstanding of Wesley’s doctrine of justification<sup>793</sup> because for Wesley, good works are necessary for justification and do not justify man. For Wesley, initial

---

<sup>783</sup> Second Dialogue between an Antinomian and His Friend, *Works* 10, p. 283.

<sup>784</sup> Albert C. Outler, ed., *John Wesley* (London: Oxford, 1964), p. 382.

<sup>785</sup> Journal, June 15, 1741: *Works* 1,316. The Moravian claim is harmonious with Zane C. Hodges’ definition of an antinomian, who would be “one who held that there are no laws governing Christian behaviour so that the Christian is entirely free from commandments and binding obligations”<sup>785</sup> Zane C. Hodges, “Legalism: The Real Thing,” *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society* 9 (1996): 25.

<sup>786</sup> Sermon XXV, Sermon on the Mount, V, 2, 3: *Works* 5, 313-314.

<sup>787</sup> Albert C. Outler ed., *John Wesley* (London: Oxford, 1964), p. 379.

<sup>788</sup> Luke L. Keefer, “Characteristics of Wesley’s Arminianism,” *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 22 (1987): 96; cf. K. J. Collins, *John Wesley: A Theological Journey* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2003), p.227.

<sup>789</sup> W. Stephen Gunter, *The Limits of “Love Divine”: John Wesley’s Response to Antinomianism and Enthusiasm* (Nashville, TN: Kingswood, 1989), p.11.

<sup>790</sup> *Institutes* 3.16.1.

<sup>791</sup> Cf. Zane C. Hodges defined legalism as the attempt to establish one’s own righteousness through completion of the law.<sup>791</sup> “Legalism: The Real Thing,” *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society*, Vol. 9, no. 2 (1996): 27.

<sup>792</sup> *Works* 8, 337.

<sup>793</sup> K. J. Collins, *John Wesley: A Theological Journey* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2003), p.224; cf. W. Stephen Gunter is of the opinion that Wesley “avoided the pitfalls of both moralism and antinomianism” in his theology.

justification is only by faith in Christ. In this sense, Wesley is not a legalist. In a broad sense, a legalist may be described as a person who stresses “Christian responsibility to such an extent that obedience becomes more than the fruit or evidence of faith. Rather obedience comes to be seen as a constituent element of justifying faith.”<sup>794</sup> In the latter sense, Wesley can be called a legalist, because he claimed that good works are conditionally necessary for final justification, while faith is the only immediate and direct condition for initial justification and entire sanctification.<sup>795</sup> Still, he is different from a legalist like a Pelagian or a Jew, or a Catholic<sup>796</sup> in the sense that he accentuated the necessity of grace to do good works and emphasised justification “not by the merit of works but by works as a condition” and God’s gift.<sup>797</sup> In another sense, a legalist or moralist may signify a person who insists upon an outward conformity to a set rule for sanctification.<sup>798</sup> In his Oxford days, Wesley stressed such rules as prohibition of smoking, card games, and dancing. It may be used as evidence that Wesley was a legalist. Nonetheless, all his life, his emphasis on sanctification is primarily laid on inward transformation into the image of God rather than outward change like the doing good. Accordingly, it is not easy to regard him as a moralist in this sense. Antinomians faulted him for moralism because Wesley emphasised the constant use of the means of grace and sincerely obeying Christ’s commandments.

### 3.2.10 The Sphere of Sanctification

#### 3.2.10.1 The Church: Unity and Schism

Viewing the history of the Church of England, Wesley sarcastically criticized separatism

---

<sup>794</sup> Sinclair B. Ferguson, David F. Wright, ed., *New Dictionary of Theology* (Leicester: Inter Varsity Press, 1988), p.379.

<sup>795</sup> Wesley’s view of good works was scholasticized to moralism by Fletcher, who emphasised that believers “must bring forth fruits of a lively faith” and only they “will be eternally justified in good works.” W. Stephen Gunter, *The Limits of “Love Divine”: John Wesley’s Response to Antinomianism and Enthusiasm* (Nashville, TN: Kingswood, 1989), p.275.

<sup>796</sup> Catholics regard good works as a merit for justification and eternal life. “Si quis dixerit, hominis justificati bona opera ita esse dona Dei, ut non sint etiam bona ipsius justificati merita, aut ipsum justificatum bonis operibus...fiunt, non vere mereri augmentum gratiae, vitam aeternam et ipsius vitae aeternae... anathema sit” (p.324). “If any one says that the good works of one that is justified are in such manner the gifts of God, as that they are not also the good merits of him that is justified...do not truly merit increase of grace, eternal life, and the attainment of that eternal life...let him be anathema” (p.46). Sixth Session (13, Jan, 1547), Canon 32 in Rev. H. J. Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent: Original Text with English Translation* (St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1941, fourth printing 1961), p. 324, 46.

<sup>797</sup> *Works* 8, 337.

<sup>798</sup> Zane C. Hodges mentions that “in ordinary jargon of evangelicalism legalism has come to mean an undue emphasis on rules—particularly rules of a negative kind,” though it is impertinent in St. Paul’s view. “Legalism: The Real Thing,” *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society* Vol. 9, no. 2 (1996): 21.

which had been prevalent in England. Though there had been several significant revivals of religion in England since the Reformation, generally, the English were little profited thereby because some serious separation consequently happened. They separated themselves from the Church of England. Among them were the Presbyterians, the Independents, the Anabaptists, and the Quakers. Their problem was that they did barely any good, except for their own communities. As a result, the people remained separated from one another and looked at each other with prejudice. This separation totally quenched the fire of national reformation.<sup>799</sup>

Deeming unity to be an indispensable element for the growth of the church in grace,<sup>800</sup> Wesley endeavoured to keep unity. For example, seeing that Thomas Maxfield and George Bell caused contention and division by enthusiasm in London, he strongly warned them of their divisive spirit.<sup>801</sup> Though he could not withhold Bell's fanatic enthusiasm and Maxfield's separation,<sup>802</sup> by his efforts for unity, he could see that his other brethren were "all at peace and unity with each other" in his societies.<sup>803</sup>

However, he could not prevent his societies from being separated from the Church of England in 1784. He explained it by the fact that they did not "renounce her fundamental doctrines" nor "refuse to join in her public worship."<sup>804</sup> It was not her original doctrines but "her orders and laws" that Wesley refused. He deemed the constitution of the Church of England the "rotten timber" as the main beams of a house, or a building burning with "the fire of love of the world."<sup>805</sup> In order to live in the household of God, he continued praying extempore, forming societies, and permitting preachers who were not Episcopally ordained to administer the sacraments.<sup>806</sup> The administration by the preachers ordained by him was necessary "because otherwise numberless souls must have perished."<sup>807</sup> Subsequently, these led him to separate Methodism from the Church of England in 1784, which means Methodism became an independent denomination.<sup>808</sup> For his denomination, Wesley revised the Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-Nine Articles. All of these were a transformation rather than a schism.

---

<sup>799</sup> Sermon CXXXII. Preached on Monday, April 21, 1777, 2,13: *Works* 7, 428.

<sup>800</sup> Journal Feb. 28, 1788: *Works* 4, 407.

<sup>801</sup> *Works* 3, 119-121.

<sup>802</sup> Luke Tyerman, *The life and Times of the Rev. John Wesley*, M.A 3 Vols. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1890), p. 438; also see W. Stephen Gunter, *The Limits of "Love Divine": John Wesley's Response to Antinomianism and Enthusiasm* (Nashville, TN: Kingswood, 1989), pp.218- 224.

<sup>803</sup> Journal Apr. 30, 1788: *Works* 4, 415.

<sup>804</sup> Letter to the Rev. Mr. Walker: *Works* 13, 195.

<sup>805</sup> Frank Baker, *John Wesley and the Church of England* (London: Epworth Press, 1970, second edition 2000), p. 182.

<sup>806</sup> *Works* 13, 196.

<sup>807</sup> Frank Baker, *John Wesley and the Church of England* (London: Epworth Press, 1970, second edition 2000), p. 166.

<sup>808</sup> *ibid.*, p. 218.



Wesley did not regard the establishment of his denomination as a schism. For him, denomination just meant independent ordination, not separation.<sup>809</sup> He regarded separated worship, e.g., not attending the worship of the Church of England as the test of schism.<sup>810</sup> To avoid this type of schism, he asked the Methodists to “go to the church once on Sunday at least.”<sup>811</sup> The preachers were asked immediately to “change every plan that would hinder their being at church at least two Sundays in four.”<sup>812</sup> As a more essential problem, heresy was defined as “denying the Lord that bought them,” which results in destructive parties or sects.<sup>813</sup> Accordingly, Wesley was not to be condemned for schism defined as division from lack of love, to say nothing of heresy. In this manner, he faced the critique that his societies separated from the Church of England.

To justify his independent stance from her, Wesley suggested his view of the unavoidable case to separate from the church.

Suppose you could not remain in the Church of England without doing something which the word of God forbids, or omitting something which the word of God positively commands; if this were the case, (but blessed be God it is not,) you ought to separate from the Church of England.<sup>814</sup>

He applied a similar principle to himself.

[I]f I could not continue united to any smaller society, Church, or body of Christians, without committing sin, without lying and hypocrisy, without preaching to others doctrines which I did not myself believe, I should be under an absolute necessity of separating from that society.<sup>815</sup>

With such a line, Wesley allowed his members to have an independent service at Church Hours in case the Minister of the Church of England was “a notoriously wicked man” or “preached Socinianism, Arian or any equally pernicious doctrine.”<sup>816</sup> In this respect, avoiding sin, and preaching the pure doctrine of original sin, atonement and the Trinity<sup>817</sup>

---

<sup>809</sup> *Ibid*, pp. 256-282.

<sup>810</sup> *Works* 8, 236.

<sup>811</sup> *Works* 8, 320.

<sup>812</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>813</sup> Sermon LXXV. On Schism 1, 8: *Works* 6, 402.

<sup>814</sup> Sermon LXXV. On Schism 1, 17: *Works* 6, p. 408.

<sup>815</sup> Sermon LXXV. On Schism 1, 17: *Works* 6, p. 409.

<sup>816</sup> *Works* 8,322.

<sup>817</sup> “If we give up this (the doctrine of original sin), we cannot defend either justification by the merits of Christ, or the renewal of our natures by his Spirit.” *Works* 9: 429; For Atonement, see *Letters* (Telford ed.) 6:297-99; for the Trinity, see *Works* 6: 199-206, especially 200; cf. Geoffrey Wainwright, “Schisms, Heresies & The Gospel: Wesleyan Reflections on Evangelical Truth & Ecclesial Unity,” in *Ancient & Post-modern*

are essential and fundamental issues of unity and separation. In a letter to John Newton on May 14, 1765, he reclassified “particular election and final perseverance” as an *opinion*, which is “compatible with love to Christ, and a work of grace,” in contrast to thirty years previously when he opposed predestination with all his might.<sup>818</sup> He also entitled “perfection” as only his opinion, “not subversive of the very foundation of Christian experience.” This attitude was for a union of evangelical preachers.<sup>819</sup> He urged a man to keep unity as far as he can. “Do not rashly tear asunder the sacred ties which unite you to any Christian society.”<sup>820</sup>

In conformity to his view of unity, he never tried to separate himself from the established church during his lifetime.<sup>821</sup>

### 3.2.10.2 Social Sanctification

Wesley affirmed that Christianity is “essentially a social religion, and...to turn it into a solitary religion indeed is to destroy it.” Christianity “cannot subsist at all without society, -without living and conversing with other men.”<sup>822</sup> The gospel of Christ knows “no holiness but social holiness.”<sup>823</sup> Of course, he did not renounce the individual religion that takes root in the deepest nook of the human heart, but emphasised that holy disposition, such as “mildness, gentleness, and long-suffering” cannot exist without communion with other men.<sup>824</sup> What he censured is not a personal religion, but a solitary religion as reclusive monasticism. His recognition of the importance of communion among the believers enabled him to organize various societies as the class meeting, the bands, and the select societies for their spiritual growth and maturation. These organizations came to contribute to transform the society of England by checking and promoting their practice.<sup>825</sup> Wesley thought that the way to accomplish social sanctification is to transform the individual.<sup>826</sup> A changed society comes through “a changed individual.” In this line, he

---

*Christianity: Paleo-Orthodoxy in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Essays in Honour of Thomas C. Oden*, ed., by Kenneth Tanner & Christopher A. Hall (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2002), pp. 191-192.

<sup>818</sup> Journal May 14, 1765: *Works* 3, 211.

<sup>819</sup> Journal May 14, 1765: *Works* 3, 212.

<sup>820</sup> Sermon LXXV. On Schism 1, 17: *Works* 6, p. 409.

<sup>821</sup> Cf. Martin Schmidt, “Wesley’s Place in Church History,” in *The Place of Wesley in the Christian Tradition* ed., by Kenneth E. Rowe (Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc, 1976), p. 85.

<sup>822</sup> Sermon XXIV. Upon Our Lord’s Sermon on The Mount. Discourse IV, 1,1: *Works* 5, 296.

<sup>823</sup> Hymns and Sacred Poems (1939), Preface, 4-5; cf. Black Robert Edwin notes, “For Wesley, holiness translated into social ethics, not private ecstasy.” *The Social Dimension of John Wesley’s Ministry as Related to His Personal Piety* (Ph. D. diss., Union Theological Seminary, 1984, An Arbor: UMI, 1987), p. 133.

<sup>824</sup> Sermon XXIV. Upon Our Lord’s Sermon on the Mount. Discourse IV, 1, 3: *Works* 5, 297.

<sup>825</sup> Cf. *Notes* on Romans 14:19.

<sup>826</sup> David Guy, “John Wesley: Apostle of Social Holiness,” in *John Wesley: Contemporary Perspective* (London: Epworth, 1988), p. 116. “Wesley’s significance emerges when, and only when, the importance of moral transformation in the individual- and his immediate and sometimes widening circle- is given due

asserted, “you have nothing to do but save souls.” Then “the converted would press on towards that holiness” which would always result in “social holiness.”<sup>827</sup> His assertion is harmonious with Christ’s instruction that Christians should play a role as the light and the salt of the world.<sup>828</sup> Christians should season whatever is round about them. He has the duty to distribute whatever grace he has received from God to others. Through his “holy temper and word and work,” he influences them.<sup>829</sup> Wesley’s view that the sufficiency of God’s grace enables us to overcome the sinfulness of both individual and society is quite optimistic.

With respect to the nature of social transformation, Wesley emphasised that it is a gift received moment by moment from God. At the same time, it also needs Christians’ complete obedience to God. For example, he believed that even slavery would be abolished by God through Christian obedience. “Go on; in the name of God and in the power of his might, till even American slavery (the vilest that ever saw the sun) shall vanish away before it.”<sup>830</sup>

Howard A. Snyder comprehensively described Wesley’s actions for social transformation as follows:

Among other things, he agitated for prison, liquor, and labour reform; set up loan funds for the poor; campaigned against the slave trade and smuggling; opened a dispensary and gave medicines to the poor; worked to solve unemployment; and personally gave away considerable sums of money to persons in need.<sup>831</sup>

We may add some items to the above as Ronald H. Stone summarized Wesley’s moral practice for social sanctification: “Evangelical preaching,” “education in class meetings, Methodist schools, Sunday schools,” “publication of books,” “criticism of war,” “arguing and writing for tax reform,” “preventing unnecessary pensions,” “criticism of selling of votes,” and “lobbying political leadership on behalf of abolition of slavery.”<sup>832</sup> Wesley made efforts to practise the will of God in almost all fields of his society. In this respect, R.

---

weight.”

<sup>827</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 117.

<sup>828</sup> Cf. R. George Eli, *Social Holiness: John Wesley’s Thinking on Christian Community and its Relationship to the Social Order* (New York etc.: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc, 1993), pp. 106-107. He similarly notes, “As light, Christian community witnesses to society as model, exemplar, illuminator, revealer, and identifier” (p.106) and “as salt and leaven, Christian community is to exert a tangible influence in society” (p. 107).

<sup>829</sup> Sermon XXIV, Upon Our Lord’s Sermon on The Mount. Discourse IV, 1, 7: *Works* 5, 299.

<sup>830</sup> Letter DCCCXCIX. February 26, 1791: *Works* 13, 153.

<sup>831</sup> Howard A. Snyder, “John Wesley, A Man For Our Times,” *Christian Today* 16 (1972): 9.

<sup>832</sup> Ronald H. Stone, *John Wesley’s Life and Ethics* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2001), pp.227-228; “After Lord Mansfield’s ruling in 1772 made slavery illegal in England” (p. 189).

George Eli's mention that Wesley's social holiness as "the outward thrust of the kingdom into society" is not only "evidenced by good works" but also requires "critical responses and prophetic action from the Christian community" seems relevant.<sup>833</sup>

As we observed above, the characteristic principles of Wesley's notion of social sanctification can be summarized in three ways: first, Christianity is a social religion, secondly, social reformation comes through individual transformation, thirdly, it is a gift given by God, which concomitantly asks our obedience to God's command, e.g., legal action,<sup>834</sup> lobbying, arguing and criticizing for important issues. It is noteworthy that Wesley lobbied whenever it was necessary.

### 3.3 Abstract and Assessment

#### 3.3.1 Abstract

According to John Wesley, sin means human voluntary transgression against a known law. Nobody descends into hell simply because of original sin, but man does so due to his own sinful deeds. Sin is the main target of sanctification. The justified do not sin wilfully. If he wilfully sins, he may lose his pardon, e.g., justification without previously repenting it.<sup>835</sup>

Prevenient grace removes our guilt of original sin on the basis of the atonement of Christ. It is resistible, not irresistible. So, man can choose his destiny by his own decision. This justifies the judgment of God, but threatens his sovereignty of human destiny. Prevenient grace accompanies man all his life. If he accepts and obeys to it, he is led to justifying grace, and sanctifying grace step by step.

In a broad sense, sanctification begins with God's awakening of a sinner in his grace. It consists of repentance and its fruits before justification. In its narrow sense, sanctification begins with justification, which is regeneration. Regeneration is the beginning of entire sanctification. Justification and sanctification are connected in the sense that both of them are founded on the atonement of Christ, who is the origin of all grace.

Sanctification is defined as "an entire deliverance from sin, a recovery of the whole image of God, the loving God with all our heart, soul, and strength."<sup>836</sup> The image of God consists of righteousness and holiness, i.e., the human right relationship with God.

Perfection does not mean an angelic perfection, or absolute obedience to God's law. It

---

<sup>833</sup> R. George Eli, *Social Holiness: John Wesley's Thinking on Christian Community and its Relationship to the Social Order* (New York etc.: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc, 1993), p. 43.

<sup>834</sup> Cf. Black, Robert Edwin concludes, "He was not opposed on principle to social legislation." *The Social Dimension of John Wesley's Ministry as Related to His Personal Piety* (Ph. D. Diss, Union Theological Seminary, 1984, An Arbor: UMI, 1987), p. 179.

<sup>835</sup> *Works* VIII, 276.

<sup>836</sup> Letter CCCCLVII to Mr. Joseph Benson, London, Dec. 28, 1770: *Works* 12, 415.

implies the purity of his motive, when the believer does anything. The purity of the motive is to do everything out of love of God and people. It does not exclude human unconscious faults and his limits in intelligence and physical power. It is to love God and people with all his heart and will.

Perfection can be accomplished in this life because it is promised in the Bible. In its absolute meaning, it can be achieved only after death, but in a relative sense, it can be attained in this life. Everybody must aspire to attain this perfection in this life.

Sanctification is instantaneously attained, whereas repentance and its fruit gradually grows. Our repentance and its fruits are both antecedent and consequent to justification. Entire perfection attained in a moment by the Holy Spirit can practically be continuous, but it is “a present experience of sanctification” rather than a fixed condition.<sup>837</sup> The second blessing can recur scores of times in our life. The experience of the instantaneous work of the Spirit is helpful to promote our sanctification in the Spirit, but it is neither necessary to all nor completes our holiness in one time.<sup>838</sup> It becomes a good stimulus to continually pursue our sanctification in the Spirit.<sup>839</sup>

Assurance of salvation depends upon the witness of the Spirit and the fruit of the Spirit. Perseverance does not unconditionally depend upon predestination, but upon our continual faith in Christ. Good works are only a secondary condition of justification and sanctification, not the merit for them. Unconditional double predestination and the imputation of Christ’s righteousness are refused.

The mode of sanctification is described as self-denial. It begins with Christian recognition that he belongs to Christ, and that he is a steward. Through self-denial, Christ lives in the believers. The motive of sanctification is the will of God and its goal is to give glory to God through a holy life.

The means of sanctification are mainly God’s Word, prayer, fastening, bible study, the Lord’s Supper, and baptism. Wesley added the works of mercy to these items. The works of mercy means good works for other people. The decisive and immediate means of sanctification is faith, which makes sanctification God’s gift.

The human role is to do the means of sanctification diligently with sincere desire of sanctification. God’s role is to bestow his entire sanctification on humans as his gift. Peculiarly, Wesley admitted that even unbelievers could use such means as reading the Bible, bible study, prayer, and fasting, especially the Lord’s Supper, but not baptism. He used various societies to promote sanctification. These organizations contributed to the

---

<sup>837</sup> Edward H., Sugden, ed. *Wesley’s Standard Sermon* 2 Vols. (London: Epworth Press, 1921), 2: 172.

<sup>838</sup> Cf. Charles David Clarke, “A Still More Excellent Way: A Historical, Theological and Biblical Evaluation of John Wesley’s Doctrine of Christian Perfection” (Ph. D. thesis, the Univ. of Potchefstroom, 1998), p. 235.

<sup>839</sup> J. Sidlow Baxter, *Christian Holiness Restudied and Restated Includes the Complete Text of A New Call to Holiness, His Deeper Works in Us, Our High Calling* (Zondervan Publishing House, 1967), p. 128.

discipline of the Methodist members for their sanctification. Infant baptism was recognized as a means of sanctification.

Wesley cannot be called an antinomian, given his stress on the use of the means of sanctification, or a legalist, given his emphasis on justification by faith in Christ. Rather, he seems to be closer to a moralist in the sense that he emphasised using all possible means to accomplish entire sanctification. Granting that Wesley viewed good works as a secondary condition for final salvation, his view can be said to be a synergist, which means that humans cooperate with God's grace for sanctification from beginning to end. Seeing that God's grace has the initiative, his synergism can be said to be a monergistic synergism. He never denied human active participation in justification and sanctification. Human freewill functions very importantly to attain entire sanctification. So does human choice to believe Jesus Christ as his Saviour. Free will was recovered by the prevenient grace of God, and is not from human nature.

### **3.3.2 Assessment**

#### **3.3.2.1 Positive Assessment**

1 Wesley's doctrine of sanctification prepared a position for human responsibility in the frame of *sola gratia* and established an ethical subject by forming the ethical ego. He presented the possibility of the Christian social ethics in contrast to the humanistic social ethics of the Enlightenment or social ethics that pursues social revolution.

2 He maintained a balance between gradual and instantaneous sanctification, by harmonizing human effort with God's gift in Christian perfection. His emphasis on gradual growth after attaining perfection corresponds with the biblical statement we should grow to the full extent of Christ.

3 His view on sanctification is optimistic in that humans can overcome the power of sin because grace is more powerful than sin.

4 His teaching of attaining final justification by good works can be helpful to reform the moral corruption of Christian life, though it has the risk to incline to the loss of the stability of justification and to justification by faith and works. The necessity of repentance awakens the saints to watch out for all kinds of sins.

5 His efforts for social sanctification and their fruits are exemplary to contemporary Christians. His view on social transformation seems pertinent in that it is based on individual sanctification, emphasis on God's initiative, and human obedience to God's guidance. His objection to slavery is his pre-eminent merit.

6 Sanctification by faith seems as probable as justification by faith. To regard sanctification as God's gift can be interpreted as his emphasis on God's sovereignty in sanctification. Sanctification is not a human merit as Roman Catholicism.



7 His efforts to maintain the unity with the Church of England are noteworthy, especially at present with the urgent need for unity instead of schism is strongly asked.

8 His opinion of using the diverse means of grace is helpful to avoid quietism and enthusiasm. His allowance for unbelievers to use such means is helpful to their salvation.

9 His emphasis on a changed life is helpful to renovate formalism of religion.

10 His stress on the human free will, coupled with human responsibility to accomplish salvation contributed to world mission, as his slogan, “the whole world is my parish.”<sup>840</sup>

### 3.3.2.2 Negative Assessment

1 Wesley’s claim that prevenient grace is bestowed on all people due to Christ’s atonement and removes the guilty of original sin from birth seems unreasonable to me. To apply his claim to those born since Jesus’ atonement can be probable, but to apply it to unbelievers born before his atonement scarcely find substantiation in the Bible. Though Christ’s atonement was foreshowed in the Old Testament, it seems implausible to apply to anybody of unbelievers outside Israel before Christ’s atonement

2 According to Wesley, 1 John 3:9 reads, “He doth not commit sin,” not “True: Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin habitually.”<sup>841</sup> The latter is regarded as that “addest to the words of this book?”<sup>842</sup> The Greek text reads: Πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἁμαρτίαν οὐ ποιεῖ, ὅτι σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει, καὶ οὐ δύναται ἁμαρτάνειν, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγέννηται. Here, ποιεῖ can be translated as a simple present action or as a present continuous action. According to the New International Version Bible, it is translated as a continuous action. “No one who is born of God will continue to sin, because God’s seed remains in him; he cannot go on sinning, because he has been born of God.” The New Living Version, English Standard Version (2001) agree with the continuous action after NIV, while the New Revised Standard Version (1989), the King James Version, and the New American Standard Version (1995) take it as a simple present action. Grammatically, both interpretations are possible because the present simple tense can indicate two actions; the simple present action and the present continuous action. Still, to understand ποιεῖ as a present continuous action is in harmonious with 1 John 1:8, which reads, “If we say that we have no sin, we are deceiving ourselves and the truth is not in us”

<sup>840</sup> Cf. Mbennah & Vorster, *op. cit.*, p. 184.

<sup>841</sup> Wesley interpreted two other passages as simple present action. “Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not, Whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him.” (1John 3:6). “No one who lives in him keeps on sinning. No one who continues to sin has either seen him or known him.” “He that committeth sin is of the devil: for the devil sinneth from the beginning.” (1 John 3:8, KJV). In contrast, the New Living Version reads, “So if we continue to live in him, we won’t sin either. But those who keep on sinning have never known him or understood who he is.” (3: 6). “But when people keep on sinning, it shows they belong to the Devil...” (3:8).

<sup>842</sup> Sermon XVIII. The Marks of the New Birth 1,5: *Works* 5, 215.

(NASV). This interpretation is congruent to two other biblical passages. Ecclesiastes 7:20 reads, “there is not a righteous man on earth who continually does good and who never sins” (אִישׁ אֲדֹנָי is qal imperfect indicating an ongoing action). Wesley held that the justified do not commit outward sin, except inward sin, but it is doubtful whether they can abstain from outward sin if they have inward sin in their heart, for inward sin cannot but produce outward sin.<sup>843</sup>

3 Wesley’s view that “the evil root, the carnal mind, is destroyed; and inbred sin subsists no more” seems self-contradictory, given his mention that inbred sin can recur even to the entirely sanctified:

...so far as these (love of God and human good tempers) reign in the soul, are not the opposite tempers, worldly-mindedness, malice, cruelty, revengefulness, destroyed? Indeed, the unclean spirit, though driven out, *may return and enter again*; nevertheless he was driven out. I use the word ‘destroyed’ because St. Paul does; ‘suspended’ I cannot find in my Bible” in (my emphasis).<sup>844</sup>

It is wrong that Wesley identified an unclean spirit with inward sin itself, for the unclean spirit was the cause of sin, but not inward sins itself. His expression that the carnal mind is the root of sin led W. E. Sangster to criticize Wesley for regarding sin as a thing to be eradicated “like a cancer or a rotten tooth.”<sup>845</sup> In the same vein, Leon O. Hynson asserts that we should interpret sin as relational term like “the distortion of relationship” rather than ontological term like “illness or contagion.”<sup>846</sup> Let us observe St. Paul’s statement of this issue. In Ephesians 4: 22-25, St. Paul delineated sin as an ontological term, i.e. a thing to be “put off.”

4: 20 ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν But you have not so learned Christ, 21 εἴ γε αὐτὸν ἠκούσατε καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε, καθὼς ἐστὶν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ if indeed you have heard Him and have been taught by Him, as the truth is in Jesus: 22 ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφὴν τὸν παλαιὸν

<sup>843</sup> Cf. Gordon Stanley Dicker, *The Concept Simul Iustus Et Peccator in Relation to the Thought of Luther, Wesley and Bonhoeffer, and Its Significance for A Doctrine of the Christian Life* (Th. D. diss., Union Theological Seminary, An Arbor: UMI, 1971), p. 93.

<sup>844</sup> Sermon XIV. The Repentance of Believers 1, 20: *Works* 5, 165; Telford, ed. *Letters*, Vol. 5, 203-204.

<sup>845</sup> W. E. Sangster, *The Path to Perfection: An Examination & Restatement of John Wesley’s Doctrine of Christian Perfection* (first published 1943: London: Epworth Press, reissued 1984), p. 113; Sermon XIV. The Repentance of Believers: *Works* 5, 165.

<sup>846</sup> Leon O. Hynson, “Original Sin as Privation: An Inquiry into a Theology of Sin and Sanctification,” *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 22 (1988): 70; also see Umphrey Lee, *John Wesley and Modern Religion* (Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1936), pp. 185; R. Flew, *The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1934), p. 335.

ἄνθρωπον τὸν φθειρόμενον κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης with reference to the former manner of life, to *put off* the old man which is being corrupt according to the desire of the deceit to you 23 ἀνανεοῦσθαι δὲ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοῦς ὑμῶν instead are being renewed in the spirit of your minds 24 καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας. and to *put on* the new man which was created according to God, in true righteousness and holiness. 25 Διὸ ἀποθέμενοι τὸ ψεῦδος λαλεῖτε ἀλήθειαν ἕκαστος μετὰ τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐσμέν ἀλλήλων μέλη. therefore, having put away falsehood, let all of us speak the truth to our neighbours, for we are members of one another (Bible Works NA 27<sup>th</sup> ed.)

Here, the old man is described like a cloth to be taken off or put on. Likewise, falsehood is depicted as a cloth to be taken off. Accordingly, we can say Wesley's description of inbred sin as "a root of bitterness" is congruent to the Bible. Nonetheless, there is a more profound meaning in Paul's statement. The ground is that ἀποθέσθαι is infinitive aorist with an accusative, ὑμᾶς. The aorist ἀποθέσθαι with ὑμᾶς indicates that their becoming believers involves a radical break with the past.<sup>847</sup> Fixing his eyes upon the aorist tense, Dr. Sidlow Baxter claimed that to put off the old man, which means that the first man, Adam, including humankind was punished and killed with Jesus on the cross, not that our old nature, namely, our inbred sin died with Christ.<sup>848</sup> For Baxter, the old man is "the whole human race in Adam," but not our old nature.<sup>849</sup> The old man was lawfully sentenced to death on the cross. This is the meaning of "I have been crucified with Christ" (NIV. Galatians 2:20). The decisive break with the last order can be well explained in the baptismal rite where believers remove their cloth before entering the water in baptism and put on a new garment after baptism. Such instants lie in Rom 6:4, Gal 3:27 and Col 3:9-

<sup>847</sup> Cf. John Murray, *Principles of Conduct: Aspects of Biblical Ethics*, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957, reprinted in 1964), p. 213. In the respect that we are united with Christ, he identified the death of the old man with Christ's death. "Exegetically speaking it is no easier to think of the old man as in process of crucifixion or mortification than it is to think of the resurrected Lord as being still in process of crucifixion."

<sup>848</sup> J. Sidlow Baxter, *Christian Holiness Restudied and Restated Includes the Complete Text of A New Call to Holiness, His Deeper Works in Us, Our High Calling* (Zondervan Publishing House, 1967), pp. 93, 101, and 109. According to him, the statement that "I have been crucified with Christ" means my "juridical identification with Christ on the Cross" (emphasis is mine).

<sup>849</sup> Cf. M. Luther viewed the old Adam in us as flesh, which means the man is ruled by our old nature, or concupiscence and pride. *LW* 27, 249. Also see Gordon Stanley Dicker, *The Concept Simul Iustus Et Peccator in Relation to the Thought of Luther, Wesley and Bonhoeffer, and Its Significance for A Doctrine of the Christian Life* (Th. D. diss. Union Theological Seminary. An Arbor, UMI, 1971): 165. "The flesh cannot be sanctified, but only mortified." Luther used the flesh, or the old man.

10.<sup>850</sup> However, he did not mention that the infinitive was used as imperative. On the basis of Greek usage that the infinitive form was used as imperative, Andrew T. Lincoln claims that Eph 4: 22-25 “do take on some imperatival force.”<sup>851</sup> But, Lincoln did not pay attention to the fact that “put on” and “put off” were used in the aorist tense. Lincoln contends that if Paul wanted to express Eph 4:22-25 as “a definitive putting on an off in the past,” he would have used ὥστε introducing a dependent clause—indicating the actual result *so that* (Mt 8:24; 27:14; Mk 1:45; 2:12; Jn 3:16; Act 1:19; 2 Cor 1:8; Gal 2:13). His contention can be refuted by Murray’s opinion that the infinitive of result also occurs without ὥστε (Acts 5:3, Heb 6:10, Rev 5:5; 16:9).<sup>852</sup> Though there is the imperative infinitive in New Testament (e.g., Phil. 3:1 and Romans 12:15), Eph. 4:22-25 could hardly be its example.<sup>853</sup> Murray interpreted this passage as a result clause. Because they learned the truth as it is in Christ, they have put off the old man and have put on the new man. Practically, they are being renewed in the spirit of their mind. Therefore, like the new man, let us put away falsehood and speak the truth. His view seems persuasive, given his scrupulous observance of Greek grammar and Paul’s use of the term, the old man.<sup>854</sup>

Accordingly, we can say that Eph 4:22-25 is an exhortation to live holy lives, on the grounds of the assurance that believers are already justified.<sup>855</sup> To put on the new man and to put off the old man means the change of believers’ stature in justification. It is beyond human ability and depends on only God. Their duty is to put away their ways of life like unbelievers. This duty is related to sanctification, not to justification. The old man already died and exists no longer, because they put it off when they believed.<sup>856</sup> The old man implies their old relation with Adam. It was broken down in their union with Christ’s death. The new man implies their new relation which was established in their union with Christ when they believe in Him. It is related to justification. In terms of sanctification, inbred sin as the carnal mind and the root of sin was not yet entirely destroyed in their nature. It cannot be destroyed like a cancer until they die because it is not a thing but a relation. Even the sanctified are often tempted and sometimes fall down. If inward sin had been entirely rooted as a thing, it would not have recurred in the sanctified. Wesley also knew that sin

---

<sup>850</sup> Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians: Word Biblical Commentary*, Vol. 42 (Dallas: Word Books Publisher, 1990), pp.283-286.

<sup>851</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 284.

<sup>852</sup> John Murray, *Principles of Conduct: Aspects of Biblical Ethics*, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957, reprinted in 1964), p. 215; A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (New York, 1914), pp.1089-1091.

<sup>853</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.214-215.

<sup>854</sup> John Murray, *op. cit.*, p. 218; Cf. for Lincoln’s interpretation of Eph 4: 20-25, see Lincoln, *op. cit.*, pp. 283-289. His view seems plausible, but it can be refuted by John Murray’s analysis of Paul’s usage of the old man. Ordinarily, Paul does not call “the sin and the flesh” the old man.

<sup>855</sup> Cf. Murray, *op. cit.*, pp.219-220.

<sup>856</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 218.

recurs, even to the sanctified. But his expression that sin can be totally rooted out, so it exists no longer has enough grounds for controversy,<sup>857</sup> or at least leaves room for misunderstanding. As J. I. Packer points out, “no Christian, however wholehearted at this moment, or at any future moment, in conscious love of God and neighbor,” will ever be impervious to attack of sin.<sup>858</sup> Hence, Wesley’s opinion that sin in believers can be completely abolished in this life must be rejected as unbiblical.<sup>859</sup>

4 In his classification of the human state, Wesley put the Jew in the circle of man under the law.<sup>860</sup> His division seems implausible, given that Paul did not feel any guilt of his obedience to God’s law when he was in Judaism, while Wesley held that man under the law feels serious guilt before God. Paul thought of himself as a blameless Jew, but after his conversion to Christianity, he felt the deficiency of his obedience to the Law. Accordingly, the general state of the Jew seems to be closer to the sleeping state rather than the state under the Law. Conversely, the state under the Law is ascribed to those whose sin was disclosed by the law of Christ, i.e., the inward sincerity of the Law by the light of the Spirit, but who still do not know the liberty of faith in Christ and the grace of the Spirit.

5 His standpoint of a real Christian as a person who does not sin, is exceedingly high for the ordinary Christian, and is unbiblical. It seems excessively strict that Christians lose pardon, i.e., justification when they wilfully commit sin.<sup>861</sup> His view means that justification by faith can be demolished by the condition of sanctification. This opinion makes justification dependent upon sanctification. It necessarily results in losing the certainty of present justification. From the reformed perspective, the Christian who willingly committed, do not become an unbeliever but are called to repent of their sin.

6 In Romans 7:7-13, all verbs are in the past tense, but the verbs in 7:14-25 are in the present tense. Therefore 7:14-25 do not describe the pre-Christian state but the present Christian experience. Because Rom. 7:25 “so then, I myself serve the law of God with my mind, but with my flesh I serve the law of sin” describes the present state of believers, Wesley’s view on present perfection cannot be supported.<sup>862</sup> Galatians 6: 17 concurs with that view. “For the sinful nature desires what is contrary to the Spirit, and the Spirit what is contrary to the sinful nature. They are in conflict with each other, so that you do not do what you want.” Though the desire of flesh can be repressed by the Spirit, it cannot be

---

<sup>857</sup> Charles David Clarke, “A Still More Excellent Way: An Historical, Theological and Biblical Evaluation of John Wesley’s Doctrine of Christian Perfection,” Ph. D. thesis, the Univ. of Potchefstroom, 1998, pp. 234-235.

<sup>858</sup> J. I. Packer, *Keep in Step with the Spirit* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1984), p. 142.

<sup>859</sup> See, Charles David Clarke, *op. cit.*, pp. 179-221; cf. R. N. Flew, *The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology* (Oxford University Press, 1934), p. 336. “[I]t is not so likely that the subtler sins of Pharishaim will be once and for ever uprooted in that same spiritual crisis.”

<sup>860</sup> Sermon IX. The Spirit of Bondage and Adoption, III, 8: *Works* 5, 108.

<sup>861</sup> *Works* 8, 276.

<sup>862</sup> *Works* 8, 276.

radically removed until death.<sup>863</sup>

7 The teaching of perfection in this life is apt to lead people to “subjectivism, moralism,” “self-righteousness, and fanaticism.”<sup>864</sup>

8 Wesley’s excessive stress on repentance and experience may lead people to a hysteric experience or pretended attitude, as Charles Wesley pointed out.<sup>865</sup>

9 The case of George Bell, perfection has a danger to cause the perfected to erroneously believe that they can infallibly discern the will of God, e.g., they can know the last day of the earth, as many people have often asserted. Although Wesley objected to this enthusiasm, it may be undeniable that Wesley’s view of perfection tempted George to think himself infallible.<sup>866</sup>

10 Wesley’s interpretation of some biblical passages on perseverance is incorrect. First, Wesley ascribed Paul’s declaration in Rom 8:38-39 to only his own perseverance: “I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor height, nor depth, nor any creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord”.<sup>867</sup> His interpretation seems impertinent given that Paul used ‘us’, which surely includes the Roman saints according to Rom 8:12. Secondly, in Jesus’ prayer, “Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are one”(John 17:11), Wesley interpreted “they” as the twelve Apostles, not all believers. However, John 17:20 reads, “I ask not only on behalf of these, but also on behalf of *those who will believe in me through their word*” (New Revised Standard Version). The expression that “they” may be one, as we are one” recurred in 21verse. Accordingly, Wesley’s interpretation is impertinent.

---

<sup>863</sup> For a similar view to mine, see Sinclair B Ferguson, “The Reformed View,” in Donald L. Alexander ed., *Christian Spirituality: Five Views of Sanctification* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1988), pp. 62-63. For an opposite view, see Anthony A. Hoekema, “The Reformed Perspective,” in Melvin Dieter, et. al., *Five Views on Sanctification* (Grand Rapids, The Zondervan Corporation, 1987), p. 232.

<sup>864</sup> Cf. Tyron Inbody, “Where United Methodists and Presbyterians Differ on Sanctification,” *Journal of Theology* 105 (2001): 97.

<sup>865</sup> W. Stephen Gunter, *The Limits of “Love Divine”: John Wesley’s Response to Antinomianism and Enthusiasm* (Nashville, TN: Kingswood, 1989), p.153. He concluded that “hysteria was diabolical.”

<sup>866</sup> “Bell asserted that his Perfection rendered him infallible, above temptation, and superior to the instructions of all persons who were not perfect.” Letters from John Fletcher to Lady Huntingdon, May 9, 1763: Fletcher Vol. II, p. 85 (Manchester, Methodist Archives); quoted by Gunter, *op. cit.*, p. 219.

<sup>867</sup> Gunter, *op. cit.*, p. 291.



## CHAPTER 4 KARL BARTH AND SANCTIFICATION

### 4.1 Introduction

Professor William Hordern held that “it is perhaps Barth who, since Wesley, developed the highest and most thorough doctrine of sanctification in his *Church Dogmatics* IV/2,” although some scholars assert that Barth has no doctrine of sanctification or hope for the improvement of human nature.<sup>1</sup> If we take Hordern’s view to be a persuasive one, it will be reasonable to probe Barth’s doctrine of sanctification after researching Wesley’s doctrine of sanctification.

#### 4.1.1 The General Evaluations of Barth’s Theology

In a positive tone, E. Jüngel regards Karl Barth as the most significant Protestant theologian since Schleiermacher.<sup>2</sup> Thomas F. Torrance compared Barth’s influence with “that of Athanasius the Great.”<sup>3</sup> John Webster views him as “the most authoritative and celebrated theological figure.”<sup>4</sup> Clifford Green dubs him “theologian of freedom” because the centre of his theology is “the freedom of God acting in love towards humanity in Jesus Christ, which sets us free in all spheres of life.”<sup>5</sup> Bernard Ramm identifies three merits in Barth’s theology: 1) He denied that the criticism of historic Christian orthodoxy by the Neologians (the Bible Criticizers) was valid. 2) He accepted all the genuinely positive gains of the Enlightenment as they have been upheld by modern learning. 3) He rewrote his historic Christian Reformed theology in the light of the Enlightenment.<sup>6</sup> Richard A. Muller claims that Barth served “to press the liberal tradition towards a more self-critical understanding of its insights and methods and, equally, to press conservative theology towards a broader and more genuinely traditional theological perspective.”<sup>7</sup> A I C Heron views Barth as “the representative *par excellence* of a conservative theological reaction against the whole drift of modern culture,” comparing him with Schleiermacher seen as

---

<sup>1</sup> William Hordern, “Is There a New Barth?,” *Christian Advocate*, VI, No. 7 (March 29, 1962): 7.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Karl Barth: A Theological Legacy*, tr. by Garrett E. Paul (Philadelphia: the Westminster Press, 1986), p.22; for the relationship between Barth and Schleiermacher, see Bruce L. McCormack, “What Has Basel to Do with Berlin? Continuities in the Theologies of Barth and Schleiermacher,” *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, Vol. 23, no.2 (2002): 146-173.

<sup>3</sup> Thomas F. Torrance, *Karl Barth* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1990), p. xi.

<sup>4</sup> John Webster, *Barth* (London & New York: Continuum, 2000), p.113.

<sup>5</sup> Clifford Green, *Karl Barth: Theologian of Freedom*, Vol. 5 of *The Making of Modern Theology: 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Century Theological Texts* (5 Vols.) (London etc.: Collins Publishers, 1989), p.11

<sup>6</sup> Bernard Ramm, *op. cit.* p. 14.

<sup>7</sup> Richard A. Muller, *Westminster Theological Journal*, Vol. 50, no.1 (Spring 1988): 154.

“the godfather of theological relativism and religious pluralism.”<sup>8</sup> H. Hartwell notes that Barth turned the concern of theology from human thoughts to the Word of God, that is, the Bible.<sup>9</sup> This may be the reason why we should study Barth. G. C. Berkouwer regarded Barth as not merely a theoretical theologian, but “the author of a concrete, self-applying theology with all manner of implications for ethics” and the grave practical problems of the modern world.<sup>10</sup>

In contradiction to this position, R. D. Williams is of the opinion that Barth failed to produce an adequate theology of the Spirit, while treating the Father and the Son relatively clearly.<sup>11</sup> Conversely, Rosato asserts that Barth dealt with faith, love and hope; justification, sanctification, and vocation under the heading of the Holy Spirit in the *Church Dogmatics* IV/1-3 and in many of his shorter writings. He tried to reveal that Barth was “first and foremost a pneumatocentric theologian and not a christocentrist.”<sup>12</sup> Rosato’s first assertion is relevant, but his second contention seems excessive, given Barth subordinated Pneumatology to Christology.<sup>13</sup> C. Van Til harshly criticized Barth for denying the historicity of the Bible.<sup>14</sup> He christened Barth’s view “the New Evangelism” in the sense that Barth never wanted “to interpret Christ in terms of the Bible,” and designated it “the New Modernism” because “what he (Barth) means by Christ is not what the historic Christian church has meant by Christ,” and finally dubbed it “the New Humanism” for the reason that Barth’s Christ is “no more than a projection of the would-be self-sufficient man.”<sup>15</sup> W. V. Puffenberger maintains that Barth’s overruling Christological interpretation puts him “in constant danger of eisegesis” and contradicts “an adequate understanding of the Bible as a whole” because in the Bible God is revealed both

---

<sup>8</sup> A I C Heron, “Barth, Schleiermacher and the task of dogmatics,” *HTS*, Vol.56, no.2&3 (2000): 393.

<sup>9</sup> *The Theology of Karl Barth* (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1964), p. 181.

<sup>10</sup> *The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth*, tr. by Henry R. Boer (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956), p.10.

<sup>11</sup> R. D. Williams, “Barth on the Triune God,” S. W. Sykes, ed., *Karl Barth: Studies of his Theological Method* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), p. 171.

<sup>12</sup> Philip Joseph Rosato, “Karl Barth’s Theology of the Holy Spirit: God’s Noetic Realization of the Ontological Relationship between Jesus Christ and All Men,” Ph. D. diss., Tübingen University, Fotodruck Präzis Barbara v. Spangenberg KG, 1976, p. 1, 352, 7. For a critique of Rosato’s thesis, see John Colwell, *Actuality and Provisionality: Eternity and Election in the Theology of Karl Barth* (Edinburgh: Rutherford House Books, 1989), pp.295, 309-314.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. John Thompson, *The Holy Spirit in the Theology of Karl Barth* (Allison Park: Pickwick Publications, 1991), p. 209. “It is correct to say, as Rosato does, that the Holy Spirit plays the mediating role between Christ and us, but wrong to infer from this that Pneumatology is virtually Barth’s main concern.” On the Contrary, Barth maintained “throughout his Christological starting point which leads from and to the trinity, election, reconciliation, Pneumatology, ecclesiology and a social and political concern.”

<sup>14</sup> C. Van Til, *Christianity and Barthianism* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed Pub. Co., 1962), p. 445.

<sup>15</sup> C. Van Til, *Karl Barth and Evangelicalism* (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian & Reformed Pub. Co., 1964), pp.31-32.

in creation and in Christ.<sup>16</sup>

Several theologians, such as H. W. Tribble (1937), J. C. Lombard (1957), O. G. Otterness (1969), M. den Dulk (1987), and J. S. Rhee (1995) wrote their doctoral theses on Barth's doctrine of sanctification. Dr. Rhee analyzed the works of Tribble, Lombard, Otterness, and den Dulk.<sup>17</sup> He treated Barth's doctrine with the intention of doing a comprehensive research and tried to apply it to the Korean context. Rhee's thesis tends to side with Barth and did not deal with the means of sanctification. Otterness points out that Barth grounded the doctrine of sanctification on Christology, which resulted in "the loss of the dynamic nature of sanctification as a process in the covenant community." *De jure* sanctification accomplished in Christ beyond time and space replaced "the description of the historical process of *de facto* sanctification."<sup>18</sup> In the light of Barth's Christology, Otterness' critique is germane, but in the light of Barth's view of Christian life, his critique is unfair, for Barth held that our love for God "must be continually renewed," and denied

---

<sup>16</sup> William Vernon Puffenberger, *The Word of God and Hermeneutics in The Theologies of Karl Barth and Gerhard Ebeling*, (Ph. D. Diss., Boston University Graduate School. Ann Arbor: UMI Dissertation Information Service, 1968), pp. 300-305.

<sup>17</sup> **H. W. Tribble's** assessment of Barth's doctrine of sanctification: 1) Barth's view of the doctrine of sanctification focused on God's claim upon man rather than a change in man's character. 2) It emphasised works of sovereign grace acting upon man rather than a divine- human cooperation. 3) For Barth, sanctification was a discontinuous act rather than a continuous act, which seems to mean the denial of gradual growth in holy life by human effort [*The Doctrine of Sanctification in the Theology of Karl Barth* (London: Edinburgh, 1937), pp. 177-204]. This view, however, only considered Barth's earlier opinions as Barth's later ones were not yet expressed. **J.C. Lombard's** critiques of Barth's doctrine of sanctification: 1) Barth's excessive emphasis on objectivistic and triumphal indicative of Jesus' sanctification weakens the concrete imperative of the sanctified man, so that he does not adequately deal with an answer to the problems which demand "concrete Christian obedience." 2) Its actual applications to the whole area of life for the total rule of Christ as well as the spontaneous power to realize it do not appear. J. C. Lombard, *Die Leer van die Heiligmaking by Karl Barth* (Kampen: Vrije Univ. diss. 1957), pp 257-260. In my opinion, Lombard's assessment seems very pertinent. Unfortunately, his thesis did not seem to reflect *KD IV/2 §66*. **M. den Dulk's** analysis of Barth's doctrine of sanctification: Barth embroidered Calvin's and Bonhoeffer's thoughts on *CD IV/2, &66*: Calvin (§66's subsections 1, 2, 4 and 6), Bonhoeffer (section 3), and Barth and Barth (section 5). His analysis is criticized by Rhee for its inaccuracy (Rhee, pp.42-43). **M. Den Dulk** criticized Barth on three points: 1) Barth's fear of the God-forgetting psychologizing, which results from emphasizing human experience of salvation rather than God's objective salvation achieved in Christ, has been a bad advisor for his theological work (p. 226). 2) Barth's tendency to restrain Pneumatology has an obsessive character because, to a large extent, he feared the liberal tendency to correspond the Spirit to human spirit (p. 227). 3) The argument that "the inward struggle" causing conversion, which is described as "the dialogue which men carry on with themselves" is sin in the sense of sloth, requires careful distinction (pp. 235, 228). M.den Dulk. *...Als Twee Die Spreken: Een manier om de heiligingsleer van Karl Barth te lezen*, (Amsterdam: 's-Gravenhage, 1987). For more detail, see J. S. Rhee, *Secularization and Sanctification: A Study of Karl Barth's Doctrine of Sanctification and Its Contextual Application to the Korean Church*, (Ph. D. diss. Vrije Univeriteit Amsterdam: UV University Press, 1994), pp. 32-44.

<sup>18</sup> Omar G Otterness, "The Doctrine of Sanctification in the theology in Karl Barth," Ph. D. diss, Chicago University, 1969, Microfilm, p. 206.

“a way of life that is fixed once and for all according to certain standpoints and regulations.”<sup>19</sup> Also, Barth noted that “in concrete history” the Holy Spirit awakes man to the subjective realisation of the objective salvation in Jesus Christ.<sup>20</sup> Briefly, the problem for Barth is in that he did not deny the dynamicity and historicity of sanctification, but subordinated Pneumatology to Christology, which resulted in his greater emphasis on the objective aspect of sanctification than the subjective. In this regard, Daniel Migliore’s contention is germane that Barth “opposed all forms of individualism and subjectivism in his theology” and “underscored the objective history of reconciliation in Jesus Christ” in his early *Church Dogmatics*.<sup>21</sup>

#### 4.1.2 His Response to the Main Theological Trends of His Time

In view of Barth’s life, E. Busch asserts that whoever wants to study Barth’s theology should know his historical background.<sup>22</sup> He deplores that “both his (Barth’s) supporters and his critics have so far failed to see this clearly enough.”<sup>23</sup> Joseph Bettis also points out that “Barth, perhaps more than any other contemporary theologian, was conscious of the historical *Sitz im Leben* of his thought.”<sup>24</sup> Taking their views to be germane, let us investigate Barth’s response to the main theological trends of his time.

##### 4.1.2.1 Barth and liberalism

Barth’s liberalism was formed under the influence of the historical-critical school in Bern, W. Hermann in Marburg, and Harnack in Berlin.<sup>25</sup> He confessed that “the possibility of understanding the Bible in terms of the history of religion began to dawn on me, and alongside Kant, Schleiermacher took a clearer place in my thought than before.”<sup>26</sup> After attending Berlin for a semester, Barth was fascinated by the work of Wilhelm Herrmann of Marburg, through whom he confessed to have found his true interest in theology for the first time.<sup>27</sup> He took a post as editorial assistant of the *Christliche Welt* under the

---

<sup>19</sup> CD IV/2, 801-802.

<sup>20</sup> CD IV/1, 643-646.

<sup>21</sup> Daniel Migliore, “Reforming the Theology and Practice of Baptism” in *Towards the Future of Reformed Theology: Tasks, Topics, Traditions*, ed. by David Willis & Michael Welker (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999), p.509

<sup>22</sup> E. Busch, *Karl Barth: His life from letters and autobiographical texts* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1976), tr. by John Bowden, p. xi. Hereafter it is written as *BAT*.

<sup>23</sup> *BAT*, xi.

<sup>24</sup> Joseph Bettis, “Political Theology and Social Ethics: The Socialist Humanism of Karl Barth,” G. Hunsinger, ed., *Karl Barth and Radical Politics* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976), p. 160.

<sup>25</sup> *BAT*, 40

<sup>26</sup> K. Barth, *Selbstdarstellung*, 1964; *BAT*, p.40.

<sup>27</sup> *BAT*, 41.

editorship of Professor Martin Rade.<sup>28</sup> In 1909, Barth served a German Reformed congregation in Geneva as assistant pastor. From 1911, he served in the parish of Safenwil. In the tradition of Marburg, Barth preached that “Calvin’s view of the authority of the Bible would be quite wrong for us.”<sup>29</sup> He did not accept “the Christ presented by the Chalcedonian Definition,” but preached that “if Christ begins to live in us...that is the beginning of Christian faith.”<sup>30</sup> He did not accept the physical resurrection of Jesus. Christ’s resurrection was interpreted as his calm acceptance of death and courageous attitude towards his enemy. Revelation was regarded as human conscience and history.<sup>31</sup>

After his father’s sudden death at the age of fifty-five, Barth began to move away from liberal theology. The first cause was his father’s last words to him, “The main thing is not scholarship, nor learning, nor criticism, but to love the Lord Jesus. We need a living relationship with God, and we must ask the Lord Jesus.”<sup>32</sup> The second is Barth’s ministry experience at Geneva and Safenwil. He was confronted with the realistic problems of poor sermons due to spiritual poverty. It motivated him to move from the Lutheran theoretical doctrine of justification to Calvin’s emphasis on the practical doctrine of sanctification.<sup>33</sup> The third is the perception of the uncertainty of religious experience and the otherness of God, which freed him from Hermannian liberalism, which identified “the voice of God with the negative experience of history with a good deal of self-confidence.”<sup>34</sup> The most decisive cause that detached him from liberalism was the response of his teachers to World War I. On 1 August 1914 when the war broke out, ninety-three German intellectuals, including almost all his teachers, supported the war policy of Kaiser Wilhelm II and this shocked him to the depths of his being.<sup>35</sup> Barth regarded their compromise with the ideology of war and their ethical failure<sup>36</sup> as the result of their faulty exegetical and dogmatic presuppositions.<sup>37</sup> Reacting against the compromise of his teachers, he began to criticize nineteenth-century theology totally. Barth declared that “liberal Christianity is not

---

<sup>28</sup> *EAS*, 8.

<sup>29</sup> *BAT*, 54.

<sup>30</sup> K. Barth, *Sermons* 14 April 1911; *BAT*, p.54.

<sup>31</sup> Sermon, 29 June 1913 in *Predigten 1913*, ed. by Nelly Barth and Gerhard Sauter (Zurich: TVZ, 1976), p. 324; McCormack, *Karl Barth’s Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology, Its Genesis and Development 1909-1936* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1997), p. 103. Hereafter, it is written as *KCD*.

<sup>32</sup> M. Lauterburg, “Preface to F. Barth,” *Christus unsere Hoffnung*, XVII; *BAT*, 68.

<sup>33</sup> K. Barth “Jesus Christ and the Movement for Social Justice,” G. Hunsinger, ed., *Karl Barth and Radical Politics* (Philadelphia, 1976), p. 34. Hereafter, it is written as *BJMS*.

<sup>34</sup> *KCD*, 124-125.

<sup>35</sup> *BJMS*, 34.

<sup>36</sup> K. Barth, *Autobiographical Text VII: Fakultätsalbum der Evangelisch-theologischen Fakultät Münster*, 1927, p. 4; *BAT*, 81.

<sup>37</sup> James D. Smart, *The Divided Mind Theology, Karl Barth and Bultmann, 1908-1933* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967), p.67.

Christianity as historically understood and is therefore not Christianity”<sup>38</sup> and “I can no longer be a liberal theologian,” for liberal theology is an “anthropocentric theology.”<sup>39</sup> As Joseph Bettis aptly puts it, Barth deemed liberalism “the real threat to humanity in the first half of the twentieth century.”<sup>40</sup>

Barth responded to liberalism<sup>41</sup> in the first edition of his commentary on *Paul’s letter to the Romans* published in 1919,<sup>42</sup> and as David L. Mueller describes, the book meant the initiation of Barth’s detachment from “the anthropocentric and cultural Christianity” of liberalism. Nevertheless, at this stage Barth did not yet break completely with the concept of continuity between God and man, which is presumably formed by Platonic idealistic thought.<sup>43</sup> For the first edition of *Der Römerbrief*, E. Busch mentioned that Hermann’s “aspect of the complex living-experiencing” is still preserved in Barth’s concepts of “organic growth.”<sup>44</sup> A. Jülicher and K. L. Schmidt compared Barth to Marcion,<sup>45</sup> while Harnack likened him to T. Müntzer and W. Koepler joined him to K. Schwenckfeld.<sup>46</sup> Barth was also dissatisfied with the first edition of *Der Römerbrief*. Thus he radically revised it to the extent that he said, “it may be claimed that no stone remains in its old place.”<sup>47</sup> The core of the book is an appeal to “the Church to let God be God, and let man learn again how to be man,” and not try to be like God. For man has always been attempting to distort the truth to suit his own selfish aims and ideas. Torrance said that it exploded like “a bomb among the theologians of Europe and shattered the selfish individualism of theological liberal-ism.”<sup>48</sup> John Macken S J views this book as “a judgment on the proud *Kulturprotestantismus* of the preceding era and on the liberal

---

<sup>38</sup> Bernard Ramm, *After Fundamentalism: The Future of Evangelical Theology* (Toronto: Fitzhenry & Whiteside Ltd. 1983), p. 6.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p.38; Karl Barth, “Liberal Theology: Some Alternatives,” tr. by L. A. Garnard, *Hibbert Journal* 69 (April 1961): 213; A I C Heron holds that liberal theology “was grounded, determined, and influenced decisively” by Schleiermacher. Heron, “Barth, Schleiermacher and the task of dogmatics,” *HTS*, Vol., no. 2&3 (2000): 393.

<sup>40</sup> Joseph Bettis, “Political Theology and Social Ethics: The Socialist Humanism of Karl Barth,” G. Hunsinger. ed., *Karl Barth and Radical Politics* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976), p. 160.

<sup>41</sup> “Nachwort,” *Schleiermacher-Auswahl*, Siebenstern Taschenbuch 113-4, 1968. p.294f.

<sup>42</sup> J. J. Kim, *Die systematische Anatomie von Karl Barths Theologie* (Seoul: Handeul, 1998), p.13.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 23.

<sup>44</sup> E. Busch, *KP*, 56; cf. Römer 1, p.62.

<sup>45</sup> *BAT*, 113.

<sup>46</sup> Karl Barth, “The Preface to the Second Edition” of *The Epistle to the Romans*, 6<sup>th</sup> edition, tr. by Edwin C. Hoskyns (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), p.13.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 2. Frank Jehle claims that many phrases of this book, e.g., “impossible possibility,” “empty space,” “bombshell crater” were influenced by “Kierkegaard and Dostoyevsky,” *EAS*, p. 11. Dr. J. S. Rhee contends that *Röm 2* shows a closer familiarity with Plato and Kant than with *Röm.1*. Rhee, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

<sup>48</sup> T. F. Torrance, *KARL BARTH; An Introduction to His Early Theology, 1910-1931* (London: SCM PRESS LTD. 1962), p.7.



theology that had built and served it.”<sup>49</sup> As a result of the book, Barth was offered a chair as associate professor of Reformed theology at Göttingen in 1921.<sup>50</sup> In 1922, Barth established the periodical *Zwischen den Zeiten* with F. Gogarten, E. Thurneysen, G. Merz. The journal functioned as vehicle for dialectical theology and exerted a significant influence upon German theology until 1933.<sup>51</sup>

To sum up, as R. A. Muller puts it, Barth and his fellows offered a significant curative to naive liberalists by pointing to human existential tragedy and terror due to sin, and by turning their attention to Scripture and many traditional doctrines centring on Christology.<sup>52</sup>

#### 4.1.1.2 Barth and Socialism

It is worth while to note Barth’s social and political strife, for it is connected with social sanctification.<sup>53</sup> Barth lived in the period of social upheaval caused by World War I and II. As a pastor as well as a theologian, Barth actively took a part in the political situation of Germany of that period, and due to his social struggle, he was called “a red pastor.”<sup>54</sup>

In 1911, Barth began his ministry at Safenwil, which moved him near to Christian socialism through his involvement in the trade-union movement of his parish.<sup>55</sup> He identified “Jesus Christ” with “the movement for social justice.”<sup>56</sup> What Barth accepted was socialistic ethical idealism, not “the behaviour of socialists and the tactics of the socialist parties.”<sup>57</sup> “Real socialism” was regarded as “real Christianity” in his time<sup>58</sup> in the sense that the true Christian change should necessarily accompany the transformation in his external relation.<sup>59</sup> In this respect, Harnack’s individualistic conception of religion was rejected.<sup>60</sup> His theory of God’s kingdom based on Jesus’ word: “My kingdom is not of this world” was also judged as “a false disjunction between spirit and material.”<sup>61</sup> In

---

<sup>49</sup> John Macken S J, *The Autonomy Theme in the Church Dogmatics: Karl Barth and His Critics* (Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p.24.

<sup>50</sup> E. Jüngel, *op. cit.*, p.25.

<sup>51</sup> David E. Mueller, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

<sup>52</sup> Richard A Muller, “The Place and Importance of Karl Barth in the Twentieth Century: A Review Essay,” *Westminster Theological Journal Volume*, Vol.50, no.1 (1988): 155.

<sup>53</sup> *BJMS*, 33 ff.

<sup>54</sup> Helmut Gollwitzer, “Karl Barth and Socialism in the Theology of Karl Barth,” G. Hunsinger, ed, *Karl Barth and Radical Politics*, p. 79.

<sup>55</sup> *Karl Barth-Rudolf Bultmann Letters*, 154; McCormack, *op. cit.*, p.85; E. Busch, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

<sup>56</sup> *BJMS*, 19.

<sup>57</sup> *KCD*, 87.

<sup>58</sup> *BJMS*, 36.

<sup>59</sup> *KCD*, 89.

<sup>60</sup> *BJMS*, 34.

<sup>61</sup> *KCD*, 91.

contradiction to him, Barth deemed God's kingdom to be accomplished in this world.<sup>62</sup> Notwithstanding the recognition of the inherence of God's kingdom in history, he did not confuse the Holy Spirit with the *Zeitgeist*. The difference lies in that the latter is too short-lived in "its power and validity" in comparison with the former. God as the wholly other saves us from the *Zeitgeist*.<sup>63</sup> With Herrmann, he thought that human attainments can not be identified with God's kingdom, but God executes his plan through forces and powers inherent in human history. God brings his Kingdom to earth "through the ethical striving of the truly converted," not "through the weapons of unrighteousness."<sup>64</sup> If a man does not participate in God's revolution, God's kingdom would appear to him as His judgment like "catastrophes and violent storms," but it is for "new life and existence."<sup>65</sup> In this view, World War I was interpreted as God's judgment to set the human race back on the right way.<sup>66</sup> Considering Barth's confidence of God's dominance inherent in human history, it is not surprising that even during the war his sermons were deeply imbued with optimism.<sup>67</sup>

On the other hand, Barth's socialism was influenced by Herrman Kutter and Leonhard Ragaz, who led a religious movement from 1906.<sup>68</sup> While Kutter had little direct involvement in the socialistic movement, Ragaz engaged in it to Christianise the socialists.<sup>69</sup> When the war broke out, Ragaz called for the conference to manifest the objection of the war. He thought the defeat of Germany was imperative for the advance of God's kingdom, objecting to their fixation on pride in their culture rather than dependence on God in Christ. At this time, Barth sided with Ragaz because he valued Ragaz's "desire to bring the religious orientation into connection with practical ethical goals."<sup>70</sup> On 26 January 1915, Barth joined the Social Democratic Party of Switzerland with Thurneysen.<sup>71</sup>

In April in 1915, Barth met with J. Christoph Blumhardt and his son Ch. Blumhardt. Through this association, Barth began to distinguish between God's kingdom and human society. God's kingdom is God's sovereign action and rule over the world and it comes from God Himself not from human beings.<sup>72</sup> In this regard, Barth overcame the mistake of

---

<sup>62</sup> K. Barth, "Jesus Christ and the Movement for social justice," G. Hunsinger, ed., *op. cit.*, p. 27.

<sup>63</sup> Barth, sermon, 11 May 1913 in *Predigten 1913*, ed. Nelly Barth and Gerhard Sauter (Zurich: TVZ, 1976), p. 225; *KCD*, p. 100.

<sup>64</sup> Barth, sermon, 2 March, 1913 in *Predigten 1913*, pp. 79-80; *KCD*, pp. 101-102.

<sup>65</sup> Sermon, 9 March, 1913 in *Predigten 1913*, p. 101; *KCD*, p. 101.

<sup>66</sup> Sermon, 23 Aug, 1914 in *Predigten 1914*, ed. Ursular and Jochen Fähler (Zurich: TVZ, 1974), p. 433; *KCD*, p. 116.

<sup>67</sup> "God is in control of the events which take place in this world." *KCD*, p. 117.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 118-119.

<sup>70</sup> "Barth's letter to Eduard Thurneysen, 5 Feb. 1915," Eduard Thurneysen, ed., *Karl Barth-Eduard Thurneysen: Briefwechsel I, 1913-1921* (Zurich: TVZ, 1973), p.29; *KCD*, pp. 120-122

<sup>71</sup> *KCD*, 110.

<sup>72</sup> J. J. Kim, *op. cit.*, p.19.

Kant that too easily identified human autonomous morality with religion.<sup>73</sup> After realizing God's transcendence through meeting the Blumhardts, Barth abandoned his support for Ragaz, who asserted the necessity of human immediate acts and programme for God's kingdom, and turned to Kutter, who emphasised our waiting to listen to the voice of God in priority to our abrupt action.<sup>74</sup> As a result, in the fall of 1919 Barth explicitly deemed socialism "one of the failed ideologies."<sup>75</sup> Since that time, God's transcendence and Christ's uniqueness, not compromising with human experience and thoughts, had been located in the centre of Barth's theology, and God's kingdom was understood as eschatological.

In 1932, he joined the German Social Democratic Party when National Socialism prevailed in Germany. He resisted Nazism through his writing, *Theologische Existenz heute* especially, no.24-no.25 (from June 1933 to 28 July 1934),<sup>76</sup> and through participating in the Confessing Church and drafting the Barmen Theological Declaration in 1934.<sup>77</sup> During this period, he sided once again with Ragaz, who clearly objected to National Socialism.<sup>78</sup> It was the core of the Declaration that the only object which the Church has "to trust and to obey in life and in death" is not Hitler's National Socialism, but Jesus Christ and his Word who is the only Lord of the Church.<sup>79</sup> Refusing Luther's view that separates God's kingdom and the sphere of the world, Barth asserted that Christians should obey Christ in their whole life.<sup>80</sup> For Barth, National Socialism was deemed to be "antichristian" because it mixed God's revelation in Jesus Christ with "the Germanic ideology" consisted of "the German Lutheran mind, heroic piety," history, and Law. It was also judged to be "antihuman" because of its "anti-Semitism" and "physical extermination" of the Jews.<sup>81</sup> Nevertheless, National Socialism was regarded as "a Church" in the sense that "the real and ardent affirmation is only possible in the form of faith, of mysticism, and of fanaticism,"<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup> Bernard Ramm, "After Fundamentalism: The Future of Evangelical Theology" (New York: Harper & Law, 1983), p. 8; cf. Joseph Bettis, "Political Theology and Social Ethics: The Socialist Humanism of Karl Barth," G. Hunsinger, ed., *Karl Barth and Radical Politics* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976), pp. 163-164.

<sup>74</sup> *KCD*, 119, 124.

<sup>75</sup> Donald D. Wall, "Karl Barth and National Socialism, 1921-1946," *Fides et historia* 15 (1983): 81.

<sup>76</sup> Bernard Ramm, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

<sup>77</sup> Webster, *op. cit.*, p.8.

<sup>78</sup> *EAS*, 10.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. *CD*, II/1, p. 175; "Article 1 of the Barmen Theological Declaration," A. C. Cochrane, *The Church's Confession Under Hitler* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962), p.239.

<sup>80</sup> K. Barth, *The German Church Confession* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1965), p. 20.

<sup>81</sup> K. Barth, *How I Changed My Mind: Introduction and Epilogue* by John D. Godsey (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1966), p. 47; K. Barth, *The Church and the Political Problem of Our Day* (New York: Charles Scriber's Sons, 1939), p. 50.

<sup>82</sup> K. Barth, *The Church and the Political Problem of Our Day* (New York: Charles Scriber's Sons, 1939), p.

Due to his attack on the political theory of Nazi's National Socialism and his refusal to take "the obligatory, unconditional oath of allegiance to the führer,"<sup>83</sup> he was deposed from his position at the University of Bonn in 1935 and deported to Switzerland.<sup>84</sup> After receiving a post at the University of Basel, he continued to advocate the cause of the Confessing Church, of the Jews, and of oppressed peoples by and large from the beginning to the end of the war.<sup>85</sup> Barth's political action continued through such writings as *The Church between East and West* (1949), *Petition of the Bruderschaften on Atomic Weapons* (1958). Anti-communism was considered as "an evil greater than communism itself."<sup>86</sup> Furthermore, he harshly criticized western capitalism for resting on the principle of the exploitation of some by others<sup>87</sup> and causing "disparities in wealth and power."<sup>88</sup>

As we have mentioned above, Barth's main concern in his social strife was to keep "the correct posture of the church towards all ideological systems" in social, political situations.<sup>89</sup> Accordingly, Barth is said to be an active Christian socialistic theologian who resisted injustice and any idolized ideologies. His concern with socialism has a strong overtone of social sanctification, and his realization that the kingdom of God is accomplished by God's power came to set the tone for God's initiative of social sanctification.

#### 4.1.1.3 Barth and Pietism

Given the sharp confrontation between Barth and Pietism on the human experience of God, it is worthwhile to delve into the relationship between Barth and Pietism. The antithesis between them may be explained in the fact that Barth regarded the religious experience of pietism as Schleiermachiian subjectivism<sup>90</sup> while Pietism criticized Barth for emphasis on objective aspect of salvation, despising the human subjective experience of salvation.<sup>91</sup>

---

43.

<sup>83</sup> *EAS*, p. 13.

<sup>84</sup> Donald, D. Wall, *op. cit.* p.86.

<sup>85</sup> Karl Barth, "Church and State,," *Community, State, and Church*, tr. by W. Herberg (Garden City: Doubleday, 1960), pp.143-144.

<sup>86</sup> K. Barth, *How I Changed My Mind: Introduction and Epilogue* by John D. Godsey (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1966), p. 47.

<sup>87</sup> *CD III/4*, 542.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. George Hunsinger, "Karl Barth and Liberation Theology," *The Journal of Religion*, Vol. 63, no. 3 (July, 1983): 251; *CD III/4*, 532.

<sup>89</sup> Shelly, Baranowski, "The Primacy of Theology," *Studies in Religion*. 10/4 (1981):460.

<sup>90</sup> Theodore Runyon (Department of Theology, Emory University, Atlanta) states, "During the era when Karl Barth was the dominating theological figure, "experience" was banned as smacking of 'Schleiermachiian subjectivism.'" T. Runyon, "The Role of Experience in Religion," *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion* 31(1992): 187.

<sup>91</sup> Wilhelm. Busch, "Die Innere Bedrohung Der Evangelischen Kirche," *Licht und Leben* 61 (1950): 132ff.

Furthermore, this issue is worthy of examination given that pietism traditionally has deep concerns about sanctification. This topic can throw light on how to comprehend the uniqueness of Barth's doctrine of sanctification based on objectivity of revelation in contrast to pietism. With these in mind, this issue will be explored.

As Eberhard Busch aptly puts it,<sup>92</sup> the change in Barth's relationship with Pietism may be classified into six stages according to his theological journey.

1) From being raised up in a Pietistic parental home to 1919, Barth made much of "individual religious experience" rather than certain strict doctrines.<sup>93</sup> In his early theology (1911-1919) he did not oppose mysticism and Pietism.<sup>94</sup> Later, Pietism was deemed to be a theological system consisting of inconsistent dogmas.<sup>95</sup> For instance, he criticized Tersteegen for confusing self-denial with a denial of the world.<sup>96</sup> In contrast to Tersteegen, Barth positively embraced the world in view of Christ's redemption for the world.<sup>97</sup> Another point of Barth's critiques of Pietism lied in the ways of the Pietists<sup>98</sup> to find out whether people were converted or not. Their ways were considered as too manipulative rather than personal. Like Pharisaism, their piety was regarded as hypocrisy and was attacked by his satire that "Blessed are those who know they are not pious!"<sup>99</sup>

2) In his commentary of the first *Epistle to the Romans* (1919), Barth poignantly criticized Pietism for its religious individualism for three reasons. First, God is the wholly other One different from this world, while individual solution belongs to this world. Therefore, "God's will cannot be done in individuals."<sup>100</sup> "Personal life as an end in itself is against God."<sup>101</sup> In this sense, he refused individual sanctification. Secondly, Pietism separates the church from the world.<sup>102</sup> The Pietists inclined to concern themselves with private sins while neglecting great social sins. They were oriented to become well adapted

---

<sup>92</sup> Eberhard Busch, *Karl Barth and the Pietists: the Young Karl Barth's Critique of Pietism & Its Response*, Forwarded by Donald W. Dayton. Tr. by Daniel W. Bloesch, (Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 2004). Hereafter, it is written as *KP*. In this section, I owed much to his book.

<sup>93</sup> *KP*, 291-292.

<sup>94</sup> On 28 April in 1911, Barth "supported the prohibition of gambling by the Federal Council." Gambling was regarded as "one point in the enemy line" with "alcoholism, mammonism and libertinism." It was deemed the duty of the church "to make the force of the kingdom of God felt by firmly saying 'no'"; K. Barth, "Wir wollen nicht, dass dieser über uns herrsche!," *Kirchenblatt für die reformierte Schweiz*, 1911, no. 21; *BAT*, pp. 58-59.

<sup>95</sup> *KP*, 18.

<sup>96</sup> K. Barth, Sermon, no. 85, November 5, 1911; *KP*, 19.

<sup>97</sup> Sermon, no. 27, January 1, 1910; *KP*, 20.

<sup>98</sup> For example, they abstain from alcohol, don't indulge in excess, don't act promiscuously and the like.

<sup>99</sup> Sermon, no. 58, January 29, 1911; *KP*, 20.

<sup>100</sup> K. Barth, *Der Römerbrief*, first edition, *Gesamtausgabe Karl Barths*, Vol. 16, Bäschlin, 1919. Hereafter, it is written as *Römer* 1.

<sup>101</sup> *Römer* 1, 206.

<sup>102</sup> *Römer* 1, 247.

subjects but closed their eyes about social injustice.<sup>103</sup> Thirdly, it focuses on its conviction that redemption can be produced by human doing.<sup>104</sup> However, because “God is always only an alien, distant God,” man cannot achieve a reality mechanically by his own doing under the Law which belongs to this old world.<sup>105</sup> The beginning of the new world as new life is connected with Christ only. Its growth is not mechanical but organic.<sup>106</sup> Accordingly, the attempt of Pietism to achieve the new world is under the wrath of God.<sup>107</sup> Pietism had only smoke as contrived piety, not fire as real piety. Its assurance of salvation was only imagination rather than a reality.<sup>108</sup> Without perception of the present power of the kingdom of God, their self-centred efforts would be in vain.<sup>109</sup> In regard to Barth’s attitude during this period, Phillip Bachman pointed out that Barth talked very little about God’s love for us and his forgiveness of our sin. Instead of it, Barth’s main concern is “similar to the concept of righteousness in A. Osiander,”<sup>110</sup> given his notion that “the divine powers enter into human life and transform the bondage of the flesh into freedom” and give us “the ability to overcome temptations.”<sup>111</sup> Barth’s critique of religious individualism seems to have been influenced by Kutter and Ragaz who asserted religious socialism. They asserted that “conversion must not only be a conversion of the individual soul, but of the world.”<sup>112</sup> This view may have influenced Barth’s view of social sanctification.

3) In the second commentary of *the Epistle to the Romans* in 1922, Barth’s critique of the Pietistic individualism was rather mollified by virtue of Franz Overbeck’s influence,<sup>113</sup> who admitted the Pietism which “is aloof from modern culture and against the secularization of the faith” and “has an ascetic character.”<sup>114</sup> Barth mentioned that man “stands before God as an individual and not by way of a detour through the whole”<sup>115</sup> but rejected the idea that the religious person can possess God and His truth. He did not accept human experience of grace without bowing to the judgment of God, that is, waiting for

---

<sup>103</sup> *KP*, 293.

<sup>104</sup> *Römer* 1, 168.

<sup>105</sup> *Römer* 1, 67.

<sup>106</sup> *Römer* 1, 62.

<sup>107</sup> *Römer* 1, 213.

<sup>108</sup> *Römer* 1, 249.

<sup>109</sup> *KP*, 294.

<sup>110</sup> Philip Bachmann, “Der Römerbrief berdeutscht und vergegenwärtigt Ein Wort zu K. Barths *Römerbrief*,” *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* (1921): 547, 523; *KP*, p. 68; Calvin viewed Osiander’s thought of justification as “the mixture of Christ’s essence with ours.” Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.11.10; 2,2,12.

<sup>111</sup> *Römer* 1, 218.

<sup>112</sup> “Gespräch zwischen Quidam und einem Pietisten (1919),” in *Weltreich, Religion und Gottesherrschaft* 2, 1922, p.86; *KP*, p.57.

<sup>113</sup> K.Barth, *Ges. Vorträge* 1, p.97.

<sup>114</sup> F. Overbeck, *Christentum und Kultur*, p. 286; quoted by Barth, *Gespräche Vorträge* 2, p.7.

<sup>115</sup> *Der Römerbrief*, second edition (Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1922), p. 427; Tr. E. C. Hoskyns, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Oxford University Press, 1933). Hereafter it is written as *Römer* 2, 427.



divine justification,<sup>116</sup> nor the idea that there is “a detectable distinction” between the believer and the unbeliever,<sup>117</sup> in the sense that the believer is still always called to penitence, and the unbeliever is always called to salvation.<sup>118</sup> The opinion that man can “earn God’s grace on his own initiative”<sup>119</sup> was designated as “the Pharisaism of the tax-collector,” in the sense that they tried to obtain God’s favour by repentance, humility, and awareness of sin like the tax-collector.<sup>120</sup>

4) In his lecture on the history of Protestant theology (1930-32),<sup>121</sup> Barth emphasised the presence of God in this world “more strongly and clearly” than the second commentary of the *Epistle to the Romans*.<sup>122</sup> Through his presence in us, God makes us his faithful covenantal partner. Although sharing a similar concern of God’s presence, he continued to attack the anthropocentric tendency of Pietism. Pietism was understood as the attempt to abolish the One who is opposite us, and to pass off God’s reality as something that is “present, demonstrable, available” in human beings.<sup>123</sup> It was also regarded as “an attempt to level the objectiveness of the theological objects, an attempt to transform an essentially non particular theology into one that was particular to the people of that era.”<sup>124</sup> For example, they used the Bible “to affirm man and serve what he wants to hear from it.”<sup>125</sup> On the other hand, Barth mentioned that “Pietism had not forgotten the justification of the sinner by God, their inclination to understand it only as a transitional stage on the way to gradually making the believer righteous and good,” and they considered Jesus Christ as “the source of all the strength we need” through gratuitous grace. The attempt of Pietism was evaluated to be only “partially successful.”<sup>126</sup>

5) In the 1950s, especially in *Kirchliche Dogmatik IV/2*, he dealt with awakening, conversion, and sanctification in Christ as “a real change in their life.”<sup>127</sup> In this respect, he shared his concern with the Pietists, but he explained it in a different way. Our sanctification is “not something in us and in our action but given to us *in Christ* and his work that he did in our place, for us.”<sup>128</sup> Our participation in Christ relies on our recognition that its reality was accomplished in Christ rather than in our imitating Him.

---

<sup>116</sup> *Römer 2*, 82.

<sup>117</sup> *Römer 2*, 383.

<sup>118</sup> *Römer 2*, 331,501.

<sup>119</sup> *Römer 2*, 84.

<sup>120</sup> *KD IV/1*, 688.

<sup>121</sup> cf. K. Barth, *Die Protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert* (Zurich: TVZ, 1946).

<sup>122</sup> E. Busch, “the Epilogue” of *Karl Barth and The Pietists*, p. 296.

<sup>123</sup> K. Barth, *Die Protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert* (Zurich: TVZ, 1946), p. 95.

<sup>124</sup> “Die Geschichte der prot. Theologie,” in *Vorlesung, 1932-1933*, 1946, pp.92ff; *KP*, p.281.

<sup>125</sup> *KP*, pp.296-297.

<sup>126</sup> K. Barth, *Die Protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert* (Zurich: TVZ, 1946), p. 103.

<sup>127</sup> *KD IV/2*, 593.

<sup>128</sup> *KD IV/2*, pp. 583ff; E. Busch, “the Epilogue” of *Karl Barth and The Pietists*, p. 299.

Holiness is not only defined as separation from this world, but also God's will: "I will be your God, and you will be my people."<sup>129</sup> In this manner, Barth emphasised our sanctification already accomplished in Christ rather than human, subjective action in sanctification.

6) At the end of the 1960s, Barth stressed "the present, reviving, transforming and renewing power of the Holy Spirit" in favour of pietism.<sup>130</sup> His point was different from pietism in view of his emphasis on the communal sanctification in Christ, rather than individual sanctification and on God's transcendent sovereignty over humankind.

Soon, Barth's critique of Pietism focused on individualism, self-centred effort for sanctification, Pharisaism, and human manipulative attempts to appropriate God for rationalization of a selfish goal. His critiques seem to be valid to some extent. Hugh Ross Mackintosh also pointed out their tendency to regard "attendance at private Bible-circles" as "more importance than Church fellowship."<sup>131</sup>

In opposition to Barth's critiques against Pietism, Ludwig Thimme spoke against Barth's early theology as lacking in Christian experience of God's presence.<sup>132</sup> Wilhelm Busch also assessed Barth's theology since 1930s negatively. Admitting that it was Barth's remarkable merit "to have shown the objective nature of salvation" in the day of the Enlightenment that took anthropocentric thoughts and experiences seriously, Busch evaluated that Barth's stress on the objective facet of salvation was only "a half truth," which would lead to "the corruption of the church" and function as "opium for the sleeping conscience," if it were not complemented by the subjective and personal aspect of salvation.<sup>133</sup> W. Busch's assessment seems pertinent given that sound theology should maintain the biblical, organic unity of the subjective and objective aspects of faith.

In addition, two issues needs to be touched upon. One is Barth's critique of the Pharisaism of Pietism. Regretting that "Today the word "pietist" suggests pretence rather than righteousness, hypocrisy rather than holiness," Kenneth B. Mulholland mentioned that Pietism was "an attempt to complete the Protestant Reformation" in Christian life as well as in doctrine, not a trial "to undo or disown the Reformation."<sup>134</sup> Hugh Ross Mackintosh also noted that the intention of the Pietists like Spener and Francke was "not

---

<sup>129</sup> *KD* IV/2, 565.

<sup>130</sup> *KP*, p. 300.

<sup>131</sup> H. R. Mackintosh, *Types of Modern Theology: Schleiermacher to Barth* (London & Glasgow: Collins Clear-Type Press, 1937, 1964), p. 20.

<sup>132</sup> L. Thimme, *Kirche, Sekte und Gemeinschaftsbewegung, vom Standpunkt einer Christlichen Soziologie* (Schwerin in dem Mecklenburg: Bahn, 1925), p. 253; H. Dannert, "Die Evangelisation," *Licht und leben* 40 (1928): 357.

<sup>133</sup> W. Busch, "Die Innere Bedrohung Der Evangelischen Kirche," *Licht und Leben* 62 (1950):132ff; *KP*, 179.

<sup>134</sup> Kenneth B. Mulholland, "From Luther to Carey: Pietism and the Modern Missionary Movement," *Bibliotheca Sacra Volume* 156 (1999): 89.

so much to remodel doctrine as to quicken spiritual life.” In England, the Pietists emphasised Bible study and separation from the worldly ways, fighting “the apathy” and “worldliness” of the church.<sup>135</sup> Though it can look like hypocrisy, such attempts of pietists should be regarded as necessary for the reformation of Christian life. The other issue is Barth’s critique of individual experience of religion. With emphasis on social sanctification and the sanctification of the church, we need to admit that religious experience cannot but be individual. Of course, individual experience should be based on God’s Word, not on human psychological, subjective concern.<sup>136</sup> As M. den Dulk points out, we do not have to oppress individual experience for fear of *gottvergessene Psychologisieren* (God-forgetting psychologizing), which results from emphasis on the human experience of salvation rather than God’s objective salvation in Christ.<sup>137</sup>

### 4.1.3 Barth’s Theology and Doctrine of Sanctification

#### 4.1.3.1 The Theological Method of Barth

Barth’s theological method can be expressed in three terms according to his theological journey.

The first term is the “historico-pantheistic method” of the period that he followed liberalism until 1919. Barth was influenced by Harnack’s historical pantheism, which taught that the historical process is divine movement, and its aim lies in that the powers of the spirit inherent in history obtain victory by degrees and enhance humankind from natural state to cultivated state; by these spiritual powers, individuals participate in the historical process in the development of autonomic character.<sup>138</sup> At that time, Barth understood God’s spirit as a power to change society, and incarnation as the divine power of the Gospel to transform society. God comes from himself and works in society and transforms this world into his kingdom.<sup>139</sup> As the church has a responsibility for society and history, she should participate in God’s movement for his kingdom.<sup>140</sup> However, through his meetings with the Blumhardts, Barth’s thought changed to the view that God is God and the world is the world; religion cannot save man; the realization of righteousness

---

<sup>135</sup> H. R. Mackintosh, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

<sup>136</sup> “Our self-decision” needs “determination by God in order for it to be experience of [God’s] Word.” *CD I/201; KD I/210*.

<sup>137</sup> M. den Dulk, *...Als Twee Die Spreken: Een manier om de heiligingsleer van Karl Barth te lezen*, (Amsterdam: ‘s-Gravenhage, 1987), p.226.

<sup>138</sup> For more, see A. von Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums: Neuauflage zum Fünfzigsten Jahrestag des Ersten Erscheinens mit Einem Geleitwort von Rudolf Bultmann* (Stuttgart: Ehrenfried Klotz Verlag, 1950); Dr. Yung-Han Kim, *Von Barth bis Moltmann: Eine reformatorische Aufhellung zu den Hauptströmungen der Gegenwartstheologie* (Seoul: The Christian Literature Society, 1982), pp.16-17.

<sup>139</sup> J. J. Kim, *op. cit.*, p.17.

<sup>140</sup> Cf. Karl Barth, “Der christliche Glaube und die Geschichte,” *SThZ* 29 (1912).

by human beings is impossible.<sup>141</sup>

The second term is the “dialectical method,” which appeared from his first edition of the Epistle to the Romans until 1932. It stressed the transcendence of God and objects to liberalism which tried to combine revelation with history, church with society, and philosophy with the Bible. God replied “No” to human attempts to use eternity for their purpose in a form of religion. As God’s “No” is complete, it is also his “Yes” as the foundation of truth.<sup>142</sup> Barth moved the centre of theology from human right thought of God to God’s right thought of God,<sup>143</sup> for finite man cannot grasp infinite God.<sup>144</sup> It emphasised God’s acceptance of us in the infinite qualitative difference between God and man.<sup>145</sup> God’s revelation is *Urgeschichte* as an unhistorical event that man cannot grasp because it is like a lightning rod, though it touches man in time. As God is the hidden One, the church cannot directly possess God’s revelation.<sup>146</sup> This led Barth’s theology to an unhistorical transcendentalism as a denial of historical revelation. At that time, Barth asserted a theory of historico-critical inspiration in the method of interpreting the Bible, which was a synthesis between the historico-critical way and orthodox inspiration theory.<sup>147</sup>

The third term is “*analogia relationis*” presented in *Kirchliche Dogmatik* III/2.<sup>148</sup> While *analogia entis* suggests a way from creature to Creator, *analogia relationis* shows a way from Creator to creature. The relationship between God and the world, God and man is analogized by the inner relationship between the Trinity. Barth grasped God and man by the *analogia relationis* between divinity and humanity in Christ. God is the One who is for man and man is for God. God commands and keeps and guides man. Man is a being who receives and obeys and follows God’s command and guidance. Christ revealed true humanity through his relationship with God and man, and his innerly ordered relationship between soul and body.<sup>149</sup> It means that Christ is the man for God, man, and his fellows.<sup>150</sup> Sanctification is the restoration of this true humanity, which is God’s image.

<sup>141</sup> K. Barth, Sermon on Gen. 15:16, 1916; J. J. Kim, *op. cit.*, pp.18-19.

<sup>142</sup> K. Barth, *Römerbrief* (1922), p.13.

<sup>143</sup> K. Barth, *Das Wort Gottes und Die Theologie: Gesammelte Vorträge* (München: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1924), p.28. “Den Inhalt der Bibel bilden even gar nicht die rechten Menschen-gedanken über Gott, sondern die rechten Gottesgedanken über den Menschen.”

<sup>144</sup> K. Barth, “Das Wort Gottes als Aufgabe der Theologie,” in *Anfänge der dialectische Theologie* 1. ed. by Von J. Moltmann (München: Kaizer, 1962), p.197ff.

<sup>145</sup> K. Barth, *Römerbrief* (1922), p.16, 25.

<sup>146</sup> *Ibid.*, p.xiii.

<sup>147</sup> K. Barth, *Römerbrief* (1919), the preface, p. v.

<sup>148</sup> *CD* III/2, 220.

<sup>149</sup> *Ibid.*, 221, 323-24.

<sup>150</sup> *Ibid.*, 222.

#### 4.1.3.2 The Structure of Barth's Theology

Granted that the structure of Barth's theology is covenant, creation, sin, reconciliation,<sup>151</sup> we can regard the doctrine of reconciliation as the centre of Barth's theology, for it is the achievement of God's covenant,<sup>152</sup> which read: "I will be your God and you shall be my people."<sup>153</sup> Faithfulness to this covenant is sanctification. However, man can not reach this faithfulness on account of his limitedness. This limit is overcome only by God Himself, i.e., by his incarnation and life as Royal Man in place of us. Klooster argues that Barth did not focus on the work of Christ on the cross for atonement, but on his incarnation which bridges the gulf between God and man.<sup>154</sup> For Barth, effecting the reconciliation between God and man is neither through Christ's reconciling death nor through his resurrection for our justification, but his being as God and man. God-man consists in the completed act of the reconciliation of man with God.<sup>155</sup> In incarnation, Jesus Christ is the salvation of every man.<sup>156</sup> Plausible as Klooster's opinion seems to be, given that Barth recognized that Christ's incarnation is the basis of our sanctified humanity, it is not a correct view that Barth connected human salvation only to Christ's incarnation. In fact, Barth considered Christ's life, death and resurrection as well as incarnation to be important for human salvation. In his doctrine of reconciliation, Christ's incarnation, life, death, and resurrection are indivisibly linked with one another.

Barth's doctrine of reconciliation can be explained by the following scheme.

Christology	IV/1	IV/2	IV/3
Person	Christ, the Lord as Servant	Christ, the Servant as Lord	Christ, the Genuine Witness
Office	High Priest	King	Prophet
State	Abasement	Exaltation	The Light of the Life
Hamartiology	Pride/ Judgment	Sloth/ Misery	Lie/ Condemnation
Soteriology	Justification	Sanctification	Calling
The Work of the Holy Spirit in the Community	The Collection of the Community	The Building of the Community	The Sending of the Community

<sup>151</sup> F. H. Klooster, *The Significance of Barth's Theology: An appraisal, with Special Reference to Election and Reconciliation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1961), p.81.

<sup>152</sup> *KD* IV/1, 71ff.

<sup>153</sup> Colin Gunton, 'salvation,' *The Cambridge Companion of Karl Barth*, ed., John Webster (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 144.

<sup>154</sup> F. H. Klooster, *op. cit.*, p.96.

<sup>155</sup> *Ibid.*, p.92.

<sup>156</sup> *KD*, III/2, 69.

The Work of the Holy Spirit in Individuals	Faith	Love	Hope
KD IV/4, Ethics, The Christian Life as God's Calling	Baptism as the Base of the Christian Life in Prayer	The Lord's Prayer for the Practice of the Christian Life	The Eucharist Renewing the Christian Life in Gratitude

In view of the objective aspects and the subjective aspects of Barth's soteriology, F. H. Klooster sees justification, sanctification and the calling of man as the objective aspect in that they are objectively accomplished in Christ, and faith, love, and hope as the subjective aspects in that they are the human assumption of salvation.<sup>157</sup> In terms of *ordo salutis*, vocation is the apex among three elements, but W. S. Johnson interprets vocation as "an intervening mode" between justification and sanctification, while considering justification as the commencement of Christian life, sanctification as "its ultimate goal."<sup>158</sup> He deems vocation to comprise "the whole of Christian life in the here and now."<sup>159</sup> His analysis of Barth's doctrine of reconciliation seems pertinent, given that for Barth, vocation embraces calling, illumination, awakening, adoption, union with Christ, conversion, regeneration and perseverance.<sup>160</sup> The relationship between vocation and sanctification will be dealt with at 5.2.8.3 in this chapter. His consideration of sanctification as the ultimate goal of Christian life implies that sanctification in this world must be incomplete.

On the other hand, the unique aspect of Barth's doctrine of reconciliation lies in combining Christ's nature and his works.<sup>161</sup> Classical Reformed theology generally does not involve Christ's nature in his works. From such a classical view, Klooster criticizes Barth for not distinguishing between Christ's person and works, but mixing those in his doctrine of reconciliation.<sup>162</sup> Similarly, Van Til pointed out that for Barth, "Christ is his work of redemption of all men."<sup>163</sup> His point seems to be pertinent in the light of Barth's notion that "Jesus Christ is the salvation of every man."<sup>164</sup> From Barth's view, Christ's person and work are not distinguished from each other. Christ's incarnation is His work

<sup>157</sup> F. H. Klooster, *The Significance of Barth's Theology: An appraisal, with Special Reference to Election and Reconciliation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1961), pp. 79-80.

<sup>158</sup> Johnson, William Stacy, *The Mystery of God: Karl Barth and the Postmodern Foundations of Theology*, (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997), p.138.

<sup>159</sup> *Ibid.* p.148.

<sup>160</sup> CD IV/3 part 2, illumination and awakening (508), adoption (533), union with Christ (540), regeneration or conversion (509-11), perseverance (645).

<sup>161</sup> CD IV/3 part 2, 61.

<sup>162</sup> Klooster, *op. cit.*, p.95.

<sup>163</sup> Cornelius Van Til, *Karl Barth and Evangelicalism*, p. 25.

<sup>164</sup> KD, III/2, 69.



not less than His person. For Barth, incarnation is the base of human sanctification. It keeps on throughout Christ' life, death, resurrection, exaltation, and ruling over his people in the Spirit.

As seen in the above scheme, Barth's doctrine of sanctification lies in the doctrine of reconciliation connected with Christology. Accordingly, it is necessary to address his teaching on sanctification from the perspective of his doctrine of reconciliation, with observing the role of Christology on sanctification.

#### 4.1.3.3 Sanctification as Theological Ethics

Barth grounded his ethics upon sanctification, for "the place where...the knowledge of God thus becomes the knowledge of the good or theological ethics, is the divine act of sanctification."<sup>165</sup> Sanctification as a main theme of dogmatics can be said to be the foundational "presupposition of all Christian ethics."<sup>166</sup>

For Barth, the importance of the doctrine of sanctification is expressed widely in his *Kirchliche Dogmatik*, as Otterness correctly observes that "the whole of Barth's theological structure is at stake at the point of the implication of his doctrine of sanctification for a viable ethics."<sup>167</sup> In the introduction to *Kirchliche Dogmatik*, Barth affirmed that dogmatics should aim at sanctification because if it is not heard in the actual life of man, dogmatics loses its object and meaning. So he identified dogmatics with ethics.<sup>168</sup> In this regard, Matheny's observation that for Barth, "theology and ethics are ineluctably related" is germane.<sup>169</sup> Accordingly, the duty of the theologian is to offer some help in order that the people of God might "understand who they are and what they are to do as God's people."<sup>170</sup>

In regard to the relation between the Gospel and ethics, Barth's view was different from the nineteenth century's social Gospel, which tended to reduce all faith to the ethics of following the example of Jesus. For Barth, the ethics proceeds out of the fullness of the Gospel and does not replace the Gospel.<sup>171</sup> Man is placed before the direct command of God, not before any ethics fabricated by human judgment and reason. In other words,

---

<sup>165</sup> K.Barth, *Ethik*. 1928/29 Vorlesung, ed. D. Braun, 2 vols., GA 2/10 (Zürich 1973/78); *Ethics*. G. W. Bromiley (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1981), p. 67. Hereafter, it is written as *Ethics*.

<sup>166</sup> *Ethics*, 18; CD IV/1, 101.

<sup>167</sup> Otterness, *op. cit*, vii.

<sup>168</sup> *Ibid*. "Die Dogmatik kann gar nicht anders: sie muß auch Ethik sein."

<sup>169</sup> Paul D. Matheny, *Dogmatics and Ethics: The Theological Realism and Ethics of Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Peter Lang GmbH. 1990), iv.

<sup>170</sup> K. Barth, "Die Theologie und der heutige Mensch," (lecture delivered in July 1930) in *Zwischen den Zeiten* 8 (1930): 376.

<sup>171</sup> Omar G. Otterness, "The Doctrine of Sanctification in the theology in Karl Barth," Ph.D. diss., Chicago University, 1969, p. v.

judgment of what is right and what is wrong” does not belong to human reason but to God’s command in the presence of the Spirit.<sup>172</sup> To decide what is right is God’s task and to find it in grace is the human task. However, as Bettis puts it, Barth’s ethics does not stay in the dimension that we discover God’s Laws and obey them<sup>173</sup> but goes forward to the higher dimension that God’s command creates, that is, our obedience in the presence of the Spirit. God’s command forces us to obey it like gravity. If we do not follow it, its result will be catastrophic. Accordingly, Barth’s ethics is “heteronomous and intrinsic” due to its force and inherent Law.<sup>174</sup>

With respect to the criteria for ethical behaviour, Barth explained them in connection to the question: “what ought we to do?”<sup>175</sup> First, our knowledge of “what” we ought to do should be renewed every day, because the church “sickens and dies” when she is tied by the previous instruction and conversion of “what.” We must always be “not possessor of the ethical” but seeker of it because what was valid yesterday is “not valid again today as it was valid yesterday.”<sup>176</sup> In this sense, the character of the ethical is “complete openness.” Secondly, “ought” signifies that we must know and obey the divine truth because it is “the rule and norm of our conduct.”<sup>177</sup> The “ought” presupposes that our obligation is always to will freely and joyfully that it might be spontaneous obedience. We experience our voluntary obligation of obedience to Him when we realize Christ became our Lord and Head through redeeming us by his life and death and resurrection. The authority and validity of God’s command is in itself, not in or from us.<sup>178</sup> Thirdly, “we” implies the commune character of our ethical doing. As the subject of responsibility to the command of God, I am never alone but “only in the community and solidarity of many, perhaps all men” in Jesus Christ, the particular One chosen by God.<sup>179</sup> Lastly, “do” emphasises the practical character of our knowledge of God’s command. Our seeking of the ethical is for practice, not “curiosity” or “a playful desire for knowledge” or “a purely theoretical interest.” Human conduct is accomplished by continuing awareness. The unceasing activity of awareness enables us to be responsible as the “authors and true subjects of our action”<sup>180</sup>

As Paul D. Matheny states, Barth’s theological ethics is a reflection on our

---

<sup>172</sup> CD II/2, 451.

<sup>173</sup> Joseph Bettis, “Political Theology and Social Ethics: The Socialist Humanism of Karl Barth,” G. Hunsinger, ed., *Karl Barth and Radical Politics* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976), p. 167.

<sup>174</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 168-169.

<sup>175</sup> CD II/2, 647ff.

<sup>176</sup> CD II/2, 646-647.

<sup>177</sup> CD II/2, 649.

<sup>178</sup> CD II/2, 651.

<sup>179</sup> CD II/2, 655.

<sup>180</sup> CD II/2, 657-658.

responsibility towards God's command.<sup>181</sup> This responsibility means our reply to God's command. Barth's theological ethics consists of "the doctrine of God's command" and "the doctrine of the sanctification of humanity by God."<sup>182</sup> In order to emphasise the ethical character of his dogmatics, Barth used the term "the Command of God," for example, "The Command as the Claim of God"(II/2, §36-37), "The Command as the Decision of God" (II/2, §38), "The Command as the Judgment of God (II/2, §39) in the last part of the doctrine of God<sup>183</sup>; "The Command of God the Creator"(III/4, §52-56) in the last part of the doctrine of creation; "The Command of God the Reconciler"(IV/4, §74-78) in the last part of the doctrine of reconciliation; and "The Command of God the Redeemer" in the last part of unwritten volume IV-4 for the doctrine of redemption.<sup>184</sup> This configuration of God's commands in Church Dogmatics implies his emphasis on the importance of God's command as the ground of theological ethics.

As it has been described above, for Barth, dogmatics is identified with theological ethics, which consists of God's command. God's command is the subject and means of sanctification. The fact that God's command is present in every last part in his entire dogmatics implies that theological ethics is the final goal of his dogmatics. Sanctification is the premise, goal, and core of this theological ethics.<sup>185</sup>

## 4.2 The Doctrine of Sanctification of Karl Barth

### 4.2.1 The Conception of Sanctification<sup>186</sup>

#### 4.2.1.1 Anthropological and Christological Presupposition

##### 4.2.1.1.1 The Knowledge of Man as God's Image through Christ

Barth contended that for the true knowledge of man, we should really look away from

---

<sup>181</sup> Paul D. Matheny, *Dogmatics and Ethics: The Theological Realism and Ethics of Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Peter Lang GmbH, 1990), p.211.

<sup>182</sup> Paul D. Matheny, *op. cit.*, p.16.

<sup>183</sup> *CD* II/2, 552-781.

<sup>184</sup> *KD* III/4, 35; Karl Barth, *Ethics* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1981), p. 61.

<sup>185</sup> *CD* II/2, 772. "The purpose of God in His judgment is the sanctification of man, i.e., his direction, preparation and exercise for the eternal life ordained and promised."

<sup>186</sup> Daniel. G. Spross refers to Barth's exegeses of the doctrine of sanctification in relation to God's holiness, the atoning death of Christ, reconciliation, the actuality of man's sanctification, the sin of the sanctified, and the role of the Holy Spirit. Spross' explication is generally adequate but lacks Barth's exegesis of the sanctification of the church, even though it has very important meaning for contemporary Christians who have become individualised. D.G. Spross, "The Doctrine of Sanctification in the Theology of Karl Barth," *Wesleyan Theological Journal*, Vol. 20, No. 2(1985): 57-60.

ourselves, and look to Jesus Christ.<sup>187</sup> As God's image, human nature can be grasped only within the history of Jesus who has a real human nature as the perfect and true man. Through His life, Jesus shows four aspects of man. First, man is the being for God in the presence of God. Secondly, man is a being in communion with fellow men.<sup>188</sup> Thirdly, man is a whole being in soul and body. Fourthly, man is being in time. In sum, Jesus faithfully obeyed God and helped and delivered other men in the proper order of his soul and body and in his time.<sup>189</sup> In this sense, the image of God in man is "co-humanity in community."<sup>190</sup> Let us observe this in more detail.

First, that man exists in the presence of God means that he is elected in the election of God of Christ and hears God's Word, and is called by it in salvation history.<sup>191</sup> Man is a being who is grateful the gracious, sovereign, demanding Word of God.<sup>192</sup> Man is a responsible subject who is raised by God in order to hear, obey and pursue God's Word.<sup>193</sup> In other words, man was created as God's covenant partner.<sup>194</sup> Man's hearing and obeying the Word of God and being God's responsible partner consist in the image of God, which differentiates him from any other beasts.<sup>195</sup> With such things, Barth acknowledged human dominion over the beasts as the image of God.<sup>196</sup> Sin is the denial of his true freedom which is given in his responsibility.<sup>197</sup>

Secondly, through Jesus' life for others we can know that man is a being for fellowmen. This co-humanity is the "copy and reflection" of the inter-Trinitarian "co-existence and co-operation" and "co-inherence and reciprocity."<sup>198</sup> As God's image, this co-humanity is presented as the relationship between male and female in Genesis.<sup>199</sup> It involves openness to another human being,<sup>200</sup> mutual speech and hearing,<sup>201</sup> to be there for the other, at his disposal within necessary limits,<sup>202</sup> and all the above is to be done on both sides with

---

<sup>187</sup> *CD* IV/2, 284.

<sup>188</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 82.

<sup>189</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 249.

<sup>190</sup> Clifford Green, *Karl Barth: Theologian of Freedom*, vol. 5 of *The Making of Modern Theology: 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Century Theological Texts* (5 Vols.) (London etc.: Collins Publishers, 1989), p. 33.

<sup>191</sup> *CD*, III/2, 140f, 149f.

<sup>192</sup> *CD*, III/2, 164-166.

<sup>193</sup> *CD*, III/2, 194ff.

<sup>194</sup> *CD* III/2, 94; IV/1, 14; II/1, 286; III/2, 86, 265; IV/1, 54, 131, 210; IV/2, 2, 47ff.

<sup>195</sup> *CD*, III/1, 178, 14; *CD*, III/2, 186.

<sup>196</sup> *CD*, III/2, 189. "In virtue of the divine likeness, man - even more than the beast over whom he is given dominion - is directed in all his acts to hear his friendly Word of God.

<sup>197</sup> *CD*, III/2, 197.

<sup>198</sup> *CD*, III/2, 185, 218.

<sup>199</sup> *CD*, III/2, 186, 289.

<sup>200</sup> *CD*, III/2, 251.

<sup>201</sup> *CD*, III/2, 254.

<sup>202</sup> *CD*, III/2, 260.

gladness.<sup>203</sup> Accordingly, isolated humanity is a contradiction to co-humanity and is sin. Notwithstanding the seriousness of his sin, “man can as little destroy or alter himself as create himself.”<sup>204</sup> God’s image as the relationship of men and God cannot be lost.<sup>205</sup>

Thirdly, the fact that Jesus is a whole man of soul and body teaches us that man is originally a being in the harmonious order of soul and body.<sup>206</sup> The ground of the human soul and body is the Holy Spirit. Man exists only in the Holy Spirit,<sup>207</sup> who is the principle and power of an integral man<sup>208</sup> Barth rejects three misunderstandings of the relationship between soul and body. 1) Dualism separating body from soul<sup>209</sup>; 2) an abstract materialistic monism which merges soul into body<sup>210</sup>; 3) an abstract monistic idealism which regards body as an obstacle, for it views spirit as the only ground of man.<sup>211</sup> Man as spirit is the subject of self-determination and man as body practises his determination.<sup>212</sup> In this way, soul and body have differentiated functions while both of them are inseparable from each other. In this relation, soul is superior to body. The dignity of spirit precedes that of body.<sup>213</sup>

Fourthly, man is a being in his time. We can know it through Jesus who lived in his time for God and human beings.<sup>214</sup> Though Jesus’ time is different from ours because his time is eternal and ours is limited, our time is connected to His eternal time. Man is a being participating in God’s rest and peace and joy by keeping the Sabbath. We begin by God and are kept by Him for ever.<sup>215</sup> In this time man should accomplish his mission, which is his fellowship with God. Man in time in Christ is not fearful of his death because it is overcome by the resurrected Christ. Even in his limited time, man can hope for eternal life to be given to him by God due to Christ’s grace.

#### 4.2.1.1.2 Man in Christ

Barth expounded *de jure* sanctification in relation to our unity with Christ.

In the predestination of God, Jesus Christ is the potential and the pattern or prototype

---

<sup>203</sup> CD, III/2, 265.

<sup>204</sup> CD, III/2, 206.

<sup>205</sup> CD, III/2, 322f.

<sup>206</sup> CD, III/2, 325-327.

<sup>207</sup> CD, III/2, 344-347.

<sup>208</sup> CD, III/2, 363f.

<sup>209</sup> CD, III/2, 380-382.

<sup>210</sup> CD, III/2, 383-390.

<sup>211</sup> CD, III/2, 392.

<sup>212</sup> CD, III/2, 398.

<sup>213</sup> CD, III/2, 417f.

<sup>214</sup> CD, III/2, 439.

<sup>215</sup> CD, III/2, 632f.

of all men. God elected humankind from eternity in His Son.<sup>216</sup> Man exists as the one who is summoned by God in Jesus Christ from eternity.<sup>217</sup> In time Christ exalted human essence into Himself through His incarnation.<sup>218</sup> Incarnation implies that the Son of God adjoined the human essence and existence in time to the divine essence in Jesus Christ. His incarnation is the exaltation of the *humanum* of all men.<sup>219</sup> All men share in one human nature and status in Jesus Christ.<sup>220</sup> In this unity, the Son of God is abased to fellowship with man and the Son of Man, i.e., human nature is exalted to the fellowship with God.<sup>221</sup> That God assumed human essence means that we are principally and ultimately like Christ in spite of our sinfulness, for we are in Him.<sup>222</sup> In Christ, God accepted the judgment upon himself instead of man, which is for the justification of man. His incarnation and resurrection and exaltation are for the sanctification of man. Human sanctification in Christ reaches the climax at Christ's exaltation to the right hand of God.<sup>223</sup>

To sum up, the divine essence is a subject in this relationship and the human essence is a predicate, in the sense that the former is to wholly give and the latter is to wholly receive.<sup>224</sup> The statement of Barth reminds us of a question that E. C. Williams posed,<sup>225</sup> "Does Barth admit human as independent existence from Christ?"

#### 4.2.1.1.3 Human Subjectivity in Christ

In Barth's view, true man exists only in Christ. As we are in Him, whatever happens in Him belongs to us. However, it does not mean Christ's merging into the Christian, nor the Christian into Christ. Christ remains the One who speaks and commands and gives as the Lord. And the Christian continues to be the one who hears and answers and receives as the servant of the Lord. God summons man as a subject, because he wants to build him as His covenant partner.<sup>226</sup> The union between Christ and the Christian does not confound or exchange their functions and roles. Barth does not recognise the mysticism of the union, but the mystery of it. This unity is not self-evident, but a mystery. Neither Christian receiving nor his acting in this fellowship is the product of his own skill, but both can be

---

<sup>216</sup> *CD* II/2, 347.

<sup>217</sup> *CD*, III/2, 155.

<sup>218</sup> *CD* IV/2, 51, 69.

<sup>219</sup> *CD* IV/1, 49.

<sup>220</sup> *CD* IV/2, 69; *CD* IV/1, 98f.

<sup>221</sup> *CD* IV/2, 503. Cf. K. Barth, *The Humanity of God* (London & Glasgow: Collins, 1961), p. 43.

<sup>222</sup> *CD* IV/2, 270.

<sup>223</sup> *CD* IV/2, 273-274.

<sup>224</sup> *CD* IV/2, 72.

<sup>225</sup> Ernest Claude Williams, "A Critical Appraisal of the Grenzfall in Karl Barth's Ethics," Ph.D. thesis, the University of South Africa, 1981, p. 143.

<sup>226</sup> *CD* III/2, 94; IV/1, 14; II/1, 286; III/2, 86, 265; IV/1, 54, 131, 210; IV/2, 2, 47ff.



understood only as the creation of the call of Christ which comes to him.<sup>227</sup> In this fellowship there is safeguarded not only the sovereignty of the Trinity but also the freedom of the human being is preserved.<sup>228</sup>

Ostensibly, Barth asserted that the Christian does not lose his freedom as subjective self-determination, but can exert it also in his union of Christ. Yet, it is not independent of God's determination in Jesus Christ. It is the definite freedom which corresponds to God's determination and direction. Hence, in a strict sense, human freedom does not make man an independent subject of God, but enables him to be an obedient partner of God. Furthermore, as far as our human nature is analogous to Jesus' humanity, human subjectivity is in danger to be absorbed in God's subjectivity,<sup>229</sup> for in the unity of divinity and humanity in Christ, the Son of God takes a part of the human essence by giving His divine determination to His human essence and His human essence takes a part of His divine essence by receiving His divine determination.<sup>230</sup> This would imply that there is scarcely a possibility of a human subjective role in Barth's doctrine of sanctification.

#### 4.2.1.1.4 Human Freedom

In Barth's doctrine of sanctification, human freedom is crucial because "only the man who is free is capable of obedience,"<sup>231</sup> which is an essential element of human factual sanctification. In Christian teaching of Incarnation (CD I/2, §13), the Holy Spirit (CD I/2, §16), the Bible (CD I/2, §21), the ethics of creation (CD III/4, §53-56), and vocation (CD IV/3, §71), Barth referred to freedom.

Unlike the Arminian concept of freedom as "free moral agent," Barth did not consider human freedom as the freedom of a judge who judges good and evil in a neutral space.<sup>232</sup> It is not something inherent in man but something given to him in relationship with God.<sup>233</sup> It is "a pure gift of grace" emanating from "God's freedom."<sup>234</sup>

The Augustinian- Pelagian controversy of human freewill was not deemed to be adequate any longer. Any human effort to obtain God's grace cannot be approved because when it is made into a condition to keep company with God, the Holy Spirit has been forgotten, and man's attempt to overcome sin will result in another sin. Whether God gives

---

<sup>227</sup> Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics, A Selection. With an Introduction by Helmut Gollwitzer*, Tr and ed, by G. W. Bromiley (New York: Harry Torchbooks, 1962), pp.245-246.

<sup>228</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 247.

<sup>229</sup> Herbert Hartwell criticized Barth for subordinating Christ's humanity to His Divinity. *The Theology of Karl Barth* (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1964), p. 186.

<sup>230</sup> CD IV/2, 70.

<sup>231</sup> Rober E. Willis, *The Ethics of Karl Barth* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971), p.244.

<sup>232</sup> CD II/2, 596.

<sup>233</sup> MT, 99.

<sup>234</sup> MT, 101.

man His grace does not depend on any human efforts but only on His free sovereignty. In this manner, Barth refused to accept the Pelagian doctrine of man's free will.<sup>235</sup> Barth even criticized Augustine for "seeking justification in the immediately perceptible actuality of the new obedience and for not only making justification identify with sanctification but also making the former absorb into the latter, by interpreting grace as the inspiration of good will and works, and by regarding faith as the impartation of man's own ability to will and perform what was commanded by the Law"<sup>236</sup> According to Barth, Augustine made a kind of synergism in which grace consisted of man's will and God's mercy, viz., man's act and God's gift<sup>237</sup> and it directly poisoned and corrupted the Church, for in the end it nullified the sovereignty of grace by human efforts. He judged it to be false that God imparts a divine quality to the human soul, thereby uplifting him by degrees until he is made a non-sinner.<sup>238</sup>

To Barth, human freedom is not the capability to do whatever man wants, but the power which *non potest peccare*.<sup>239</sup> This freedom is dependent upon "the self-impartation of Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit" to appropriate human sanctification, which is already accomplished by Jesus Christ.<sup>240</sup> Through regeneration by God's Word and Spirit, he becomes a free responsible covenant-partner of God.<sup>241</sup> The Holy Spirit does not force him to be what He wants him to be, but establishes him as a free subject as His partner.<sup>242</sup> God's command is *Erlaubnis* (permission) for man, for it gives him freedom to obey it. This is not "you can, for you should" as Kant said, but "you can, for you may."<sup>243</sup> Human freedom is his self-determination as *Anerkennung* (acknowledgement), which means his submission to the authority of Jesus Christ and his command. In this regard, Joseph Bettis' contention that for Barth human freedom is "found neither in submission to natural or arbitrary Law, nor in liberal autonomy," but in obedience to the divine command seems pertinent<sup>244</sup> This freedom is also distinguished from submission to fate,<sup>245</sup> for when man meets the opposite force to God's direction, it gives him the power to resist it. This

---

<sup>235</sup> *GC*, 29-30.

<sup>236</sup> Augustine, *De spirit et lit.*, 3.5 and 9.13: "That grace may heal the will, and the will, now that it has been healed, may fulfil the Law."; *GC*, 31.

<sup>237</sup> Augustine, *Enchiridion*, 32; *GC*, 32-33.

<sup>238</sup> *GC*, 35.

<sup>239</sup> *CD* IV/2, 494f.

<sup>240</sup> *CD* IV/2, 531. cf. Robert E. Willis, *The Ethics of Karl Barth* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971), p. 240.

<sup>241</sup> *CD* IV/3,2, 447;

<sup>242</sup> *CD* III/3, 941.

<sup>243</sup> Karl Barth, *God Here and Now*, tr. by Paul M. Van Buren, Vol. X of *Religious Perspectives*, ed. Ruth Nanda Anshen (10 vols.; New York: Harper & ReM, 1964), p. 91.

<sup>244</sup> Joseph Bettis, "Political Theology and Social Ethics: The Socialist Humanism of Karl Barth," in G. Hunsinger, ed., *Karl Barth and Radical Politics* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976), p. 160.

<sup>245</sup> *MT*, 117.

freedom results from the presence and activity of the Holy Spirit.<sup>246</sup> It is the freedom to elect God as elected by Him.

In terms of vocation, Barth delineated freedom as the liberation of man.<sup>247</sup> This liberation results from God's vocation.<sup>248</sup> It is the essential renewal of man to be a witness of Christ's Gospel. Barth depicts this liberation in seven ways. First, it is the transition from solitariness into fellowship.<sup>249</sup> Secondly, it is "his deliverance from the ocean of apparently unlimited possibilities by transference to the rock of one necessity" to be a witness of Christ.<sup>250</sup> Thirdly, it is his transition from the forcible realm of things to the free arena of man. Fourthly, it is his change from a desiring and demanding being to a receiving being.<sup>251</sup> Fifthly, it is a deliverance from indecision and confusion due to his unlimited freedom and deficiency of his adviser, to action of obedience to his Lord.<sup>252</sup> Sixthly, it is a transition from his existence under the moral and immoral Law to that under forgiveness and gratitude, i.e., the Gospel.<sup>253</sup> Seventhly, it is liberation from anxiety of the world to prayer.<sup>254</sup> Jesus' vocation is a vocation to prayer confessing God's lordship over all things. Through his prayer to God who is greater than his anxiety, he is liberated from his anxiety.<sup>255</sup> For Barth, this liberation of man can be said to be a form of sanctification of man.

Briefly, for Barth, human freedom is not independent of, but dependent on God's freedom. It is the limited freedom to acknowledge, accept, decide, and obey what God gave him.<sup>256</sup> This freedom can be called an ingredient of *de facto* sanctification.

#### **4.2.1.2 Hamartiological Presupposition**

##### **4.2.1.2.1 Original Sin and Voluntary Sin**

###### **4.2.1.2.1.1 Original Sin as the Fall**

Sanctification can be defined as overcoming sin. Hence it is essential for our study to examine Barth's opinion of original sin as the beginning of human sin.

---

<sup>246</sup> CD II/1, 257.

<sup>247</sup> CD IV/3,2,650.

<sup>248</sup> CD IV/3,2, 649-650.

<sup>249</sup> CD IV/3,2,664.

<sup>250</sup> CD IV/3,2,665.

<sup>251</sup> CD IV/3,2, 666-667.

<sup>252</sup> CD IV/3,2, 669.

<sup>253</sup> CD IV/3,2, 670.

<sup>254</sup> CD IV/3,2, 671.

<sup>255</sup> CD IV/3,2,673.

<sup>256</sup> Cf. Barth, *The Humanity of God*, p. 84.

Barth depicted it as “the imprisonment of his existence in that circle of evil and evil activity.”<sup>257</sup> *Peccatum originale* is “sin so far as man lives it in the inevitability and totality of his existence as one already fallen in Adam.”<sup>258</sup> It is “antecedent to every evil thought, word and deed.”<sup>259</sup> Original sin is “the total incapacity for good which is prior to every act of the individual” and “incapacity to develop or even to desire the state of complete and victorious God-consciousness.”<sup>260</sup>

Sin becomes individual guilt because it is “not only already accepted and admitted but committed by every individual” with sinfulness which penetrated his will. It is also “the corporate act and corporate guilt of the human race.” Due to this hereditary sin, man is conditioned by the sinfulness of the antecedent generation, and by turn conditions the subsequent generation.<sup>261</sup> From his social view, the original sin was regarded as self-seeking, that is, the pursuit of private property under the system of capitalism.<sup>262</sup> Graciously, in spite of the fall, God’s promise was renewed, the divine image in man as lord of the beast was never lost.<sup>263</sup>

Considering the necessity of original sin, he held that “it is ordained by God as that which makes redemption necessary.”<sup>264</sup> In the counsel of God the shadow accompanied by the light of the election of Christ is necessary as the object of the divine rejection.<sup>265</sup> God’s negation is testified by Adam’s fall.<sup>266</sup> His sin is grounded in his freedom which is ordained by God.<sup>267</sup> This freedom was not a neutral *liberum arbitrium*, i.e., freedom to choose between good and evil, but freedom to choose obedience to God.<sup>268</sup> He used his freedom to “appropriate to himself the satanic desire” to be.”<sup>269</sup> Adam’s choice was the irrational, absurd, and impossible possibility of sin.<sup>270</sup> He is guilty of death, but it is transferred to Christ.<sup>271</sup> “From all eternity” God “sees us in His Son as sinner to whom He

---

<sup>257</sup> CD IV/1, 500. Bernard Ramm also explicates Barth’s view of the seriousness of sin in relation to his negation of natural theology, modern humanism, and the literal interpretation of the prophetic part of the Bible. For more detail, see *After Fundamentalism*, pp. 161-185.

<sup>258</sup> CD I/2, 189.

<sup>259</sup> CD I/2, 191.

<sup>260</sup> CD III/3, 320.

<sup>261</sup> CD III/3, 320

<sup>262</sup> K. Barth, “Jesus Christ and the Movement for social justice,” in G. Hunsinger. ed., *Karl Barth and Radical Politics* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976), p. 32.

<sup>263</sup> CD III/1, 206.

<sup>264</sup> CD III/3,322.

<sup>265</sup> For Barth’s view of supralapsarianism and infralapsarianism, see CD II/2, 126-145.

<sup>266</sup> CD II/2, 122.

<sup>267</sup> CD III/3, 322.

<sup>268</sup> KD III/1, 301.

<sup>269</sup> CD II/2, 122.

<sup>270</sup> KD IV/1, 454.

<sup>271</sup> CD II/2, 122.

is gracious.”<sup>272</sup>

On the historicity of the fall, Barth also regarded Adam’s fall as a Saga.<sup>273</sup> In other words, it is a parable describing our present existence as beings apart from God.<sup>274</sup> Adam is not our precursor, but our type.<sup>275</sup> The first Adam means “the natural, earthly, historical man.”<sup>276</sup> The fall is not caused “by the transgression of Adam.” The fall is not a historical event related with “a transition from a *status integritatis* to a *status corruptionis*,” but “Adam is the representative of all who followed him.”<sup>277</sup> “There never was a golden age. The first man was immediately the first sinner.”<sup>278</sup> Man transgressed from birth (Ps. 51:5). From birth, all through his life he “lives out the disobedience in which his life is already involved.”<sup>279</sup> Sin is not “a lapse or a series of lapses in a man’s life” but “the characteristic mark of human life.” The fall happened with the appearance of human life.<sup>280</sup> It is “not a single historical event but an indicator of the state of humanity as *homo labilis*.”<sup>281</sup> Neither Adam nor the risen Christ can be “historical figures.” Adam’s fall as the origin of sin is “in no strict sense an historical or psychological happening” like “the righteousness manifested to the world in Christ.” It is “timeless and transcendental.”<sup>282</sup> This corollary resulted from Barth’s acceptance of the critical method of history. This interpretation of original sin has been made common in the West.<sup>283</sup>

However, if it is not a historical event, how can it be meaningful for our historical salvation? If Adam’s fall and Christ’s resurrection are not historical facts, can the teaching of our salvation based on them be efficient? Is there any difference between the Bible and any traditional myths or tales? According to St. Paul’s construe, Adam’s being and deed is not less historically true than Christ’s death and resurrection. Barth’s refusing the historicity of Adam’s fall results in rejecting the true nature of Adam’s sin as breaking a specific and concrete command of God, by which he brought guilt and depravity into humankind.

---

<sup>272</sup> CD II/2, 124.

<sup>273</sup> CD IV/1, 508.

<sup>274</sup> CD IV/1, 509-11.

<sup>275</sup> CD IV/1, 508.

<sup>276</sup> Barth, *Romans* 6<sup>th</sup>, p. 172.

<sup>277</sup> KD IV/1, 557,566; G. C. Berkouwer, *The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth*, p. 324. There is “no room in Karl Barth’s concept for the view that man was placed under the Law of the good Creator before the fall into sin and unrighteousness.”

<sup>278</sup> CD IV/1, 508.

<sup>279</sup> CD I/2, 190.

<sup>280</sup> Barth, *Romans* 6<sup>th</sup>, p. 173.

<sup>281</sup> Rodin R. Scott, *Evil and Theodicy in the Theology of Karl Barth* (New York etc.: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc, 1997), p. 119.

<sup>282</sup> Barth, *Romans* 6<sup>th</sup>, p. 171.

<sup>283</sup> Cf. G. C. Berkouwer, *Sin*, pp. 424-33; H. Berkhof: *Christian Faith* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), pp. 203-9; O. Weber, *Foundations of Dogmatics* 1 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), pp. 508f.

#### 4.2.1.2.1.2 Voluntary Sin

For Barth, sin is always a voluntary rejection of the acknowledgement of God in such forms as “unfaithfulness, unbelief, disobedience and ingratitude.”<sup>284</sup> Sin is “disobedience against the will of God,” and is “a freeing of oneself from grace and its Law.”<sup>285</sup> He refuted both the opinion that Adam “poisoned us or passed on a disease” and the opinion that Adam’s sin is an example which irresistibly overthrows us, for no one has to be Adam. We freely and voluntarily sin against God on our responsibility.<sup>286</sup> Sin is voluntary, but not Pelagian as human free choice without any external compulsory force, because of the two supra-personal aspects. Firstly, God has providently concluded all human beings in disobedience.<sup>287</sup> Secondly, the sinner cannot control the powers of his own possibilities and capacities, which are lordless forces against man himself.<sup>288</sup> All actual sins are “the manifestation of universal sin and momentary or partial victories of the flesh over the spirit.” In this sense, voluntary sin is the result of original sin as universal sin. As “the repression of the God-consciousness,” sin destroys “the harmony between originally perfect man and the originally perfect world.”<sup>289</sup>

In view of God’s No, Barth also spoke of sin as an “impossible possibility.” Sin is not autonomous reality but nothingness which God does not will, but which the human person loves and chooses.<sup>290</sup> As man wants what God does not will, it is called impossible possibility and a contradiction.<sup>291</sup> Accordingly, human sin is play-acting, an illusion which sinners do.<sup>292</sup>

In terms of redemption, the sin against the Law is “a reality that has already been accused, condemned, and abolished in Jesus Christ.”<sup>293</sup> To know sin as forgiven sin precedes “to know sin as sin as our rebellion against God and our transgression of His command.”<sup>294</sup> Such a viewpoint of sin originates from his looking at sin from the event of the death and the resurrection of Christ which took place in *Geschichte*. Subsequently, the primary sin of man is mainly regarded as a concrete rejection of grace that is offered in Jesus Christ rather than a disobedience of the Law. However, this view of sin as “a reality

---

<sup>284</sup> CD IV/2, 491.

<sup>285</sup> KD III/3, 350.

<sup>286</sup> CD IV/1, 509,501.

<sup>287</sup> CD IV/1, 504.

<sup>288</sup> CD IV/4, 214.

<sup>289</sup> CD III/3,321.

<sup>290</sup> CD IV/1, 419.

<sup>291</sup> KD IV/1, 158 (CD IV/1, 144).

<sup>292</sup> John Webster, *Barth’s Moral Theology: Human Action in Barth’s thought* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), p.71, 72. Hereafter it is written as *MT*.

<sup>293</sup> *MT*, 67.

<sup>294</sup> CD II/2, 768.



abolished in Christ” does not seem to be harmonious with his explication of sin in the *Church Dogmatics* III/3, where he described the difference between the sin of believers and the sin of unbelievers as follows. The former is “venial, shadowy, impotent, and no longer dominant but waning” due to Christ’ atonement, while the latter “will grow and rule, consolidating and extending itself.”<sup>295</sup> Here he seems to recognize that if man does not believe in Christ, sin can rule over him in spite of Christ’s objectively accomplished salvation.

Barth observed sin under the light of Jesus’ obedience in four ways. First, we can see that sin kills God, brother, and himself in Jesus’ death.<sup>296</sup> Secondly, Jesus reveals the sinfulness of sin.<sup>297</sup> Thirdly, sin is the principle of all human beings and their activity.<sup>298</sup> Fourthly, Jesus’ death shows us the width and weight of sin.<sup>299</sup> Through Christ’s obedience, we know ourselves as sinner.<sup>300</sup>

Generally, for Barth, sin is not serious due to Christ’s redemption. It is in a process of continually being overcome by Christians on this earth, as well as something already abolished in Jesus Christ. Christians can overcome sin by this confession. “However evil it is, God is its lord.”<sup>301</sup>

#### 4.2.1.2.2 The Three Sins and Their Results

Barth explicated sin differently from the Bible though he acknowledges human sinfulness. He states Hamartiology only according to Jesus’ action. The knowledge of sin cannot come from the human intelligence because it perverts the true image of sin.<sup>302</sup> It derives from only the knowledge of the existence and work of Jesus Christ as the Mediator of the covenant. Sin is man’s doing the opposite of what Jesus Christ does, viz., pride instead of the humiliation of the Son of God, sloth instead of His exaltation, falsehood instead of His true prophecy.<sup>303</sup> Sin is falsehood in its role, and is pride and sloth in its forms. While pride and sloth is the work of the man of sin, falsehood is his word.<sup>304</sup> He also sees man’s hostility towards God’s grace as proper and true sin.<sup>305</sup> Evil is unbelief which occurs to us

---

<sup>295</sup> *CD* III/3,321.

<sup>296</sup> *CD* IV/2, 397-399.

<sup>297</sup> *CD* IV/2, 400-403.

<sup>298</sup> *CD* IV/2, 403-407.

<sup>299</sup> *CD* IV/2, 407-421.

<sup>300</sup> *CD* IV/2, 413.

<sup>301</sup> *CD* IV/4, 214.

<sup>302</sup> *CD* IV/2, 387, 379.

<sup>303</sup> *CD* IV/3,2, 369.

<sup>304</sup> *CD* IV/3,2, 372-373.

<sup>305</sup> *GC*, 59.

when we do not agree to the work of the Word and of the Spirit.<sup>306</sup> In Barth's view, sin is not the opposite of Law but the opposite of Christ and His liberation.

#### 4.2.1.2.2.1 Pride and Fall

Jesus' humility reveals our pride. Sin as pride is the desire which tries to occupy the place of God and play a divine role.<sup>307</sup> In contrast to God's action becoming man, man tries to become and be like God. In his desire to be like God, man departs from his given position and gives up his identity as God's covenant partner.<sup>308</sup> As a result, he is led to serving the false god, which he made according to his standard.<sup>309</sup> While Jesus is the Lord who becomes servant, man becomes "the servant who wants to be lord" over the world and his fellow man.<sup>310</sup> While Jesus is the Judge that allows Himself to be judged, the proud man attempts to make himself be a judge of himself and others concerning good and evil, right and wrong. This destroys and dissolves any possibility of a realization of his co-humanity and freedom, which he received through Christ.<sup>311</sup> This pride of man encourages him to misunderstand that he can establish himself as a free being and agent. When he seeks God's help to accomplish his desire be a free agent, he reaches the territory of religion to pursue self-justification.<sup>312</sup> Here sin appears as "man's action in the misunderstanding and misuse of the Law." Namely, he struggles to satisfy the claim of the Law to get cleaning, justification, and sanctification by himself.<sup>313</sup> This is fall.

As a result, human fall causes God's judgment of him. Pride of man is judged by the justice of God. God, however, hates sin but loves man. Thus, God judged His Son instead of sinful man.<sup>314</sup> In the cross a "No" has been spoken and sinful man has perished.<sup>315</sup> The sentence of God results in man's pardon.<sup>316</sup> Pardon of God comprises God's promise. First, it is the promise that God forgives all sins of past, present and future.<sup>317</sup> Secondly, it is the institution into a specific right which replaces the wrong which he has committed. It denotes a right of God's child.<sup>318</sup> Thirdly, it means living in hope and expectation of God.

---

<sup>306</sup> *GC*, 28.

<sup>307</sup> *CD* IV/3, 1, 372.

<sup>308</sup> *KD* IV/1, 465.

<sup>309</sup> *Ibid.*, p.467ff.

<sup>310</sup> *Ibid.*, p.479ff.

<sup>311</sup> *Ibid.*, p.483ff.

<sup>312</sup> *Ibid.*, p.537f.

<sup>313</sup> *CD* II/2, 590.

<sup>314</sup> *CD*, IV/1, 550.

<sup>315</sup> *CD*, IV/1, 543.

<sup>316</sup> *CD*, IV/1, 568.

<sup>317</sup> *CD*, IV/1, 596-597.

<sup>318</sup> *CD*, IV/1, 599.

He lives in the movement to move the goal before him.<sup>319</sup> This is the justification of man, which is accepted by faith. God's judgment and pardon, justification by faith is the adequate prescription of human pride.

#### 4.2.1.2.2.2 Sloth and Misery

Barth depicted sloth as "sluggishness, indolence, slowness or inertia," i.e., a kind of evil inaction.<sup>320</sup> Sloth is the object to be overcome in the human situation by the exalted Christ.<sup>321</sup> It is the sin to rebuff and oppose to go after His ascendant movement of exaltation and elevation of humanity.<sup>322</sup> As sloth is the action of defiance, non-belief, and ungratefulness, it is sinful. The man of sloth "desires only to be left alone like a hedge-hog that rolls into a ball, turning his prickly spikes towards those who would disturb his sleep."<sup>323</sup> He lives as if there were no God.

Sloth can be explained in four ways, i.e., in relation to God, his fellow-man, the created order, his time and history.<sup>324</sup> First, sloth is a refusal to live in and under the freedom presented in Christ.<sup>325</sup> The slothful man rejects the Gospel of Jesus' death and resurrection which frees him from his anxiety.<sup>326</sup> As a result, he loses the chance to experience real freedom from God's direction and calling. It results in our "*Dummheit*" as our loss of the knowledge of God, for it is the sin refusing Jesus Christ who is God's Word and God's wisdom.<sup>327</sup> It is to close our eyes and to persist in the darkness against the clear light of day. His refusal leads himself to the loss of freedom.<sup>328</sup> Secondly, sloth is not to acknowledge Jesus as the fellow-man incarnated for us. It appears in such diverse forms as indifference to other men, the secret of obvious oppression and exploitation of others, actual transgression like robbery, murder, and warfare.<sup>329</sup> It is the loss of authentic co-humanity. Thirdly, sloth is a refusal to accept discipline in order that the human soul might control his body, and the body serve the soul.<sup>330</sup> He rejects such discipline and leaves the body to live a life uncontrolled by the soul, while Jesus Christ took a harsh and complete discipline of the flesh by the direction of the Holy Spirit.<sup>331</sup> This distortion of the unity and

---

<sup>319</sup> *CD*, IV/1, 601.

<sup>320</sup> *CD* IV/2, 403.

<sup>321</sup> *CD* IV/2, 378.

<sup>322</sup> *CD* IV/2, 403.

<sup>323</sup> *CD* IV/2, 404-405.

<sup>324</sup> *KD* IV/2, 459.

<sup>325</sup> *KD* IV/2, 457f.

<sup>326</sup> *CD* IV/2, 470.

<sup>327</sup> *CD* IV/2, 409.

<sup>328</sup> *CD* IV/2, 419.

<sup>329</sup> *CD* IV/2, 436f.

<sup>330</sup> *CD* IV/2, 453.

<sup>331</sup> *CD* IV/2, 454.

order of soul and body falls into “*Verlotterung*” (dissipation), a kind of total self-abandonment.<sup>332</sup> Fourthly, he is entangled in neglect, disorder, discord and degeneration.<sup>333</sup> Sloth causes dissipation, dissolution, and decomposition as the opposite of the unity between soul and body.<sup>334</sup> As a result, he loses his significance and place in history.<sup>335</sup>

To sum up, the man of sloth who rejects the resurrected Jesus Christ and His exaltation is in the state *Elend* – misery, which is a total sickness unto death and a life that is controlled by obsessive *Sorge* - worry. Sin as sloth is the condition and attitude of man to deprive himself of the divinely given dignity and freedom.<sup>336</sup> It can be delineated as the alienation of man from God, neighbour, and self.

#### 4.2.1.2.2.3 Falsehood and Condemnation

Sin as deceit is arbitrary, unfounded, unjustifiable and wicked infringement out from the reality of the covenant which God has established.<sup>337</sup> This falsehood is the darkness contrasted with the light of election, creation and reconciliation. Barth regarded the human falsehood not as a moral phenomenon but a spiritual or a very unspiritual and anti-spiritual phenomenon. It is much more evil and dangerous than the pure moral lie, for it is immanent in the encounter with Jesus Christ.<sup>338</sup> This falsehood not only sleeps secretly in the man of sin but also objectively and factually emerges quite clearly in his unbelief, superstition and error as the movement of evasion which arises in the meeting with Jesus Christ and His truth.<sup>339</sup> Barth elucidated the movements which evade the truth as follows.

Firstly, the man of falsehood avoids accepting Jesus’ identity with the truth and its identity with Jesus Christ. By such trial, he relativises and transforms the truth presented in the action and person of Christ. Secondly, he hates that Jesus as the true Witness is “the man of Gethsemane and Golgotha, and therefore the truth is the truth of His death and passion.”<sup>340</sup> This cross accuses man of being a sinner. Thirdly, he does not want to listen to it and to answer Him with gratitude and obedience even if He tells us this truth in the Holy Spirit. The man of sin is astonished at this truth, for he is not prepared to be the lost son, or to be converted. He suspects this truth because the identity of the Witness and His

---

<sup>332</sup> *KD* IV/2, 517.

<sup>333</sup> *CD* IV/2, 453.

<sup>334</sup> *CD* IV/2, 459.

<sup>335</sup> *KD* IV/2, 497-502.

<sup>336</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>337</sup> *KD* IV/2, 532f, 549f.

<sup>338</sup> *CD* IV/3,2, 434.

<sup>339</sup> *CD* IV/3,2, 451.

<sup>340</sup> *CD* IV/3,2, 441.

testimony is so strange and the Word of the cross is so offensive.<sup>341</sup> Fourthly, he rejects the truth as the free Word of God, which bestows us the true freedom.<sup>342</sup>

Truth indisputably tears the mask from the man of sin and convicts him as a liar. Truth is not an idea, principle, or system but the living Jesus.<sup>343</sup> Jesus is Himself “the truth and its expression.”<sup>344</sup> Through His free and concrete acts which are right before God, Jesus proves Himself to be the true Witness.<sup>345</sup> The man of sin does not deny the truth, but hears it in the form in which it is changed into “his willing and powerful servant, consoler and helper.” The disguised truth has “a scent of righteousness and holiness, of wisdom, excellence and prudence, of zeal, seriousness and energy, and of patience and love for God and man.” Jesus strips it of the attractive pretence and condemns it and reveals its limit.<sup>346</sup> Man’s falsehood results in his condemnation.<sup>347</sup> This liar can only be judged and condemned by God and be lost.<sup>348</sup>

Fortunately, the threat of God’s judgment has not yet been achieved and man is not yet damned and lost. He has time to converse with God. His real being is the man created well by God and justified and sanctified for Him in Jesus Christ. The condemnation is of his real being but of his living with the distorted image which he has set up by his falsehood. The wretched image controls, determines, and limits his existence. Living with this image is described as follows. First, his living with a false image has no centre as meaningful source of his being.<sup>349</sup> Secondly, it has no real coexistence between truth and untruth. Thirdly, it is the great painfulness and profound falsehood of the human situation.<sup>350</sup> Fourthly, it is so profoundly indeterminate of truth.<sup>351</sup> Fifthly, the painfulness of his living is concentrated on the problem which his speech can not utter or express the truth because of his falsehood.<sup>352</sup> Barth finally conferred two facts concerning the threat under which the man of falsehood stands. First, God will not endure the man who persistently tries to change the truth into untruth.<sup>353</sup> Secondly, we do not have to exclude the possibility of the unexpected withdrawal of this final threat in Jesus Christ for the deliverance of all men. On account of this statement, Barth has been doubted as a Universalist.<sup>354</sup>

---

<sup>341</sup> *CD IV/3*, 1, 444.

<sup>342</sup> *CD IV/3,2*, 446f.

<sup>343</sup> *CD IV/3,2*, 375-376.

<sup>344</sup> *CD IV/3,2*, 378.

<sup>345</sup> *CD IV/3,2*, 381

<sup>346</sup> *CD IV/3,2*, 436.

<sup>347</sup> *CD IV/3,2*, 462.

<sup>348</sup> *CD IV/3,2*, 465.

<sup>349</sup> *CD IV/3,2*, 468-469.

<sup>350</sup> *CD IV/3,2*, 470-471.

<sup>351</sup> *CD IV/3,2*, 472.

<sup>352</sup> *CD IV/3,2*, 472-473.

<sup>353</sup> *CD IV/3,2*, 477.

<sup>354</sup> *CD IV/3,2*, 478.

#### 4.2.1.3 The Definition of Sanctification

Barth's early concept of sanctification (1905-1909) is understood as something that we subjectively feel in any peace, power, stimulus, encouragement, or freedom in religious activity. In *Rom 2*, Barth explicated, "To sanctify something means to separate and prepare it that it may be presented and offered to God."<sup>355</sup> In his *Ethik* (1928/29),<sup>356</sup> Barth defined sanctification as the establishment of a divine relation, for when our action is sanctified, it means divine separation, not a quality inherent in the action itself.<sup>357</sup>

In *KD IV/2*, Barth understood the meaning of sanctification simply as regeneration, renewal or conversion, or penitence, or discipleship.

What is meant by sanctification (*sanctificatio*) might be just as well be described by the less common biblical term regeneration (*regeneratio*) or renewal (*renovatio*), or by that of conversion (*conversio*), or by that of penitence (*poenitentia*) which plays so important a role in both the Old and New Testaments, or comprehensively by that of discipleship which is so outstanding especially in the synoptic Gospel. The content of all these terms will have to be brought out under the title of sanctification.<sup>358</sup>

Man's new birth and conversion were delineated as "the liberation of man" taken in Christ or "the freedom" as "a new creation."<sup>359</sup> It is the freedom of the new man and the limit of the old man. Repentance was depicted as "fundamentally a return to correct thinking," which comprises "a renewal of reason and understanding." It is through the Word that "reason must itself become new, i.e., open to the miracle of mercy which is, of course, higher than all reason" (Phil 4:7).<sup>360</sup> Our sanctification in Christ includes "a powerful restriction and mitigation of our very great stupidity, a certain clarification of our perception and thinking."<sup>361</sup>

In *KD I/1*, Barth defined sanctification as some distinction of man in real fellowship with God.

---

<sup>355</sup> *Rom.2*, p. 431.

<sup>356</sup> K. Barth, *Ethik*. 1928/29 Vorlesung, ed. D. Braun, 2 vols, *GA 2/10* (Zürich 1973/78); *Ethics*. G. W. Bromiley (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1981).

<sup>357</sup> *Ethics*, p.112.

<sup>358</sup> *KD IV/2*, 566.

<sup>359</sup> *CD IV/2*, 496.

<sup>360</sup> *Ethics*, p. 415.

<sup>361</sup> *CD IV/2*, 228.



The setting apart, the seizing, appropriating and distinguishing of the men who receive it (God's Spirit), the distinguishing by which they become that which in and of themselves they neither are nor can be, men who belong to God, who are in real fellowship with Him, who live before God and with God.<sup>362</sup>

In *KD* III/4, he defined sanctification as “the hearing and obeying which proceeds from and by the word of God.”<sup>363</sup> In *KD* IV/1, Barth described sanctification as man's subjection to God's direction. This is the description of the subjective aspect of sanctification.

As distinct from justification, and as its necessary consequence, this subjection of man to the divine direction is usually called sanctification. It is nothing other than the basic presupposition of all Christian ethics. Sanctification is the claiming of all human life and being and activity by the will of God for the active fulfilment of that will.<sup>364</sup>

Sanctification is the subjection already accomplished in and by Christ, not by Christians. This is the description of the objective aspect of sanctification.

We must note first that this subjection of man under God's direction and therefore, his sanctification is a form of the atonement, of the conversion of man to God accomplished and revealed in Jesus Christ...Sanctification does not mean our self-sanctifying as the filling out of the justification...it is sanctification by and in Jesus Christ, who, according to 1 Cor. 1:30, is made unto us both justification and sanctification.<sup>365</sup>

Also in his *Ethics*, Barth regarded sanctification as the claiming of man which is basically fulfilled in God's revelation, attested to in Scripture, and promulgated in Christian preaching.<sup>366</sup> This is an important difference between Barth and other theologians on the doctrine of sanctification.

In *CD* IV/1, in terms of subjective sanctification, Barth described sanctification as “the work of the Holy Spirit which makes man a Christian,” which means “that man can

---

<sup>362</sup> *KD* 1/1, 472.

<sup>363</sup> *KD* III/4, 2.

<sup>364</sup> *KD* IV/1, 108.

<sup>365</sup> *KD* IV/1, 108.

<sup>366</sup> *Ethics*, p.16.

love.”<sup>367</sup> Christian love is “the active human recognition” of the proof of God’s love revealed in Christ and is “the human response” to God’s direction of “man’s conversion to God in Jesus Christ.”<sup>368</sup> Barth connected love to lowliness and service. Sanctification is “the participation of the community” in the exaltation to “the lowliness in which He served and still serves, and rules as He serves.”<sup>369</sup> Man’s sanctification for God is “a renewal of his life for the service of God and neighbour, the doing of good works, comforted bearing of the cross and the faithful attestation of what God wills for the world and has said and done to it.”<sup>370</sup> Serving in love is man’s new humanity achieved in Christ. To look at and move towards new humanity is possible only by God’s initiative grace.<sup>371</sup> In *CD IV/3.2*, Barth defined sanctification as the renewal in which God liberates our beings to be a Christian by His vocation.<sup>372</sup> Its aim is for us to be a witness to God.

To sum up, Barth’s concept of sanctification is the renewal of life as God’s work to make man a Christian<sup>373</sup> by calling us to discipleship, awaking us to conversion and asking us to bearing our cross.<sup>374</sup> It is the distinction of the man to serve God and neighbours in love as God’s faithful covenantal partner and a witness to the humanity of Jesus, who is the image of God. It is the freedom and “the renewal of reason and understanding” given by the direction of the Holy Spirit, which enables us to participate in the sanctification of Jesus Christ which was already accomplished.<sup>375</sup>

### 4.2.3 The Motivation and Goal of Sanctification

Barth explicated the motive of Christian sanctification as gratitude for the grace of God on the grounds of Paul’s statement; “I, exhorting you by the mercy of God, I exhort you to present your life as a living sacrifice.”<sup>376</sup> Faith in God’s mercy leads us to the humble obedience which necessarily makes the living sacrifice of the Christian life.<sup>377</sup> Our gratitude of God’s grace and mercy is the motive for our obedience of God’s command, i.e., our sanctification. Barth regarded Christian thankfulness in his life as the essence of actual obedience that is well-pleasing to God.<sup>378</sup> God’s child who is truly thankful does not think

---

<sup>367</sup> *CD IV/1*, 103.

<sup>368</sup> *CD IV/1*, 102.

<sup>369</sup> *CD IV/2*, 690-691.

<sup>370</sup> *CD IV/2*, 160.

<sup>371</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>372</sup> *CD IV/3.2*, 652.

<sup>373</sup> *CD IV/2*, 513.

<sup>374</sup> *CD IV/3.2*, 620f.

<sup>375</sup> *CD IV/2*, 511.

<sup>376</sup> Karl Barth, *The Christian Life*, tr. by J. Strathearn McNab (London: Student Christian Movement, 1961), p.24. Hereafter it will be written *CL*.

<sup>377</sup> *CL*, pp. 41-42.

<sup>378</sup> *GC*, 82.

he has to pay back what God has been giving him but gives testimony to it in freedom.<sup>379</sup> The true gratitude is where we realise that God has given us something for which we cannot and need not repay equal evaluation.<sup>380</sup> Real gratitude can only be expressed when in thanks for a gift we return in a token way the confession that “I have understood what you mean, I am glad that you like me, I feel myself under an obligation to you and now as long as I can I will show it.” That gratitude is the living sacrifice that we can make for God. When this thought is understood, some renewal happens.<sup>381</sup>

The goal of sanctification is the restoration of the image of God, which means the conformity of our humanity to the humanity of Jesus Christ, who is the image of God.<sup>382</sup> Sanctification is as “a copy, a parallel, a likeness of His being and activity.”<sup>383</sup> The tenet that “the *fin principale* of human life” is to glorify God is applied to sanctification.<sup>384</sup> Conversion is an act to exalt and liberate his fellows “for the glory of God in the life of the new man.”<sup>385</sup>

#### 4.2.4 God’s Role and Human Role in Sanctification

For Barth, “our sanctification is God’s work, not our work.” Our role in sanctification is to cleave to the sanctification “accomplished and prepared for us by the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ,” asking what we ought to do.<sup>386</sup> With this in mind, let us examine Barth’s view of God’s role and human role in sanctification in more detail.

##### 4.2.4.1 God’s Role in Sanctification

The role of God in human sanctification is to elect and love and sanctify the human being in Christ.<sup>387</sup> In Barth’s view, sanctification was accomplished in the incarnation, life, death, resurrection, and exaltation of Christ. And it is just God’s grace that made it possible. Accordingly, God’s role is to plan Christ’s incarnation and carry out it. Christ completed His sanctification in place of us through His obedient life and death and resurrection and exaltation. Consequently, the reality of sanctification is hidden in the eternal act of God’s election of Christ.<sup>388</sup> God’s election of Christ and Christ’s obedience of God’s will consists in the objectivity of sanctification, which entirely excludes our role. Even in our

---

<sup>379</sup> *GC*, 82-83.

<sup>380</sup> *CL*, 62.

<sup>381</sup> *CL*, 61-62.

<sup>382</sup> *CD II/2*, 566f.

<sup>383</sup> *CD IV/1*, 773.

<sup>384</sup> *CD III/2*, 183

<sup>385</sup> *CD IV/2*, 564.

<sup>386</sup> *CD II/2*, 645.

<sup>387</sup> *Ethics*, p. 49.

<sup>388</sup> *Ethics*, p. 113.

subjective sanctification, God is the acting Subject.<sup>389</sup> Barth delineates our present and subjective sanctification as the Christian life in the presence of the Holy Spirit. God pours out His Spirit over man on the grounds of the completed objective work of Christ. Through the Holy Spirit, God lives in us for our sanctification.<sup>390</sup> Christian life is something that is not done by us, but which God has done, does, and will do. It is something that Christ lives, has lived and will live to all eternity as the Intermediary between God and man.<sup>391</sup> Accordingly, sanctification can be said to be God's living in us through Christ. It is thoroughly God's work.

Traditionally, sanctification is ascribed to the work of the Holy Spirit. Barth also emphasised the role of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit as God's grace and wisdom leads us into faith in Christ. He does not struggle with human intellect "but leads it on, guides it, inspires it, encourages it, sets it in motion."<sup>392</sup> He overcomes our radical evil abhorrence for the revelation of the Living God.<sup>393</sup> His direction empowers us to obey God's command. For Barth, the direction of the Son of Man, the call to discipleship and the awakening to conversion can be ascribed to the role of the Holy Spirit in sanctification. Those can be regarded as the subjective application to individuals of the objective reality of sanctification which is accomplished in Jesus Christ. The Holy Spirit transfers the sanctification of Christ to us through His direction, which consists of indication, correction, and instruction. This direction creates saints as man's new form of existence, i.e., the true covenant-partner of God.<sup>394</sup> On the basis of Christ's atonement, the Holy Spirit also gives man freedom to obey Christ's direction. He urges man to use his freedom which is given to him by God. Through His direction, man recognizes his free position as the new existence in Christ and grasps and uses his freedom in Christ and puts his old man to death and serves the Lord. The Holy Spirit asks us as Christians to do appropriate good works.<sup>395</sup> His direction disturbs our lives and limits our sin and lifts us up to look to Christ.<sup>396</sup> As a result, man is liberated from the evil of the world and comes to obey Christ.<sup>397</sup> The Holy Spirit restores our relationship with God, ourselves, our fellow men. He corrects the whole orders which are related to us. In this way, the Holy Spirit works in the whole process of our sanctification.

#### 4.2.4.2 The Human Role and Responsibility for Sanctification

---

<sup>389</sup> *CD*, IV/2, 566f.

<sup>390</sup> *CL*, pp. 11-12.

<sup>391</sup> *CL*, p. 13.

<sup>392</sup> Ramm, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

<sup>393</sup> *HG*, 31.

<sup>394</sup> *CD* IV/2, 523.

<sup>395</sup> *CD* IV/2, 372.

<sup>396</sup> *CD* IV/2, 524-529.

<sup>397</sup> *CD* IV/2, 529ff.

For Barth, there is no human independent role in the doctrine of sanctification. Man only responds to the initiative of God, which appears in the form of awakening, indication, direction, and the vocation of the Holy Spirit. Barth's view of man's role can be described in such terms as obedience of faith, prayer, living sacrifice and self-examination.

#### 4.2.4.2.1 Obedience of Faith as Witness to God's Will and Actions

Barth asserted that sanctification certainly does not happen without man but to and in man. It includes "the conscription and the collaboration of his inner and outer forces," namely, of his whole being.<sup>398</sup> Man responds to the direction of the Holy Spirit through his obedience of faith. It is not the achievement of individual piety, but the witness to God's reconciliation.

At the beginning of his life Barth expected God to bring His Kingdom to earth through the ethical striving of the truly converted.<sup>399</sup> It implies that he recognised the human subjective role in the doctrine of sanctification. In 1919, his view changed from the emphasis of the human role in sanctification to the stress of human simple faith in God's grace. Nonetheless, Barth did not deny the human responsibility in sanctification. Man should obey God with gratitude, for He redeemed him. God's salvation imposed the responsibility on human beings to surrender their whole life to God's sovereignty.<sup>400</sup> Barth recognized human freedom and power to obey God's command. Sanctification must be initiated by our own deed. This "*Sollen*" excludes a fatalistic view of the pessimistic sanctification like human surrender to something that cannot be avoided. Along this line, Schleiermacher's term, "*Abhängigkeit*" (dependence) was refused because of its passive tone which seems to eliminate human active "*Selbstbestimmung*."<sup>401</sup> For Barth, a Christian can believe, obey and confess only in his own personality and responsibility. Nonetheless, human obedience does not rely on his inherent resources. Its command comes from God not himself. Man can do so only when he is called to undertake these things by Christ through the Holy Spirit, who does not only require obedience but also empower him to obey. In virtue of the indication of His Spirit, he perceives himself as a man who is sanctified in Christ despite his sin.<sup>402</sup> As a result, he believes in Jesus Christ and confesses Him as his Lord and obeys Him by his exercise of the freedom set in him in God's grace. Incomplete as his obedience is, it is his participation in the sanctification of Christ which is

---

<sup>398</sup> CD IV/2, 556.

<sup>399</sup> McCormack, *op. cit.* p. 102.

<sup>400</sup> *Der Römerbrief*, I, 240f.

<sup>401</sup> William Stacy Johnson, *The Mystery of God: Karl Barth and the Post-modern Foundations of Theology* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997), p.137.

<sup>402</sup> *Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics, A Selection*. With an Introduction by Helmut Gollwitzer, tr. and ed. by G. W. Bromiley (New York: Harry Torchbooks, 1962), p.253.

already accomplished and his witness to it. That is to say, our obedience as *de facto* sanctification is a witness to *de jure* sanctification.

#### 4.2.4.2.2 Prayer

For Barth, prayer is the communion with God enlightened by God. In the act of prayer, authentic human self-consciousness is born and ethical knowledge and agency receives its permission to be.<sup>403</sup> Every doctrine of special ethics must end in a doctrine of prayer.<sup>404</sup> To pray, obey and repent with faith in the Holy Spirit is the duty and role of the believer in sanctification. Barth described prayer as “a simple act by which we accept and use the divine gift” and “an act in which we obey...the will of God.” His description of prayer as an act of obedience signifies that there is a human role in prayer. Prayer is a human act in which our mind and heart is awake while our prayer allows the Holy Spirit to act for us.<sup>405</sup> Especially in preaching, prayer is essential, for the preaching cannot reap any good result without it. Therefore, the whole congregation should join in prayer.

The Holy Spirit himself intercedes for us with groaning that cannot be uttered.<sup>406</sup> The true prayer which God listens to is not made by Christians but by the Holy Spirit.<sup>407</sup> Barth stressed that we do not have freedom to pray or not to pray, for prayer is not an act that comes naturally from us but a grace from God and his word in Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit. The fact that the Holy Spirit prays for us does not mean that we do not have to pray. Conversely, we must pray. This has the facets of both grace and freedom: we pray, but God replies to our prayer. Initiative of prayer lies with the Holy Spirit, but man actively participates in prayer in his freedom. It implies human subjectivity as the predicate of the Lord, the subject.

#### 4.2.4.2.3 Living Sacrifice<sup>408</sup>

---

<sup>403</sup> Paul D. Matheny, *Dogmatics and Ethics: The Theological Realism and Ethics of Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Peter Lang GmbH, 1990), p.213.

<sup>404</sup> *GC*, 10.

<sup>405</sup> K. Barth, *Prayer*, ed. by Don E. Saliers, tr. by Sara F. Terrien (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1985), pp. 40-41.

<sup>406</sup> *PP*, 98.

<sup>407</sup> *GC*, 38.

<sup>408</sup> Barth interpreted Paul's exhortation to present our bodies as a living sacrifice by God's grace (Rom. 12:1) as that “our whole life waits for the resurrection of the flesh, for our life is in its sinfulness.” (*CL*, 35f) Yet his interpretation seems to be unreasonable, for the meaning of the verb *pari, sthmi* is used as a religious technical term in relation to sacrifice *offer, bring, present* (Friberg Lexicon). The *pari, sthmi* means only “offer our bodies to God” as a sacrifice at present, not “wait for the resurrection of our body.” Barth also interpreted a living sacrifice as to “present our bodies as they are, namely sinful” to God. It is not correct, given that in the biblical text, “a living sacrifice” is modified by “holy, acceptable to God.” Although our



The sacrifice pleasing God is to believe and obey the Word of God that we have heard.<sup>409</sup> By this sacrifice, we become the instruments of God through which He accomplishes his will. We can and must offer our bodies as a sacrifice, not because we can do anything for God, but only because we are summoned to do so by Him.<sup>410</sup> By this summons, we are distinguished from the world to be holy beings. Accordingly, our holiness is not immanent in our action, but dependent upon God's summons, which makes our living sacrifice acceptable to God.<sup>411</sup> As the One who is good is God, man can do good acts when he acts obediently to God as a hearer of God's Word.<sup>412</sup> Living sacrifice as hearing and obeying the Word of God is our duty and role.

#### 4.2.4.2.4 Self-Examination

Christ will judge us according to what we have done whether it be good or bad (2 Cor. 5: 10). This is why we should examine ourselves. The standpoint of judgment is God's command and his Law.<sup>413</sup> How we stand before God relates to our free decisions, which is the basis of God's judgment. Our life consists of "a continuous series of decisions" which we must make and practise. Accordingly, we should examine the direction of our way every moment.<sup>414</sup> As God is our Judge, we should remember Him "in our willing and doing," keep Him "before our minds' eyes," and move towards our examination by Him "in our own self-examination."<sup>415</sup> Filling our time "by what we do and do not do" is our responsibility as God's covenant-partner. This responsibility is a characteristic of Christian ethics.<sup>416</sup> "In true responsibility to God's command" we have acted and act and will act. It is God's sovereign decision.<sup>417</sup> Then how can we achieve this responsibility? It is to cleave to Christ's sanctity accomplished in his death and resurrection, for "sanctification is God's work and not our work."<sup>418</sup> It is possible by God's living the Christian life in us through Jesus Christ, in the Holy Spirit.<sup>419</sup> We practise self-examination by receiving the direction and guidance of God living in us.

---

condition as sinner is acceptable to God, it cannot be said to be "holy" to God. Furthermore, Barth's view that the life we live as a sinner in our situation is the one that is claimed by God cannot be acceptable (*CL*, 35-37).

<sup>409</sup> *CL*, 38-39.

<sup>410</sup> *CL*, 39-40.

<sup>411</sup> *Ethics*, p.112.

<sup>412</sup> *Ethics*, pp.49-50.

<sup>413</sup> *CD 2/2*, 633.

<sup>414</sup> *CD 2/2*, 634.

<sup>415</sup> *CD 2/2*, 636.

<sup>416</sup> *CD 2/2*, 641-42.

<sup>417</sup> *CD 2/2*, 644.

<sup>418</sup> *CD 2/2*, 645.

<sup>419</sup> *CL*, 64.

#### 4.2.4.3 Summary and Critique

For Barth, God justifies, sanctifies, and glorifies us, which means that it does not need our action. “All that is required of us is to accept the fact, by receiving and acknowledging His free grace.”<sup>420</sup> As Willis aptly puts it, Barth had a tendency to belittle “human sensitivity and responsibility by providing an unreal delineation of man’s ethical situation,” in other words by depicting sanctification as God’s determination which happened in Christ from eternity.<sup>421</sup> In this sense, his view of the human role in sanctification is passive as obedience consequent to God’s precedent action. It seems to be a theistic determinism subordinating human free obedience to God’s precedent decision, though Barth did not completely deny the human role and responsibility. In a different view, Otterness analyses the cause of Barth’s passive view of the human role in sanctification as follows. It results from his analogy between Christ’s humanity and our humanity.<sup>422</sup> In Barth’s view, Christ’s humanity is subordinate to His divinity, that is, it is not independent or subjective, but passive.<sup>423</sup> In a strict sense, it is not self-determining.<sup>424</sup> As our humanity is the same as Christ’s humanity, our humanity is also not subjective but subordinate to God’s decision. This endangers the human self-determining role in the doctrine of sanctification. Consequently, it is difficult for Barth to maintain a personal covenant relationship between God’s sovereignty and man’s response.<sup>425</sup>

Briefly, in Barth’s view of the human role on sanctification, the deprecation of the free historicity of human experience and the limit of human subjectivity seems problematic.

#### 4.2.5 The Nature of Sanctification

##### 4.2.5.1 Historicity/Visibility and Transhistoricity/Invisibility

Here historicity relates to visibility and transhistoricity to invisibility.

In the preface of *Der Römerbrief*, Barth emphasised the infinite qualitative difference between time and eternity, between God and man which is an unbridgeable gap between both sides.<sup>426</sup> In these two realms, Christian sanctification belongs to the divine eternal

---

<sup>420</sup> CD III/4, 407.

<sup>421</sup> Robert E Willis, *The Ethics of Karl Barth* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971), p.99.

<sup>422</sup> Otterness. *op. cit.*, p. 206; John Macken SJ, *The Autonomy Theme in the Church Dogmatics: Karl Barth and His Critics* (Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p.59.

<sup>423</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 209.

<sup>424</sup> Herbert Hartwell also proposes that “the Son of God is the Subject of the person of Jesus Christ casts a doubt upon the true humanity of Jesus Christ.” *The Theology of Karl Barth* (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1964), p. 185.

<sup>425</sup> Otterness, *op. cit.*, pp.223-224.

<sup>426</sup> Karl Barth, *The Epistle To the Romans* 6<sup>th</sup> ed., tr. E. C. Hoskyns (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), p.10 From now it is written as *Rom.6*.

realm which is “invisible and non historical,”<sup>427</sup> because “the action of God cannot occur in time” but only in eternity.<sup>428</sup> As the two realms are totally different dimensions, it is impossible to pass over the border “by gradual advance or by painstaking climb, or by any human effort.”<sup>429</sup> Only God’s grace can connect these realms.<sup>430</sup> Only through faith and obedience by God’s grace can the visible and concrete sanctification of the human being appear in this world.<sup>431</sup> In this period, Barth regarded religious piety as self-sanctification by the Law as enemy of God’s righteousness.<sup>432</sup> He rejected Schleiermacher’s attempt to construct a religion as the betrayal of Christ<sup>433</sup> When religious sanctification is given up, divine sanctification is created as the imperative of grace.<sup>434</sup>

In his lecture on “Church and Culture,” Barth insisted that there is no visible sanctification; no sanctification which can be seen, proved or measured,” comparing “cultural Protestantism” to building the tower of Babel.<sup>435</sup> In *Rechtfertigung und Heiligung* (1927),<sup>436</sup> he affirmed sanctification as a process. Sanctification is the temporal side of the mysterious act of grace. It is “a historical psychological process.”<sup>437</sup> In his *Ethics* (1928-29), he understood that our existence is a highly determined existence by God’s Word that is the essence of our sanctification.<sup>438</sup> Our sanctification is God’s total, real and effective grace.<sup>439</sup> The guarantee of the relation between the eternal reality and the present reality of our sanctification is indirect and obscure, for it is grounded on the eternal determination of God. The coincidence of the divine sanctification with the human sanctification will be revealed in an eschatological reality, Jesus Christ himself.<sup>440</sup>

In *The Holy Ghost and the Christian Life* (1938), Barth maintained that sanctification as living in obedience to God is hidden, just as our faith is hidden in repentance and trust, for our obedience never becomes perceptible to us in itself.<sup>441</sup> In other words, man cannot

---

<sup>427</sup> *Rom.6*, 163.

<sup>428</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 435.

<sup>429</sup> *Rom.6*, p. 240

<sup>430</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 220.

<sup>431</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 223

<sup>432</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 242.

<sup>433</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 225

<sup>434</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 239

<sup>435</sup> K. Barth, *Theology and Church: Shorter Writings 1920-1928*, tr. L. P. Smith (London, 1962), pp. 345, 349, 354.

<sup>436</sup> K. Barth, *Rechtfertigung und Heiligung* (1927), *ZdZ* 5: 281-309. Hereafter, it will be written as *RH*.

<sup>437</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 300-301.

<sup>438</sup> *Ethics*, p.107.

<sup>439</sup> *Ethics*, p.113.

<sup>440</sup> *Ethics*, p. 115.

<sup>441</sup> K. Barth, *The Holy Ghost and the Christian Life*, tr. by R. Birch Hoyle (London: Frederick Muller Limited, 1938). Hereafter it is written as *HC*,62.

carry the duty for love thoroughly and unequivocally.<sup>442</sup> Sanctification is real but hidden in the mystery of the Holy Spirit. Although our sanctification is a reality that takes place, it is a work only to be understood as grace, and never to be comprehended by man.<sup>443</sup> Our sanctification as obedience is a problem that we can not solve because we render service by what we do, but our real service to God and our neighbour is not within our own power but within God's grace. The true reality of our sanctification lies in Christ's obedience because our obedience is imperfect and its mystery making our action holy lies in the grace of the Holy Spirit. Sanctification is hidden not in the inwardness of our intuition, or as a secret of our heart (as Phenomenologists like Husserl would say), but in God and is completely out of our control.<sup>444</sup>

In *CD IV/2*, he elucidated sanctification as a real event which happens here and now in time and on earth. But he denied the reality of sanctification as human and earthly history. Sanctification is real, not because it takes place as human and earthly history, but because it takes place in fellowship with the life of Jesus Christ. Our sanctification is so provisional and limited on this earth, but it is eternally executed in Christ by God. As such, its true reality lies in Christ. Our subjective sanctification however takes place in time and on earth.<sup>445</sup> It does not merely have a whole aspect of the creature but also "it is itself wholly and utterly creaturely by nature."<sup>446</sup> Barth stressed the historicity of sanctification in the following sentence. "...as the attestation of the elevation of man accomplished in Him, it is *a historical event*. In what takes place to them as He calls them to lift up themselves, His exaltation has *its concrete consequence in the world* and its continuing."<sup>447</sup> (Italics are my emphasis). The visibility of sanctification is expressed in the following sentence. "The eddy (of sanctification) arises and is *visible* in the stream, first in the lives of these men, but then- seeing that they have their fellows- as a fact in the common life of all men."<sup>448</sup>

In summary, Barth scarcely admitted the historicity and visibility of sanctification but emphasised the transhistoricity and invisibility until *CD IV/2*. After that time, he admitted that our subjective sanctification is a historical event and visible. Its complete reality as objective sanctification lies in Christ beyond human history and will appear at the end of the world.

#### **4.2.5.2 De Jure and De Facto**

---

<sup>442</sup> *HC*,65.

<sup>443</sup> *HC*,9.

<sup>444</sup> *HC*,69.

<sup>445</sup> *CD IV/2*, 553-554.

<sup>446</sup> *CD IV/2*, 557.

<sup>447</sup> *CD IV/2*, 529.

<sup>448</sup> *Ibid.*

#### 4.2.5.2.1 *De Jure* Sanctification<sup>449</sup>

For Barth, the *de jure* sanctification has been effectively and authoritatively accomplished for entire humankind as the exaltation of human nature by God in Jesus Christ.<sup>450</sup> The sanctification of man is described as the existence of those who are judged by God, as a fact which is already completed, which has been factually and objectively created.<sup>451</sup> *De jure* sanctification involves a change in the status of man, viz., a new determination, or transformation before God like justification, which has taken place for all men.<sup>452</sup> Through that man has been accepted by God as a covenant-partner. This *de jure* sanctification has already been achieved in the incarnation, death, resurrection, and exaltation of Jesus Christ.<sup>453</sup> Although it is not yet known to all men, the actuality of sanctification does not depend upon their knowledge of it. It is not man who determine this new situation but God who has acted in Jesus Christ. Whether men believe it, approve it, or do not know about it at all, God determined and accomplished it in Jesus Christ. Stressing the sovereign freedom of God over against man, Barth does not permit the effectiveness of divine action to be dependent finally upon man's response. God's decision about man is a final and completed matter. Hence, *de jure* sanctification is called this objective sanctification.

##### 4.2.5.2.1.1 Sanctification in the Life of Royal Man<sup>454</sup>

As human sanctification was accomplished in Christ, it is necessary to investigate the sanctification of Christ as our sanctification. The sanctification of Christ will be referred to in 5.2.9.2. Accordingly, here we will deal with "the life of Royal Man," in whom we were already objectively sanctified.

From the view of Barth, Jesus Christ kept the covenant of God with His people in the action of His life by His spontaneous will. This is his sanctification. His sanctification is delivered to us by the power of His resurrection because He was exalted to God with our humanity.

In His life, Jesus accomplished "the solidarity of God with man," "His perfect fellowship with His people," and "the thanksgiving of human creation corresponding to God's grace." In other words, His life was the achievement of the aim of "the divine preservation and rule of the creaturely world."<sup>455</sup> Jesus showed us the faithfulness in

---

<sup>449</sup> Cf. The *de jure* sanctification is connected to 5.2.7.2 "Predestination and election" and 5.2.9.2 the Sanctification of Christ.

<sup>450</sup> *CD* IV/2, 511, 518.

<sup>451</sup> *CD* II/2, 774.

<sup>452</sup> *CD* IV/2, 511.

<sup>453</sup> *CD* IV/2, 278.

<sup>454</sup> This is connected to '5.2.8.2 The Sanctification of Christ' on this thesis.

<sup>455</sup> *CD* IV/2, 114.

accordance with the faithfulness of God. His faithfulness empowered him to identify himself with the meek and the lowly<sup>456</sup> and to ignore the wealthy and the morally elite.<sup>457</sup> His relationship to the order of life and the valuation which were current in the world around him was revolutionary. He transvalued all the values and orders in order to remind them of the fact that God Himself is their limit and frontier.<sup>458</sup> Jesus lived as the judge of the fallen world of the old Adam.

Barth explicated Jesus in relation to His life and action. “Jesus’ life was His act.” The totality of his being cannot be distinguishable from the totality of His action. We must give up the distinction between His *logos* and His *ethos*. His concrete activity was accompanied by the accounts of His concrete speech. In other words, His activity was “the kindling light of His speech.” The particularity of His activity was connected with “His preaching of the Gospel and teaching and proclamation.”<sup>459</sup> His distinctive acts had supernatural character, which stemmed from the kingdom of God. They comprised exorcism, healing, and the miracles against nature.<sup>460</sup> They took place in response to human misery. His miracles brought men deliverance from every torment and embarrassment.<sup>461</sup> These imply God’s *coup d’état* which comforted the sad and freed the poor unconditionally in spite of their sin.<sup>462</sup> In these miraculous acts, God showed us His faithfulness to His covenant with us. God hates sin but loves man. Human sorrow and shame are in Him because He is for us.<sup>463</sup> Barth related faith to miracles. Faith is an important element of miracles. It stems from its object which is Jesus Christ. It is human freedom given by Jesus. By His action, the Liberator has conferred man the freedom to believe in Him.<sup>464</sup> In His miraculous action in Christ, through liberating man from every depression, God revealed His faithfulness to him as His covenant.

Jesus’ cross controls and determines and penetrates the whole existence and divine likeness and activity of the man Jesus.<sup>465</sup> Christian faith, love, and hope are for the Crucified. Jesus undertook His cross in His freedom.<sup>466</sup> From the outset, this cross is the sign of Jesus’ total existence.<sup>467</sup> Christ’s exaltation took place in and with His humiliation

---

<sup>456</sup> CD IV/2, 166-169.

<sup>457</sup> CD IV/2, 168-171.

<sup>458</sup> CD IV/2, 173.

<sup>459</sup> CD IV/2, 209-210.

<sup>460</sup> CD IV/2, 212ff.

<sup>461</sup> CD IV/2, 221-222.

<sup>462</sup> CD IV/2, 224.

<sup>463</sup> CD IV/2, 225.

<sup>464</sup> CD IV/2, 242-244.

<sup>465</sup> CD IV/2, 249.

<sup>466</sup> CD IV/2, 258-259.

<sup>467</sup> CD IV/2, 251.



on the cross.<sup>468</sup> His cross means the prince of the world was judged and cast out.<sup>469</sup> His cross is for disciples the “light and power and glory and promise and fulfilment, present liberation and the hope of that which is still to come, the forgiveness of sins, and eternal life.”<sup>470</sup>

Jesus behaved in place of us in union with us. Accordingly, His incarnation and life led us to the fellowship with God, our turning away from evil ways and being saints and His covenant partners. In other words, as He is our Head and Lord, we were justified and sanctified before God.<sup>471</sup> This is our *de jure* sanctification.

#### **4.2.5.2.2 De Facto Sanctification**

Although our *de jure* sanctification is accomplished in Christ, our *de facto* sanctification is concealed in Jesus Christ.<sup>472</sup> Barth regarded the participation of the saints in the sanctity of Christ as the characteristics of *de facto* sanctification. It involves a response on the part of individual men. It is a confession and life out of *de jure* sanctification. According to Barth, our subjective sanctification takes place by the direction of the resurrected Christ, the call to discipleship, and the awakening to conversion, the dignity of the cross, and the praise of works. The first three of these terms will be dealt with in ‘4.2.6 The Modes of Sanctification’ and the praise of works in ‘4.2.9 Good Works and Sanctification.’

##### **4.2.5.2.2.1 The Direction of the Son**

Barth maintained that we cannot see our factual sanctification in our lives. In other words, we can neither know Him as He is nor ourselves as we are in Him, i.e., sanctified being.<sup>473</sup> In the present, only by faith can we recognize our sanctification in Christ. In order to see our being in Him, we need “a penetration and removal” of that which hides.<sup>474</sup> The essence of the hiddenness is the Royal Man under the sign of the cross.<sup>475</sup> First, the cross is the fulfilment of self-humiliation, the condescension of Christ.<sup>476</sup> Secondly, in His crucifixion, Christ undertook our situation and altered and transformed it. Our old man is put to death and our new man is converted to the new life. Thirdly, the cross means all human acts and accomplishments are useless.<sup>477</sup>

---

<sup>468</sup> CD IV/2, 256.

<sup>469</sup> John 16:11; 12:31.

<sup>470</sup> CD IV/2, 263.

<sup>471</sup> CD IV/2, 274-275.

<sup>472</sup> CD IV/2, 286.

<sup>473</sup> CD IV/2, 287.

<sup>474</sup> CD IV/2, 280.

<sup>475</sup> CD IV/2, 290.

<sup>476</sup> CD IV/2, 292.

<sup>477</sup> CD IV/2, 293-295.

The power to know the secret of the cross comes from the resurrected Christ's revelation. In His crucifixion He closes Himself off from us and in His resurrection He discloses Himself to us.<sup>478</sup> In His resurrection our new being appears. By the resurrected Christ we receive *der Kracht des Übergangs* (the power of transition) from Christ to Christians. This power "affects us by opening our eyes and ears and heart and conscience and reason for our new and exalted man."<sup>479</sup> This power is light, liberation, knowledge and peace.<sup>480</sup> Light is "the power of the reality, shining from the darkness of His Crucifixion, of the exalted and new and true man who is now seated at the right hand of God." It shows us that we belong to Christ. Liberation is the power to "free us for conversion" to be a Christian.<sup>481</sup> Knowledge is the power to enable us to know ourselves as what we are known in accordance with the divine seeing and thinking and speaking. Peace is the power of reconciliation of the world with God, self, and fellows.<sup>482</sup> In addition, Barth presented the power of humility, of hungering and thirsting after righteousness, of fellowship, of prayer and confession, of faith and hope and above all of love. These are included in eternal life, whose seed is sowed in man by the resurrected Jesus. This power frees human life from self-centred greed and anxiety.<sup>483</sup>

The power of the transition is known in the presence and action of the Holy Spirit.<sup>484</sup> It creates Christian subjectivity, the existence of Christians.<sup>485</sup> In § 64.4 of his *Church Dogmatics*, Barth explicated the direction of the Holy Spirit as indication, correction, and instruction. First, the Holy Spirit indicates that we are free beings as a new existence in Christ. We are in Christ and Christ in us.<sup>486</sup> Secondly, the Spirit corrects us when "we are already free in Jesus, but we think and speak and will and act and behave as if we were not free...as if we ourselves were not already exalted and renewed and sanctified in man Jesus."<sup>487</sup> The Holy Spirit fights for the new man and against the old man. He converts us from restraint to freedom, from disobedience to obedience, from death to life.<sup>488</sup> Thirdly, the Holy Spirit instructs us what God's will towards us in our concrete situation is. In this sense, He is our professor of theological ethics.<sup>489</sup> His instruction is not any general

---

<sup>478</sup> CD IV/2, 299.

<sup>479</sup> CD IV/2, 307.

<sup>480</sup> CD IV/2, 310-314.

<sup>481</sup> CD IV/2, 311.

<sup>482</sup> CD IV/2, 312-314.

<sup>483</sup> CD IV/2, 315-316.

<sup>484</sup> CD IV/2, 319.

<sup>485</sup> CD IV/2, 315.

<sup>486</sup> CD IV/2, 363.

<sup>487</sup> CD IV/2, 367.

<sup>488</sup> CD IV/2, 368.

<sup>489</sup> CD IV/2, 372.

regulation or rule or code but “the commanding of the living God.”<sup>490</sup> It “awakens and calls us to use and exercise our freedom in Jesus” to do the good works which we ought to do here and now. It awakens and summons us to participate in His exaltation.<sup>491</sup> In this way, the direction of the Holy Spirit makes us participate in the sanctification of Christ. Hence the sanctification of man can be described as receiving the direction of the royal man Jesus in the Holy Spirit.

Later, Barth realized that *Einweisung, Zurechtweisung und Unterweisung* (indication, correction, and instruction) are too weak and ineffective to express the dynamic work of the Holy Spirit fully. So he selected new terms, i.e., *Störung, Grenz und Sichauflichten* (disturbance, limit and lifting up).<sup>492</sup> Connecting two kinds of terms to each other, he elucidated how the subjective sanctification takes place within us.

First, when the Holy Spirit assigns an indicative direction to a person, he is unavoidably disturbed. The *Störung* delineates that converts are still sinners while they are saints.<sup>493</sup> A man transformed by the Holy Spirit becomes a new being in Christ and recognises that he is still doing wrong as he did before. His union with Christ, greatly disturbs his life. Since the Holy Spirit continues to disturb him, he loses peace of mind or inner harmony with himself and confronts the incongruity, hostility, and objection within his heart and conscience. The divine objection against their sinning is written upon their hearts through the Holy Spirit.<sup>494</sup> He is already on the side of God against the world.<sup>495</sup>

Secondly, when the Holy Spirit furnishes a corrective direction to a person, he experiences a definite *Grenz* against his old identity as sinner. The direction of the Holy Spirit pushes our old identity into a corner and creates a new identity. Although the old man as sinner and the new man as saint exist together and fight within our being, God considers only our *Sein als Heilige* as a *göttliche Realität*, while He regards our *Sein als Sünder* as a *Nichtige*.<sup>496</sup> This direction towards the completion of new man implies the victory of our Lord and His kingdom against the power of sin.<sup>497</sup> By His limit of being a sinner, the Spirit creates an empty space which is fraught with freedom given by Him. The freedom enables us to take part actively in the sanctification of Christ as a witness of His holiness.<sup>498</sup>

Thirdly, when the Holy Spirit donates an instructive direction to a person, he

---

<sup>490</sup> CD IV/2, 373.

<sup>491</sup> CD IV/2, 374.

<sup>492</sup> CD IV/2, 523.

<sup>493</sup> CD IV/2, 524.

<sup>494</sup> CD IV/2, 593.

<sup>495</sup> CD IV/2, 525.

<sup>496</sup> CD IV/2, 526.

<sup>497</sup> CD IV/2, 595.

<sup>498</sup> CD IV/2, 530.

experiences lifting to the Christ above. We are called to lift up our heads and look to Jesus Christ above.<sup>499</sup> Through this *Aufrichten* and *Aufsehn* to Christ, we participate in Him. It necessarily creates our correspondence to Christ's holiness.<sup>500</sup> It is *de facto* our sanctification.<sup>501</sup> Although our subjective sanctification is only relative and has a doubtful and questionable aspect, it is real change.<sup>502</sup> As its actual result, Christian subjective sanctification is able to be seen in his individual life and his community life.<sup>503</sup>

#### 4.2.5.2.3 Summary and Critique

O. G. Otterness contends that Barth emphasised *de jure* sanctification already accomplished in Christ rather than *de facto* sanctification.<sup>504</sup> Otterness also points out that *de jure* sanctification is adequate for the concept of justification but not for that of sanctification. Calvin succeeded in maintaining the balance between *de jure* sanctification and the *de facto* sanctification of Christians by distinguishing between Christ's obedience and Christian obedience. Barth seldom differentiated between the two.<sup>505</sup> Human sanctification is only the reflection and direction of Christ's sanctification, not his independent sanctification as his obedience to God's Law. It became the cause of Barth's difficulty in delineating human subjective sanctification.

Generally, pertinent as Otterness' critique is, J. S. Rhee points out Otterness' negligence of *Church Dogmatics* IV/2 §67 and §68 which describes *de facto* sanctification. In fact, Otterness did not deal with §67 and §68.<sup>506</sup> In contrast to Otterness, Rhee contends that Barth consistently stressed the subjective aspect of sanctification as well as the "objective and transcendental" aspect of sanctification.<sup>507</sup> Barth dealt with "objective sanctification in § 64" and "its subjective application in §67 and §68."<sup>508</sup> For Barth, Jesus Christ is not only the clue to expounding God's reconciling work on its objective side, but also the sign to explicate sanctification on its subjective side. It means that the resurrected Christ awakens and converts and sanctifies man through the direction of the Holy Spirit, who is Christ's Spirit.<sup>509</sup> In the direction of the Spirit, the Living Christ meets "definite

---

<sup>499</sup> CD IV/2, 527.

<sup>500</sup> CD IV/2, 529.

<sup>501</sup> CD IV/2, 527.

<sup>502</sup> CD IV/2, 526. "How could it be the *real sanctification* of real man if man himself were not present in his inner and outer activity, if it took place at some supernatural height or depth with him?" (Italics are my emphasis).

<sup>503</sup> CD IV/2, 529.

<sup>504</sup> Otterness, *op. cit.*, p. 206.

<sup>505</sup> *Ibid.*, p.152.

<sup>506</sup> Rhee, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

<sup>507</sup> Rhee, *op. cit.* p.132.

<sup>508</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 175.

<sup>509</sup> *Ibid.*; CD IV/2, 522.

men at definite times in their lives.”<sup>510</sup> Therefore, Otterness’ view that Barth’s doctrine of sanctification is lacking in historicity is not utterly germane. In my view, Otterness’ point that for Barth, man’s sanctification is mainly the reflection and witness of the sanctification of Christ seems to be very pertinent. However, his critique seems impertinent that “Barth has very little to say about sanctification as a process other than to affirm that it was realized in Jesus Christ”<sup>511</sup> given that for Barth, the Holy Spirit also directs us as to what we do or do not do in our concrete situation in the most suitable and concrete way.<sup>512</sup> Rhee’s assessment seems relevant in that Barth’s theology describes the subjective aspect of sanctification as our own obedience to God’s will.<sup>513</sup> In fact, Barth dealt with human factual obedience to God’s command in ‘The Command of God the Creator’ in *the Church Dogmatics* III/4.

To sum up, Barth laid the centre and root of sanctification on its objectivity from which its subjectivity is derived. The subjective reality of human sanctification is the provisional reflection of the objective reality of the sanctification of Christ. The true reality of our sanctification will appear in Christ at the end of the world. Although emphasizing *de jure* sanctification in Christ, Barth did not deny *de facto* sanctification.

#### 4.2.5.3 Instantaneousness/Definitiveness and Gradualness/Continuity

In his “Moderne Theologie und Reichgottesarbeit” (1909)<sup>514</sup> Barth did not admit the concept of sanctification as a process which is the life-long struggle against the power of sin or the concepts of sanctification as obedience to the command of God as the given rule. He understood sanctification as the spiritual experience such as peace, power, stimulus, encouragement and freedom, which is beneficial for religious life and can be found in any religion.

In his *Der Römerbrief I* (1919), Barth elucidated that sanctification happens once for all, and is not a continually recurrent process.<sup>515</sup> He discarded the religious method of pietism, for he thought it a non-Christian hypothesis that God is so strict and demanding that human beings cannot ever satisfy Him and as a result, nobody can be joyful with Him due to everlasting fear. Accordingly, we must “go back to our starting point, to the freedom which

---

<sup>510</sup> *Ibid.*; CD IV/3. 2, 502.

<sup>511</sup> Otterness, *op. cit.*, p.169.

<sup>512</sup> CD IV/2, 372-374.

<sup>513</sup> Herbert Hartwell also maintains that Barth acknowledged “both an objective and a subjective aspect of man’s justification, sanctification, and vocation, treating all these objective and subjective realities with equal emphasis and in a balanced manner.” *The Theology of Karl Barth* (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1964), pp. 28-29.

<sup>514</sup> K.Barth, “Moderne Theologie und Reichgottesarbeit,” in *Vorträge und kleinere Arbeiten /905-1909*, ed. H.-A.Drewsand H.Stoevesandt, GA 21, Zurich 1992, pp.334-366.

<sup>515</sup> K. Barth, *Der Römerbrief*, 1st edition, ed. H. Schmidt, GA 16, (Zürich: TVZ, 1985), p. 276.

we have in the Messiah.”<sup>516</sup> Sanctification is not an “on and off” affair. It is the permanent condition of the Christian in Christ. This disposition of Barth’s possibly originates from Luther’s doctrine of justification. Barth’s concept of the single sanctification can be regarded as the radical opposite of the pietistic view of sanctification, “which presupposes the subject of sanctification as man rather than God.”<sup>517</sup> In his *Der Römerbrief 2*, human change from the old man to the new man is not a partial improvement, but a radical break. It is not reversal but definite turning.<sup>518</sup> In this period, Barth emphasised instant and definite sanctification.

In *Rechtfertigung und Heiligung* (1927),<sup>519</sup> Barth affirmed sanctification as a process. Sanctification is the temporal side of the mysterious act of grace. It is “multiplex, inchoate, relative, *inaequalis*” and “a historical psychological process.”<sup>520</sup> Until the eschatological *Erlösung*, there is an endless struggle with himself, his neighbours, the righteous and the wise of the world.<sup>521</sup> This struggle does not happen once only, but continually.<sup>522</sup>

In *CD IV/1*, he explicated the continuity of sanctification in terms of *mortificatio* and *vivicatio* in the act of faith.<sup>523</sup> As recognition of faith, *mortificatio* and *vivicatio* takes place continually through our participation in the death and the resurrection of Jesus Christ.<sup>524</sup> It is a movement towards subjective sanctification. In *CD IV/2* and *IV/3*, he expounded that the continuity of sanctification in relation to the struggle between the old man and the new man in conversion. When conversion influences the whole man, he experiences the *Auseinandersetzung* between the old man and the new man.<sup>525</sup> The quarrel was described by Calvin as the mortification of the old man and the vivification of the new. Barth depicted the former as *renovatio negativa*, the latter as *renovatio positiva*. The struggle continues all our life. It is the continuity of the new experience given by God every moment. In this warfare, the new man finally defeats the old man by the power of God’s destination of history. This conflict has one direction in history according to His predestination.<sup>526</sup> The direction of this strife is the victory of the new man and the

---

<sup>516</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 241.

<sup>517</sup> J. S. Rhee, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

<sup>518</sup> *Römer 2*, 181-182.

<sup>519</sup> K. Barth, „Rechtfertigung und Heiligung“ (1927), *ZdZ* 5: 281-309. Hereafter, it will be written as *RH*.

<sup>520</sup> *RH*, 300-301.

<sup>521</sup> *RH*, 305.

<sup>522</sup> *CD IV/1*, 722-724.

<sup>523</sup> *CD IV/1*, 769f.

<sup>524</sup> *CD IV/1*, 774.

<sup>525</sup> *CD IV/2*, 570.

<sup>526</sup> *CD IV/2*, 574. Barth criticized Calvin for his biased stress of the *mortificatio* of the old man rather than *vivicatio* of the new man. Barth viewed this as a weak point of the doctrine of sanctification of the Reformed tradition because this direction is apt to result in defeatism of the possibility of sanctification due to its stress on the corrupt nature of humans. However, this critique contrasts with the opinion of Ronald S. Wallace, who



destruction of all ignorance by knowledge in the community. This is the history of genuine triumph.<sup>527</sup>

Jesse Couenhoven insists that Barth is closer to Luther than Calvin “in understanding Christian life more as continual return to the Gospel promise than as a journey of growth in holiness.”<sup>528</sup> His insistence seems legitimate given that Barth emphasised sanctification once and for all accomplished in Christ rather than the practical progress of sanctification.

To sum up, Barth first presented definitiveness and immediacy and later gradualness. Instantaneousness was ascribed to the initial awakening in our subjective sanctification,<sup>529</sup> and definitiveness to objective sanctification achieved in Christ and continuity to our subjective sanctification in the Holy Spirit.

#### 4.2.5.4 Perfection and Imperfection

##### 4.2.5.4.1 The Definitive Perfection of Sanctification

Barth emphasised the completion of our sanctification by Christ. We can know that we are the saints already sanctified in Christ<sup>530</sup> through the fact that the Bible calls us saints.

The perfection of our sanctification relates to Christ’s sacrifice.<sup>531</sup> Those who were alienated by wicked works were reconciled through Christ’s death. In Heb 13:12. Jesus suffered so that he might sanctify the people with his own blood. We are once and for all (ἐφάπαξ) sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ (Heb10:10).<sup>532</sup> By one offering he has perfected for ever (εἰς τὸ διηνεκές) them who are sanctified (Heb 10:14). According to v.5 the replacement of the first (the sacrifices and offerings of men) by the second (His own doing of the will of God) was accomplished by Jesus already εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον. It happened at a particular time. When we were still weak, sinners (v.8), even God’s enemies (v. 10), Christ died once for our sins in order to bring us

---

held that Calvin’s “theology is as much a theology of the resurrection as it is of the cross” [Ronald S. Wallace, *Calvin, Geneva, and the Reformation* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1988), p.215]. I think Wallace’s opinion seems right given that Calvin contended both mortification and vivification in his *Institutes* 3.3.3, 5, 8 and Calvin’s commentary on Psalms 9:2, 10:17; 17:15; 16:7; 22:1; 21:6, but Barth’s viewpoint is more reasonable given that mortification consists of three chapters; 3.3 - repentance, 3.7 - self denial, and 3.8 - bearing the cross, while vivification partly appears in 3.3.3, 5 and 3.3.8 (Mortification and Vivification). Indeed, Calvin asserted that our present life is more analogous to being buried with Christ than to being risen with Him (Comm. on Phil. 3:21).

<sup>527</sup> CD IV/3, 2, 210-211.

<sup>528</sup> Jesse Couenhoven, “Grace as Pardon and Power: Pictures of the Christian Life in Luther, Calvin, and Barth,” *Journal of Religious Ethics*, Vol. 28, no. 1 (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2000), pp.65-66.

<sup>529</sup> CD IV/2, 557.

<sup>530</sup> CD IV/2, 516.

<sup>531</sup> KD IV/2, 585

<sup>532</sup> CD IV/1, 224.

to God (I Pet.3:18).<sup>533</sup> It is “the true and perfect sacrifice,” by which we are sanctified.<sup>534</sup> Hence, it is “too late” to attempt to do something for our sanctification as if it is “too late” to try to create heaven and earth. Barth stressed that we cannot make any preceding or consequent contribution for our sanctification.<sup>535</sup>

This statement is repeated in his exegesis of Gal 1:4, “the man of sin, the first Adam... ‘the present evil of world’ was taken and killed and buried with Him on the cross.”<sup>536</sup> Barth expounded definitive sanctification in many passages (Heb 9:14; 2:14; Rom 6:6; 6:10).<sup>537</sup> Barth explicated the day of the divine judgment as the birthday of a new man. It means the decisive and once and for all change from the old man to the new man who obeys to God’s will as a faithful partner in covenant with God.<sup>538</sup> It is definite positional sanctification.<sup>539</sup>

For Barth, God has already done all for us, including sanctification. We only have to accept it in faith. Is this then not the same as justification due to Christ’s atonement? Barth held that human sanctification is “a form of the atonement, of the conversion of man to God accomplished and revealed in Jesus Christ.”<sup>540</sup> Adding my exposition to it, Christ’s atonement can be connected with sanctification in the sense that it is the removal of both guilt and the sinful old man in union with Christ. Also, Christ’s perfect obedience<sup>541</sup> as His sanctification prepared His perfect sacrifice. If His obedient life had not been perfect, His sacrifice could not have been perfect. In this respect, his once and for all sacrifice accomplished the perfection of our atonement and sanctification. It could be classified as the objective aspect of sanctification.

#### 4.2.5.4.2 The Imperfection of Sanctification

Barth expounded the imperfection of sanctification in relation to the imperfection of salvation in this world.<sup>542</sup> Although we were indeed saved, we expect hope for our sonship, groaning in ourselves. We are the children of God now and it has not yet been manifested

---

<sup>533</sup> *CD IV/1*, 224.

<sup>534</sup> *CD IV/1*, 282.

<sup>535</sup> *CD IV/2*, 516-517.

<sup>536</sup> *CD IV/1*, 254.

<sup>537</sup> *CD IV/1*, 255-256.

<sup>538</sup> *CD IV/1*, 281, 298.

<sup>539</sup> *CD IV/2*, 365. Also for the comparison between Barth’s view with the definitive sanctification of John Murray, see John Murray, “Definitive Sanctification,” *Collected Writings of John Murray* Vol.2 (Edinburgh: Banner Truth Trust, 1977), pp.277-304. It was published in *Calvin Theological Journal*, Vol. 2, no. 1 (April 1967):5-21. Barth’s definitive viewpoint on sanctification was written in 1953 and translated in 1956.

<sup>540</sup> *CD IV/1*, 101.

<sup>541</sup> Barth explicated that Christ “learned obedience by the things which he suffered” (Heb. 5:8) and His perfect sacrifice fulfilled the will of God in place of and for us. *CD IV/1*, 282.

<sup>542</sup> *GC*, p. 77.

what we shall be (I Jn 3:1). Christians should wait and persevere until the Lord comes to us for the future redemption.<sup>543</sup> This implies that Christian temporal sanctification is incomplete in this world though it is already completed in Jesus' exaltation. In this world, our sanctification is unfinished work.<sup>544</sup> Because the reality of God's children has not appeared, we wait for the time, purifying ourselves after His purity (Cf. 1Jn 3:2-3). When "the veil of partition" is removed and the temporal order ends, "our final reality" of fulfilled redemption will come.<sup>545</sup> In that hope we believe, obey, and persevere. The hope is the root and end of our sanctification. Our sanctification is "a life lived in hope" of future redemption,<sup>546</sup> a life of conscience, gratitude and prayer. It is a life-long process "auf dem Wege."<sup>547</sup>

The imperfection and obscurity of our obedience inevitably set the limits of our sanctification. Barth criticized Wesleyan perfectionism for not accepting any distinction between me and Christ. Barth saw man's obedience as imperfect and possibly deceptive, even with respect to intention. As a Christian, "I still find in myself my pride and fall." In this respect, Barth regarded it as nonsense that by my unity with Christ, "sin and death in me" do not any longer rule over me,<sup>548</sup> for sin was overcome in Christ, but not in me. Nonetheless, Barth admitted the difference of the level in sanctification between each individual man<sup>549</sup> according to his maturity.<sup>550</sup>

In *Church Dogmatics* IV/3, 1, he described the imperfection of sanctification in view of vocation. God liberates our beings to be Christians by His vocation.<sup>551</sup> In any event, sanctification as liberation has just commenced, but is "not in any sense complete."<sup>552</sup> Christian life is a life in transition from a dark past to a bright future. The alteration took place clearly and definitely, but has not yet been accomplished. It is in the process of accomplishment. In the process, we wait in anticipation for the final form of what God has done and revealed in Jesus Christ, i.e., the liberation of all men.<sup>553</sup>

#### 4.2.5.4.3 Summary

To sum up, our objective sanctification was perfectly accomplished in Christ, but our

---

<sup>543</sup> *RH*, p. 309

<sup>544</sup> *RH*, p. 308.

<sup>545</sup> *GC*, p. 76.

<sup>546</sup> *RH*, p. 380.

<sup>547</sup> *RH*, p. 301.

<sup>548</sup> *CD* IV/1, 771.

<sup>549</sup> *RH*, p. 301.

<sup>550</sup> *RH*, p. 302.

<sup>551</sup> *CD* IV/3,2, 650.

<sup>552</sup> *CD* IV/3,2, 673.

<sup>553</sup> *CD* IV/3,2, 674-675.

subjective sanctification is imperfect in this world. It progresses in our experience of participation in Christ's holiness and its perfect reality shall be revealed in future.

## 4.2.6 The Modes of Sanctification

### 4.2.6.1 The Call to Discipleship and Self-Denial

"The Call to Discipleship" is the kernel of Barth's doctrine of *de facto* sanctification in the sense that it produces saints and disciples. The resurrected Jesus calls man to discipleship by His word in His Spirit to be His witness, which is predestined in Christ from eternity. Barth depicted this call as the grace which commands, for God's command gives man the power and freedom to obey it. Accordingly, the call does not require any preparation or any qualification or any presupposition. Jesus calls them as those who already belong to Him in His election.<sup>554</sup> The call to discipleship binds a man to the One who summons him, not to "an idea of Christ, or a Christology."<sup>555</sup>

Barth explicated the concrete forms of discipleship through the New Testament. *First*, the disciple must be free from attachment to property. It attests that "the kingdom of mammon is broken by the coming of the kingdom of God."<sup>556</sup> *Secondly*, discipleship brings freedom from "the universal dominion and constraint of ordinary conception" of social status and the view of values. Christ identified Himself with the ignored, secluded, and detested—the weak, poor, lowly.<sup>557</sup> The kingdom brings transvaluation of all values. *Thirdly*, discipleship asks us to end "the fixed idea of the necessity and beneficial value of force." The Christian does not have to fear force nor exercise it. He loves his enemy as well as his friend. *Fourthly*, discipleship brings us freedom from our imprisonment in family relationships.<sup>558</sup> As our confinement in the family appears to be a cold war against all others, which should be broken by Christ's call. *Fifthly*, discipleship asks us the better way than Israelite religious piety because it stems from the imminent kingdom of God. Jesus presents His morality in the Sermon on the Mount.<sup>559</sup> *Finally*, the decisive mark of discipleship is to take up the cross. Here I will deal with self-denial because bearing the cross will be coped with 5.2.6.3 The Dignity of Cross.

The first reaction to the call to discipleship is to believe Jesus to be the Saviour and Lord and to obey His command. Faith is indissolubly connected to obedience. It is an act

---

<sup>554</sup> CD IV/2, 535.

<sup>555</sup> CD IV/2, 536.

<sup>556</sup> CD IV/2, 548.

<sup>557</sup> CD IV/2, 168.

<sup>558</sup> CD IV/2, 549-550.

<sup>559</sup> CD IV/2, 551m

of obedience which breaks with the past and turns to Jesus.<sup>560</sup> It means turning away from oneself, i.e., self-denial, which is the first step of discipleship. The principle of self-denial was elicited from the Bible. “Whosoever will follow me, let him deny himself” (Mk 8:34). It comprises “non-violent enemy-love” as a possibility only in participation in Christ’s crucifixion.<sup>561</sup>

Our ego prevents us from denying ourselves in many plausible ways. Thus Barth tried to discern between true self-denial and four forms of pretended self-denial. First, self-criticism is not self-denial, for it is rather another way to develop the self. Secondly, a mental denial is not a true denial, for it is just emotional and theoretical obedience not self-surrender, which is actual and true obedience as total commitment to Jesus.<sup>562</sup> Thirdly, self-interpretation is not self-denial, for it is a form as a pretended obedience to Jesus. Through one’s arbitrary interpretation of God’s command, man avoids obeying the divine command as it is, but takes only its spiritual meaning and useful sense for himself. Fourthly, self-subjection is not self-denial. It is a plausible form of self-denial to avoid self-surrender to Jesus, for self-subjection is to obey Jesus’ command rather than to Jesus, the Commander.<sup>563</sup>

Barth affirmed that simple obedience is true self-denial.<sup>564</sup> It is instant and unconditional. Our definite first step in self-denial is a part of the larger assault on the world of slothful men. Its ultimate goal is to be “witness of the great assault which is directed against the world in and with the coming of the kingdom.”<sup>565</sup> Our self-denial contributes to the advance of the kingdom of God, for it expands God’s rule over the world while it retrenches the kingdom of the world through the break with the worldly disposition. Christians have to witness the sanctification of Christ publicly and visibly through their sanctification, which is a reflection of Christ’s sanctification and our break with the world, because a silent participant in His Kingdom is quite useless as a witness.<sup>566</sup>

#### 4.2.6.2 The Awakening to Conversion

In Barth’s view, the subjectivity of sanctification consists of the call to discipleship and the awakening to conversion by the Holy Spirit. Conversion deals with the actual occurrence in which man makes use of the freedom given by God’s call to discipleship. If then, is this awakening from which state of human being to which state? One has to move from sloth to

---

<sup>560</sup> CD IV/2, 537-538.

<sup>561</sup> David Lauber, *Barth on the Descent into Hell: God, Atonement and the Christian Life* (Aldershot and Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Co., 1988, 2004), pp. 176-177.

<sup>562</sup> CD IV/2, 540.

<sup>563</sup> CD IV/2, 542.

<sup>564</sup> CD IV/2, 540.

<sup>565</sup> CD IV/2, 543.

<sup>566</sup> CD IV/2, 545-546.

be a Christian in fellowship with Christ.<sup>567</sup> Man as sinner moves relentlessly downward in sloth away from God and therefore departs from his reality as a creature of God. Although he must stop the movement, he cannot awaken himself. Accordingly, he needs a jolt, not from this world but only from God.<sup>568</sup> The jolt is the power of the Holy Spirit. This jolt lifts up man from the sloth of death to look to Christ and moves him from the life of the old man to the life of the new man. It is a matter of “*Halt*” and “*About Face*” and “*Forward March*.” This movement has an axis as its principle that God is for man and man is for God.<sup>569</sup>

Barth explicated awakening in relation to the human dimension and the divine dimension. The initiative of conversion belongs to the divine dimension in that it is in God while its occurrence is ascribed to the human dimension in that it takes place wholly and utterly on the earthly and creaturely level.<sup>570</sup> Man “cooperates in such a way that the whole is still an action which is specifically divine.”<sup>571</sup> Accordingly, we can say that conversion consists of the unity between God’s awakening and human awaking.<sup>572</sup>

Conversion comprises the whole human life. It involves the relationship to the brother. It expresses itself in society as “humility, gentleness, a readiness to serve, responsibility, and loyalty.”<sup>573</sup> This is an act to exalt and liberate his fellows “for the glory of God in the life of the new man.” As an example, Barth argues that the prophetic urge of Israel’s return to God entails the radical alteration of “the practical, cultic, economic and political conduct of Israel,” and the ruling of social relationships.<sup>574</sup>

Barth’s conversion is not identified with an act of penance as the Roma Catholic doctrine nor the single event as Wesley’s emphasis. Although the initial awakening takes place once and for all, God’s command of conversion is given over and over again.<sup>575</sup> In a strict sense it is not a single act in the past or a series of continuing moments. Rather, it is the complete freedom to start again and again. The Christian experiences his new being, which is created in Christ, every day.<sup>576</sup> Barth comprehended that conversion starts from regeneration, advances with repentance, and finishes with renovation. It is in process, not finished once and for all.<sup>577</sup> The Christian incessantly needs reawakening for continual

---

<sup>567</sup> CD IV/2, 553.

<sup>568</sup> CD IV/2, 555.

<sup>569</sup> CD IV/2, 560-561.

<sup>570</sup> CD IV/2, 556-557.

<sup>571</sup> CD IV/2, 557.

<sup>572</sup> CD IV/2, 558.

<sup>573</sup> CD IV/2, 563.

<sup>574</sup> CD IV/2, 564.

<sup>575</sup> CD IV/2, 557.

<sup>576</sup> CD IV/2, 409.

<sup>577</sup> CD IV/2, 560.



renovation.<sup>578</sup> Its continuity is not due to a substantial change in man, which is suggested by Jerome Hamer,<sup>579</sup> but rather entirely dependent upon the faithfulness of the covenant God.

Barth expounded conversion in relation to Calvin's concept of mortification and vivification. Mortification is not standing in terror before the Law, but the turning from the old man. Vivification is not only the comfort from the Gospel of forgiveness, but practising righteousness and mercy.<sup>580</sup> These two movements are generated by the confrontation with the Holy Spirit. Man is still wholly the old man and already wholly the new man.<sup>581</sup> Barth criticizes Calvin and Kohlbrügge for stressing the *mortificatio* at the expense of *vivificatio*.<sup>582</sup> They emphasised "halt" rather than "advance." In contrast, Barth accents *vivificatio* as "the meaning and end of *mortificatio*" in sanctification.<sup>583</sup> The completion of this movement awaits the eschatological event.

#### 4.2.6.3 The Dignity of the Cross<sup>584</sup>

For Barth, as our subjective sanctification is to participate in the sanctification of Christ, our partaking in His cross is inevitable for our sanctification. Jesus bore His cross in order that we might be justified and sanctified. His cross is integral to the total sanctification of humankind and our cross is indispensable to our subjective sanctification as *Lebensbewegung*. Accordingly, to reject our cross is to disconnect us from the movement of subjective sanctification.<sup>585</sup> His vocation is calling to participate in His cross.<sup>586</sup>

The cross comprises suffering and glory, shame and dignity. God distinguished us from the world through our participation in the cross, which is the way to reject the world.<sup>587</sup> As glory is obtained through our participation in Christ's cross, our cross is honourable. The cross is regarded as one form of the fellowship between Christ and Christians, for it implies the one obedience of both Christ and us to One God. As God the Father dealt with His Son by the cross, He deals with us in the same way.<sup>588</sup> In the cross, we communicate with Christ.

---

<sup>578</sup> CD IV/2, 555, 567.

<sup>579</sup> Jerome Hamer, *Karl Barth*, trans. Dominic M. Maruca (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1962), pp. 94-95.

<sup>580</sup> CD IV/2, 574-575.

<sup>581</sup> CD IV/2, 572.

<sup>582</sup> CD IV/2, 575.

<sup>583</sup> CD IV/2, 577.

<sup>584</sup> Barth describes Christian affliction in § 71 The Vocation of Man, subsection 5 "The Christian in Affliction." In this thesis, this subject is dealt with at '4.2.6.4 Vocation and Sanctification' and at '4.2.10.3.3 'The Upholding of the Church.'

<sup>585</sup> CD IV/2, 602.

<sup>586</sup> CD IV/3. 2, 620f.

<sup>587</sup> CD IV/2, 605.

<sup>588</sup> CD IV/2, 607.

At all events, Jesus' cross is different from ours in the sense that His cross is to undertake substitute suffering for many by Himself alone. Our cross is seldom guiltless like His cross, nor contributive to our redemption like His. As the reward of the cross, His exaltation also is different from ours.<sup>589</sup> Our cross cannot be a reproduction of His redemptive crucifixion, even though it is to follow His cross and is sometimes for others. In this regard, Jesus' cross is linked with our cross not directly but indirectly.<sup>590</sup>

The cross is unavoidable for our sanctification, for God graciously predestined it for our life. It is a means of our sanctification in the following four ways. Firstly, it helps the Christian be humble. Without the cross as a limit for him, he is apt to be proud of himself.<sup>591</sup> Even a little pain can remind him of his "fragility and pettiness." The cross causes him to seek his salvation and his power to serve God outside himself. Secondly, the cross reminds him of the punishment of his sin. Jesus has borne the great punishment for humankind on His cross. We remember the fact whenever we see it. Our little cross also reminds us of the little punishment of our sin and corruption. It is the rod of God's love rather than His wrath.<sup>592</sup> It causes us to be grateful for His love and redemption and to convert to Him voluntarily. Thirdly, the cross disciplines the Christian and increases his faith, hope and love. Unless he experiences the cross, he misunderstands these virtues as his own impulsion. Such misunderstanding causes him to wander and maraud and plunder. So, through the cross, the Holy Spirit makes him see his idle and impious life. The cross reminds him of his limit and God's absoluteness. He accepts the direction of the Holy Spirit through it. Fourthly, the cross can be the evidence of whether any Christian is faithful or not.<sup>593</sup> If he continues to do good works despite the cross, it verifies his identity as a Christian. The cross purifies and sanctifies him through his endurance of suffering from it.

Barth elucidated the cross in three ways: persecution, suffering as creature, temptation. Firstly, the cross means persecution by the world, though it is a *rara avis* today. This persecution comes from the fact that Christian lifestyle is different from that of the world.<sup>594</sup> The Christian decision and act can meet with mistrust and repudiation, suspicion, scorn, and open indignation, though today is a time of tolerance. Such things isolate us and subject us to attack from our fellows. The Christians' lifestyle causes them to turn from the majority of their society.<sup>595</sup> Secondly, the cross includes such afflictions of creaturely life as misfortunes, accidents, sickness and age, parting from his loving persons, disruption and

---

<sup>589</sup> CD IV/2, 600.

<sup>590</sup> CD IV/2, 605.

<sup>591</sup> CD IV/2, 606-607.

<sup>592</sup> CD IV/2, 608.

<sup>593</sup> CD IV/2, 608-609.

<sup>594</sup> CD IV/2, 610.

<sup>595</sup> CD IV/2, 611.

hospitality of his human relationship, anxiety about his daily bread, and finally death.<sup>596</sup> Thirdly, the cross is the affliction of temptation of the flesh called the Law of sin. It comes to us regardless of age or maturity. Temptation may appear in the form of intellectual doubt of the truth of Christianity. Even a real Christian can be attacked by false theories. Some practical doubts may tempt him. Some Christians doubt the presence of and action of the Trinity. Others are too dry and empty to pray. Barth regarded it as the bitterest and sharpest form of the cross “that we will not do what we know is truth.”<sup>597</sup> Even Jesus Christ who is the Son of God had to ask: “Why have you forsaken me?” The fact that Jesus was also tempted by doubt comforts us when we cannot evade our cross in the form of doubt. As Jesus suffered from doubt like us, we can be convinced that we will not be forsaken through our doubt. Our cross is provisional, which ends with our death.

Barth concluded the discussion with two observations. First, the cross is not self-sought suffering, but participation in the passion of Jesus Christ. It is not any wish or action of our own like that of the ungodly, which does not have the comfort and promise of suffering with Jesus. We should pray that we may do not give our cross up nor refuse it, but accept it freely. Secondly, the *tolerantia crucis* is not an end in itself. That is, it is not ultimate, but provisional.<sup>598</sup> Our cross begins with our birth and ends with our death. It is not eternal. What is eternal is the crown of life. Therefore, we can bear our cross, waiting for God’s comfort.

As with Rhee’s estimation, we can say that Barth regarded the cross as the best means of sanctification given that Barth dealt with the cross as a distinct section of the sanctification of man.<sup>599</sup> Rhee contends that traditional dogmatics treats the means of sanctification as Scripture-reading, prayer, sacraments and the like. However, his contention is not applicable to Calvin, for Calvin referred extensively to cross-bearing in his Institutes of the Christian religion.<sup>600</sup> Briefly, to Barth, bearing the cross is an important mode for our subjective sanctification.

#### 4.2.7 The Means of Sanctification

Barth did not suggest the means of sanctification clearly. For Barth, sanctification is accomplished by God, not by human efforts. The means of sanctification is what the Holy Spirit uses for human sanctification. Because God uses them, their meaning as the means of sanctification used by man is mitigated.<sup>601</sup> God initially uses the means of sanctification and man responds to God’s initiative.

---

<sup>596</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>597</sup> *CD IV/2*, 612.

<sup>598</sup> *CD IV/2*, 613.

<sup>599</sup> Rhee, p. 210.

<sup>600</sup> *Ibid.; Institutes*, 3. 8. 1-10.

<sup>601</sup> K. Barth, “An Outing to the Bruderholz,” in *Fragments Grave and Gay* (London, 1971), p. 88.

## 4.2.7.1 The Word of God

### 4.2.7.1.1 The Bible and the Word of God

Barth saw the Word of God in three ways; first, the Bible as the recorded form of God's Word, secondly, the Word as the Logos which lives eternally, thirdly, preaching as the exclaimed Word. His distinction between Scripture and God's Word seems to result from his strategy to defend the Bible from the attack of liberalists and to emphasise the freedom of the living Word ruling over human beings. Nonetheless, his view of the Bible has been criticized by many conservative scholars.

Barth did not indicate that the Bible is a means for human sanctification because he disliked a human "manipulative approach to Scripture." He advised us to obey the command of the living God rather than to follow the biblical story. The Bible is mainly indirectly used for Christian moral life. The Word of God itself is the subject of sanctification rather than the means of sanctification. God's Word is God Himself who speaks His will to us. Accordingly, man must first meet the God who speaks to us in the Bible. After that, God directs him in the presence of His Spirit adequately to his concrete situation.<sup>602</sup> God's Word can not be the product of human thought, philosophy, or theology. As it is something directly given by God, it cannot be debated and can only be accepted in gratitude, faith, and obedience, or can be rejected by us.<sup>603</sup> It is entirely the office of the Holy Spirit to open our ears to enable us to know and receive the Creator's Word. The delivery of the Word of God transforms man and requires human decision, i.e. repentance and conversion.<sup>604</sup> In this sense, Barth can be said to regard the Word of God as a means of sanctification.

To Barth, the Bible is not an infallible book, for it was written by ordinary people with the words and world views of their times, though it was inspired by the Holy Spirit. Hence, Barth suggested that the application of the Bible needs serious consideration of the passages of the Bible and rational assessment of our context. The interpretation of the passages of the Bible on any special topic needs our theological work. For example, when Barth reads of homosexuality, he deals with it in terms of theological anthropology rather than direct moral rules in the Bible. The result is seen in his exposition on Gen 1:27, 1 Cor 11:11, and Rom 1:25-27. In Barth's view, "Christian ethics should not proceed by using the Bible arbitrarily" but "develop under the direct control of dogmatics." The Bible is not a "supernatural register which provides direct moral guidance" like "a box of magic cards,"<sup>605</sup> or the source book of moral rules.<sup>606</sup> Neither the Decalogue nor the Sermon on

---

<sup>602</sup> *GC*, 22.

<sup>603</sup> B. Ramm, *op.cit.*, p.163.

<sup>604</sup> *GC*, 45.

<sup>605</sup> *CD* II/2, 794.

the Mount could be taken as fundamental moral codes.<sup>607</sup> The Bible has the character as the book that included the witness to the Word of God or the divine revelation rather than a moral principle.<sup>608</sup>

Granting that the Bible must be carefully read and properly interpreted to apply it to our situation, Barth's view of the fallacy of the Bible is not compatible with fundamental Reformed theology.<sup>609</sup> Furthermore, his denial of the Decalogue as a moral code seems to imply the negation of the third use of the Law.

#### 4.2.7.1.2 The Command of God

Barth saw the command of God as the starting point of theological ethics.<sup>610</sup> The command of God is the subject and means of sanctification, for it is the sanctifying command (*das heiligende Gebot*).<sup>611</sup> God's command is a gracious command in the sense that His command is only given to those who received His grace.<sup>612</sup> God's grace means that God has given us Himself in Jesus Christ.<sup>613</sup> God's command presupposes our freedom to obey His command. This freedom is given by God Himself in the presence of the Holy Spirit. He awakens our freedom by His direction of our position which is set in Jesus Christ.

The command of God is expressed in terms; "claim," "decision," and "judgment." First,

---

<sup>606</sup> *Ibid.*, p.675.

<sup>607</sup> CD IV/2, 679-700. cf. Hunsinger states the difference between Karl Barth's opinion and Dietrich Bonhoeffer's opinion of Christian action against injustice concretely and interestingly. He concludes that Bonhoeffer was seeking a basis on which the church could proclaim concrete commands, but he could find no such basis in Barth. Hunsinger suggests that though Barth has such a theological basis, it must be made more precise and explicit (pp.190-191). G. Hunsinger, "Karl Barth and radical politics: some further consideration," *Science Religieuses/ Studies in Religion*, Vol. 7, no.2 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978), pp. 167-191. Comparing Barth's Christian Ethics with Niebuhr's, Bettis sides with Barth. Joseph Bettish, "Theology and Politics: Karl Barth and Reinhold Niebuhr on Social Ethics after Liberalism," *Religion in Life* 48 (1979): 53-62. Williams also supports Barth's view, pointing out Niebuhr's fallacy. Williams argues that Barth did not suggest any legalistic and pharisaic casuistry or code, for he regarded God's command as direct and immediate as well as specific and concrete in each situation. See Ernest Claude Williams, "A Critical Appraisal of the Grenzfall in Karl Barth's Ethics," Ph. D. thesis, The University of South Africa, 1981, pp.124-32. In contrast to Williams, Stanley Hauerwas points out that in Barth's theology, "God's demand on man is certainly not to be construed as general principles that give direction to the Christian life" and Barth's account of God's direction is ambiguous. Stanley Hauerwas, *Character and the Christian Life: A Study in Theological Ethics with a new introduction by the author* (San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1985), p.141. In my opinion, a general moral principle is necessary for Christians to act consistently, granting that the Spirit directs man individually according to his particular situation (CD II/2, 662; III/4, 17). In this respect, Barth's view of the Decalogue seems to be rather impertinent.

<sup>608</sup> B. Ramm, *op. cit.*, p.47.

<sup>609</sup> For more detail of Barth's view of the Bible, see Ramm, *op. cit.*, pp. 97-100; also CD I/2, 499-509.

<sup>610</sup> KD II/2, 519.

<sup>611</sup> KD II/2, 548.

<sup>612</sup> KD II/2, 511.

<sup>613</sup> KD II/2, 548.

God's command as claim aims at our restoration in the image of God, which is in conformity to the act of God.<sup>614</sup> God's command imposes on us a duty without legalism, and confers permission without wanton on us.<sup>615</sup> Secondly, the command as God's decision is definite, clear, and unconditional in a human, concrete situation.<sup>616</sup> The goodness of these particular commandments unites those who accept the commandments and makes them into instruments to harmonize with one another.<sup>617</sup> It sanctifies our human relationship. Thirdly, the command as God's judgment is dealt with as the presupposition, practice, and end of God's judgment. Presupposition is God's wish to own man as his partner. Practice is to make us righteous by His judgment of Christ. Purpose is to detach us from judgment.<sup>618</sup> God's command as judgment is totally for our sanctification.<sup>619</sup>

On the other hand, as Russel W. Palmer aptly puts it, Barth described God's command as a spiritual, ethical, and personal event.<sup>620</sup> His command is a spiritual event because it immediately acts on us in the presence and work of the Holy Spirit. It is an ethical event because it shapes "totally the context in which ethical decision is required."<sup>621</sup> It is a personal event because the immediacy of what God asks requires our instantaneous, personal obedience to it.<sup>622</sup>

God's command is not identified with the passages of the Bible. To discern His command needs proper interpretation of the Bible. Without this interpretation "both dogmatically and ethically the Bible cannot help us in discerning" the command of the Holy Spirit.<sup>623</sup> In this manner, Barth emphasised the importance of theological work in the

---

<sup>614</sup> CD II/2, 566f, 575.

<sup>615</sup> CD II/2, 602-603.

<sup>616</sup> Cf. Ernest Claude Williams elucidates Barth's view of Christian determination in relation to the intuitive element and rational element of God's command. He argues that Barth keeps the tension between intuitionism of God's command and the preparation and rationality of human obedience [Ernest Claude Williams, "A Critical Appraisal of the Grenzfall in Karl Barth's Ethics," Ph. D. thesis, The University of South Africa, 1981, p.112-140]. Conversely, Robert E. Willis contends that the relation between the immediacy of God's command and rational deliberation is not fully consistent and remains finally unclear in Barth's theology, given that at some points, Barth suggested "a rather clear affinity between rational assessment and the command," while at other times, he precluded "the possibility of rational deliberation." [Robert E. Willis, *The Ethics of Karl Barth* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971), pp.440- 441]. In my view, this issue seems to be solved if we admit that the command of the Spirit decides according to each situation whether we rationally deliberate on an event or immediately act.

<sup>617</sup> CD II/2, 717, 726-728.

<sup>618</sup> CD II/2, 764f.

<sup>619</sup> CD II/2, 772.

<sup>620</sup> Russell W. Palmer, "Methodological Weakness in Barth's Approach to Ethics," *The Journal of Religious Thought*, Vol. 26, no. 1 (1969): 70.

<sup>621</sup> CD III/4, 15f, 19f, 24f.

<sup>622</sup> CD II/2, 609.

<sup>623</sup> Nigel Biggar, *The Hastening that Waits: Karl Barth's Ethics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 165.



application of the Bible to our life, and kept the dynamics of God's command in the Spirit, avoiding the arbitrary and literal use of the Bible.

To sum up, for Barth, God's command can be said to be a subject and means of sanctification. The claim that God's command is a subject of sanctification is his contribution to theology.

#### 4.2.7.1.3 Preaching and Dogmatics

Barth maintained that the statement that the Bible becomes God's Word for us is a more precise understanding than that which argues the Bible is the Word of God.<sup>624</sup> For Barth, preaching is closer to the Word of God than the Bible, which is an important cause of the critique raised by other conservative scholars. Barth defined it as that a man who is called to this task speaks the Word of God to his fellow men in God's name by means of a passage from the Bible. The preacher has to announce it after he hears what God wants to say to the Church. Barth saw preaching as based not on human experience, but on faith to point to divine truth in preaching.<sup>625</sup> Preaching is the exercise of sovereign power on the part of God and obedience on the part of man.<sup>626</sup> Preaching must faithfully adhere to doctrine, which is the confession of our faith.<sup>627</sup> Preaching is a human act sanctified by God because it is done by God's command.<sup>628</sup>

In preaching for Christian sanctification, the preacher must make the effort and struggle to deliver the word aright with all humility, enthusiasm and sincerity, even though he knows well that in fact, only the Holy Spirit can teach honourably.<sup>629</sup> To hear and exclaim God's Word needs prayer, for it is possible only by the help of Holy Spirit.<sup>630</sup> The church should not forget that true preaching is taught from the Holy Spirit, and theological training is subordinated to him.<sup>631</sup> At the same time, Barth censured the fanatics' arrogant attitude in behaving as if they can preach the Word of God with only the Spirit's help without any theological training. Briefly, preaching exclaimed in the presence of the Holy Spirit is God's Word to gather sinners and get them to repent. Hence preaching is an important means to sanctify man.

Dogmatics plays the role of investigating the content and interpretation of the Bible

---

<sup>624</sup> K. Barth, *Prayer and Preaching*. Tr. by Sara F. Terrien (Guildford and London: SCM Press Ltd, 1964), p. 92. Hereafter it is written as *PP*.

<sup>625</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>626</sup> *PP*, 70.

<sup>627</sup> *PP*, 80.

<sup>628</sup> *PP*, 88.

<sup>629</sup> *PP*, 83.

<sup>630</sup> *CD I/I*, 80.

<sup>631</sup> *PP*, 83-84.

before it is used for preaching.<sup>632</sup> It lies between Biblical theology and Practical theology and needs the gift of the Holy Spirit.<sup>633</sup> Dogmatics pursues pure doctrines and teachings from the Bible. It is inseparable from philosophical ethics because the Bible directs our actions for God and neighbours.<sup>634</sup> Dogmatics should be biblical, confessional, and ecclesiastical in order to help man to hear God's voice for today. It makes clear the content of God's Word and states it properly for teaching.<sup>635</sup> In this way, dogmatics purifies and clarifies the teaching of the church for the sanctification of man. It is the role of dogmatics for sanctification. This view can be an answer to 2.1.2.5 Syncretistic Sanctification and will be reflected in 6.2.3.4 Purification from Syncretism.

#### 4.2.7.1.4 Gospel and Law

Unlike Luther who sharply distinguished between the Law and the Gospel,<sup>636</sup> Barth understood the relationship between the Gospel and the Law as interated.<sup>637</sup> He also rebuked Calvinism for the assertion that it is possible to proclaim the Gospel without hearing the Law, on the basis of the passage that "Thou shall fear and love God."<sup>638</sup> He stressed that the Old Testament should be interpreted by the New Testament and the former is not identified with the Law and the latter with the Gospel.<sup>639</sup>

In Barth's view, it is impossible to divide the Gospel from the Law. The latter is always in the former. The Law as imperative is counterpart to the Gospel as indicative. The former is the outer side, i.e., the form of grace and the latter is the inner side, the content of grace.<sup>640</sup> In this respect, he stood by Luther's line which emphasises the need to exclaim both Gospel and Law at one sermon, rather than Calvin's. He maintained that if any man thinks that Christian morality results from the Law of sin and death, he is continually at fault.<sup>641</sup> God's grace liberated us from the Law of sin and death and anointed us with the Holy Spirit. Now the Law of the Holy Spirit of life as the Law of freedom took the place of the Law of sin and death.<sup>642</sup> The Christian is not any longer under a schoolmaster. He is a free child of God.

---

<sup>632</sup> *CD I/1*, 766.

<sup>633</sup> *CD I/1*, 768.

<sup>634</sup> *CD I/1*, 792f.

<sup>635</sup> *CD I/1*, 851-853.

<sup>636</sup> For the relationship between Gospel and Law, see *GG*, 4-8.

<sup>637</sup> K. Barth, *Prayer and Preaching*. Tr. by Sara F. Terrien (Guildford and London: SCM Press Ltd, 1964), p.

69. Hereafter it is written *PP*.

<sup>638</sup> *PP*, 71. "How is it possible to proclaim the Gospel without also hearing the Law which says: 'Thou shalt fear and love God'? This error is particularly astonishing in Calvinism".

<sup>639</sup> *CD I/2*, 481.

<sup>640</sup> *CD II/2*, 567.

<sup>641</sup> *PP*, 83.

<sup>642</sup> *CD II/2*, 591.

Robert E. Willis maintains that for Barth, “the imperative of the Law does not impose alien restrictions or demands on man, but directs him towards the action that will most appropriately embody his status under grace.”<sup>643</sup> In other words, God’s command orders us to be free.<sup>644</sup> God is for us, and therefore nobody and nothing can be against us.<sup>645</sup> It is ‘the Law of liberty’ as James says (James 2:12) and ‘the Law of the Holy Spirit’ (Rom 8:2).<sup>646</sup> This Law also has the element of command. This Law is the Lord Himself because the Lord is our Lord who orders us. Christ orders us to “be” in Christ without anxiety and fear. This being in Christ as “standing,” “abiding” in Him is an invitation and permission as a command.<sup>647</sup> It demands obedience to a law for those who are set in it. The Christian should be the active witnesses of the realization of the law. The Law as an ordinary rule of life comprises “humility and love and selflessness, the confession” and “the loyalty and perseverance of faith, the joyousness of hope,” which are “a fulfilment of the injunction to let their light shine.”<sup>648</sup>

According to Tiefel Hans Otto, flaws akin to error in Luther are found in Barth’s dealing with the Law’s use and application in a particular situation.<sup>649</sup> Luther accentuated the theological use of the Law and the free guide of the Holy Spirit according to the principle of love for Christian life. Barth’s view is similar to Luther’s in the sense that there are no concrete and fixed principles and rules to apply to our specific situation in his theology.<sup>650</sup> The distinction between them is that Barth did not recognize that the theological use of the Law, i.e., its condemning function still lives in the Christian,<sup>651</sup> while Luther accentuated the theological use of the Law.

Briefly, Barth subordinated the third use of the Law to the direct command of the Spirit. This is apt to weaken human active use of the Law as a means of sanctification. His view seems to have resulted from his attempt to prevent liberal theologians from appropriating the Bible so as to hear what they want to hear. Notwithstanding, his emphasis on the direct guidance of the Spirit can be valid in terms of Christian life in the presence of the living God.

---

<sup>643</sup> Robert E. Willis, *The Ethics of Karl Barth* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971), p.441.

<sup>644</sup> *CD II/2*, 593.

<sup>645</sup> *CD II/2*, 600.

<sup>646</sup> *CD II/2*, 589.

<sup>647</sup> *CD II/2*, 600-601.

<sup>648</sup> *CD II/2*, 601.

<sup>649</sup> T. H. Otto, *The Ethics of Gospel and Law: Aspects of the Barth-Luther Debate* (Ph.D. thesis, Yale University, Ann Arbor:UMI, 1968), p. 139.

<sup>650</sup> Cf. Nigel Biggar, *The Hastening that Waits: Karl Barth’s Ethics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 163; Stanley Hauerwas, *Character and The Christian Life: A Study in Theological Ethics with a new introduction by the author* (San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1985), p.141.

<sup>651</sup> *CD II/2*, 591.

#### 4.2.7.2 The Sacraments

In the *Church Dogmatics* II/1(1940), he considered the first sacrament as the incarnation of the Son of God,<sup>652</sup> which is “the foundation of everything that God instituted and used in His revelation.” While baptism is regarded as the starting point of the Christian life, the Lord’s Supper is considered as the sign of the future that we all await.<sup>653</sup> Barth regarded Baptism as the foundation of Christian Life and the Lord’s Supper as ‘The Renewal of Christian Life’. The Lord’s Supper is the thanksgiving which responds to the presence of Jesus Christ in his self-sacrifice.<sup>654</sup> It is called the action of actions and typifies the unity of Christ with the community.<sup>655</sup>

In his exegesis of the *Epistle to the Romans*, Barth viewed baptism as a sacrament, as a form of the Word of God, as a means of grace.<sup>656</sup> In the *Göttingen Dogmatics* (1924-25), he connected baptism with Christian vocation and the Lord’s Supper with the perseverance of the saints.<sup>657</sup> His *Teaching of the Church regarding Baptism* (1947) presented baptism as the witness both to all of God’s action in the death and resurrection of Christ and to “the praise of God which breaks from the lips of the forgiven sinner.”<sup>658</sup> Barth’s stress on human free and responsible response made him reject infant baptism on the grounds that infants could not have the freedom of responsible obedience and conversion. He thought that infant baptism is lacking in the biblical support.<sup>659</sup>

In 1963 Barth regarded “baptism not as a ‘means’ of grace and salvation, not as a ‘sacrament’ but as an act, a confession, a prayer of faith, or of the obedience of faith.”<sup>660</sup> As baptism and the Lord’s Supper are God’s gifts and promises, we can only freely receive and practise them with gratitude but they are neither sacraments nor a means of grace.

---

<sup>652</sup> CD II/1,53f.

<sup>653</sup> CD IV/4., ix.

<sup>654</sup> CD IV/2, 658.

<sup>655</sup> CD IV/3, 761.

<sup>656</sup> Karl Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans 6<sup>th</sup>*, tr. Edwyn C. Hoskyns (London & Oxford & New York, 1968), p.192. “But baptism is a sacrament of truth and holiness...it is...not merely the Christian “myth” but-the Word of God. Baptism mediates the new creation: it is not itself grace, but from first to last a means of grace.”

<sup>657</sup> Karl Barth, “Unterricht in der christlichen Religion,” Vol.3 (unpublished typescript), pp. 187-254, tr. Daniel Migliore, *The Göttingen Dogmatics*, Vol.1 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1991), pp.xv-lxii.

<sup>658</sup> Karl Barth, *The Teaching of the Church regarding Baptism* (London: SCM Press, 1948), p.14.

<sup>659</sup> *Ibid.*, p.41; CL, 165. For further study, see CL, 179-195. Daniel Migliore criticizes Barth’s rejection of infant baptism from the Reformed viewpoint [Daniel Migliore, “Reforming the Theology and Practice of Baptism,” *Towards the Future of Reformed Theology: Tasks, Topics, Traditions*, ed. by David Willis & Michael Welker (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999) p.508].

<sup>660</sup> “Letter to H. Bizer 29 March 1963,” K, Barth, *Letters 1961-68* (Edinburgh, 1981), p. 96; CD IV/4. 128. Barth declares that baptism is not a sacrament but a true and genuine human action which responds to the divine act and word” (CD IV/4, 128). Also see CL, 46.

Barth's view is different from that of traditional Reformed theology.

Baptism in the Holy Spirit was considered as a bestowal on a man which is the hallmark of belonging to the Church, for his spiritual life starts not with his birth but with his baptism, which unites him with the Church that is Christ's body.<sup>661</sup> It is the gracious act of God by which his work in Jesus Christ becomes a new beginning for us, turning us to faithfulness towards God and to calling upon him."<sup>662</sup> Its meaning is the promise of taking part in the beginning of this unimaginable life of God.<sup>663</sup> Conversely, baptism in water was deemed the human action that man recognizes, accepts, and confesses God's salvation as an event for him. It is human recollection of God's salvation and human hope of God's promise which is revealed through the event. It is the action of man to commit himself to God and the free response and obedience of His calling to the salvation of the future and the event to be sent by God as a witness of His salvation. It is the confession of community and candidate that "the total renewal of man which has taken place in Jesus Christ is their own renewal, their own sanctification for God, not as their work but as His, not as a self-sanctification for God which they have undertaken, or are preparing to undertake but as the sanctification for God which has come to them, as to all men in Jesus Christ."<sup>664</sup> In this sense, baptism is concerned with 'the conversion of all who have a part in it'.<sup>665</sup>

To sum up, early Barth regarded baptism as a means of sanctification and a sacrament, but later Barth dismissed baptism and the Lord's Supper as sacraments. It is a serious fault because baptism and the Lord's Supper can not be neglected as sacraments and a means of grace, for the latter is a visible Word of God showing us His grace and the former is a sign which symbolizes our union with Christ in the Holy Spirit.

#### 4.2.7.3 Prayer<sup>666</sup>

Barth regarded prayer as God's gift which we should receive and obey with gratitude rather than a means of grace, because he did not admit any human effort or manipulation as a means to receive God's grace. In Barth's view, prayer is the obedience to God's

---

<sup>661</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>662</sup> Nigel Biggar, *The Hastening that Waits: Karl Barth's Ethics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 68.

<sup>663</sup> *PP*, 14.

<sup>664</sup> *CD IV/4*, 161.

<sup>665</sup> *CL*, 134.

<sup>666</sup> John Webster allots invocation and the first two petitions of the Lord's Prayer to section 76, 77, and 78 of the *Church Dogmatics* each, which is published under the title "The Christian Life," 1930. For further study of the Lord's Prayer, see John Webster, *Barth's Ethics of Reconciliation* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 175-213].

command to pray, not a rule to get His grace.<sup>667</sup> In this sense, such a concept as means is not adequate to Barth's theology.

The Heidelberg Catechism describes prayer as asking God to help us "when we are distressed by the imperfection of our obedience and the want of our faith."<sup>668</sup> Calvin argued that prayer cannot estrange us from other people but unites us to them, for it includes a matter concerning us all.<sup>669</sup> Barth elucidated prayer as a gracious gift of God more than our action. Prayer is not an act that comes naturally from us, but a grace from God and his word in Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit. Although we do something in prayer, the essence of prayer is God's gift, not our action because the response of our prayer depends only on God. The intercession of Christ united with us is the only reason that our prayer can be replied by God.<sup>670</sup> The prayer of Christ is the base of our prayer. God cannot fail to answer, for all our prayers are summed up in Jesus Christ. Hence prayer is God's gift in Christ before it is our action separated from Christ. As God's gift, the whole prayer is God's invitation for us to take part in the reign of God's life and kingdom in both this world and that world. Prayer is God's hope for us not to be alone. To pray is to stand before God in our own humanity whether or not we are together. All Christian prayer is based on the acknowledgment of God's name, will, and reign.<sup>671</sup>

On the other hand, Barth explicated prayer as "a simple act by which we accept and use the divine gift; an act in which we obey this command of the grace."<sup>672</sup> To obey grace means that prayer is also an act on the part of human beings. Prayer is our human action when we recognize our misery and make out that God's aid will come.<sup>673</sup> It is a decisive petition, which is the core of our prayer.<sup>674</sup> Prayer cannot be for us a means of creating something like a gift to God, but rather we are in the position of people who can only receive. It is not for cultivation of humility, but an expression of humility.<sup>675</sup> Prayer cannot be gossiping, mumbling, and using only lips, but must be an act of affection from the core of our heart.<sup>676</sup> God wants us to surrender ourselves to him before we produce our requests.<sup>677</sup> Barth did not say that we do not have to do anything because the Holy Spirit

---

<sup>667</sup> CD III/4, 3.

<sup>668</sup> K. Barth, *Prayer*, p.30.

<sup>669</sup> *Ibid.*, 32. For further study, see John Kelsay, "Prayer and Ethics: Reflection on Calvin and Barth," *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 82, no.2 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1989), pp.169-184. He sees Barth's justification of prayer as the Christian deontological obedience to God's command, while Calvin's justification of prayer as the teleological exercise of faith.

<sup>670</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 33-34.

<sup>671</sup> *Prayer*, pp.15-16.

<sup>672</sup> *Prayer*, p.38.

<sup>673</sup> *Ibid.*, p.39.

<sup>674</sup> CD III/4, 102.

<sup>675</sup> CD III/4, 97.

<sup>676</sup> *Prayer*, p.38.

<sup>677</sup> *Ibid.*, p.40.



will pray for us. Conversely, we must pray in our freedom. Prayer has the facets of both grace and freedom: we pray, but God replies to our prayer. Our freedom is not compressed by the freedom of God. Prayer can be said to be a human act, for our mind and heart are awake during our prayer, allowing the Holy Spirit to act for us.<sup>678</sup> It is free human obedience to God's gracious command to pray.

Briefly, for Barth, prayer is a gracious gift and a command and human act to receive God's gift and to obey His command rather than a means of sanctification.

#### 4.2.7.4 The Communion in Covenant Community

Otterness argued that while Barth emphasised the role of Christ in sanctification, he did not underscore the role of the Holy Spirit. Thus Otterness suggested that the Holy Spirit creates the covenant community and sanctifies Christians by their reciprocal communion, i.e., giving and receiving of God's forgiveness. He asserted that the role of church members should be accentuated as the concrete dynamic power of the Spirit as well as Christ's role for sanctification.<sup>679</sup> Although his critique and substitution have some value, they are not completely right, for Barth admitted not only the peculiar role of Christ in sanctification, but also the role of our neighbours as the instrument of sanctification. The expression of the divine command, "the direction of our neighbour," which is described as "education, right (the law), and custom,"<sup>680</sup> can be "the instrument of our sanctification" as long as we know its limits and humbly admit it.<sup>681</sup>

Barth also recognised the individual role for sanctification of community in his *Church Dogmatics*. "The community is edified and upbuilt through the reciprocal ministry of its individuals."<sup>682</sup> Each Christian is appointed to accompany the other as "a witness of the divine covenant," the election of God, and the grace and mercy of God which are addressed to them. That is the law of the common life of God's people.<sup>683</sup> Through this law of love for the community, all the members of God's people "serve and help and uphold and comfort and admonish" one another by the power of the Holy Spirit.<sup>684</sup> By those actions, they are used as instruments in the sanctification of one another, i.e., the sanctification of the Christian community. This witness is genuine and useful,

---

<sup>678</sup> *Ibid.*, p.41.

<sup>679</sup> Omar G. Otterness, *op. cit.*, pp.232-233.

<sup>680</sup> *Ethics*, p. 363.

<sup>681</sup> A teacher is "the instrument of his (student's) sanctification" (*Ethics*, p.374). "...the neighbour who can be the bearer of it (true right)...can have the task being the instrument of our sanctification..." (p.384). "...society with its custom can have a task, beyond that of education and right, in the service of the sanctification of men." (p.399).

<sup>682</sup> *CD IV/2*, 627.

<sup>683</sup> *CD IV/2*, 814.

<sup>684</sup> *CD IV/2*, 815, 816.

notwithstanding all its fragility. As in the primacy, the first commandment to “love your God” is always before the second commandment to “love your neighbour,” the men who are loved by God and love Him in return enjoy and use the freedom to love one another.<sup>685</sup>

In his interpretation of Act 9:10-22 and 22:12-16, Barth emphasised that Ananias is used by Jesus as an instrument to tell His will to Saul. This means that the Christian community plays its role as the means of the conversion of Saul by Jesus Himself. The community can be said to be an important means of Jesus Christ for the sanctification of the elect.<sup>686</sup>

## 4.2.8 The Relation with Other Doctrines

### 4.2.8.1 Justification and sanctification

For Barth, the events of salvation are regarded as happening simultaneously. He did not accept the *ordo salutis* as a temporal sequence. Justification and sanctification are only different aspects of the *simul* of the one reconciliation event.<sup>687</sup> Justification which is the objective reality of reconciliation becomes visible in its subjective reality of sanctification.<sup>688</sup> The human response to the one event of reconciliation is faith and obedience.<sup>689</sup> Faith is connected to justification and obedience is related to sanctification. Christologically speaking, Barth founded sanctification on the humanity of Jesus as the Son of Man and his exaltation, and founded justification on the divinity of Jesus as the Son of God and his humiliation.<sup>690</sup>

Barth criticized Roman Catholicism and Rudolf Bultmann for their tendency to merge justification into sanctification. For them justification is just the commencement of sanctification. Such a view depraves God’s gracious sovereignty, and incites man’s self-sanctification. On the contrary, “the young Luther and Zinzendorf and H. F. Kohlbrügge” has a tendency to amalgamate sanctification with justification. In such a scheme, sanctification is merely a rephrasing of justification.<sup>691</sup> It confines God’s grace only to the forgiveness of sin and prevents Christians from obeying God’s demand to lead a holy life. According to the Chalcedonian Christology, Barth asserted that justification and sanctification must be distinguished, but they cannot be divided or separated as with Christ’s humanity and divinity or his humiliation and exaltation. Justification cannot be

---

<sup>685</sup> CD IV/2, 818.

<sup>686</sup> CD IV/3,2, 206-207.

<sup>687</sup> CD, IV/2, 502.

<sup>688</sup> KD I/2, 358f.

<sup>689</sup> CD, IV/2, 503.

<sup>690</sup> CD, IV/2, 19.

<sup>691</sup> CD, IV/2, 504-505.

deduced from, incorporated into, replaced by sanctification and *vice versa*.<sup>692</sup>

At the very least, he did not deny the order of salvation completely. As there is a chronological order in the event of Jesus Christ, there is an executional order in salvation. Namely, God first turns to man and then does man to Him. God's turning towards man is justification and man's turning to God is sanctification. In order to avoid the misunderstanding of separation between justification and sanctification by chronological order, Barth preferred a new term, *Sachordnung* (order of substance).<sup>693</sup> In God's intentional order, sanctification is superior to justification, for it is the purpose of reconciliation. God's intention to save us is to make us holy people. In the structural order of reconciliation, justification is superior to sanctification.<sup>694</sup> He described justification as the *Grund* and the *Voraussetzung* (presupposition) of sanctification and the first momentum. Barth hence concluded that both are superior and inferior to each other according to the different standpoints from which we look.<sup>695</sup>

Justification is not without sanctification, given James's thesis that "faith is not without works." In other words, one's sanctification is the self-authentication of his justification, for action itself authenticates faith.<sup>696</sup> However, Barth's sanctification is fundamentally different from that of Roman Catholics or Liberals, which subtly promotes the idea of a works-righteousness and denies the influence of ultimate evil. Rather he confessed that we are unable to recognize and repent of our sin and that our repentance always falls short of God's standard.<sup>697</sup> His Word alone convicts us of sin, and His Spirit alone can make this Word become truth to us. If we acquire a relative sinlessness and righteousness in the sphere of our own inner and outer action, such action is really sin and unbelief, for it refuses to live by God's forgiving mercy.<sup>698</sup> Barth's opinion of sanctification is distinguishable from that of the Pietists that the forensic understanding of Christ's righteousness for us must be supplemented by the understanding of the Christ working in us and through us.<sup>699</sup> Barth asserted that our sacrifice or efforts can not have the meaning of the reconciliation between God and us.<sup>700</sup>

#### 4.2.8.2 Predestination, Election, and Sanctification

A. D. R. Polman does not doubt that Barth is the first theologian who wrote "with intense

---

<sup>692</sup> *CD*, IV/2, 503-505.

<sup>693</sup> *CD*, IV/2, 574, f.

<sup>694</sup> *CD*, IV/2, 508.

<sup>695</sup> *CD*, IV/2, 511.

<sup>696</sup> *HC*, 58.

<sup>697</sup> *HC*, 52.

<sup>698</sup> *GC*, 45.

<sup>699</sup> Dale Brown, *Understanding Pietism* (Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1979), p. 89.

<sup>700</sup> *CL*, 42.

interest and devotion” on election. Barth allotted “more than five-hundred pages to predestination in the *Church Dogmatics*.”<sup>701</sup> Von Balthasar considers Barth’s doctrine of election as the heart of his theology.<sup>702</sup> Bruce L. McCormack viewed it as “not only the first, last and central word,” but also the whole of his doctrine of reconciliation.<sup>703</sup> Barth’s doctrine of election is “the head of all other Christian dogmas.”<sup>704</sup> Hence it will be right to deal with election in relation to sanctification.

In terms of election and predestination, Barth interpreted sanctification in Jesus Christ. In 2 Thess 2:13, he emphasised God’s election for us from the beginning through His Spirit’s sanctification of us and our belief in truth.<sup>705</sup> On the basis of Eph 1:4, he explicated God’s eternal election of us to be holy before God.

Barth’s doctrine of predestination is different from those of traditional theologians, especially Calvin’s. Barth assessed Calvin’s doctrine of double predestination as dark and foreboding because it refers to election and abandonment of men apart from Jesus Christ.<sup>706</sup> For Barth, man is not predestined to be overcome by the evil power but to life and glory in Jesus.<sup>707</sup> In Jesus Christ, God elected Himself for suffering, rejection, death, and damnation, but sinful man for salvation, blessedness, and eternal life.<sup>708</sup> Accordingly, for Barth, there is no reprobation of man. It caused Barth to be criticized for a Universalist. In fact, Barth had an ambivalent opinion of universal salvation.<sup>709</sup> On the one hand, he objected to an *apokatastasis* as the goal and end of all things because it limits the freedom of God,<sup>710</sup> on the other hand, on the basis of some biblical passages implying the final restoration of the whole creation, he says, “wouldn’t it be good if grace should save all and surprise us!”<sup>711</sup> We are to be open not only to the divine possibility but to hope and pray

---

<sup>701</sup> A. D. R. Polman, *Barth*, tr. Calvin D. Freeman (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1968), pp. 31-2.

<sup>702</sup> Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Karl Barth: Darstellung und Deutung seiner Theologie* (Cologne: Jakob Hegner Verlag, 1951), p. 187.

<sup>703</sup> Bruce McCormack, “The Sum of the Gospel,” *Towards the Future of Reformed Theology: Tasks, Topics, Traditions*, ed. David Willis & Michael Welker (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999), p.492.

<sup>704</sup> *CD*, II/2, 77..

<sup>705</sup> *KD* IV/2, 586.

<sup>706</sup> *CD* II/2, 339. See Polman, *Barth*, pp.31-32 for the reason why Barth refuses Calvin’s double predestination.

<sup>707</sup> A. D. R. Polman christens Barth’s view “a purified supralapsarianism.” Polman, *Barth*, p. 34.

<sup>708</sup> *KD* II/2, 32.

<sup>709</sup> Cf. Colin E. Gunton also admits that there is “a fundamental ambiguity in Barth’s thought” of universalism. *Becoming and Being: The Doctrine of God in Charles Hartshorne and Karl Barth* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), p. 182.

<sup>710</sup> *CD* IV/3.1, 477.

<sup>711</sup> Karl Barth, *The Humanity of God*, tr. By J. N. Thomas and T. Weiser (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1960), pp. 61-62.

for it.<sup>712</sup> Klooster criticizes Barth for ignoring Rom.9-11 of reprobation.<sup>713</sup> The critique is right, but it is not correct that in his opinion the passage which speaks of Christ as the reprobate in the Bible is nowhere to be found, for Matt. 27:46 is saying, "MY GOD, MY GOD, WHY HAVE YOU FORSAKEN ME?" Barth regarded the verse as an important testimony for the reprobation of Christ.

For Barth, the relation between predestination and sanctification is that all men should recognize the elected in Jesus and live as ones elected, viz. sanctified life.<sup>714</sup> Because Jesus saved all of us from all our sins, all are *de jure* Christian. Accordingly, the mission should be accomplished in the way that we awake them "you are already saved by Jesus Christ" not "you should be saved by believing Jesus as your savior." Such an approach to evangelism and mission may take the unwholesome pressure off the evangelists and missionaries who feel so compelled to win converts.<sup>715</sup> Notwithstanding, it is an excessively objective soteriology excluding human free choice to accept Jesus as his saviour, while the Bible says that salvation takes place only when one receives Jesus as his Lord and Saviour (Mk. 16:16). Such a view of predestination also seems doubtful of its effect in changing human life. His view of predestination inclines to antinomianism,<sup>716</sup> for man was saved and will be saved by the primal decision of God regardless of his obedience to the Law.

#### 4.2.8.3 Vocation and Sanctification

Barth's doctrine of vocation means not only calling, but also embraces illumination, awakening, adoption, union with Christ, conversion, regeneration, and perseverance.<sup>717</sup> Furthermore, it is based on God's election, for the Christian is called on account of his election.<sup>718</sup> It takes place according to God's predestination in Jesus Christ.<sup>719</sup> As all people are in Jesus Christ, we must avoid the immature distinction between the called and the non-called.<sup>720</sup> Barth regretted that traditional theology stressed only the kingly and

---

<sup>712</sup> CD IV/3.1, 477-478. For the various critiques of Barth's tendency of universalism, see Fred. H. Klooster, *The Significance of Barth's Theology: An appraisal, with Special Reference to Election and Reconciliation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1961), p.59, 67; E. Brunner, *Dogmatics* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1949), I: 346-352; G. C. Berkouwer, *The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth*, tr. H. R. Boer (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956), pp. 116, 361-363.

<sup>713</sup> Klooster, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

<sup>714</sup> KD II/2, 354.

<sup>715</sup> Bernard Ramm, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

<sup>716</sup> Cf. Polman, *Barth*, p. 36.

<sup>717</sup> CD IV/3.2, illumination and awakening (508), adoption (533), union with Christ (540), regeneration or conversion (509-11), perseverance (645).

<sup>718</sup> CD IV/3.2, 484f.

<sup>719</sup> CD IV/3.2, 4.

<sup>720</sup> CD IV/3.2, 493f.

priestly offices of Christ and as a result, dealt with soteriology only in justification and sanctification. So he strongly asserted the restoration of the prophetic office of Christ, i.e., the doctrine of vocation.

Barth regarded vocation as the way of its application, while he considers justification and sanctification as the content of reconciliation.<sup>721</sup> Because the present Jesus Christ meets limited men at limited times and places through vocation, vocation can be delineated a temporal event and a subjective experience.<sup>722</sup> Effective calling makes a personal encounter between His Spirit and a particular man.<sup>723</sup> It is an event and knowledge which actually creates the “distinction” between the Christian and non-Christian, and an “alteration” of man’s being.<sup>724</sup> Through His calling and human response, conversion and sanctification finally takes place. For Barth, the aim of the vocation is mainly to make a Christian, as it were, a man to keep company with Jesus. Jesus Christ unites us with Himself and then in this union we unite ourselves with Christ. In this unity Christ speaks, behaves, and rules as Lord and we receive His rule with gratitude.<sup>725</sup> As vocation aims for justification and sanctification, it is not complete, but in the process of achievement.<sup>726</sup>

Vocation is also a claim to discipleship of Jesus Christ and to be His witness. The witness is not only to witness divine holiness but to witness the sanctification of Christ for us. At last, it is a call to become a witness of the reconciliation to the world achieved in Christ and His person and work.<sup>727</sup> The essence of God’s vocation lies in making them His witnesses as *Mittheiligen*.<sup>728</sup> This vocation includes serving God through serving the world.<sup>729</sup> It is a call to the justified and sanctified to take part actively in spiritual, moral, social and political spheres. Faithfulness to this vocation causes is an affliction for Christians. This affliction originates from the revolt of the world against the witness that Christians give to the world.<sup>730</sup> They cannot avoid this repression from the world. Affliction is good to Christians, for it is the evidence that they stand at the side of God and God stands at their sides. This pain is to take part in Christ’s pain and its result is to participate in His resurrection and glory.<sup>731</sup> It is great comfort that Christ also experiences this affliction with His people.<sup>732</sup>

---

<sup>721</sup> CD IV/3,1, 8.

<sup>722</sup> CD IV/3,2, 498f.

<sup>723</sup> CD IV/3,2, 502.

<sup>724</sup> CD IV/1, 92; CD IV/3,1, 218; CD IV/3, 2, 650ff.

<sup>725</sup> CD IV/3,2, 541f.

<sup>726</sup> CD IV/3,2, 673.

<sup>727</sup> CD IV/3,2, 606.

<sup>728</sup> CD IV/2, 522.

<sup>729</sup> CD IV/3, 2, 516.

<sup>730</sup> CD IV/3,2, 620-625.

<sup>731</sup> CD IV/3,2, 641-642.

<sup>732</sup> CD IV/3,2, 634f.



#### 4.2.8.4 Faith, Perseverance, and Sanctification

For Barth, faith is a means of justification and the internal foundation of sanctification and sanctification itself, for it is the act of repentance and conversion as the death of the old man and the birth of new man.<sup>733</sup>

When Barth interprets Gal.2.19f, he insisted that the Christian lives not in his faith in the Son of God but, in the faith of the Son of God.<sup>734</sup> His interpretation is at issue, for in “ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῆ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ,” genitive τοῦ can be considered as an objective genitive or possessive genitive. A lot of English Versions (ASV, ESV-English Standard Version 2001, GNV-Geneva Bible 1599, NAU-New American Standard Bible with Codes, NIB, NIV, RSV, NRS, and NKJ) translate the sentence as objective genitive, namely faith in the Son of God, not faith of the Son of God. However, DBY, KJV, WEB-the Webster Bible, YLT-Young’s Literal Bible write “the faith of the Son of God.” At first glance, it seems to be rather natural that we have faith in the Son of God rather than that the Son of God has faith. However, we ought to recognize that πίστις can be translated as faith or faithfulness. Peter Stuhlmacher does not miss this point. He contends that the expression πίστις Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, which repeatedly appears in Paul’s letters (Gal 2:16; 3:22; Phil 3:9; Rom 3:22,26) does not denote Jesus’ own “faith or faithfulness” but rather our faith in Jesus. In his view, the πίστις Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ is our human faith in Jesus as Lord and reconciler, and this faith leads to justification (Rom 3:26; 10:9-10).<sup>735</sup> On the contrary, Thomas Finger elucidates this issue in detail in the following sentences.

Grammatically, πίστις Ἰησοῦ/ χριστοῦ can mean either ‘faith in Jesus Christ’ or the ‘faithfulness’ of Jesus Christ’. Since the Reformation, it has almost always been understood in the former sense. However, many scholars have challenged this reading recently, for at least two reasons.<sup>736</sup> First, it makes some key justification statements unnecessarily redundant. According to this (common) translation, Rom 3.22 speaks of ‘the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ (διὰ πί,στωj Ἰησοῦ/ χριστοῦ) for all who believe...’ But why should Paul refer twice to human belief? Would he not more likely wish to speak of ‘the

---

<sup>733</sup> Otterness also regards the human looking to Jesus in faith as his sanctification “because it gives life a new direction.” O. G. Otterness, *op. cit.*, p. 143. For the concept of faith, see 4.2.4.2.1 Obedience of Faith, and 4.2.9.4.1 Faith.

<sup>734</sup> K. Barth, *God, Grace and Gospel*. tr. by J. Strathern McNab (London: Robert Cunningham and Sons Ltd., Alva., 1959), p. 7.

<sup>735</sup> Peter Stuhlmacher, *A Challenge to the New Perspective, Revising Paul’s Doctrine of justification with an essay of Donald A. Hagner* (Downers, ILL: Inter-Varsity Press, 2001), p.66.

<sup>736</sup> Richard Rays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ* (Chico, CA: Scholars, 1983).

righteousness of God through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ for all who believe...,’ referring once to the object of belief (Jesus’ faithfulness) and once to belief itself?<sup>737</sup>

Finger construes πίστις Ἰησοῦ/ cristou as the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. Barth’s *Romans* also reads through ‘his faithfulness in Jesus Christ’.<sup>738</sup> Finger also demonstrates his similar opinion in Gal 2.16. The traditional translation of Gal 2.16 is that “we have come to believe in Christ Jesus, so that we might be justified *by faith in Christ* (ἐκ πίστεως χριστοῦ).” T. Finger suggests a better interpretation than the traditional translation. It is “we have come to believe in Christ Jesus, so that we might be justified *by the faithfulness of Christ*.” (Italics are my emphasis).<sup>739</sup> For T. Finger, Paul would rather have emphasised the origin of justification than not have referred overmuch to human faith, ‘the faithfulness of Jesus Christ’, for he has stressed the divine initiative when speaking of justification.<sup>740</sup> Accordingly, the exegesis of Barth of the πίστις Ἰησοῦ/ cristou means the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. And the translation of the *Church Dogmatics* IV/2, 277, 601 of this phrase, ‘the faith of Jesus Christ’ needs to be changed into ‘the faithfulness of Jesus Christ’ because the former is more ambiguous than the latter.

Jesus’ faithfulness is distinguishable from ours because it is an action that took place once and for all and is not to be repeated. His faithfulness is vicarious obedience which we shall never imitate. Jesus fulfilled the Law once by His faithfulness including obedience and death.<sup>741</sup> We live in His faithfulness, viz., his faithful obedience to God, which accomplished our justification and sanctification. This living in His faithfulness is our participation in His sanctification, i.e., our sanctification.

In *the Holy Ghost and the Christian Life*, Barth depicted faith as movement. To live by faith means that we come from Christ and are going to Christ. Barth censured the Lutheran interpretation for its quietistic tendency. While there is movement even in the serenity of faith as Phil.3: “Not that I have already attained...but I pressed on... .”<sup>742</sup> Barth described faith as “the Beginning, the Miracle, and the Creation in every moment of time.”<sup>743</sup> Faith is not our possession, but an event that is perpetually renewed. The perpetual renewal of faith is God’s gift because no Christian could continue his faith but for God’s continuous

---

<sup>737</sup> Thomas Finger, “An Anabaptist Perspective on Justification,” in *Justification and sanctification in the Traditions of the Reformation: Prague V The Fifth Consultation on the First and Second Reformations Geneva 13-17/02 1998* (Geneva: World Alliance of Reformed Churches, 1999), pp.58-59.

<sup>738</sup> *Romans* 6<sup>th</sup>, 96.

<sup>739</sup> Thomas Finger, *op. cit.*, p.59.

<sup>740</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>741</sup> *GG*, 12.

<sup>742</sup> *HC*, 48-52.

<sup>743</sup> *Romans* 6<sup>th</sup> edition, p.499.

supply of the Holy Spirit.<sup>744</sup> This shows that Barth's view of faith is dynamic rather than static.

Perseverance is necessary in the process of sanctification, for without it Christians cannot continue to pursue their faith. Barth expounded ὑπομονή (perseverance) in relation to the attitude of the Christian in affliction. Perseverance is demanded and permitted by Christian fellowship with the Crucified and the Resurrected. The Christian must not allow himself to be shaken by his enemies, but remain firmly as a witness and a disciple in any affliction. To them who endure all his difficulties and keep his faith, God will give great reward. The Christian does not have to fear this affliction, for everything will be revealed and God take care of him and his enemies cannot harm his soul.<sup>745</sup>

In conclusion, for Barth, faith has the two meanings; Christ's faithfulness and our faith as movement. Our faith in the faithfulness of Christ is the foundation and means of sanctification.<sup>746</sup> Faith and perseverance are necessary in the process of Christian sanctification.

#### 4.2.9 Good Works and Sanctification: the Praise of Works

Barth delineated good works as an outward appearance of sanctification, while he depicted conversion as the inward movement of sanctification. Human work comprises good works and bad works. Scripture tells us of God's judgment of the bad works and his reward of the good works.<sup>747</sup> Barth defined good works as the human act which God praises and which in turn praises God.<sup>748</sup> Good works cannot sanctify us as well as they cannot justify us, for human works done to obtain a merit are nothing less than bad works. Our works are good before God only when they are done by faith.<sup>749</sup> Good works commence with abandoning "the spirit of mammon and the self-seeking." When men do the good works that God wants, they "will be Christians and true human beings."<sup>750</sup> In this manner, Barth regarded good works as the evidence of true faith.

In view of our witness of God's good works, Barth depicted our good works as follows. As only God is good, his work can be the only norm and source of all goodness.<sup>751</sup> Accordingly, human work can be good, only when it is in accordance with the divine work.

---

<sup>744</sup> HC, 48-52.

<sup>745</sup> CD IV/3,2, 647.

<sup>746</sup> G. C. Berkouwer, *Faith and Sanctification*, tr. J. Vriend (Grand Rapids, 1952), p.32.

<sup>747</sup> CD IV/2, 586.

<sup>748</sup> CD IV/2, 584.

<sup>749</sup> CD IV/2, 587.

<sup>750</sup> K. Barth, "Jesus Christ and the Movement for social justice" (1911) in: G. Hunsinger. ed. *Karl Barth and Radical Politics* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press), 1976, p. 37.

<sup>751</sup> CD IV/2, 588.

God's work is mainly connected to the covenant of grace,<sup>752</sup> which comprises all parts of salvation history, i.e., election, creation, reconciliation, and redemption. Human work is to witness and proclaim God's good works in the world.<sup>753</sup> Man can participate in God's work only through hearing and obeying God's call to be a witness to His work.<sup>754</sup> Our witness must be done by our word and deed throughout our whole life.<sup>755</sup> It is not to achieve something for himself but only to confess his sinfulness and to proclaim God's gracious work of salvation to the world.<sup>756</sup> It is a "work of faith" and the fruit of conversion.<sup>757</sup> The Church must witness God's work calmly, with cheerfulness and confidence. This attitude is called *gründliche Anspruchslosigkeit* (fundamental claimlessness).<sup>758</sup> A Christian is called to be a participant in God's work in his definite place and time, which is one part of the whole covenant history. The work of one witness is integrated to one declaration of the great cloud of witnesses (Heb 11). Although their commission can be said to be particular because their context is definite, there is universality in the fellowship of the covenant community. The central and proper content of Christian witness is Jesus Christ, who is the *telos* and the *Mitte* of the covenant history of God.<sup>759</sup>

#### 4.2.10 The Teleological Structure of Sanctification: The Sphere of Sanctification

The doctrine of sanctification of Barth has a certain teleological structure. The goal and purpose of God in sanctification is not merely the reconciliation of individuals and their community but also the reconciliation of the world.<sup>760</sup> According to Rhee, this structure can be explicated in the following stages. As the first step, God sanctified His Son. The second step is that Jesus Christ sanctifies His covenant community through His humiliating death on the cross and His exalting resurrection. The third step is that individual sanctification takes place through the mediatory ministry of this covenant community. The fourth step is that they become an instrument for the sanctification of the world.<sup>761</sup> Rhee's analysis seems to reconstruct 'The Holy One and the Saints' of § 66 in *CD IV/2*. Agreeing with his analysis, with the addition of one stage, God's Holiness, the stages of Barth's

---

<sup>752</sup> *CD IV/2*, 75-76.

<sup>753</sup> *CD IV/2*, 591.

<sup>754</sup> *CD IV/2*, 592f.

<sup>755</sup> *CD IV/2*, 597.

<sup>756</sup> *CD IV/2*, 590.

<sup>757</sup> *CD IV/2*, 595.

<sup>758</sup> *CD IV/2*, 594; 756-757.

<sup>759</sup> *CD IV/2*, 596-597.

<sup>760</sup> *CD IV/2*, 519.

<sup>761</sup> Rhee, *op.cit.*, pp.166-168.

doctrine of sanctification will be dealt with. Of course, since God's holiness is original, it cannot be called a stage of sanctification in the sense 'making some object holy'. Nonetheless, it is meaningful because God's holiness is the starting point of all the other stages of sanctification.

#### 4.2.10.1 God's Holiness and Sanctification

First of all, Barth dealt with God's holiness in relation to sanctification. In the statement that "I am God, and not man" (Hos 11:9), he described God's holiness as absoluteness, uniqueness, distinctness, and inviolable sovereignty.<sup>762</sup> The absolute superiority of God's holiness does not allow any other's holiness to be compared with His.<sup>763</sup> God's command that you should be holy because I am holy (Lev 19:2; 11:44; 20:7) implies that His holiness "demands and enforces the holiness of His people." It presumes "the election and calling of this people" for His service, and "the fact that He has made Himself the God of this people and this people His people."<sup>764</sup> God's holiness wins over the ungodliness and disobedience of his people. God does not yield Himself to disregard or negotiate with the people to whom He is gracious, but thoroughly eradicates and annihilates their confrontation.<sup>765</sup> Due to His immutability, God can relate Himself to unholy people without destroying or denying His own holiness.<sup>766</sup> His holiness is like a consuming fire.<sup>767</sup>

God shows His holiness by His acts of judgment and grace among and to Israel. God sanctifies his people as its Lord (Ez 37:28) before the Gentiles in order that Israel may worship Him as the Holy One in the world. Grace results in the forgiveness of sin, and holiness results in the judgment upon sin.<sup>768</sup> If grace causes justification, holiness demands sanctification. Because of His holiness, God cannot allow us to go our own way but sanctifies us.<sup>769</sup> An intrinsically unholy man is saved not because he sanctified himself, but because he submits himself to the holiness of God.<sup>770</sup> The division between God's grace and holiness or the Law and the Gospel ends in the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus Christ.<sup>771</sup> Finally, God's holiness makes his people holy through Jesus Christ and His Spirit.

In a word, God's holiness makes God the acting agent in the sanctification of man.

---

<sup>762</sup> *KD IV/2*, 566.

<sup>763</sup> *CD IV/2*, 513.

<sup>764</sup> *KD IV/2*, 567.

<sup>765</sup> *KD IV/1*, 360-361.

<sup>766</sup> *CD IV/2*, 513.

<sup>767</sup> *KD II/1*, 365.

<sup>768</sup> *KD II/1*, 360.

<sup>769</sup> *KD II/1*, 366.

<sup>770</sup> *KD II/1*, 364f.

<sup>771</sup> *KD II/1*, 367f.

#### 4.2.10.2 The Sanctification of Christ<sup>772</sup>

On the basis of the statement that Christ is our sanctification and justification (1Cor.1:30), Barth related our sanctification to Jesus' incarnation and exaltation in *CD IV/2*. Rhee understood that for Barth, Jesus' exaltation was "God's recognition of His authentic humanity as it was lived in His whole life humiliation."<sup>773</sup> Rhee views Jesus' sanctification as substitute sanctification for us. Jesus' substitute sanctification has been neglected for the reason that He did not need sanctification due to "His holy divinity and sinless humanity."<sup>774</sup> However Rhee's explanation of the reason why Jesus sanctified Himself (Jn 17:19) and God sanctified Jesus Christ (10:36) does not seem to be enough. In my view, God's sanctifying Christ in Jn 10:36 indicates God's distinguishing Christ for the salvation of the world, not cleaning Christ's sin.<sup>775</sup> Jesus' sanctifying Himself in Jn 17:19 signifies dedicating and making Himself holy for His perfect atonement sacrifice. In these two cases, sanctifying Christ does not mean purifying Christ's sin. Accordingly, Christ's substitute sanctification was for our sanctification, but was not God's or Christ's purifying of Christ's sin in any sense.

Jn 17:17 reads "Sanctify them through thy truth." Barth expounded that this request was firstly fulfilled to Christ Himself, on the grounds that He is "the holy servant Jesus" in Act 4:27-30. Yet his opinion is not correct, for Jesus' holiness is eternal and God's sanctifying Christ implies God's election and preparation of Christ for the salvation of the world. Barth also maintained that it is Christ Himself who is first of all sanctified by the blood of the covenant in Heb. 10: 29.<sup>776</sup> However, Barth's opinion seems unreasonable. Heb 10:29 reads "πόσω δοκεῖτε χείρονος ἀξιωθήσεται τιμωρίας ὁ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καταπατήσας καὶ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης κοινὸν ἡγησάμενος, ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας Here "ἡγιάσθη" (sanctified) is connected with ὁ of ὁ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καταπατήσας (the person who has trampled the son of God). The person who has trampled the son of God and has treated the blood of the covenant as a common thing (unholy thing)<sup>777</sup> is the same one who was sanctified by the blood of the covenant. Here, Christ is not the person who has trampled himself, accordingly, He cannot be the person who was sanctified by His own blood.

The sanctification of Jesus Christ is our sanctification in the sense that we are united

<sup>772</sup> I dealt with the sanctification of Christ in relation to 4.2.5.2.1.1 Sanctification in the Life of Royal Man in *de jure* sanctification.

<sup>773</sup> Rhee, *op. cit.*, pp.161-162.

<sup>774</sup> *Ibid.*,171.

<sup>775</sup> Cf. C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John* (London: Wiliam Clowes & Sons Limited. 1978), p. 385

<sup>776</sup> *CD IV/2*, 512.

<sup>777</sup> κοινον denotes here the opposite of "holy thing"(αἱγιος). For further study, refer to Philip E. Hughes, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ., 1977), p. 423.



with Him and He cleaned all our sins by His atoning sacrifice, which was prepared by Himself. It is rather closer to our justification than to our sanctification. Only His obedience as our representative can be regarded as accomplishing our sanctification. As obedience to God is sanctification, His obedience through all His life can be connected with our sanctification.<sup>778</sup> It is not only the accomplishment of His sanctification as a man but also for our sanctification as our representative. His obedience is related to both our justification and sanctification. The focus lies in regarding the obedience of Christ as His righteousness to be imputed for our justification, or as His substitute sanctification for our sanctification. If we lay more importance on the latter, Christ's obedience as His substitute sanctification for us has a decisively important meaning as the absolute ground of our objective sanctification.

#### 4.2.10.3 The Sanctification of the Covenant Community

In his *Church Dogmatics* Barth noted that the main emphasis in the Old Testament is on sanctification itself or on God as the Holy Subject sanctifying His people. The New Testaments shows us that the holiness of the church depends on the sanctifying action of Jesus Christ, not on an inherent quality of her own.<sup>779</sup> The saints of the New Testament exist only in plurality. In Cor. 14:43 the congregations are referred to as “churches of the saints.” Their holiness does not come from individuals comprising the community, but from the Holy One gathering the saints and generating the ἀγιασμός of men. The Holiness of Church does not depend on its success or failure but only on the Holy One who sanctifies her.<sup>780</sup>

Barth explained his doctrine of the church with three terms; upbuilding, growth, and upholding. The order and the unity of the church will be dealt with because they are of importance to our contemporary church.

##### 4.2.10.3.1 The Upbuilding of the Holy Community

God is the true builder. Only God is primarily at work from the beginning to the end<sup>781</sup> in the creation of the community as only He created heaven and earth in the beginning. The true church is inaugurated, controlled, and supported by the quickening power of the living Jesus. God as the active Subject also acts, not only in Jesus, but “by Him, to and with other men.” Its upbuilding is utterly and totally God's work, so it is utterly and totally the work of the community. Therefore, it has its own activity and responsibility and its glory of the

---

<sup>778</sup> See Calvin's *Comm.* on Heb. 5:9, CO 55, 64.

<sup>779</sup> *KD* IV/2, 580.

<sup>780</sup> *CD* IV/1, 650ff.

<sup>781</sup> *CD* IV/2, 632.

work of the community. Due to its weakness, it needs to be corrected and improved by the teaching and warning of the apostles.<sup>782</sup> By love is the community built. The members of the community are integrated by God and adapt themselves to be one organism.<sup>783</sup> The organic community is similar to socialism, whose saying is “one for all, and all for one.” Unless it lacks mutual integration and adaptation, it will meet “aberrations and confusions, petrifications and dissolution, arrests and defeats.”<sup>784</sup> All Christians are commonly called to move in the direction of the goal of their edification. In daily life, the community edifies itself.<sup>785</sup>

The goal of the true Church is to reveal the sanctification of all humanity and human life which has already taken place *de iure* in Jesus Christ.<sup>786</sup> The witness of the community however is provisional in the senses that it is imperfect, apprehensive, and uncertain because the community still takes part in the darkness which it cannot grasp. This provisional representation of the community will be fulfilled on the last day.

The Holy Spirit gives Christians the freedom to be able to serve Christ and to cope with the provisional representation.<sup>787</sup> The community is edified and built up through the reciprocal ministry of its individuals.<sup>788</sup> Although they are still the *communio peccatorum* in the sense that they are children of Adam, who are participant in the transgression and fall and misery of all men, they are *the communio sanctorum* because they are already distinguished from all other men by the direction of the Holy Spirit.<sup>789</sup>

#### 4.2.10.3.2 The Growth of the Holy Community

According to Barth, like a seed which secretly grows, the community grows *per definitionem* despite its fragility.<sup>790</sup> The true growth is intensive, vertical and spiritual rather than extensive, horizontal, and quantitative. The vertical growth does not always accompany its numerical increase. The rule and efficacy of church growth is based on Christian plans and efforts, but on the power of growth immanent in the community. The power is to “exalt the lowly, enrich the poor, give joy to the sad and make heroes of the feeble.” The power of its growth is the living Jesus who works “in the quickening power of

---

<sup>782</sup> CD IV/2, 634.

<sup>783</sup> CD IV/2, 636.

<sup>784</sup> K. Barth, “Jesus Christ and the Movement for social justice” in G. Hunsinger. ed., *Karl Barth and Radical Politics* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976), p.33.

<sup>785</sup> CD IV/2, 639.

<sup>786</sup> CD IV/2, 620.

<sup>787</sup> CD IV/2, 623.

<sup>788</sup> CD IV/2, 627.

<sup>789</sup> CD IV/2, 642.

<sup>790</sup> CD IV/2, 645.

the Holy Spirit.”<sup>791</sup>

The church is holy because she is ruled and controlled by Christ.<sup>792</sup> The kingdom of God is “the lordship of God established in the world in Jesus Christ.”<sup>793</sup> God’s kingdom is the community, and not the reverse.<sup>794</sup> When the church is ruled by God, she can be called the kingdom of God. The community came from the kingdom and goes towards it.<sup>795</sup> This may be her sanctification.

#### 4.2.10.3.3 The Upholding of the Community

The upholding of the community is the work of the *totus Christus*. Because it is in danger among very different human societies, the community needs defence, protection and preservation. The threat against the upholding of the community comes from both outside and within.<sup>796</sup>

Persecution as a threat from outside takes place when the community proclaims the Gospel. This persecution appears in various forms and levels. This persecution can result in the loss of the life of the community. Secondly, Barth regards tolerance as a more terrible world weapon,<sup>797</sup> because it can hold back the *communio sanctorum*. The two threats from inside are alienation (secularisation) as self-assertion and self-glorification (sacralisation).<sup>798</sup> First, alienation is to be detached from Jesus who is the Good Shepherd. It happens when the community begins to hear the voice of the world instead of its Lord, Jesus Christ. Secularization makes the community only a part of the world, and by which the community as the salt loses its savour.<sup>799</sup> The resultant forms can be a national church, a state church, a cultural church, a world church. Secondly, self-glorification is to develop and maintain itself by self-assertion not by self-adaptation. Recognising the lordship and glory of Jesus over the world and her status as His ambassador to the world, the self-glorified community regards itself as a superior world within the world.<sup>800</sup> Self-assertion will endanger its true life and growth, for it is replacing the Holy Spirit by its spirit.<sup>801</sup>

Briefly, Christ’s protection of the church from sacralisation and secularisation, and of Christian belief during times of persecution is the sanctification of the church.

---

<sup>791</sup> CD IV/2, 648-650

<sup>792</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>793</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>794</sup> CD IV/2, 656.

<sup>795</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>796</sup> CD IV/2, 661-662.

<sup>797</sup> CD IV/2, 662-664.

<sup>798</sup> CD IV/2, 665-666.

<sup>799</sup> CD IV/2, 668.

<sup>800</sup> CD IV/2, 668-669

<sup>801</sup> CD IV/2, 670.

#### 4.2.10.3.4 The Order of the Community

Barth regarded order as essential for the upbuilding of the community. Order is the result of Christ's victory over pandemonium and disorder.<sup>802</sup> The upbuilding of the community is accomplished in the order of definite relationships and connexions. Order is connected with public worship, the determination and distribution of the various interrelated obligations and functions, discipline and overseeing and rule over all kinds of human relationships.<sup>803</sup>

The order of the community originates from the presupposition that Jesus is the Head of the community and the community is His body.<sup>804</sup> The Head is first, the Body is second. That is the basic law and order. Accordingly, the law receives direction from the Bible in which Jesus is attested.<sup>805</sup> Barth suggested four laws for every true church. First, the basic Law is the Law of service.<sup>806</sup> "And whoever of you will be the chief, shall be the servant of all" (Mk 10:44). Secondly, the liturgical Law as Christian worship.<sup>807</sup> Divine service offers the community its commission to be a witness of the sanctification of Christ to the world from this service. In this service, the community receive directions and orders and instructions, and comfort and promises, and freedom.<sup>808</sup> Thirdly, church law is living Law.<sup>809</sup> This living Law is the living Jesus, who "rules and upholds and orders." Accordingly, the community is always "open for new direction and instruction." In this sense, the Christian community must be an *ecclesia semper reformanda*.<sup>810</sup> Fourthly, true Church law is exemplary law. Church law is "a pattern of the formation and administration" of political, economic, cultural and other human societies.<sup>811</sup> The lordship of Jesus Christ is the true basis of all worldly law as well as ecclesiastical law.<sup>812</sup>

To keep this order by these four laws is the sanctification of the church.

#### 4.2.10.3.5 The Unity of the Church: Ecumenical Movement

For Barth, the unity of the church is reflection of the unity and oneness of the Trinitarian God.<sup>813</sup> It is the Holy Scriptures and Christ's salvific works that give the church its

---

<sup>802</sup> CD IV/2, 676.

<sup>803</sup> CD IV/2, 678.

<sup>804</sup> CD IV/2, 679.

<sup>805</sup> CD IV/2, 683.

<sup>806</sup> CD IV/2, 690.

<sup>807</sup> CD IV/2, 695.

<sup>808</sup> CD IV/2, 698-699.

<sup>809</sup> CD IV/2, 710.

<sup>810</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>811</sup> CD IV/2, 719.

<sup>812</sup> CD IV/2, 725.

<sup>813</sup> CD IV/1, 668.

uniqueness and unity.<sup>814</sup> The unity of the church is based on “the imperative content of the acknowledgement that there is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God above all, for all and in all.”<sup>815</sup> The content consists in the confession of our faith, which includes Jesus’ resurrection, Lordship, Second Advent, the authority of the Holy Scripture and man’s hearing and obeying the Word of God.<sup>816</sup> This faith cannot be expressed in the invisible Church but “only in the relativity and determinateness of a specific place within the visible Church,” which is “differentiated in itself and very extensively divided.”<sup>817</sup> If local communities are in this condition, their multiplicity does not cause danger to the strength of the unity.<sup>818</sup>

As such an example, Barth held that the Lutheran, Reformed, and Anglican Church are not three different Churches but “the three present forms of one and the same Church,” namely, the Evangelical Church.<sup>819</sup> Although they have “specific errors, specific theological notions, badly, misleadingly, erroneously and arbitrarily construed,” they are not heresies. Such differences “in the common confession” and “the commonly recognised authority of Holy Scripture” do not have to be a cause of schism.<sup>820</sup> In contrast, it is a betrayal of itself that “the Church ceases to oppose the heretical Church and its theology,” where the Roman Catholic Church and Neo Protestant Churches may be included.<sup>821</sup>

In terms of mission, Barth viewed evangelical unity as “fundamentally related to the missionary motive,” whose nature is “rooted in the command of Jesus as received through the text of Scripture” (Mt 28:16-20).<sup>822</sup> The Church as *Communio sanctorum* is *congregatio fidelium* and *the coniuratio testium* who may and must speak because they believe.<sup>823</sup> Therefore the unity of the church is “made secure by our speaking out in faith, from this side and that, just as long as we can still speak with one another.”<sup>824</sup>

In view of practice, the unity of the church is accomplished by our humility and service

---

<sup>814</sup> K. Barth, *God Here and Now*, tr. by Paul M. Van Buren (Harper and Row, New York, 1964), pp. 62-64.

<sup>815</sup> K. Barth, *The Church and the Churches* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1936), p. 27.

<sup>816</sup> CD III/4, 4; Gregory G. Bolich, *Karl Barth & Evangelicalism* (Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980), pp. 177-179.

<sup>817</sup> CD I/2, 824.

<sup>818</sup> K. Barth, *The Church and the Churches* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1936), p.42.

<sup>819</sup> CD I/2, 831-832.

<sup>820</sup> CD I/2, 832, 835.

<sup>821</sup> CD I/2, 837.

<sup>822</sup> Karl Barth, “An Exegetical Study of Matthew 28:16-20,” tr. Thomas Wieser, in *The Theology of the Christian Mission*, ed. Gerald H. Anderson (Nashville: Abingdon, 1961), pp. 55-71; Gregory G. Bolich, *Karl Barth & Evangelicalism* (Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980), p. 174.

<sup>823</sup> K. Barth, *Evangelical Theology: An Introduction* (Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979), p. 33.

<sup>824</sup> K. Barth, *The Church and the Political Problem of Our Day* (New York: Charles Scriber’s Sons, 1939), p.87.

to our neighbours in one confession of our faith in and our obedience to Christ.<sup>825</sup> This part can be an answer to ‘2.1.2.3.4 Separatism’ and will be applied to ‘6.2.4.1 Preserving the Truth of the Bible’ and ‘6.2.4.2 Self-Denial for Unity and Cooperation.’

#### **4.2.10.3.6 The Service of the Church for the World**

Barth related Christian love to the sanctification of the world. To love a neighbour is to witness God’s love to him. Firstly, God loves them and they love Him in return. After that, they love one another within the community. It is evidence of God’s grace.<sup>826</sup> As a result, their love for their neighbour and brother becomes the witness for the sanctification of the world.<sup>827</sup> In their words and works and attitudes, all Christians are asked to be witnesses of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.<sup>828</sup> The church speaks not only with words but also with its silent service to all the handicapped, weak and needy in the world and finally with its prayer for the world according to the summons of the Word.<sup>829</sup>

#### **4.2.10.4 The Individual Sanctification: the Marks of Christian Life**

In the doctrine of reconciliation Barth dealt with faith, love, and hope in relation to Christian life. We referred to them shortly at 5.2.1.2.2 ‘The Three Sins of Man’. As pride, sloth, and falsehood are sins, sanctification as overcoming of sin ought to comprise faith, love, and hope in Christian life. According to the structure of Barth’s doctrine of reconciliation, faith is the treatment of human pride. Accordingly, faith leads man to humility after Christ. And order can be said to be a fruit of humility, given that pride causes disorder. Humility and trust are the important foundations and attributes of love as sanctification according to I Cor 13. A life in humility and faith is the character of Christian sanctified life. Love is our active act to oppose sloth. Gratitude is characteristic of the saved by God’s love. Conscience and hope from the light of truth are the signs of man’s liberation from falsehood and the cure of the despair due to falsehood. Hope is our expectation of the salvation which will appear in future.<sup>830</sup> Hope provides substance and stability to faith and love. “Hope springs from faith” and “nourishes and sustains” it.<sup>831</sup>

Briefly, if we synthesize the *Church Dogmatics* IV and *Ethics*, the character of

---

<sup>825</sup> K. Barth, *The Church and the Churches* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1936), p. 57, 67; CD IV/1, 644.

<sup>826</sup> CD IV/2, 814.

<sup>827</sup> CD IV/2, 817.

<sup>828</sup> CD IV/2, 824.

<sup>829</sup> K. Barth, *Evangelical Theology: An Introduction* (Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979), p.38.

<sup>830</sup> Act 13:7. Love hopes everything.

<sup>831</sup> CD IV/2., pp.911-912.



Christian life can be explicated as faith, humility, order, love, gratitude, conscience and hope. Let us then observe each of them in more detail.

#### 4.2.10.4.1 Faith

In *Church Dogmatics* II/2, Barth designated faith as follows. Faith means repentance that acknowledges that I am a sinner and I remain a mortal sinner even in my best works. It is to recognize the absolute despair of the possibility to change me into a new being.<sup>832</sup> It is true surrender to the death of all self-centred dignity and power. This faith makes us hope in God's help and mercy. In this hope, faith leads to prayer for the divine mercy.<sup>833</sup> Faith is the essence of all transformation or renewal of our life. Repentance results in conversion. To believe is to turn from sloth to the delight and pleasure of God's good will. This faith is the birth and life of the new man who can and will do what is good and well-pleasing to God.<sup>834</sup> As a dying of the old man and birth of the new, "faith is actually and literally our temporal orientation, preparation, and exercise, and therefore our sanctification for eternal life."<sup>835</sup> Faith is the counter-part of pride while love is that of sloth.

In *Church Dogmatics* IV/1, Barth elucidated faith in the three ways. Firstly, faith is to look and hold and depend upon Jesus by self-emptying.<sup>836</sup> Secondly, its object is Jesus Christ, who "makes us free to believe in Him."<sup>837</sup> Thirdly, this faith generates a new and particular being of man as Christian subject.<sup>838</sup> Barth explicated faith in relation to its behaviours in terms of *Anerkennen*, *Erkennen*, and *Bekennen*, which is to witness the change of the human condition which has happened in Jesus Christ.<sup>839</sup> First, the acknowledgment of Christian faith means the proclamation that "Jesus Christ is my Lord" and "the Head of the Church" and "the Lord of Scripture." Secondly, recognition is an obedience accompanying true knowledge of Christ, which proceeds from acknowledgment.<sup>840</sup> This recognition disturbs us.<sup>841</sup> It means the existence of the struggle between the old man and the new man. It results in *mortificatio* of the old man and *vivificatio* of the new man in the power of the Holy Spirit. Thirdly, confession is the radiation of God and His glory. The Christian in this confession is the light reflecting the

---

<sup>832</sup> CD II/2, 769.

<sup>833</sup> CD II/2, 770.

<sup>834</sup> CD II/2, 772-773.

<sup>835</sup> CD IV/2, 731.

<sup>836</sup> CD IV/1, 629, 743.

<sup>837</sup> CD IV/1, 744-745.

<sup>838</sup> CD IV/1, 749.

<sup>839</sup> CD IV/1, 752.

<sup>840</sup> CD IV/1, 760-761.

<sup>841</sup> CD IV/1, 769.

great light, which is Jesus Christ.<sup>842</sup> Confessing is an act of faith to confess the fact that we belong to Jesus Christ.<sup>843</sup> Jesus demands faith which appears as obedience, because faith and obedience are undivided moments of the one occurrence, different aspects of one reality without any hiatus like thunder and lightning.<sup>844</sup>

Briefly, faith leads to sanctification and is the mark of the sanctified.

#### 4.2.10.4.2 Humility

In “the Command of God the Reconciler” of his *Ethics*, Barth explicated humility as follows.<sup>845</sup> Humility (*tapeinophrosune*) means “the attitude of the sinner who is upheld by the grace of God.”<sup>846</sup> Humility is “the attitude of those who are held up in their fall and saved in their lostness.” It is courage “to trust in despair,” not to stay in despair. Through certain despair of self and its works, we may have peace in Christ. The true Christian life is “penitence before God and therefore service to the neighbour” as sinners that have been accepted by God in Christ.<sup>847</sup>

The expression of humility is sacrifice to God. In sacrifice, consecration happens “in the form of forfeiting possession.”<sup>848</sup> Sacrifice rests on the recognition that God’s mercy has come to us sinner, i.e., God has revealed himself to us as the meaning of reconciliation.<sup>849</sup> God dwells with “those who are of a humble and contrite heart and who fear his Word.”<sup>850</sup> Our sacrifice can be done only “in faith, hearing and obeying his Word.”<sup>851</sup> Sacrifice, namely, living as those who are slain by God’s Word means “a new thinking and a brokenness and openness of our will.”<sup>852</sup> Repentance before God results in service to the neighbour. Its core is to forgive his sin insofar as I can forgive.<sup>853</sup> Real service for others is done “in and through God himself.” Our service can be true only by grace, i.e., it is fulfilled in Christ. It needs our prayer with forgiveness of others.<sup>854</sup>

---

<sup>842</sup> *CD IV/1*, 776-778.

<sup>843</sup> *CD IV/1*, 777.

<sup>844</sup> *CD IV/2*, 537f.

<sup>845</sup> *Ethics*, p. 399ff.

<sup>846</sup> *Ibid.* p. 402.

<sup>847</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 402-403.

<sup>848</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 405-406.

<sup>849</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 406-407.

<sup>850</sup> *Ibid.* p. 408.

<sup>851</sup> *Ibid.* p. 413.

<sup>852</sup> *Ibid.* p. 419.

<sup>853</sup> *Ibid.* p. 436.

<sup>854</sup> *Ibid.* p.439- 440.

#### 4.2.10.4.3 Order

Barth dealt with order in connection with the command of God the Creator in his *Ethics*.<sup>855</sup> The foundation of order is laid on the fact that “God is always the God of order.”<sup>856</sup> Order means “regulation, i.e., the establishment of constancy in my action” by the command of the one Creator. Order is “to subject oneself to God.” This command includes the will of God, which wills our subjection. In this sense, order is orientated from above to below, from God to man.<sup>857</sup> God’s will is also “a uniformly determined will” because God is the one. Although we attain “a uniform determination” and real unity from God’s simple and singular will.<sup>858</sup> God separates us from “the caprice and whim and chance” which are characteristic in the ungodly by giving his constant direction. The orders in the world draw their force from the free word of God.<sup>859</sup>

Barth explicated order in four circles; work, marriage, family, equality and leadership.<sup>860</sup> As they will be dealt with in social sanctification, I will refer to only equality and leadership. In the church, equality signifies “the common acknowledgment of the revolt against God” and of the mercy of God.<sup>861</sup> Leadership signifies “the existence of a special ministry for the proclamation of the Law and of grace.” In the state, equality signifies “the repression of the struggle of all against all, of the oppression of the weak by the strong, through the instrumentality of the Law as this is upheld by force.” Leadership signifies “the existence of the office of a watchman to preserve the law by the use of force.” The criterion of leadership is whether a leader does only “what establishes and protects the right of all.”<sup>862</sup>

#### 4.2.10.4.4 Love

In terms of *agape* and *eros*, Barth explicated love. Christian love is *agape*, which is free to give the loving subject to the object of his love. Another kind of love is *eros*, which stems from natural self-assertion and pursues its interest in the other. *Agape* corresponds to the human nature formed and fashioned by God, while *eros* contradicts and denies it.<sup>863</sup> When God loves and calls a man for *agape*, he turns from *eros* to *agape*.<sup>864</sup> The basis of love is laid on in God’s love.<sup>865</sup>

---

<sup>855</sup> Barth, *Ethics*, p. 208.

<sup>856</sup> *Ibid.* p. 214.

<sup>857</sup> *Ethics*. p. 212.

<sup>858</sup> *Ibid.* p. 213.

<sup>859</sup> *Ibid.* p. 214.

<sup>860</sup> *Ibid.* p. 216.

<sup>861</sup> *Ibid.* p. 244.

<sup>862</sup> *Ibid.* p. 245.

<sup>863</sup> *CD IV/2*, 733-734.

<sup>864</sup> *CD IV/2*, 749.

<sup>865</sup> *CD IV/2*, 757.

Divine love is classified as electing love, purifying love, and creative love.<sup>866</sup> In His sovereign election, God loves man for His sake despite his pride and fall, sloth and misery.<sup>867</sup> Secondly, God purifies man with total grace and total judgment, in which mortification and vivification happen.<sup>868</sup> Thirdly, God's creative love liberates man from self-love and empowers him to give himself to others. Although love originates from God, love is an act of man. In sanctification, there must be genuine human obedience because Jesus is God and also man.<sup>869</sup>

To Barth, love for God and love for men are inseparable.<sup>870</sup> The love of God and of men should be constantly announced, communicated and affirmed in the form of human action.<sup>871</sup> Men who are loved by God and love Him freely can love one another.<sup>872</sup> God's love has flown into us "can transform us in love into human beings again."<sup>873</sup> Barth delineated the manner of love that counts, triumphs, and endures according to I Cor 13.<sup>874</sup> This victorious love reflects the resurrection of Jesus Christ and anticipates the coming resurrection.<sup>875</sup> It also reflects the first revelation of the exaltation and enthronement of Jesus and of the establishment of God's lordship over all men and His whole creation.<sup>876</sup> In this love, the old creation is transformed into the new creation.

#### 4.2.10.4.5 Gratitude

Barth described gratitude in relation to the command of God the Redeemer.<sup>877</sup> Gratitude is our response to God's salvation and love. From the standpoint of redemption, we must be grateful. Without gratitude, our humility and orderliness would not be real. Gratitude means that "I am gladly, i.e., voluntarily and cheerfully ready for what God wills of me."<sup>878</sup>

In an eschatological context, gratitude is possible as the content of the divine command for two reasons. Firstly, I myself am won by redemption. Hence, I live in gratitude by the

---

<sup>866</sup> CD IV/2, 766-779.

<sup>867</sup> CD IV/2, 767.

<sup>868</sup> CD IV/2, 772-773.

<sup>869</sup> CD IV/2, 801.

<sup>870</sup> CD IV/2, 803.

<sup>871</sup> CD IV/2, 812-813.

<sup>872</sup> CD IV/2, 818.

<sup>873</sup> K. Barth, "Jesus Christ and the Movement for social justice," in G. Hunsinger, ed. *Karl Barth and Radical Politics* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press), 1976, p.35.

<sup>874</sup> CD IV/2, 825.

<sup>875</sup> CD IV/2, 832.

<sup>876</sup> CD IV/2, 836.

<sup>877</sup> *Ethics*, p. 497f.

<sup>878</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 499-500.

fact that I am the child of God.<sup>879</sup> It is the Holy Spirit who enables us to command gratitude from ourselves. Secondly, God's command liberates me by winning me for God the Redeemer. This is our liberation from enemies who opposes God's command and from our own work competing with the work that God has commanded. The command of the Redeemer brings "loosening, release, and relaxation" to us. Gratitude signifies "an attack upon us in as much as we are not yet won for God, a thrust against upon the centre of the misery of our present."

Barth connected gratitude with play. Through gratitude we "can and should simply play before God." There are three reasons for this can be explicated in three terms. First, our work is "more play than work" because we are God's little children.<sup>880</sup> It is possible when we realize that "only God is fully serious." Secondly, our participation in the promise is provisional in comparison with the eternity of heaven.<sup>881</sup> Therefore, the final seriousness will be allotted there and then. Thirdly, "insofar we are grateful to God," the strangeness and hostility of his command vanish. In the light of eschatological reality, our action can be "art and humour."<sup>882</sup> Although, humour can arise "only when we wrestle with the seriousness of the present," it is given to us because our anxiety and seriousness are overcome by the knowledge of our future.<sup>883</sup>

#### 4.2.10.4.6 Conscience

The characteristic of Christian life is obedience to conscience. Because of all its immanent wickedness, conscience must be based on "not a voice within us but an alien voice that speaks to us from outside," i.e., on the command of God. To have a conscience is the same as "to have the Holy Spirit," given that through the Holy Spirit, we know "what is in God, his judgement on our conduct." Through prayer, we have "a conscience that tells us the truth."<sup>884</sup>

Barth observed conscience from three perspectives. Firstly, in conscience, our own voice is just God's voice in the sense that God speaks to us through our self-consciousness.<sup>885</sup> Given that conscience has the divine authority, we have to obey the truth about ourselves, which is received in the voice of conscience. The freedom of conscience is the freedom of the children of God and God's own freedom. Conscience is one's own, so it cannot be public.<sup>886</sup> It does not err, but "we err in our hearing of it."<sup>887</sup> Secondly, the

---

<sup>879</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 500-501.

<sup>880</sup> *Ibid.* p. 504.

<sup>881</sup> *Ethics*, pp. 504-505.

<sup>882</sup> *Ibid.* p. 506.

<sup>883</sup> *Ibid.* p. 511.

<sup>884</sup> *Ibid.* p. 478.

<sup>885</sup> *Ibid.* p. 480-481.

<sup>886</sup> *Ibid.* p. 482-483.

content of what conscience declares relates to our acts to the coming eternal kingdom of God. In conscience, we know God's absolute rule over all people and things. The voice of conscience measures whether my conduct is "a step towards the future which is promised me by God's Word, the future of the Lord and his lordship over all people and things."<sup>888</sup> In this respect, conscience is "the living and present message of the coming kingdom of God." Thirdly, the revolutionary summons of conscience has the meaning of waiting and hastening.<sup>889</sup> Hastening means that we are summoned "to surrender to the living God" and "to rest in the unrest of the act of life." The pronouncement of conscience asks us to maintain a balance between mysticism and enthusiasm.<sup>890</sup>

#### 4.2.10.4.7 Hope

For Barth, hope is the treatment of man's falsehood, which is in Christ, our light. Christ is our Prophet leading us to God's light and truth. We are called to live a life corresponding to the light of the world.<sup>891</sup> Focusing hope on *parousia*, Barth explicated a threefold *parousia*. The first *parousia* is Christ's resurrection, the second *parousia* that is now with us is Pentecost, and the third *parousia* which has not yet come is the coming again of Christ. The first *parousia* is connected with faith, the second with love, the third with hope.<sup>892</sup> The position of hope is between the time when the prophetic action of Christ already began and the time when it is not yet accomplished.<sup>893</sup>

The character of hope is explicated in three terms: gratuitousness, limitedness, and confirmation with dubiety. First, hope is a gift of Jesus Christ (2 Thess 2:16), and a work of the Holy Spirit (Gal 5:5; Rom 15:13). Secondly, the scheme of "already but not yet" means that Christian existence is limited, so that no matter how devotional his service is, it cannot be in "righteousness, innocence, and blessedness." This limit will be removed with the coming of Christ. Nonetheless, Christ's resurrection and the present action of the Holy Spirit offer us the firm basis of hope.<sup>894</sup> The other limit is that he cannot decide whether his accomplishment as a witness of Christ is "good or bad, valuable or worthless, meaningful or meaningless." His thought, speech, and action will be judged only in the light of the Judge.<sup>895</sup> Thirdly, we suffer "the dubiety and fragility" because the last *parousia* of Christ has not yet come, but Christian hope of Christ and His salvation can be

---

<sup>887</sup> *Ibid.* p. 485.

<sup>888</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 486-487.

<sup>889</sup> *Ibid.* p. 490.

<sup>890</sup> *Ibid.* p. 492.

<sup>891</sup> *CD IV/3*, 2, 902.

<sup>892</sup> *CD IV/3*, 2, 910ff.

<sup>893</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 904.

<sup>894</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 911.

<sup>895</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 921-922.



confirmed “through the illuminating power of the Holy Spirit”<sup>896</sup>

The object and content of hope are described as follows. Its object is Jesus Christ and his grace that he will bring to us then.<sup>897</sup> The content of hope is the expectation that God will “perform his promise” and “manifest his will” in due time and “act as the part of the Father towards us.”<sup>898</sup> This promise includes the resurrection of our glorified body.<sup>899</sup> The body will be clothed upon “incorruptible and immortal being.”<sup>900</sup>

On the three important aspects of Christian life in hope, Barth delineated them as follows. First, hope is individual but not private. Individual hope is in the universal hope of the kingdom of God.<sup>901</sup> Christian hope has a public dimension, because the Christian belongs to “the community,” “all humanity,” and “the whole cosmic order” in Christ, and is also the representative of both Christ and the surrounding humanity as a nightwatchman looking forward to the rising of “the Sun of righteousness.”<sup>902</sup> Secondly, Christian life in hope is “in expectation of the coming of Jesus Christ to judgment,” which brings eternal light and life, and the liberation of what is fettered, “the healing of what is sick,” and “the correction of what is perverted.”<sup>903</sup> Thirdly, life in hope derives from God, it does not proceed from man. “The clarity and certainty of eternal life” is only in Jesus Christ as “its origin, theme and contents.”<sup>904</sup> Thus, Christians work out “with fear and trembling” their salvation. In order to hope for God’s promise, Christians must use the freedom given by the Spirit and the Word.<sup>905</sup>

#### 4.2.10.5 The Sanctification of the World

In his lecture on Jesus Christ and Social Justice (1911), Barth emphasised that Christianity is “a social religion, a religion of solidarity,” while criticizing Luther for the individualistic tendency of Christianity. Christianity is not “a matter of the closet” but that of society. This fact became clear given that God is called “our Father,” not “my Father.”<sup>906</sup>

In his *Der Römerbrief I*, he asserted the surrender of the whole life. Explicating Rom 6: 19b as “the sum of all ethics,” he affirmed that all areas of life and all parts of the body

---

<sup>896</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 916-917.

<sup>897</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.914-915.

<sup>898</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 913.

<sup>899</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.924-926.

<sup>900</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 928.

<sup>901</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 930-931.

<sup>902</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 932-933.

<sup>903</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 934-935.

<sup>904</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.939-940.

<sup>905</sup> *CD IV/2*, 523.

<sup>906</sup> K. Barth, “Jesus Christ and the Movement for social justice,” in G. Hunsinger. ed., *Karl Barth and Radical Politics* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press,1976), p.34.

being affected and used by the power of sin should be surrendered and sanctified.<sup>907</sup> Claiming *die Heiligung des Ganzen*, he excluded any kind of duality in Christian ethics. For him, politics, society, nation, and world should be included in the sphere of sanctification. It means the end of individual pietism to him.<sup>908</sup> In the *Ethik* (1928/29), he connected our sanctification with our neighbour. “To follow Jesus” means “to be sacrificed with him for the brethren, to be bound to men, to be bound in life to our neighbours as those to whom we owe our life.”<sup>909</sup>

For Barth, the *telos* of the sanctification is the sanctification of the world.<sup>910</sup> The mission of the covenant partner is to witness Christ to the world. At the same time, he reflects Christ’s holiness through his sanctified life. In the final intention of God’s election, the sanctification of the world therefore precedes the sanctification of the individual and the church.<sup>911</sup> Accordingly, Christians should not stay in their own salvation but expand their sight to the creation of God. The church must witness to the worldwide action of God. Christ’s kingship and lordship is exerted all over the world.<sup>912</sup>

#### **4.2.10.5.1 Political Sanctification: The Relationship between Church and State**

Barth’s view of social transformation was not based on natural theology but on the Bible. Surprised at the German fascination with National Socialism, Barth questioned why National Socialism should be born in the motherland of the Reformation.<sup>913</sup> The answer was found in the two-kingdom doctrine of Luther. The kingdom of God is ruled by the Gospel, while the kingdom of the world is ruled by the Law. Whereas the Gospel is valid in the church, the Law is valid in the state. Such laws as “politics, law, economy, science and art follow their own laws.”<sup>914</sup> Two realms do not interfere with each other. Such a view of the two kingdoms failed to recognize their interrelationship and to consider Christian political responsibility. Barth saw that the Gospel does not only provide for the spiritual realm, but also for the material realm of our bodies and earthly life. According to Mt. 28:18, Christ is the Lord of the cosmos as well as the Lord of the church.<sup>915</sup> The state

---

<sup>907</sup> *Röm.* I, p. 240.

<sup>908</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 277.

<sup>909</sup> *Ethics*, p. 329.

<sup>910</sup> Karl Barth, *The Knowledge of God and the Service of God According to the Teaching of the Reformation, Recalling the Scottish Confession of 1560* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1938), pp.219-221.

<sup>911</sup> *CD IV/2*, 511.

<sup>912</sup> *CD IV/2*, 518-519.

<sup>913</sup> Karl Barth, *Eine Schweizer Stimme: 1938-1945* (Zollikon-Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag A. G., 1945), p. 113, 267.

<sup>914</sup> *EAS*, 105.

<sup>915</sup> Karl Barth, *Die Christliche Lehre nach dem Heidelberger Katechismus* (Zollikon-Zürich: Evangelischer

is outside the church, but not outside the ruling sphere of Christ. Christ's ruling over the state implies that the political system should be another form of the gracious kingdom protecting and restraining people.<sup>916</sup> Because "the church is the witness of God's justification, of the action in which God in Christ establishes human justice against evil," adequate political action by Christians is necessary for law and justice, for the constitutional state.<sup>917</sup> The state should not be led by an unjustifiable ideology like National Socialism, but by God's justice. Nevertheless, the Christian must not pursue anarchic rebellion, but should rather seek a just state order.<sup>918</sup> The Christian way to help the state is to pray for it rather than encourage violence.<sup>919</sup> When the church is in conflict with the state, she "may and must pray" "for her own restoration and preservation" and also "for the restoration and preservation of the just state"<sup>920</sup> For Barth, both prayer and action are important. If the church considers only one of them, she "would not take his responsibility for the civil community."<sup>921</sup> In this manner, Barth emphasised Christian social participation to realize Christ's ruling over the world, that is, the kingdom of God.<sup>922</sup>

On the other hand, the brotherhood of the church becomes a model for equality among men in the state.<sup>923</sup> Although the Gospel provides political direction, it is never a system or a programme, a principle, or morality.<sup>924</sup> It is spirit and life. Christ is the living Law. Therefore, it cannot be a system detached from God. For Barth, the Christian message in the political sphere cannot be directly visible, but only in the reflection of the church's political decision.<sup>925</sup>

State power and its task are provisionally committed by God. Hence, the task imposed on Christians is to help the church to go about its own task more effectively. The church must ask the state for its own freedom to carry out its ministry.<sup>926</sup> Because the justice that God committed to the state is possible on the basis of the justification which Christ has

---

Verlag A.G., 1948), p. 73.

<sup>916</sup> *EG*, 22.

<sup>917</sup> K. Barth, *Christengemeinde und Bürgergemeinde* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1946), p. 23. Hereafter, it is written *CB*.

<sup>918</sup> *AS*, 41.

<sup>919</sup> K. Barth, *Rechtfertigung und Recht, Christengemeinde und Bürgergemeinde, Evangelium und Gesetz* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1998), p.29.

<sup>920</sup> K. Barth, *The Church and the Political Problem of Our Day* (New York: Charles Scriber's Sons, 1939), p.59.

<sup>921</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 55.

<sup>922</sup> Frank Jehle described Christ's ruling as "Christ's royal reign." *EAS*, p.103; cf. Christian Walter, "Königsherrschaft Christi," *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* (Berlin and New York, 1990), p. 314.

<sup>923</sup> *CD*, IV/2, 724.

<sup>924</sup> *CB*, 13, 15, 30.

<sup>925</sup> *CB*, 33.

<sup>926</sup> Rovin W. Lovin, *Christian Faith and Public Choices: The Social Ethics of Barth, Brunner, and Bonhoeffer* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), p.117.

achieved, the state has to administer justice sincerely, as “a servant of divine justification,” so that the church might freely preach the Gospel of justification.<sup>927</sup> The state achieves the external sanctification of the unholy world through the controlling of human selfish desires.<sup>928</sup> The church should secure the subsistence of the State, as far as the freedom of the Church should be secured by the subsistence of the State.<sup>929</sup> The church can fulfil this mission through prayer for the state,<sup>930</sup> calling the state to adhere to its own mission,<sup>931</sup> encouraging and guiding the church members for active political participation.<sup>932</sup> The church may venture into political preaching in order to lead Christians rightly in the political realm.<sup>933</sup>

Whenever the state represses justice, the church should keep and defend the divine “taxis” (God’s order) from distortion<sup>934</sup> because the church received a right and duty from God to restrict political power.<sup>935</sup> Barth christens it “*neue Gehorsam*.” This political obedience to God was represented by defying the evil ruler and his regime.<sup>936</sup> God’s grace is “stormy” when the church resists the suppression of the state.<sup>937</sup> Barth rebuked “Christians in the Communist East Zone” for accepting unjust persecution in the name of political neutrality.<sup>938</sup> As a practice of his belief, he volunteered for duty as a border guard in the Swiss militia in 1940 and served “for 104 days” in spite of his age.<sup>939</sup> Barth emphasised that forcible struggle must be taken after discreet consideration of all kinds of conditions for such an action in prayer.<sup>940</sup>

Barth’s aim was not a political church but a church that would simply and solely be true to its Lord. Yet that fidelity demands a freedom that is a public moral claim, a freedom that calls for understanding by others and has implications for their own actions.<sup>941</sup>

No political power can ever be identified with revelation. State power and order are

---

<sup>927</sup> K. Barth, *Community, State and Church*, tr. W. Herberg (New York, 1960), p.119, 131.

<sup>928</sup> *AS*, 18f.

<sup>929</sup> *Ibid.*, p.35.

<sup>930</sup> K. Barth, *Church and State*, p. 136.

<sup>931</sup> *Ibid.*, p.34.

<sup>932</sup> *AS*, 82.

<sup>933</sup> K. Barth, *Church and State*, p.47.

<sup>934</sup> *Ibid.*, p.138.

<sup>935</sup> K. Barth et al, *The Spiritual Issues of the War 112* (Dec. 26, 1941):2.

<sup>936</sup> K. Barth, *Church and State*, p.140.

<sup>937</sup> K. Barth, “The Proclaim of God’s Free State,” *God Here and Now*, tr. P. van Buren (London, 1964), p.36.

<sup>938</sup> *Karl Barth’s Table Talk*, recorded and edited by John D. Godsey (Richmond: John Know Press, 1963), p. 70.

<sup>939</sup> *BAT*, pp. 305-306.

<sup>940</sup> *K. Barth’s Table Talk*, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

<sup>941</sup> Rovin W. Lovin, *Christian Faith and Public Choices: The Social Ethics of Barth, Brunner, and Bonhoeffer* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), p.122.

always external, relative and provisional,<sup>942</sup> while the Kingdom of God is eternal, absolute, ultimate. Our loyalty to the state is necessarily critical because of its incompleteness, compared to that for God's Kingdom.<sup>943</sup> Hence, the church must not try to bind the Gospel to any particular political power or party.<sup>944</sup> Barth disagreed with a Christian party, for it would unavoidably cause distrust and ignominy to the Church.<sup>945</sup> The church does not have to pursue the Western tradition, for the Western tradition is not identical with God's guide.<sup>946</sup> Because God's Word is not tied to any political system, old or new, the church can be free from both of them.

To sum up, Barth emphasised that the church can and should participate in the political field actively and freely for the practice of Christ's lordship over the world, keeping the distinction between the Gospel and any ideology or political system in mind. Barth's view of political sanctification is more developmental than Calvin's. This can in part be an answer to '2.1.2.3.2 Evasion from Reforming the World' and will be reflected in '6.2.3.3 The Participation of Social Justice.'

#### 4.2.10.5.1.1 Was Barth a Marxist?

Friedrich-Wilhelm Marquardt attempted to show that "Karl Barth was a socialist" on the basis of Barth's forty three socialist speeches.<sup>947</sup> Marquardt claimed that the "substance" of Barth's commentary on Romans 13 is "Lenin and the bolshevist revolution"<sup>948</sup> and was concerned to "sketch Barth's anarchro-socialist profile."<sup>949</sup> Bruce L. McCormack insists that "Barth was very close to Marxists indeed."<sup>950</sup> His insistence seems pertinent in the light of Barth's notion that "regarding the goal, social democracy is one with Jesus"<sup>951</sup> and "what they (socialists) want is what Jesus wanted too."<sup>952</sup> Because he believed "what Jesus has to bring to us are not ideas but a way of life," Barth could say that "as an atheist, a

---

<sup>942</sup> K. Barth, "The Christian Community in the Midst of Political Change: Documents of a Hungarian Journey," in *Against the Stream: Shorter Post-War Writings 1946-52* (London: SCM Press, 1954), p.80. Hereafter, it is written as *AS*.

<sup>943</sup> *AS*, 37f.

<sup>944</sup> K. Barth, *The Faith of the Church: A Commentary on the Apostle's Creed according to Calvin's Catechism (1943)* (London: Collins, 1960), p. 147.

<sup>945</sup> K. Barth, "Christian Community and Civil Community," in pp. 44-46.

<sup>946</sup> K. Barth, "The Church Between East and West," *AS*, 128.

<sup>947</sup> F.-W. Marquardt, 'socialism in the Theology of Karl Barth,' George Hunsinger, tr. and ed., *Karl Barth and Radical Politics* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976), p. 47; W. R. Ward, "The Social Commitment in Karl Barth," *Religious Motivation: Biographical and Sociological Problems for the Church Historian*, Vol. 15 of Derek Baker ed., *Studies in Church History* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1978), p. 453.

<sup>948</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 62.

<sup>949</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 56.

<sup>950</sup> *KCD*, p. 89.

<sup>951</sup> Karl Barth, "Jesus Christ and Social Justice," G. Hunsinger, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

<sup>952</sup> *Ibid.*, p.36.

materialist, and a Darwinist, one can be a genuine follower and disciple of Jesus.”<sup>953</sup> Barth’s views on “the abolition of private property” and “the nationalization of the means of production” in particular, are similar to those of communism.<sup>954</sup>

Barth may be said to have differed from Marx on four points.<sup>955</sup> Firstly, he recognized both soul and material. This is shown by Barth’s assertion that God’s will is done “in this world” comprising spiritual things and material things.<sup>956</sup> Secondly, he gave priority to the internal transformation of the individual rather than social transformation. In his sermon for 1914, Barth criticized men for fighting for social justice without Jesus.

Yes, Jesus has proclaimed a new, righteous world, the Kingdom of God, but only those will enter, only those will see it, who are of a pure heart and a good will...whoever wants a better world must become a better man.<sup>957</sup>

This casts light on his view that human transformation is necessary for entering the kingdom of God, though it is not sure whether he recognized that human transformation can be possible only by Christ’s Gospel. Thirdly, though he deemed socialist demands to be “an important part of the application of the Gospel,”<sup>958</sup> he did not identify the kingdom of God with Socialism after meeting with Blumhardts.<sup>959</sup> Lastly, as Shelly Baranowski puts it, Barth could never endorse anarchist tactics as the absolute means of political action.<sup>960</sup> He did not think that God’s kingdom could be accomplished “through the weapons of unrighteousness.”<sup>961</sup> Hence, it is improbable to call Barth a Marxist. This corollary becomes clearer, given that he criticized communism for misleading and seducing men. Communism was compared to “the lion (the devil) that prowls the East today” and he judged it to be resisted.<sup>962</sup>

---

<sup>953</sup> *Ibid.*, p.22.

<sup>954</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 29-31, 43.

<sup>955</sup> “About the manner in which they act to attain it, I could not say the same thing.” *Ibid.*, p.36.

<sup>956</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 27; Cf. Stuart Mews, “Neo-orthodoxy, liberalism and war 1914-18,” p.373 in *Studies in Church History* edited by Derek Baker, Vol. 14 *Renaissance and Renewal in Christian History*.

<sup>957</sup> K. Barth, *Predigten 1914*, ed., Ursula and Jochen Fähler (Zurich: TVZ, 1976), pp. 38, 42, 591; cf. K. Barth, “Jesus Christ and the Movement for social justice” (1911) in: G. Hunsinger. ed., *Karl Barth and Radical Politics* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976), p. 37.

<sup>958</sup> *KCD*, p.80.

<sup>959</sup> “Everything that humans are able to accomplish can only be transitory”...even attainment “of the socialists ought never to be identified with the Kingdom.” Barth, sermon, 28 Dec. 1913 in *Predigten 1913*, p. 686. Quoted in *KCD*, *op. cit.*, p.101.

<sup>960</sup> Baranowski, Shelly, “The Primacy of Theology: Karl Barth and Socialism,” *Studies in Religion*, Vol.10, no.4 (1981): 452.

<sup>961</sup> K. Barth, sermon, 2 March, 1913 in *Predigten 1913*, pp. 79-80; *KCD*, pp. 101-102.

<sup>962</sup> “Karl Barth’s Own Words: Excerpts from the Swiss theologian’s letter to an East German pastor, with translation, subtitles and introduction by Rose Marie Oswald Barth,” *The Christian Century* 76 (March 25,



Of course, Barth can be said to have a proclivity to communism rather than capitalism given his comment that anti-communism was “an evil greater than communism itself.”<sup>963</sup> His tendency towards communism resulted from his esteem of its high ideal to create “just social conditions acceptable for all layers of the population.”<sup>964</sup> Although he did not regard “the kind of Communism ruling in Russia” as “a form of life worthy of our acceptance or approval,” he never did give up the expectation of serious socialism which is based on “justice and freedom.”<sup>965</sup> Barth might neither have perceived the limit of communism nor have foreseen its degradation because his expectation of socialism was very great. Anyway, in contrast to his critique, contemporary capitalism seems to have many strong points in spite of the allowance of private property. In this respect, Calvin’s recognition of private property is more realistic. The Old Testament seems to support the concept of private property. The New Testament emphasises the practice of love, but does not seem to support any particular economic system.

#### **4.2.10.5.2 Social Sanctification**

##### **4.2.10.5.2.1 The Holy Day: Sanctification of All Time**

All time belongs to God, but He marked Sunday as the special time for serving Him.<sup>966</sup> This day plays a role as a mark of God’s covenant and indicates salvation history planted in world history.<sup>967</sup> It functions as an eschatological mark at the end of human works and designates the ultimate completion of covenant and salvation history.<sup>968</sup> The holy day can be described as two freedoms: one is freedom from anxiety of work and the other is freedom for serving God.<sup>969</sup> From obedience of this day, we learn to deny work and ourselves, but to trust in God.<sup>970</sup>

Barth offered some principal explanations for the holy day. First, this day is God’s day, not man’s day.<sup>971</sup> Secondly, the day is a day for celebration, not a compelling day by religious duty. Thirdly, it is the day for communion with other people in God, not for

---

1959): 352-355.

<sup>963</sup> K. Barth, *How I Changed My Mind*: Introduction and Epilogue by John D. Godsey (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1966), p. 47.

<sup>964</sup> K. Barth, *Offene Briefe 1945-1968*, ed. by Diether Koch (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 1984) (GA 15), p. 210.

<sup>965</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 163f.

<sup>966</sup> CD III/4, 49f.

<sup>967</sup> CD III/4, 52ff.

<sup>968</sup> CD III/4, 56ff.

<sup>969</sup> CD III/4, 60.

<sup>970</sup> CD III/4, 63f.

<sup>971</sup> CD III/4, 66-67.

isolation, nor for family meeting.<sup>972</sup> Fourthly, this day is “the sign of that which is the meaning of all days.” On Sunday, we reflect our life during the week day. “If the weeks are really sour, the festivals cannot be joyous.” Conversely, “if the festivals are really joyous, the weeks cannot be merely sour.” The proper service of God on Sunday enables us to enjoy rest, peace, and prayer as a break from everyday activities.<sup>973</sup>

#### **4.2.10.5.2.2 Marriage, Family, and Neighbours: Relational Sanctification**

##### **4.2.10.5.2.2.1 Man and Woman: Marriage**

For Barth, the focus of the relationship between man and woman is on co-existence and encounter with their fellow-men.<sup>974</sup> He deemed “coitus without coexistence” to be “demonic.” The command of God does not require any rejection or restraint of sex but “the completion of the sexual relation” integrated into the entire encounter of man and woman. It requests of us “the decisive sanctification of physical sexuality and the sex relationship.”<sup>975</sup> Accordingly, “physical sexuality and the sex relationship cannot remain outside the scope” of God’s sanctifying command.<sup>976</sup>

With respect to sexual identity, Barth understood it to be male and female in true encounters and relations with others.<sup>977</sup> Man and woman should be faithful to their human nature and to their special gift and duty.<sup>978</sup> They should not try to exchange their particular vocation nor elude their sexuality, in other words we should object to “effeminacy in the male or mannishness in the female” or neutralisation of the sexes resulting in “dehumanisation.” This confusion of sexual identity may not be adopted by “the modern feminist movement.”<sup>979</sup> Homosexuality is “the physical, psychological and social sickness,” “the phenomenon of perversion,” corruption and putrefaction and the root of inhumanity.<sup>980</sup>

The proper relationship between man and woman can be summarised into three categories: “to consider one another,” “to hear the question” put by each other, and “to make responsible answer to one another.”<sup>981</sup> Their proper function and attitude “must not be confused and interchanged but faithfully maintained.” They are equal to God and in

---

<sup>972</sup> *CD III/4*, 68-71.

<sup>973</sup> *CD III/4*, 71-72.

<sup>974</sup> *CD III/4*, 118.

<sup>975</sup> *CD III/4*, 132-133.

<sup>976</sup> *CD III/4*, 132.

<sup>977</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.149-150, 156.

<sup>978</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 152, 157.

<sup>979</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 154-155.

<sup>980</sup> *CD III/4*, p. 166.

<sup>981</sup> *CD III/4*, p. 167.

their reciprocal relation and orientation.<sup>982</sup> There is an order that man precedes woman and woman follows man. It means succession and “super- and sub-ordination” but does not mean any inequality between them.<sup>983</sup> By God’s command, they are claimed and “sanctified as man and woman.” Subjection and obedience are ascribed to both of them. Both the dictatorship of the man and the acquiescence of the woman are contrary to God’s command.<sup>984</sup> The mature woman fulfils “the position and function” allotted to her, showing her independence, mastery, and equality with man.<sup>985</sup> This part answers ‘2.1.2.5.5 Confucianism’ and will be reflected in ‘6.2.3.2 Social Order and Authority.’

Barth viewed marriage as the *telos* and core of the relation between man and woman. Marriage is “a special calling,” “a gift and grace” of God.<sup>986</sup> It is a calling to desire “total and all-embracing fellowship for life.”<sup>987</sup> This partnership is the genuine freedom concomitant with responsibility in reciprocal totality.<sup>988</sup> Marriage is “an exclusive life-partnership,” that is, “essentially monogamy.”<sup>989</sup> Polygamy often found on the mission field should not be allowed to change the divine command of monogamy.<sup>990</sup> Conversely, it should be replaced by monogamy. Marriage is “a lasting life-partnership” because “what therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.”<sup>991</sup> Divorce is allowed in “a highly extraordinary case”<sup>992</sup> with faith in God’s permission.<sup>993</sup> Marriage has an institutional side because it has eventuated in the civil and ecclesiastical society. Additionally, marriage is not obligatory or necessary for everyone.<sup>994</sup> The command of God of marriage manifested in Gen 2:34 was accomplished in the marriage between Christ and his church described in Eph 5:32. After the achievement of God’s promise, human marriage is not any longer an absolute, but relatively necessary. Celibacy is no longer a disgrace or a superior thing.<sup>995</sup> It can be regarded as a valid choice.

#### 4.2.10.5.2.2.2 Parents and Children

Everyone is the child of his parents. God’s command directs us to show “a very definite

---

<sup>982</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 168-169.

<sup>983</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.169-170.

<sup>984</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 178.

<sup>985</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 180.

<sup>986</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 183.

<sup>987</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 189.

<sup>988</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 191.

<sup>989</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 195.

<sup>990</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 203.

<sup>991</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.203-204.

<sup>992</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 208, 211.

<sup>993</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 211.

<sup>994</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 148.

<sup>995</sup> *CD III/4*, 143-144.

attitude of subordination” to our parents. Parents are wiser and more experienced, which gives them the responsibility to convey their knowledge and experience to their children.<sup>996</sup> Children must learn from their parents as their apprentices to be led into “the way of life.” The divine ground of this demand is the fact that parents are “God’s primary and natural representatives.” Human fatherhood may symbolise the fatherhood of God in a man. Parents remind their children of God as their *Prius*.<sup>997</sup> Children honour God by honouring their parents, through accepting the education of their parents.<sup>998</sup> The fifth command of the obedience of children is not a social convention, but was established by God. Accordingly, it is limited by the first command of God, which means that the obedience to God precedes the obedience to their parents.<sup>999</sup>

On the modes of children’s honouring of their parents, Barth explicated it according to their growth stages. When they are very young, they simply accept the instruction of their parents. When they are adolescent, they must uncomplainingly obey their parents in heteronomy and autonomy. When they are adult, they honour them “by going their own way on their own feet.”<sup>1000</sup> The validity of their obedience is not dependent upon how well their parents practise the responsibility as teachers or advisers or how good a character they have.<sup>1001</sup> It is founded on God’s command. They should recognise that the duty of their parents is very difficult to administrate.<sup>1002</sup>

As the origin of the view that children should obey the command of God, Barth suggested Christ, as the only One that completely accomplished the command.<sup>1003</sup> Through “the sanctifying power of the command,” man can obey the command already accomplished in Christ.<sup>1004</sup>

Parenthood was considered as a free choice or “optional gift of the goodness of God.” The description of childlessness as a curse often manifested in the Old Testament is not valid any longer in our days.<sup>1005</sup> Childless parents must be comforted and cheerful in God. On whether a couple has a child or not, first, it must be responsibly decided after discerning God’s will rather than natural consequence.<sup>1006</sup> Secondly, it should be “joint consideration and decision” between two persons. Thirdly, the burden of birth control

---

<sup>996</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 243.

<sup>997</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 245-246.

<sup>998</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 247.

<sup>999</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.251-252.

<sup>1000</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.253-254.

<sup>1001</sup> *Ibid.* pp.255-256.

<sup>1002</sup> *Ibid.* p.257.

<sup>1003</sup> *Ibid.* p. 258.

<sup>1004</sup> *Ibid.* p. 260.

<sup>1005</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 266-267.

<sup>1006</sup> *CD III/4*, pp. 270-271.

should be the husband's share because wife is the weaker vessel.<sup>1007</sup>

To be parents implies honour and obligation. Obligation means that they are responsible for their children "as long as they live." As the closest representatives of God, they live for their children, testifying to the fact that their children are protected and guided "under the hand of God."<sup>1008</sup> Their honour and obligation is "not to obtrude" themselves on their children but "to impart this witness" to them. The success of their education depends upon whether they are disciplined before God.<sup>1009</sup> Pointing out that the disciplinary severity of Proverbs is no longer valid after Jesus' redemption, Barth emphasised bringing them up in the *paideia*,<sup>a</sup> (nurture) and *nougesia*,<sup>a</sup> (admonition) of the Lord.<sup>1010</sup> Parents offer various opportunities to their children, including that of meeting God. The limit of their responsibility must be admitted under God's forgiving grace.<sup>1011</sup>

#### 4.2.10.5.2.2.3 Near and Distant Neighbours

Barth defined near neighbours as "those who are near to him by nature and in and with the fact of his historical existence," i.e., his people, and viewed distant neighbours as those who have "a different natural and historical basis and form."<sup>1012</sup> Focus is on the fact that each of them is "a fellow human being." Accordingly, God's command is notified to man in his distinction "as a member of his people" and "as a member of humanity." In a particular natural and historical situation, God's command summons man to obedience and "sanctifies him."<sup>1013</sup>

The first distinction between close neighbours and distant neighbours is their language, which must be used well to the honour of God and to form a partnership with the other.<sup>1014</sup> To develop relationships with foreigners, it is necessary to learn their language. The second distinction is geographical location,<sup>1015</sup> where man is summoned "to the obedient praise to God" and "love of his neighbours."<sup>1016</sup> This locality can be very significant to him "in the context of its sanctification" by God's command. One's own people must not be a barrier, but an entrance for his service for the sanctification of his neighbours and himself. The third distinction is history. According to Barth, if the sanctification of anyone "is not the sanctification of his historical existence," it cannot be regarded as his

---

<sup>1007</sup> *Ibid.* p. 276.

<sup>1008</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 277-278.

<sup>1009</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 279-280.

<sup>1010</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 282-283.

<sup>1011</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 284-285.

<sup>1012</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 286.

<sup>1013</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 287-288.

<sup>1014</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 289-290.

<sup>1015</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 291-292.

<sup>1016</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 292.

sanctification.<sup>1017</sup> Recognising the situation of his people and himself is guided by God, and he must serve his people according to God's command. At the same time, he must be concerned with other people, i.e., the fellow humanity in Christ. In this manner, the sphere of his sanctification is extended from his particular existence to the universal existence in Christ.<sup>1018</sup>

Those three distinctions are impermanent, fluid and changeable "where God's command is issued." Barth's insight is extraordinary, given that European countries were reborn as the European Union. Viewed in individual life, our particularity is limited to the period when we live on earth.<sup>1019</sup> Viewed in a spiritual light, the barrier of language was demolished in the Pentecostal event, which was the symbol of the kingdom of God to come in future in order to recover us from division.<sup>1020</sup>

#### **4.2.10.5.2.3 Social Issues: Murder, Suicide, Abortion, Euthanasia, Self-Defence, and the Death Penalty**

Barth elucidated the sixth commandment: "Thou shalt not kill" as "protection to human life against wilful and wanton extinction." The protection of human life depends upon the command of God, who is the Creator, rather than its inherent value.<sup>1021</sup> This implies that its protection can be limited, defined by the command of God because God is the Lord of life. In the case of Jesus Christ, his life was sacrificed to save people by God's will. As life is "a loan from God entrusted to man for His service" such sacrifice is "legitimate."<sup>1022</sup> However, "indifference, wilfulness and wantonness" cannot be generally allowed to substitute the obligation to protect life.<sup>1023</sup>

Suicide is viewed as "a last and most radical means of procuring for oneself justice and freedom" in an exceptional case, which means the case that it is authorised by God.<sup>1024</sup> But for God's acknowledgement, suicide is only self-murder. Unlike the Roman Catholic Church, Barth thought that there is "surely forgiveness for suicide." He deemed the view that suicide is unforgivable to be false.<sup>1025</sup> For Barth, there was no biblical passage that specifically condemned suicide.<sup>1026</sup> For example, Saul, Ahithopel, Judas, and Samson who all took their own lives were not condemned. Samson's self-destruction, in particular, did

---

<sup>1017</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 294-295.

<sup>1018</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 296-297.

<sup>1019</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 300-302.

<sup>1020</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 320-323.

<sup>1021</sup> *CD III/4*, 397-398.

<sup>1022</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 402.

<sup>1023</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 398.

<sup>1024</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 403-404.

<sup>1025</sup> *CD III/4* 405.

<sup>1026</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 408.



not prevent him from being almost considered a martyr (Heb 11:32; 12:1).<sup>1027</sup> As a form of self-sacrifice or self-offering, self-destruction was distinguished from suicide. Barth claimed that man should choose self-destruction “joyfully, resolutely and with a good rather than a doubtful conscience” when due to torment, there is danger to betray his friends and duty, or to deny his belief. In any other situation, he “should not do so.” The final moment of self-decision must follow God’s command. Self-destruction by God’s command is not “murder.”<sup>1028</sup>

*Abortus* is “a killing of human life” and a “monstrous thing,” because it is “a man and not a thing” from the beginning.<sup>1029</sup> Although the embryo does not have independent life, it is not a simple part of the mother’s body. Rather, it can sometimes live in spite of its mother’s illness or death. In this respect, it may be said to be “a human being in its own right.” Abortion is the denial of the gift given by God and the destruction of the life redeemed by Jesus Christ. On this matter, Barth sided with the conservative view of the Roman Catholic Church.<sup>1030</sup> Nonetheless, Barth admitted that “there is a forgiveness” to be appropriated even for abortion.<sup>1031</sup> In abortion, God has his sovereignty as the Creator of life and his permission for abortion would be very rare.<sup>1032</sup> It can be justified in the case where a pregnancy threatens the life of the mother. Human society has no right to extinguish the incurably infirm, the insane, imbeciles, the deformed, and the crippled on the grounds that they cannot look after themselves.<sup>1033</sup> This part will be reflected in ‘6.2.3.1 Stewardship for Community and Environment.’

Euthanasia must be permitted “within the defined limits.” Its limit depends only upon God’s “specific and clear command.” Therefore, it must not be administered in an arbitrary manner or out of any selfish motive to want a patient to die in a short time. Like living, dying can also be a blessing to man from God. In this respect, euthanasia can deprive man of his blessing. It is uncertain whether euthanasia will be of benefit to a patient or not. A doctor should use discretion in applying it to the patient.<sup>1034</sup>

Killing in self-defence to protect life and belongings can be justifiable before a civil judge, but it may not be before God. It is natural, but not holy. Self-defence must be directed by God’s command, which can be different from the limits of the law.<sup>1035</sup> Examples occur in 1 Cor 6:1-11, Mt 5:38-42. Barth interpreted such passages as “ye resist

---

<sup>1027</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 408-411.

<sup>1028</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 412-413.

<sup>1029</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.415-416.

<sup>1030</sup> *Ibid.*, p.416.

<sup>1031</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 419.

<sup>1032</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 420-421.

<sup>1033</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.422-423.

<sup>1034</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 425-426.

<sup>1035</sup> *CD III/4*, 428-429.

not evil,” and “overcome evil with good” as “quite literally” valid truth “for all men” beyond time and place.<sup>1036</sup> By his view, the Bible set the attacker “on the same level as a beggar or borrower.” It implies that we must understand the difficult situation of the attacker in view of mercy and compassion<sup>1037</sup> and we must believe that God will fight and conquer for us in the situation. Self-defence should be done according to the command of God, not our natural instinct. Our instinct should be sanctified by God’s command.<sup>1038</sup> In the command of God, we can do self-defence “in the genuine interest” and “love” for the attacker “with pure hand and a clear conscience.”<sup>1039</sup> In this manner, self-defence is involved in the service of God. In my view, Barth’s opinion did not consider the case of evil robbers who inflict damage and suffering on ordinary law-abiding citizens.

Capital punishment was viewed as “the final and most drastic means of defence against a human assailant.” The victim committed his right of self defence by using society’s laws, courts judges, and executioner. In view of peace and impartiality, the death penalty is “decided and executed by the society.” For example, all men of Israel were commanded to take part in stoning the criminal (Lev 20:2). This is to prevent individual, arbitrary revenge and the general anarchy of endless avenging. At the same time, it asks every individual in the community to share the responsibility.<sup>1040</sup>

Barth manifested a negative view of the death penalty for three reasons. Firstly, considering the purpose of punishment as bringing the criminal to “an acknowledgment of his error,” and inciting him to “future amendment,” Barth understood the death sentence to deprive him of the chance to be corrected by presupposing the impossibility of amending him.<sup>1041</sup> Secondly, human punishment is different from the retributive justice of God because the former is fallible, while the latter is infallible. Besides, given the fact that Christ died instead of every criminal, a life sentence should be considered before a death sentence.<sup>1042</sup> Thirdly, the theory that punishment is to protect society and the individual is contradictory because the criminal is a member of the society. Punishing by death is to give up the life that the society must protect. Accordingly, keeping a prisoner alive and rendering him harmless should be preferable to the death sentence.<sup>1043</sup>

Barth believed three exceptional situations would make for the death penalty: that it is better “for one person to die” than “that the whole nation should perish,” that it is “an just reward” for his deed in the will of God, that it is “the only mercy” to be offered the

---

<sup>1036</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 429-430.

<sup>1037</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 431.

<sup>1038</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 434.

<sup>1039</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 433-435.

<sup>1040</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 437-439.

<sup>1041</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 440-441.

<sup>1042</sup> *CD III/4*, pp. 442-443.

<sup>1043</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 444-445.

criminal. Of course, he should be given the opportunity to be forgiven by God. For example, serious treason during a war deserves the death sentence.<sup>1044</sup> Tyrannicide should be done in obedience to God's command. In this respect, the failure of the plan to have assassinated Adolf Hitler resulted from "that they had no a clear and categorical command from God to do it."<sup>1045</sup>

#### 4.2.10.5.2.4 War and Conscription

For Barth, it is utterly unacceptable to rationalize war in view of "the nature of the state" or "the historical existence of nation." To wage war is "no part of the normal task of the state."<sup>1046</sup> Its normal task is to create peace and to serve life. Its primary concern should be a life of order rather than rearmament or disarmament. The duty of Christian ethics is to keep war at bay by fashioning true peace between nations. Practically and relatively, war can be avoided to a great extent.<sup>1047</sup> Barth fully supported the ten theses presented to the German Evangelical Church Synod in April 1958, whose core was that the Church and the individual Christian must only say *No* to any form of atomic warfare.<sup>1048</sup>

As a case of unavoidable war, Barth noted that war could be unavoidable if one nation finds "its very existence and autonomy" are threatened,<sup>1049</sup> and if God's command requires a nation to defend the state or its allied state in such an emergency, it must wage war with faith and obedience. The acceptance of the command is unconditional regardless of victory or defeat. In war, an individual faces the serious risk of being killed by enemies or killing them,<sup>1050</sup> but as a citizen he must obey and pray for the state.

While conscription can be morally acceptable, an individual can refuse conscription as a conscientious objector if his judgment identifies that war evil, unjust, and irresponsible. He must accept the hostility of the majority and the penalty of the law for his disobedience.<sup>1051</sup> The church also should sometimes judge whether the command of God is correspondent with military service.<sup>1052</sup> When its judgment isn't popular, the church must face threats or suffering. Barth's view throws light on the Korean context where Jehovah's witnesses refuse military service.

---

<sup>1044</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 447-448.

<sup>1045</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 449.

<sup>1046</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 457-458.

<sup>1047</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 460.

<sup>1048</sup> Rowan Williams, "Barth, War and the State," *Reckoning with Barth: Essay in Commemoration of the Centenary of Karl Barth's Birth*, ed. by Nigel Biggar (London & Oxford: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd, 1988), pp. 170-172; Werner Schmauch and Ernst Wolf, "Königsherrschaft Christi," *Theologische Existenz Heute* 64 (Munich, 1958): 70.

<sup>1049</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 461.

<sup>1050</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.462-463.

<sup>1051</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 466-468.

<sup>1052</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 469.

#### 4.2.10.5.2.5 Work

As God cares for his creatures as the object of his love, He asks man to care for them through his work.<sup>1053</sup> Work signifies “man’s active affirmation of his existence as a human creature.”<sup>1054</sup> Through work, man is distinguished as “the centre of the earthly creation.”<sup>1055</sup> It offers a man dignity, though it is not divine. It is the fulfilment of ordered unity in the sense that it is “to fashion nature through the spirit” and “to fulfil the spirit through nature.” It is “a form of human obedience” to God’s command and “a fulfilment of the law of human nature.”<sup>1056</sup>

Human obedience to God’s command is essential *ergon* and his cultural task is a *parergon*. Culture does not have an independent value. Without faith and obedience, human work will face a serious uncertainty, losing its reason, end, and meaning. The aim of work is in “the true and essential service to which God wills to call him with the coming of His kingdom.”<sup>1057</sup> The service consists in “the preservation, safeguarding, development and fashioning of human life.” For this service, man “must do what he can within the limits of what is possible, to guarantee his existence.”

Barth suggested some criteria to decide what is right and commanded. The *first* criterion is to set particular ends for himself and to do his best to achieve them.<sup>1058</sup> This criterion of right work is called “the criterion of objectivity.” It is not we, but God who clearly judges whether work is objective or not, and whether we are “heart and soul” in the work.<sup>1059</sup> The *second* one is whether the work makes any significant contribution to human existence.<sup>1060</sup> Christians have a duty to influence society to distinguish between useless, injurious work and worthy, honest work. The *third* criterion of work is the “humanity of human work” as the basic motive.<sup>1061</sup> This means that our work should not be performed in isolation from, hostility to, or exploitation of our fellow men, but in fellowship and coordination with others who have to earn their breads.<sup>1062</sup> The *fourth* criterion of right work is “the criterion of reflectivity,” which means that right work needs our concentration, not a simple mechanical behaviour.<sup>1063</sup> It also requires honesty, courage, rest and consistency at the point where they are lacking.<sup>1064</sup> The *fifth* criterion of true work

---

<sup>1053</sup> CD III/4, 517.

<sup>1054</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 518.

<sup>1055</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 521.

<sup>1056</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 519-520.

<sup>1057</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 523-524.

<sup>1058</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 526-527.

<sup>1059</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 528-529.

<sup>1060</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 530-531.

<sup>1061</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 532-535.

<sup>1062</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 536-537.

<sup>1063</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 546-547.

<sup>1064</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 550.

is whether it aims at “the freedom of man for existence.” This freedom takes place in God’s commandment of the Sabbath, which is for man’s freedom and rest. Without relaxation, tension of work will destroy man.<sup>1065</sup> Real rest needs contemplation, which can be described as a transition from work to the Word of God to hear and answer it. Man can receive true and eternal rest because God speaks to him in his mercy. True rest is a matter of “pure receiving” comprising our answer, calling on his name, praise, and petition.<sup>1066</sup>

#### 4.2.10.5.3 Summary and Critique

Russell W. Palmer criticized Barth for his inconsistency concerning the death penalty.<sup>1067</sup> Barth’s application of analogy to the specific problems of ethics is too arbitrary.<sup>1068</sup> Palmer elaborated his view as follows. Firstly, Barth’s opinion that “because Christ is the Light of the world,” the “Christian should oppose all secret diplomacy” can be refuted by Thieliicke’s suggestion that “secret diplomacy is justified by the fact of the messianic secret.”<sup>1069</sup> Secondly, if monogamy can be justified by the covenant relationship between God and his people, polygamy can be justified by the contention that God loves all men. Thirdly, if the death penalty can be abolished by Christ’s death, why can the penalties of other crimes not be abolished? Fourthly, was human procreation just for preparing for the coming of Christ? Is it also for the service of God’s cultural command? Palmer’s other criticism is that Barth’s view of procreation was influenced as much by modern Western culture as it was influenced by the New Testament. Briefly, Palmer pronounced Barth’s ethical programme a failure.<sup>1070</sup>

In my view, Palmer’s analysis of Barth’s ethics seems quite valid due to his consistent logic. It would imply that for the direction of our ethics, we should use the biblical passages directly related to our specific issues rather than the analogy between Christ and us. However, except for Barth’s inherence to Christological centrality, his conclusion seems generally pertinent. We should particularly value Barth’s view reducing the penalty’s harshness in the light of Christ’s redemption. Palmer thinks little of this point. Granting that the Bible is primarily given to the people of the time, the records of the Bible related to the particularity of the time may be invalid for our time. Hence, we need to recognise that we can use other resources besides the Bible for particular issues because God uses our regenerated reason for our time. In this respect, Barth was not to be blamed.

---

<sup>1065</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 551-552.

<sup>1066</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 563-564.

<sup>1067</sup> Russell W. Palmer, “Methodological Weakness in Barth’s Approach to Ethics,” *The Journal of Religious Thought*, Vol. 26, no. 1 (1969): 75-76.

<sup>1068</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 78.

<sup>1069</sup> *Ibid.*; also see Barth, *Community, State and Church*, p.176; Helmut Thieliicke, *Theologische Ethik*, I, 412.

<sup>1070</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 80-81.

His failure resulted only from his excessive inherence to the method of analogy, not his consideration of the ideas or issues of his time. Rather, he cited many biblical passages in relation to ethical issues. Another important point may be to recognise that the Bible can offer the basis of human ethics, but it cannot answer all issues of our times.

## 4.3 Abstract and Assessment

### 4.3.1 Abstract

Barth defined sanctification as God's action to involve man in the sanctification of Christ. The human role is to respond to the obedience of faith to the direction of the Holy Spirit. The response consists of his exertion of the freedom which is given by God in Jesus Christ. It is human participation in the sanctity of Christ. The role of God in sanctification is the entire initiative in which He elects Christ and His people in Christ, plans Christ's incarnation, death and resurrection, and exaltation. Christ accomplishes the predestination of God. Through Christ's being and work, God completely accomplished the sanctification of man. It is objective sanctification which is already achieved in Christ. It means the perfection of *de jure* sanctification.

The Holy Spirit as Christ's Spirit directs man in his new status and freedom, which is achieved in Christ. By the direction of the Holy Spirit, man recognizes his position as a new being in Christ and takes part in the sanctification of Christ. The presence of the Holy Spirit in Christ's direction confers freedom upon man. This freedom leads him to obedience of God's will. His will is the call to discipline, which consists of following Jesus through self-denial,<sup>1071</sup> which is the life of bearing his cross. We participate in the obedience of Christ in the presence of the Holy Spirit. Our lives are the reflection of the sanctity of Christ. This is *de facto* sanctification. It is incomplete in this world. This denotes imperfection of *de facto* sanctification.

The Christian who is awakened to conversion experiences a disturbance between the old man and the new man. Although he is already definitely holy, its true reality is concealed in Christ. It will be revealed to him in the *eschaton*. All his life he continues struggling with sin in him. Everyday he is awakened as a new being in Christ by the direction of the Holy Spirit. His mortification and vivification take place again and again. All the same, victory is determined in Christ and the new man wins continuously with the help of His Spirit. This is the gradualness of sanctification. The first awakening to conversion takes place immediately. It is the immediacy of sanctification. It is connected with our definitive sanctification due to the atonement of Christ.

God's Word is the living Lord Himself. Accordingly, man cannot grasp and possess it

---

<sup>1071</sup> CD IV/1, 101.

like his belongings. His Word always takes the initiative to direct us. When we hear God's Word, it needs our instant and unconditional obedience. Sometimes it asks our rational deliberation to apply His Word to our situation.<sup>1072</sup>

Barth's worry about arbitrary human manipulation of the Bible makes his attitudes towards the means of sanctification unclear. Whether the Bible, prayer, and sacraments are the instruments of sanctification seem unclear, while the cross and the fellowship of saints are clearly described as the means of sanctification. As they are used by the Holy Spirit rather than by man, Barth avoided the expression of the means of sanctification. In using them, the initiative depends upon the Spirit and man only responds to it.

Everyone was objectively elected and sanctified in Christ. It was already accomplished in Christ. Through his obedient life and death Christ has sanctified everyone once and for all. Only many people do not recognise this fact. The ultimate determination of God does not change according to human choice and decision of the Gospel. Human reprobation is an impossible possibility, for all humankind was elected in Christ. Nonetheless, there are a lot of people who live as if they were not elected and sanctified. Their destiny is gloomy. The grace of God may save them in the *eschaton*. We do not have to give up the possibility of their salvation. In this way, Barth rejects the reprobation of man.

Human good works are the fruits of sanctification. They result from human gratitude for the salvation of God. They do not merit God's grace and justification. They are our reflection of the goodness of God. They stem from our looking to Christ according to the direction of the Holy Spirit. We are not the origin of the light but the radiation of the light, who is God. Sanctification consists of "the mutuality of God's grace and human gratitude."<sup>1073</sup>

The sphere of the doctrine of sanctification should not stay only in the individual Christian and the Church. Rather the message should reach the world under the rule of God. The goal of God is the reconciliation of the world. The sanctification of Christ, the sanctification of the Church in Him, and individual sanctification aim at the sanctification of the world. Though Barth is said to be a Christian socialist, he was not a Marxist. His concern for social transformation based on the distribution of riches, sheds light on his view of the sanctification of the world.

The Christian community is created by the direction of the Holy Spirit and grows only by the life of Christ. It should be protected from sacralisation and secularisation by the Living Lord and the waking up of the community. Its law is the law of service and love.

---

<sup>1072</sup> Besides, to admit that particular biblical statements are mistaken, or even to doubt the validity of certain principles espoused by particular biblical voices or traditions, is not necessarily to deny that the Bible is a moral authority, even in some sense the primary moral authority. Nigel Biggar, *The Hastening that Waits: Karl Barth's Ethics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 167.

<sup>1073</sup> John Webster, "Introducing Barth," in *The Cambridge Companion to Karl Barth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p.14.



The Christian lives his life in faith, love, and hope, which are the treatment for the three sins: pride, sloth, and falsehood. Christian life is a life of offering a living sacrifice in gratitude and faith. His sanctification appears in his love. It moves from the incomplete form to the complete form at the end of the world.

The application of Barth's teaching of sanctification is presented in 'The Christian Community and The Civil Community.' The Christian community should pray and help and ask in order that the civil community rightly serves the command of God which is given to it. If necessary, the Christian community can protest against the civil community. The community must not pursue anarchy, for God rules over the world by His order. Barth dealt with the protection of life from his peculiar perspective based on the Bible and his contextual knowledge.

### 4.3.2 Assessment

#### 4.3.2.1 Positive Assessment

1 As O. G. Otterness refers to it, Barth's utmost contribution to the doctrine of sanctification is to induce the personal and relational categories which are adequate to present "the dynamics of reconciliation within covenant" instead of concepts like the cleaning of human corrupt nature or the elevation of human nature or the second blessing.<sup>1074</sup> In Barth's view, the image of God is not a quality or something inherent to man. It is the proper human relationship with God, fellowmen, and self. His view of sin comprising pride, sloth, and falsehood has a relational aspect in contrast to the ontological aspect of traditional theology. It reflects the existential aspect of man. Barth's view of grace is not that of an impersonal power to change human nature but the gift of God which creates a new relationship between men and God. It offers man the freedom which empowers him to be a faithful covenant partner of God.

2 He protested against individualism, sectarianism and secularism. His stress on "saints only in plurality" acquires such a purpose. In the teleological structure of his theology, this contributes to the sanctification of the world, which is noteworthy for the advancement of world mission and evangelism in Jesus Christ. For Barth, the sanctification of the individual Christian is not in itself but in the service of the sanctification of the world through its witness. Furthermore, as Lukas Burckhardt aptly put,<sup>1075</sup> Barth's direct participation in the political and social struggle is a good example of political sanctification

---

<sup>1074</sup> O. G. Otterness, *op. cit.*, p. 189.

<sup>1075</sup> "In face of the threat of the Third Reich, when courage was lacking, he virtually embodied this resistance in his own person." Lukas Burckhardt's memorial address at the funeral service on Dec. 14, 1968. Cited by Frank Jehle, *Ever against the Stream: The Politics of Karl Barth, 1906-1968*, tr. by Richard and Martha Burnett (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2002), p. 2.

as the sanctification of the world. The Korean Church needs a more active attitude with respect to the political sphere.

3 The objective aspect of his doctrine of sanctification offers the assurance and security of salvation. It awakens the believers to focus not on their subjective feeling, but on the work of God which was already accomplished.

4 His emphasis on the sovereignty of God in the process of sanctification strengthens the line of Reformed theology against Arminianism and Pelagianism. His theology is thoroughly centred on the grace of God to the extent that it is called the triumph of grace. It will presumably attract modern people to Christianity.

5 Through his emphasis on the Word of God, his defence of theology against liberalism deserves our praise. He seems to have done his best for the future of theology in the worst time when liberalism and anthropocentric thought overwhelmed the world.<sup>1076</sup> He converted the criterion of judgment from human experience, philosophy, and science to the Bible. He also recovered human ethics without God to theological ethics with the humanity of God.

6 His exposition of πίστις as faithfulness may be his contribution. We are saved through the faithfulness of God in Christ. The faithfulness of Christ precedes our faith in Him. We live in our belief in His faithfulness.

7 His accentuation of freedom can be helpful to deliver the doctrine of sanctification from the snare of legalism and quietism.

8 He linked sanctification to theological ethics which consists of faith, love, and hope. His ethics does not depend on any moral principle or any passages of the Bible but God's command in the presence of the Spirit. This offers dynamicity to Christian life, which delivers us from standardization and rigidity due to fixed rules.

9 His consideration of the incarnation of Christ as the most basic and important sacrament is plausible.

#### 4.3.2.2 Negative Assessment

1 The radical critique of Barth's doctrine of reconciliation is that he ignored the human subjective decision of whether he will accept Jesus as his Saviour and Lord, by regarding all the people as saved and exalted in Christ's person, irrespective of his belief in Jesus.<sup>1077</sup> Contrary to his opinion, the Bible supports the idea that human salvation takes place when

---

<sup>1076</sup> Cf. John Webster, "Introducing Barth," *The Cambridge Companion to Karl Barth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 11. "Barth is certainly a central figure in the break up of the modern tradition in its theological expression."

<sup>1077</sup> Cf. P. J. Rosato, *op. cit.*, p. 310. "For man's role as a truly free agent distinct from Jesus Christ and as a true partner in God's salvific encounter with him in time through the Holy Spirit loses its own salvific importance."

he receives Jesus as his Saviour and Lord with the help of the Holy Spirit (John 1:12). By objectifying all human salvation, Barth nullified the statements of the Bible referring to the human subjective decision and the destiny of the reprobated.<sup>1078</sup> Unavoidably, it resulted in a tendency towards universal salvation. His universalistic inclination mitigated the urgency of mission to save men from destruction.<sup>1079</sup> Besides, as abolishing double predestination, Barth could not explain the reason why men do not believe Christ, if they were elected to salvation in Christ from eternity. His neglecting of human subjective decision rescinds God's judgment of human unbelief in Christ and his evil deeds, which are revealed in the Book of Revelation.

2 His regarding of the obedience of Christ as the true reality of our sanctification makes our own sanctification relatively trivial. Our humanity was sanctified in the incarnation, death, resurrection, and exaltation of Christ, for the humanity of Christ is our humanity in the way that His humanity includes the humanity of everyone. Incarnation is the union between Christ and man in the election of God. This causes Barth's sanctification to be an objective sanctification. To Barth, our sanctification is only a witness or reflection of the sanctification of Christ rather than our own sanctification by our obedience to the Law. Granting his notion that our own sanctification as obedience to the direction of the Holy Spirit of God's will really exist in our earthly level<sup>1080</sup> and our *de facto* sanctification is human obedience to God's concrete will,<sup>1081</sup> his view of sanctification is excessively objective due to his Christological understanding. Furthermore, as Hartwell aptly points out,<sup>1082</sup> there remain some questions of Barth's explication of objective and subjective sanctification. If our sanctification is already objectively completed in Christ, why should it subjectively be completed by people? In other words, if sanctification is already objectively accomplished in Christ, does our subjective sanctification have any meaning? And can objectively achieved sanctification have any meaning for those who do not subjectively obey the Gospel? This leads us to infer that our

---

<sup>1078</sup> Cf. Robert E. Cushman also noted that Barth deprived man of "his proper subjectivity-his depth and his freedom," his article, "Karl Barth on the Holy Spirit," *Religion in Life*, Vol., no. 4 (1955): 566-578; Douglas J. W. Milne mentions, "Barth is in danger of absorbing the individual with his historical decision of faith as human subject into the one subject Jesus Christ in his eternal predestination." "A Barthian Stricture on Reformed Theology-The Unconditionality of the Covenant of Grace", *The Reformed Theological Review*, Vol. 55 (S-D, 1996): 132

<sup>1079</sup> Nigel Biggar, *The Hastening that Waits: Karl Barth's Ethics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 162.

<sup>1080</sup> CD IV/2, 372-374.

<sup>1081</sup> See 4.2.7.1.2 on this thesis. Cf. CD III/4, 236. Here, it would be unreasonable that the adulteress does not have to obey Jesus' command, "Go and sin no more" because she is already sanctified in Christ. Rather, she must have obeyed it because she has freedom to obey. And her concrete obedience can be regarded as her *de facto* sanctification, though it is imperfect, relative and provisional. In Barth's theological ethics, our obedience is not substituted by Christ's obedience. It is our sanctification by God who acts in us.

<sup>1082</sup> Herbert Hartwell, *The Theology of Karl Barth* (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1964), p.187.

subjective sanctification would factually be meaningless, or the objective sanctification would be incomplete due to human subjective refusal of it.

3 His analogy between our humanity and Christ's humanity presents a serious problem in itself. According to this analogue, the human being cannot be the active subject in sanctification, for in Barth's view, the humanity of Christ does not have any decisive power and authority over His divinity. It is the Apollinarian view to make divinity the subject of Christ.<sup>1083</sup> Barth's view of Christology contradicts the Chalcedon Creed that neither the divine nor human nature is to be ignored or confused. Subsequently, for Barth, as our humanity is the same as the humanity of Christ, it can never be an independent or active subject in sanctification.<sup>1084</sup> It has just formal subjectivity as response to the direction of God. However, the subjectivity of man is different from that of Christ's humanity as understood by Barth. Human subjectivity is the foundation of God's judgment upon us.

4 His view of the Bible is not identified with the Word of God. The Bible becomes the Word of God only when the Holy Spirit uses it in our concrete situation, for example, through listening to preaching in the presence of the Holy Spirit. Although it has the advantage of preventing selfish misuse of the passages of the Bible, it confines the third function of the Law and demolishes the authority of the Bible as a universally effective moral principle. It contradicts the view of Reformed theology.

5 He denied the third use of the Law in sanctification. Consequently, his ethics cannot provide general guidance for people.<sup>1085</sup> Bonhoeffer pointed out that Barth failed to offer a way to connect the concrete command of God with the habitual business of political decisions and public debate.<sup>1086</sup> To Barth, only "the Holy Spirit is Himself our Law and rule."<sup>1087</sup> According to Donald D. Wall, in a letter to Bethge in May 1967, Barth "expressed regret over his political silence in the 1920's" and acknowledged "his failure to provide explicit ethical directives in the early 1930's."<sup>1088</sup> His rejection of the Decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount as a fundamental moral Law seems to reflect his antinomian inclination.<sup>1089</sup>

---

<sup>1083</sup> Arnold Come, *An Introduction to Barth's Dogmatics for Preachers* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963), pp.133ff.

<sup>1084</sup> Cf. George S. Henry, *The Gospel of the Incarnation* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1958), 127.

<sup>1085</sup> Robin W. Lovin, *Christian Faith and Public Choices: The Social Ethics of Barth, Brunner, and Bonhoeffer* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), p.45.

<sup>1086</sup> *Ibid.*, p.46; CD II/2, 672. For Brunner's question about Barth's silence of the totalitarianism of Russia and Barth's answer, see K. Barth, "Against Abstract Anti-Communism; Answer to Brunner (1948)," Clifford Green, *Karl Barth: Theologian of Freedom* (London: Collins Publishers, 1989), pp. 297-300.

<sup>1087</sup> CD IV/2, 373.

<sup>1088</sup> Donald, D. Wall, "Karl Barth and National Socialism, 1921-1946," *Fides et historia* 15 (1983): 91.

<sup>1089</sup> Gerrit C. Berkouwer described Barth's view as antinomianistic on the grounds that Barth wished "to deny the importance of the actual content of the Law" by interpreting "the Decalogue as *Ortsangabe*," which

6 He rejected the history of original sin. It contradicts Paul's statement of it. Besides, his view of sin which regards sin as human rejection of the Gospel is unreasonable. He asserted that there is no revelation of God without Christ. It means that without mission, any man cannot hear the Gospel, and cannot decide to obey it. If so, how is it possible that the man is a sinner? However, the Bible says that everyone is a sinner. Accordingly, his view of sin is not correct. His contradiction can be solved only when we admit the history of original sin, which makes everyone a sinner.

7 His interpretation of the sanctification of Christ is incorrect.<sup>1090</sup> The self-sanctification of Jesus Christ is not for His sin, for He is not a sinner. Although God identified Christ with sin (2 Cor 5:21),<sup>1091</sup> His self-sanctification is not His purification of His sin but our sin. His atonement is for our sins not His sins. Of course, He undertook our sin on His body and removed our sin through His sacrifice. However, it is not His sanctification in the sense that His sin is forgiven. Rather it means our sins were forgiven by His sacrifice. His sanctification is His preparation as high priest for the whole sacrifice, which has been prepared through His obedience throughout his life. His sanctification for our sanctification can acquire its validity in the respect that His atonement definitively put off our old man with our guilt, and His obedience is the substitute of our obedience, which can be counted as our sanctification.

8 It is his flaw to disregard baptism and the Lord's Supper as sacramental means of grace, viz., as a means of sanctification.

9 Barth's language of human decision as obedience to God's command is adequate to explicate the Christian relations with God and his behaviour, but inadequate to elucidate the growth of Christian character in "God's sanctifying works."<sup>1092</sup> His view of sanctification is lacking in the change of disposition, that is, harmonious personality. Conversely, Calvin and Wesley dealt with the change and growth of Christian character as his "existence and behaviour" in relation to sanctification.<sup>1093</sup> Of course, Barth referred to the order of soul and body, but it was ascribed only to Christ. Our practical orderly life between soul and body was not described by Barth.

---

means the relative position in which God speaks and commands his people, and "Barth's interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount is cast in the same antinomistic mold." *Faith and Sanctification*, tr. by J. Vriend (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1952), pp. 186-187, 189f.

<sup>1090</sup> See '4.2.10.2 The Sanctification of Christ.'

<sup>1091</sup> "God made him who had no sin to be sin for us, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God."

<sup>1092</sup> Stanley Hauerwas, *Character and the Christian Life: A Study in Theological Ethics with a new introduction by the author* (San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1985), p.141.

<sup>1093</sup> *Ibid.*, p.179.

## CHAPTER 5 A REFORMED DOCTRINE OF SANCTIFICATION FOR THE KOREAN CONTEXT

### 5.1 Comparison between Calvin, Wesley, and Barth On the Doctrine of Sanctification

In this chapter, it will be unnecessary to describe in detail all aspects of sanctification as they have already been dealt with in each part of the previous chapters. Hence, the discussion will be restricted to a comparison of the opinions of the three theologians according to each issue.

#### 5.1.1 Their Responses to the Theological Trends of Their Times

Calvin criticized spiritualists for neglecting the written word of God, while relying too much on the immediate guidance of the Holy Spirit.<sup>1</sup> He also rebuked libertines for their lack of self-discipline and their indulging in debauchery.<sup>2</sup> He saw astrology as “foolish curiosity to judge by the stars everything that will come to men and to inquire there and take counsel about one’s affairs,” and as ‘diabolical superstition’.<sup>3</sup> He also considered as superstition, the worship of saints and relics by the Roman Church.<sup>4</sup> He did acknowledge certain advantages of capitalism.

Wesley attacked antinomians for interpreting their dreams, visions, and experiences as God’s revelation.<sup>5</sup> He criticised formalism for its lifelessness and indolence,<sup>6</sup> and rejected mystic quietism for not using the means of sanctification. He strongly rejected slavery and contributed to its abolition.<sup>7</sup>

Barth criticized the German Christians for combining God’s revelation in Christ of Scriptures with their own diverse ideology, which included “events and powers, figures and truths” in history.<sup>8</sup> In contrast, he stressed the objective authority of the Bible. As a

---

<sup>1</sup> See 2.2.6.1.1.1 The Holy Spirit, the Bible and Its Interpretation on this thesis.

<sup>2</sup> See 2.1.3.2 Libertinism.

<sup>3</sup> *CO* 7, 515-16.

<sup>4</sup> J. Calvin. *Traité des reliques*, in *La Vraie piété*, ed. I. Backus and C. Chimelli (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1986), p.163. Quoted by Bernard Cottret, *Calvin: A Biography*, first published in 1995 under the title, *Calvin Biographie*, tr. M. Wallace McDonald (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2000), p.283.

<sup>5</sup> *Works* 7, 211; 11, 428; 5, 478.

<sup>6</sup> *Works* 7, 326.

<sup>7</sup> Ronald H. Stone, *John Wesley’s Life and Ethics* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2001), pp. 227-228.

<sup>8</sup> “Declaration Concerning the Right Understanding of the Reformation Confession of Faith in the German Confessions of Faith in the German Evangelical Church of the Present” Appendix VII in Arthur C. Cochrane, *The Church’s Confession Under Hitler* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962), pp. 238-242.



socialist, he reproached capitalism for its selfishness and inequality in distribution of richness. He objected to war except in case of self-defense.<sup>9</sup>

## 5.1.2 The Conception of Sanctification

### 5.1.2.1 Hamartiological Presupposition

#### 5.1.2.1.1 Original Sin

Calvin described original sin as Adam's sin and as concupiscence, that is, our corrupt nature inherited from Adam. He regarded concupiscence as sin, which was constantly present in our hearts.<sup>10</sup> Conversely, Wesley did not consider it as sin in the proper sense, which leads us to hell.<sup>11</sup> He also viewed original sin as Adam's sin. Conversely, Barth did not view original sin historically as Adam's fall, but simply the reflection of the present sinful state of humans.<sup>12</sup>

All three agreed on original sin as total human corruption. Wesley differs from Calvin in respect that the former did not regard original sin as the cause of human voluntary sin, because prevenient grace enables man to avoid sinning against the law, while the latter did not recognize that man can overcome the effect of original sin. Barth also denied that man cannot sin against God, because God confined man in disobedience.<sup>13</sup>

#### 5.1.2.1.2 Voluntary Sin

Calvin was indifferent to the distinction between original sin and voluntary sin. For him, human voluntary sin originates from man's corrupted nature after the fall. The "heart of man is the abode of all evils."<sup>14</sup> Viewing concupiscence as the substance of sin, he considered the transgression of the law as [voluntary] sin.<sup>15</sup> He suggested pride, hypocrisy, sloth, avarice, variance and schism as primary sins, with many other lists of voluntary sins.

Wesley viewed actual sin as a voluntary transgression of the known law of God.<sup>16</sup> He considered pride and self will, inordinate affection, and schism as primary sins. His distinction between inward sin and outward sin is peculiar. The latter can be overcome by the justified, while the former can only be overcome by the entirely sanctified.

For Barth, sin is always voluntary refusal to acknowledge God as such because of

---

<sup>9</sup> See 4.2.10.5.2 Social Sanctification.

<sup>10</sup> See 2.2.1.2.1 Original Sin.

<sup>11</sup> *Works* 9, 332.

<sup>12</sup> *KD* IV/1, 557,566

<sup>13</sup> *CD* IV/1, 504.

<sup>14</sup> *Comm.* on Mt.15:17.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. *Institutes* 3.18.10. "...works righteousness is perfect obedience to the law."

<sup>16</sup> Sermon XIX. Privilege of Those that are Born of God, II, 2: *Works* 5, 227.



“unfaithfulness, unbelief, disobedience and ingratitude.”<sup>17</sup> Sin is “disobedience against the will of God,” and is “a freeing of oneself from grace and its law.”<sup>18</sup> In view of God’s No, Barth also spoke of sin as an “impossible possibility.” Sin is not autonomous reality, but nothingness, which God does not will, but the human person loves and chooses.<sup>19</sup> He considered pride, sloth and falsehood as primary sins.<sup>20</sup>

### 5.1.2.2 Anthropological Presupposition

#### 5.1.2.2.1 Humanity as the Image of God

Calvin interpreted the image of God as “wisdom, righteousness, and holiness.”<sup>21</sup> God’s image indicates Adam’s wholeness - his sound understanding, “his affections subordinated to reason, all his senses in harmony, and his recognition that all these were gifts of God.”<sup>22</sup> By confining the image of God in an inner good of the human soul, Calvin rejected the opinion that the image of God lies in the dominion of man.<sup>23</sup> Calvin noted our relationship with God as the image of God.<sup>24</sup> After Adam’s Fall, all man’s abilities are so depraved and corrupted that all his actions are threatened by relentless chaos and greed.<sup>25</sup> Nonetheless, the image of God remains in the human being and Adam did not cease to be man.

Wesley depicted the image of God in three ways.. Firstly, the natural image of God is his own immortality; “a spiritual being, endued with understanding, freedom of will, and various affections.”<sup>26</sup> Secondly, the political image of God implies governance over sea and earth, while thirdly, the moral image of God is “righteousness and true holiness” (Eph 4:24), love and purity. After the fall, man lost the moral image of God, while keeping the spiritual and the political image of God.

Barth considered the image of God as Christ. Man is the being for God in the presence of God; a being in communion with fellow men;<sup>27</sup> a whole being in soul and body; and finally, a being in time. It was manifested in the life of Jesus that he faithfully obeyed God and helped and delivered other men in the proper order of his soul and body and in his

---

<sup>17</sup> *CD* IV/2, 491.

<sup>18</sup> *KD* III/3, 350.

<sup>19</sup> *CD* IV/1, 419.

<sup>20</sup> See 4.2.1.2.2 Three Sins and Their Results.

<sup>21</sup> *Comm.* on Gen. 1:26. In Col. 3:10, the image is described as true knowledge, righteousness and holiness; in 2 Cor. 3:18 it is depicted as true piety, righteousness, purity, intelligence.

<sup>22</sup> *Institutes* 1.15.3.

<sup>23</sup> *Institutes* 1.15.4 ; cf. B. A. Gerrish, “Mirror of God’s Goodness,” *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, Vol. 45 (1981): 214.

<sup>24</sup> *Institutes* 2.1.4; 2.2.12.

<sup>25</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.12.

<sup>26</sup> Sermon XLV: *Works* 6, 66.

<sup>27</sup> *KD* III/2, 2, 79.

time.<sup>28</sup> Briefly, the image of God in man is “co-humanity in community.”<sup>29</sup>

Summing up, the image of God in view of sanctification can be defined as our right relationship with God, neighbours, creature, and ourselves. The relationship with ourselves indicates the harmony between spirit and body. This will portray the fruit of the Holy Spirit in the growth in Christian character.

#### **5.1.2.2.2 Grace**

For Wesley, prevenient grace as human conscience is similar to Calvin’s concept of natural grace, and prevenient grace as the braking effect on human evil is similar to the first use of the law in Calvin. Sanctifying grace is similar to the particular work of the Holy Spirit.<sup>30</sup> For Barth, God’s grace means that God has given us Himself in Jesus Christ.<sup>31</sup>

All three theologians agree that without grace, man cannot be sanctified.

#### **5.1.2.2.3 Free Will**

For Calvin, the restoration of free will is restricted to the elect by special grace, but for Wesley, free will is recovered for all by virtue of prevenient grace, regardless of their election. In terms of the time of the restoration of free will, Wesley thought it is recovered by prevenient grace before man hears the Gospel, in order that man can cooperate with God in his salvation, while Calvin thought it is recovered by special grace at the moment when one hears the Gospel.<sup>32</sup> Wesley saw the role of free will in justification, as being more active than did Calvin. Both, however, held similar views of sanctification. A view peculiar to Wesley was that sanctification achieved by human cooperation with God affects human final justification.

To Barth, human freedom is not a capability to do whatever man wants, but the freedom of *non potest peccare*.<sup>33</sup> The freedom is not independent from God’s freedom, but is the ability to accept God’s free decision for him. This freedom can be explained as “the self-impartment of Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit” to appropriate human sanctification which is already accomplished by Jesus Christ.<sup>34</sup> Through regeneration by God’s Word and Spirit, he becomes a free and responsible covenant-partner of God.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 249.

<sup>29</sup> Clifford Green, *Karl Barth: Theologian of Freedom*, Vol. 5 of *The Making of Modern Theology: 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Century Theological Texts* (5 Vols.) (London etc.: Collins Publishers, 1989), p. 33.

<sup>30</sup> See 3.2.1.4.1 Prevenient Grace and Human Recovery.

<sup>31</sup> *KD II/2*, 548.

<sup>32</sup> See 2.2.1.3.2 The Restoration of Human Nature and Freedom and 3.2.1.4.1 Prevenient Grace and Human Recovery.

<sup>33</sup> *CD IV/2*, 494f.

<sup>34</sup> *CD IV/2*, 531. cf. Robert E. Willis, *The Ethics of Karl Barth* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971), p. 240.

<sup>35</sup> *CD IV/3,2*, 447.

### 5.1.2.3 The Definition of Sanctification

For Calvin, sanctification is the work of the Holy Spirit restoring the image of God in us, by continually mortifying the lusts of our flesh and renewing the whole man, in our union with Christ, in order to serve Him.<sup>36</sup> For Wesley, sanctification is “an entire deliverance from sin, a restoration of the whole image of God, the loving God with all our heart, soul, and strength.”<sup>37</sup> For Barth, sanctification is God’s direction to the sanctification of Jesus Christ, which is already objectively accomplished<sup>38</sup> and His calling of us to participate in it. Its aim is the restoration of our humanity to the humanity of Jesus who is the image of God.

All of them defined sanctification as the restoration of God’s image. Wesley emphasised perfect love; Calvin, mortification and vivification in our union with Christ; and Barth the sanctification which is accomplished in Christ, and our participation in it by the Holy Spirit.

### 5.1.3 The Role of God and the Human Role

#### 5.1.3.1 The Role of God

Calvin attributed sanctification to the work of God, who is the author of all our holiness and “invites us to repentance.”<sup>39</sup> The Holy Spirit sanctifies us by uniting us with Christ and by generating our faith and converting us through his secret work and inspiration.<sup>40</sup> He purifies us of all uncleanness, wickedness, corruption, and evil life<sup>41</sup> and submits us to divine righteousness through restraining our lusts.<sup>42</sup> The Holy Spirit transfuses spiritual energies into the Christian to overcome his powerlessness, the result of which is called “quickenings.”<sup>43</sup> The Spirit illuminates our minds, forms our hearts to love, cultivates righteousness<sup>44</sup> and makes us docile through his secret influence.<sup>45</sup> He strengthens our faith by giving the confirmation to us, when the Word and sacraments set God’s good will before us. He also moderates our emotions in prayer.<sup>46</sup>

For Wesley, the Spirit “establishes our faith, and perfects our obedience, by

---

<sup>36</sup> 2.2.1.5 The Definition of Sanctification.

<sup>37</sup> Letter CCCCLVII to Mr. Joseph Benson, London, Dec. 28, 1770: *Works* 12, 415.

<sup>38</sup> *CD* IV/2, 511.

<sup>39</sup> John Calvin, *Sermons on the Epistles to the Ephesians* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth & Trust, 1987), p.165.

<sup>40</sup> *CO* 38, 466.

<sup>41</sup> *CO* 8, 113: *The Treatise on Eternal Election* (1563).

<sup>42</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.14.

<sup>43</sup> Sermon No.70 on Job 109.

<sup>44</sup> *Institutes* 2.5.5.

<sup>45</sup> *CO* 32, 270.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. *Comm.* on Jer. 29:12.

enlightening the understanding and rectifying the will.”<sup>47</sup> The Holy spirit comforts believers, helps our infirmities and by shedding the love of God and humankind abroad in their hearts, purifies them “from the love of the world, from the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life.” He saves men from anger and pride; unnatural likings; evil in general; wicked conversation. He instills enthusiasm in men to do good works.<sup>48</sup> In prayer, the Spirit intercedes for the saints according to the will of God when we do not know what we should pray for as we ought.<sup>49</sup>

For Barth, God planned and completed Christ’s incarnation. Christ completed His sanctification in place of us through His obedient life and death and resurrection and exaltation. Through the direction of the Son of Man, the call to discipleship and the awakening to conversion, the Holy Spirit appropriates Christ’s objective sanctification to us subjectively. The direction of Christ consists of indication, correction, and instruction. The Holy Spirit recovers our relationship with God, ourselves and our fellow men. This relationship is the essence of the image of God.<sup>50</sup>

### 5.1.3.2 The Role of Man

For Calvin, sanctification is entirely the work of God’s grace from the beginning to the end, but it did not exclude our responsible response to and participation in the sanctification of Christ.<sup>51</sup> Our role is to constantly use the means of sanctification, which God offers us. To express our responsibility, Calvin used the terms: obedience, watchfulness, self-examination for self-correction and self-offering. They also were described as cross bearing, self-denial, and meditation of the future.

Wesley saw our role in our sanctification as “to cease to do evil” and “to learn to do well” by denying ourselves, bearing our cross daily by keeping watch for sin remaining in us,<sup>52</sup> and by doing works of piety and mercy. As we play an important role in our final salvation, we should diligently use all means for our sanctification.

For Barth, there is no humanly independent role in the doctrine of sanctification, as man only responds to the initiative of God, which appears as forms of awakening, indication, direction, and vocation of the Holy Spirit.<sup>53</sup> For him, the human role in terms of ‘the obedience of faith in freedom’, ‘attentiveness’, ‘prayer’, and ‘living sacrifice’ was depicted as following Christ, bearing the cross, self-denial, and good works.

---

<sup>47</sup> Letter to The Right Reverend The Lord Bishop of Gloucester: ‘The Operation of the Holy Ghost’: *Works* 9, 149.

<sup>48</sup> Sermon IX. The Spirit of Bondage and Adoption: *Works* 5, 108.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.* pp.165-166.

<sup>50</sup> See 4.2.4.1 God’s Role of Sanctification.

<sup>51</sup> See 2.2.3.3 The Human Role of Sanctification.

<sup>52</sup> Sermon LXXXV. Working out our own Salvation,” 2.4: *Works* 6, 511.

<sup>53</sup> See 4.2.4 God’s Role and Human Role of Sanctification.

Calvin and Wesley both emphasised use of the means of sanctification. Barth is very close to Calvin in his usage of terms for the human role.

## 5.1.4 The Nature of Sanctification

### 5.1.4.1 Visibility and Invisibility

Calvin explained the *visibility* of our sanctification in terms of good works. Whether some people are spiritual is “evident from their works.”<sup>54</sup> “Newness of life is testified by good works.”<sup>55</sup> If our good works are visible, our sanctification can be said to be visible. In his commentary on Rom. 14:17 (footnote no. 426) Calvin linked sanctification to the fruit of the Holy Spirit. As the fruit of the Spirit, “righteousness, peace, and joy” must be things “apparent and visible” because they are not only “things acceptable to God” but also things “approved by men.” But only the beginning of our sanctification is visible in the world.<sup>56</sup> Its completion will only be visible in the eschaton – the end of the world.<sup>57</sup> The invisibility of sanctification means that complete sanctification is hidden in Christ, only to be finally manifested on the last day.<sup>58</sup> Our sanctification is visible in our incomplete works, but invisible in the sense of its true reality.

Barth’s views of the visibility and the invisibility of sanctification are similar to those of Calvin. In *Römer II* (1922), he noted that only through faith and obedience by God’s grace, can the visible and concrete sanctification of the human being appear in this world.<sup>59</sup> In his lecture on “Church and Culture,” he insisted that no sanctification “can be seen, proved or measured.”<sup>60</sup> In *The Holy Ghost and the Christian Life* (1938), Barth maintained that sanctification as living in obedience to God is hidden, just as our faith is hidden in repentance and trust, for our obedience never becomes perceptible to us in itself.<sup>61</sup> However, in his later years (1955), Barth’s view changed to affirm the historical reality of sanctification. “How could it be the real sanctification of real man if man himself were not present in his inner and outer activity, if it took place at some supernatural height or depth with him?”<sup>62</sup> Barth admitted the visibility of sanctification in human life. “The eddy (of sanctification) arises and is *visible* in the stream, first in the lives of these men, but then-

---

<sup>54</sup> *Comm.* on Gal. 5:22.

<sup>55</sup> *Comm.* on 1Jn. 3:7.

<sup>56</sup> *Institutes* 4.8.12

<sup>57</sup> *Comm.* on Mt. 25:31-36.

<sup>58</sup> *Comm.* on Lk. 19:22.

<sup>59</sup> Karl Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans* 6<sup>th</sup> ed., tr. E. C. Hoskyns (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), p.223.

<sup>60</sup> K. Barth, *Theology and Church: Shorter Writings 1920-1928*, tr. L. P. Smith (London, 1962), pp. 345, 349, 354.

<sup>61</sup> *HC*, 62.

<sup>62</sup> *CD IV/2*, 556.

seeing that they have their fellows- as a fact in the common life of all men.”<sup>63</sup> Nonetheless, the true reality of our sanctification lies in Christ’s obedience, because our obedience is imperfect.

Wesley did not mention the visibility of sanctification directly. However, we can assume that he admitted it, given his mention of how to decide whether a Christian is perfectly sanctified or not.

#### 5.1.4.2 Forensic and Factual Sanctification

For Calvin, the forensic aspect of sanctification means that Christ’s sanctification is transferred to us in his union with us. His idea is developed through the metaphor of Head and Body. Sanctification fulfilled in Christ as our Head has really been fulfilled in his Body, and all his members too.<sup>64</sup> In other words, all the saints were fully sanctified “in the one offering of Christ.”<sup>65</sup> The factual aspect of sanctification is shown by the impartation of Christ’s holiness to the church, our conformity to the pattern of the sanctification of Christ, mortification and vivification in Christ’s death and resurrection.<sup>66</sup> These processes are accomplished by both the Spirit and responsible human participation.

For Wesley, sanctification is the factual and subjective change by the work of the Holy Spirit rather than of a forensic nature in the sense that he did not grant the imputation of the righteousness of Christ. Justification as ‘forgiveness and acceptance before God’ is only positional sanctification, not our real righteousness or holiness.<sup>67</sup> God declares we are holy only when we are really made holy by obeying the law of Christ in the Spirit. Accordingly, Wesley’s doctrine of sanctification is factual rather than forensic.

For Barth, *de jure* sanctification means that the sanctification of the entire humankind has been effectively and authoritatively accomplished in Jesus Christ.<sup>68</sup> The sanctification of man is the existence of those who are judged in Christ by God, as a fact, which has already been completed and has been factually and objectively created.<sup>69</sup> It involves a change in the status of man before God like justification, which has taken place for all men.<sup>70</sup> It has already been achieved in the incarnation, death, resurrection, and exaltation of Jesus Christ.<sup>71</sup> *De facto* sanctification signifies the sanctification that is accomplished by our participation in the sanctification of Christ, which was referred to in terms of the

---

<sup>63</sup> CD IV/2, 529.

<sup>64</sup> *Comm.* on Dan. 7:27; CO 41: 84; Serm. on Eph. 1:17-19.

<sup>65</sup> *Comm.* on Heb. 10:14.

<sup>66</sup> See 2.2.4.2.2 Factual Sanctification.

<sup>67</sup> See 3.2.1.3.3 Imputation of Christ’s Righteousness.

<sup>68</sup> CD IV/2, 511, 518.

<sup>69</sup> CD II/2, 774.

<sup>70</sup> CD IV/2, 511.

<sup>71</sup> CD IV/2, 278.

direction of the resurrected Christ, the call to discipleship, the awakening to conversion, the dignity of the cross, and the praise of works.<sup>72</sup>

#### **5.1.4.2.1 The Marks of the Sanctified**

For Calvin, the marks of the sanctified are love, modesty, docility, ordered life, purity, moderation, and communion and unity.<sup>73</sup> For Wesley, they are faith, hope, love, purity, stewardship, and unity.<sup>74</sup> For Barth, they are faith, hope, love, order, humility, gratitude, and conscience.<sup>75</sup> Calvin seems to have emphasised Christian docility and moderation for teaching the Word of God; Wesley pure love and stewardship for the transformation of society; And Barth, human humility and conscience to break liberal anthropocentric thoughts.

#### **5.1.4.3 Instantaneousness and Gradualness**

For Calvin, Christian sanctification as the first conversion, which is initiated by God's intervention, is instant, but the whole process of sanctification is gradual.<sup>76</sup>

For Wesley, sanctification is both instantaneous and gradual. Man's holiness grows gradually through repentance before justification, repentance after justification, and after entire sanctification; while justification and entire sanctification happen in a moment, by faith.<sup>77</sup>

Barth first presented definitiveness and immediacy, and later gradualness. Instantaneousness was ascribed to the initial awakening in our subjective sanctification;<sup>78</sup> definitiveness to objective sanctification achieved in Christ; and continuity to our life-long struggle between the old man and the new man in us in the Holy Spirit.<sup>79</sup>

#### **5.1.4.4 Perfection and Imperfection**

For Calvin, the perfection of sanctification is "the entire devotion" of our heart and soul excluding any untruth or hypocrisy as in Job's case.<sup>80</sup> In this sense, perfection is possible in this world. But perfection as perfect obedience to the will of God is not possible in this world, and it can be accomplished after death. We can achieve only a little progress in

---

<sup>72</sup> See 4.2.5.2.2 *De Facto* Sanctification.

<sup>73</sup> See 2.2.4.2.2.4 The Marks of Sanctification.

<sup>74</sup> See 3.2.4.5.1 The Marks of Sanctification.

<sup>75</sup> See 4.2.10.4 Individual Sanctification: the Marks of Sanctification.

<sup>76</sup> See 2.2.4.3 Gradualness and Instantaneousness.

<sup>77</sup> See 3.2.5.1 Instantaneousness and Gradualness.

<sup>78</sup> *CD IV/2*, 557.

<sup>79</sup> See 4.2.5.3 Instantaneousness and Gradualness.

<sup>80</sup> Sermon on Job 1:1.



sanctification in this world. Calvin, however, did not object to using the term, perfection, if it includes “the recognition of our imperfection both in truth and in humility.”<sup>81</sup>

For Barth, perfection means that our sanctification was already completely accomplished by Christ, and imperfection means that our factual sanctification in this world is a little accomplished and it will be accomplished at Christ’s second coming.<sup>82</sup>

For Wesley, perfection means that the love of God and of one’s neighbour totally dominates the life of the Christian. It is complete obedience to the known laws of God. It is a relative perfection, not an absolute perfection. Accordingly, its attainment is possible in this world.<sup>83</sup>

#### 5.1.4.5 Pessimistic or Optimistic?

As Tyron Inbody aptly observes, the Calvinistic view of the doctrine of sanctification, which emphasised total depravity of human nature and “the impossibility of perfection in this life,” seems rather pessimistic, while Wesley’s view of sanctification, which stressed prevenient grace and the possibility of perfection in this life, seems quite optimistic.<sup>84</sup>

Barth’s view of the doctrine of sanctification is very optimistic. Our sanctification was accomplished in Christ and under the direction of the Spirit, Christ’s sanctification becomes ours. This has a positive direction towards success in our struggle between the old man and the new man due to God’s predestination. Christian life is the history of genuine triumph. Our achieved sanctification in Christ will appear in the eschaton. Barth criticized Calvin for emphasizing mortification rather than vivification, which results in defeating the possibility of sanctification because of its stress on the corrupt nature of humans. Barth stressed *vivificatio* as “the meaning and end of *mortificatio*” in sanctification.<sup>85</sup> In this sense, his view of sanctification is optimistic.

### 5.1.5 The Motive and Goal of Sanctification

#### 5.1.5.1 The Motive of Sanctification

For Calvin, the first motive of sanctification is God’s commandment (Lev. 19:12, 1 Pet. 1:15-16).<sup>86</sup> The second motive is that to express Christ in our life is one condition that “we

---

<sup>81</sup> August. ad Bonif. lib. 3, c. 7 in *Institutes* 3, 17.15.

<sup>82</sup> See 4.2.5.4 Perfection and Imperfection.

<sup>83</sup> See 3.2.5.2 Perfection or Imperfection.

<sup>84</sup> Tyron Inbody, “Where United Methodists and Presbyterians Differ on Sanctification,” *Journal of Theology* 105 (2001): 77.

<sup>85</sup> *CD IV/2*, 577.

<sup>86</sup> *Institutes* 3.6.4.

have been adopted as sons by the Lord.”<sup>87</sup> The third is that sanctification is “the end of our redemption and calling”.<sup>88</sup> The fourth is that we should resemble God because he is our Father.<sup>89</sup> The fifth is that we should be holy because we are Christ’s holy body.<sup>90</sup> The sixth is that we are the temple of the Holy Spirit.<sup>91</sup> The seventh is our gratitude for God’s benefits.<sup>92</sup>

For Barth, it is God’s command that you should be holy because I am holy (Lev 19:2; 11:44; 20:7). The second motive of sanctification is gratitude for the grace of God. Faith in God’s mercy leads us to the humble obedience which necessarily makes the living sacrifice of the Christian life.<sup>93</sup> Gratitude leads us to witness God’s grace in freedom.<sup>94</sup>

For Wesley, the motive for our sanctification is the will of God, which is “that we should be inwardly and outwardly holy; that we should be good, and do good, in every kind and in the highest degree whereof we are capable.”<sup>95</sup>

### 5.1.5.2 The Goal of Sanctification

For Calvin, the goal of sanctification is our holiness without blemish,<sup>96</sup> it is finally to the glory of God. One reason that we do good works “ought to be enough: that God may be glorified” in our good works.<sup>97</sup> “[W]e are consecrated...to God” in order to “do nothing except to his glory.”<sup>98</sup>

For Barth, it is to restore our humanity to the humanity of Jesus Christ, who is the image of God.<sup>99</sup> Sanctification as conversion is an act to exalt and liberate his fellows “for the glory of God in the life of the new man.”<sup>100</sup>

For Wesley, we can say that the aim of Christian sanctified life is to give glory to God, while the labour of love is done “to the glory of God.”<sup>101</sup> The sanctified Christian “in his whole life and conversation, whether he eats or drinks, or whatsoever he does,” does all to

---

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>88</sup> *Institutes* 3.16.2.

<sup>89</sup> *Institutes* 3.6.3. .

<sup>90</sup> Sermon on Eph. 5:28-30.

<sup>91</sup> *Institutes* 3.6.3.

<sup>92</sup> *Institutes* 3.16.3.

<sup>93</sup> *CL*, pp. 41-42.

<sup>94</sup> *GC*, 82-83.

<sup>95</sup> Sermon XXXVII. ‘The Nature of Enthusiasm,’ 3, 23: *Works* 5, 474.

<sup>96</sup> *Institutes* 4.1.17.

<sup>97</sup> *Institutes* 3.16.3.

<sup>98</sup> *CO* 49, 471; Comm. on Rom 11: 36.

<sup>99</sup> *CD* IV/1, 773.

<sup>100</sup> *CD* IV/2, 564.

<sup>101</sup> Sermon XCVIII. On Visiting the Sick, 2.1: *Works* 7, 120.

the glory of God.”<sup>102</sup> The actions and words of sanctified man “aim at the glory of God.”<sup>103</sup>

The three theologians’ views are similar.

## 5.1.6 The Modes of Sanctification

For Calvin, the main emphasis of sanctification is on the mortification of our flesh, i.e., the self-denial in regard to the glories of the world; bearing the cross; and the meditation on the future life, though he also accentuated our obedience to Christ and the cultivation of our positive and active love towards neighbours in this life.<sup>104</sup>

For Wesley, the stress is on self-denial and our love towards God and people in God’s grace.<sup>105</sup> For Barth, the mode of sanctification consists of the call to discipleship comprising self-denial, the awakening to conversion, the dignity of the cross, and the praise of works.<sup>106</sup> Barth is closer to Calvin than Wesley on the mode of sanctification.

## 5.1.7 The Means of Sanctification

### 5.1.7.1 The Word of God

#### 5.1.7.1.1 Gospel and Law

Calvin believed that only the Gospel can lead us to obey God’s will. The grace of God in the gospel of Jesus Christ “nourishes us without support of the law.”<sup>107</sup> Conversely, the judgments of the Law against us “disturb our faith rather than to establish it.”<sup>108</sup> The Law “does not change the heart for a righteous.”<sup>109</sup> Only the Gospel’s promise can move us to grateful obedience.<sup>110</sup> The moral law as a pedagogue and spur can promote true piety,<sup>111</sup> only when it is used in Christ by the Spirit.

Wesley emphasised the precedence of the Law over the Gospel in leading sinners to repent. He utterly rejected the idea that the preaching of the gospel, i.e., “the speaking of

---

<sup>102</sup> Sermon CVII. On God’s Vineyard, 1.9: *Works* 7, 206; Sermon CXXXIII. Preached on the Occasion of the Death of the Rev. MR. John Fletcher, 1.4: *Works* 7, 432.

<sup>103</sup> Sermon CXIV. The Unity of the Divine Being, 23: *Works* 7, 272.

<sup>104</sup> See 2.2.5 The Modes of Sanctification.

<sup>105</sup> See 3.2.6 The Mode of Sanctification: Self-denial.

<sup>106</sup> See 4.2.6 The Modes of Sanctification.

<sup>107</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.7.

<sup>108</sup> *Institutes* 3.2.7.

<sup>109</sup> *Calvin: Commentaries of The Library of Christian Classics* (Institute for the Christian Information & Data, 1999), p.281.

<sup>110</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.12.

<sup>111</sup> *Institutes* 4.20.2,3.

nothing but the sufferings and merits of Christ” answers all the ends of the law.<sup>112</sup> According to his experience, “one in a thousand may have been awakened by the gospel.” The way is not the gospel, but the law that God ordinarily uses to convict sinners. The gospel is not the means which God has ordained for repentance of the sinner, or our Lord himself used.<sup>113</sup> In this respect, he differs completely with Calvin.

Barth rejected the possibility to proclaim the Gospel without hearing the Law, on the basis of the passage, “Thou shall fear and love God.”<sup>114</sup> It is impossible to separate the Gospel from the Law, because the former is the form of grace and the latter is the content of grace.<sup>115</sup>

#### 5.1.7.1.2 The Third Use of the Law

Calvin called the *tertius usus legis* the *usus in renatis* (the use for the regenerated,<sup>116</sup> whose use is to instruct Christians to obey God’s commandment and will.<sup>117</sup> He stressed the Ten Commandments as the central means for sanctification, though he interpreted them in the light of the Sermon on the Mount and Jesus’ other teachings.

For Wesley, the third use of the law is “to keep us alive.”<sup>118</sup> It is the excellent means whereby the Spirit leads us to eternal life. Wesley placed more emphasis on the third use in Christian life because of his “conflict with the antinomian understanding of the Christian life.”<sup>119</sup> In this respect, he is closer to Calvin rather than to Luther. A point of difference between Calvin and Wesley is that the latter emphasised the Sermon on the Mount as the central standard for sanctification, and not the Decalogue.

Barth’s attitude towards the third use of the law is rather vague. He held that the Bible is not a “supernatural register which provides direct moral guidance” like “a box of magic cards.”<sup>120</sup> It is also not a source book of moral rules.<sup>121</sup> Neither the Decalogue nor the Sermon on the Mount could be taken as fundamental moral codes.<sup>122</sup> In place of that, he

---

<sup>112</sup> Sermon XXXV. “The Law Established Through Faith,” 1.3: *Works* 5, 449.

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>114</sup> K. Barth, *Prayer and Preaching*. Tr. by Sara F. Terrien (Guildford and London: SCM Press Ltd, 1964), p. 71.

<sup>115</sup> *CD* II/2, 566.

<sup>116</sup> *Institutes* (1536), ed. by Rev. Ed., tr. and annotated by Ford Lewis Battle (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 1. 35-36.

<sup>117</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.12. Hans-Joachim Kraus, “The Contemporary Relevance of Calvin’s Theology” in *Towards the Future of Reformed Theology: Tasks, Topics, Traditions*, ed. David Willis & Michael Welker (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999), p. 331.

<sup>118</sup> Sermon XXXIV. “The Original, Nature, Property, and the Uses of the Law” 4, 3: *Works* 5, 443.

<sup>119</sup> Randy L. Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley’s Practical Theology* (Nashville, Kingwood Books, 1994), p. 161.

<sup>120</sup> *CD* II/2, 794.

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid.*, 675.

<sup>122</sup> *CD* IV/2, 679-700.

asserted that the command of God is a subject and a means of sanctification.<sup>123</sup> The problem, however, is that God's command is not identified with the Bible or the law. God's command is given by the Spirit and can be discerned by a careful study of the Bible or dogmatics and preaching to the church. His caution of God's will is a merit, but his negation of the Decalogue and the Ten Commandments as moral rules seems to be a fault.

### 5.1.7.2 Prayer

Calvin recognized prayer as a means of sanctification on the grounds that "all things which God made are made holy to us through the word of God and prayers."<sup>124</sup> Prayer is "a means for the Holy Spirit to increase and strengthen faith."<sup>125</sup> He viewed the efficiency of prayer as confined to living people, so that he rejected Peter Caroli's teaching that "it is possible to aid the dead by prayer, not that their sins may be remitted, but that they may be raised up as expeditiously as possible."<sup>126</sup>

For Wesley, prayer is "a channel through which the grace of God is conveyed."<sup>127</sup> He drew the example of prayer as a means of grace from Matt. 7:7, 8, which read: "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you." Peculiarly, he regarded prayer as God's command given to both believers and unbelievers on the grounds of the case of Cornelius.<sup>128</sup> Prayer is a strong means for entire sanctification.

Barth regarded prayer as God's gift which we should receive and obey with gratitude rather than a means of grace, because he did not admit any human effort or manipulation to receive God's grace.<sup>129</sup> It is a simple act by which we accept and use the divine gift.<sup>130</sup> As God's gift, the whole prayer is a means for us to take part in the reign of God's life and kingdom in both this world and the next.<sup>131</sup> The intercession of Christ united with us in one humanity is the only reason that our prayer can be replied to by God.<sup>132</sup> Barth's view is that we are to be open, not only to the divine possibility of universal salvation, but that we hope and pray for it.<sup>133</sup> It seems more optimistic than prayer for the dead of the Roman

---

<sup>123</sup> CD II/2, 772.

<sup>124</sup> *Sermons on the Epistle to Timothy & Titus* by John Calvin, (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth & Trust, reprinted in 1983, first published in 1579), p.366b, n. 20.

<sup>125</sup> John Kesley, "Pray and Ethics; Reflection of Calvin and Barth" *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 82, no. 2 (Missoula, Scholars Press, 1989): 172.

<sup>126</sup> Letter to Megander, GeneVa, Feb. 1537; LC 1, 13, 47.

<sup>127</sup> Sermon XVI 'The Means of Grace' 4, 1: *Works* 5, 195.

<sup>128</sup> Wesley, Journal June 26, 1740: *Works* 1: 279.

<sup>129</sup> CD III/4, 3.

<sup>130</sup> Calvin, *Prayer*, p.38.

<sup>131</sup> *Prayer*, p.15.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid*, 34.

<sup>133</sup> CD IV/3.1, 477-478.

Catholic Church.

### 5.1.7.3 Sacraments

#### 5.1.7.3.1 Baptism

Calvin mentioned that baptism arouses, nourishes, and confirms our faith.<sup>134</sup> It strengthens our weak faith in God's promises in three respects. First, by recalling the memory of our baptism, we can be "confident of the forgiveness of sins."<sup>135</sup> Secondly, the performance of the rite means mortification and new life, a uniting of the person with the death and resurrection of Christ.<sup>136</sup> Thirdly, it is the sign of union with Christ himself, which leads to the fellowship with the Trinity. All believers are taught and encouraged in the Christian life to lift their hearts to God in baptism.<sup>137</sup> Through infant baptism, believers are aroused to a surer confidence of the salvation of their children, and the children are "engrafted into the body of the church"<sup>138</sup>, so causing them to greatly strive "to an earnest zeal for worshiping God" when they grow up and recognize its meaning.<sup>139</sup> In this manner, for Calvin, baptism and infant baptism are a means of sanctification.

Wesley understood baptism as the instrument of regeneration, although he did not identify baptism by water with regeneration. "By water then, as a means, the water of baptism, we are regenerated or born again."<sup>140</sup> He did not deny the connection between infant baptism and the new birth. "It is certain, our Church supposes that all who are baptized in their infancy are at the same time born again."<sup>141</sup>

In 1963 Barth regarded "baptism not as a 'means' of grace and salvation, not as a 'sacrament', but as an act, a confession, a prayer of faith, or of the obedience of faith."<sup>142</sup> As baptism is God's gift and promise, we can only freely receive and practise it with gratitude, but it is neither a sacrament nor a means of grace. This viewpoint of Barth differs from that of Calvin and Wesley. Baptism is also the action of man to commit himself to God, the free response and obedience to His calling to the salvation of the future, and an event sent by God as a witness of His salvation. In this sense, baptism is concerned with

---

<sup>134</sup> *Institutes* 4.15.14.

<sup>135</sup> *Institutes* 4.15.3.

<sup>136</sup> *Institutes* 4.15.5.

<sup>137</sup> John D. Witvliet, "Baptism as a Sacrament of Reconciliation in the Thought of John Calvin" in *Studia Liturgica*, Vol. 27, no. 2 (1997): 159.

<sup>138</sup> *Institutes* 4.16.9.

<sup>139</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>140</sup> *Works* 10, 192.

<sup>141</sup> Sermon XLV The New Birth, 4.2: *Works* 6, 74.

<sup>142</sup> "Letter to H. Bizer 29 March 1963," in K. Barth, *Letters* 1961-8 (Edinburgh, 1981), p. 96; CD IV/4. 128. Barth declares that baptism is not a sacrament, but a true and genuine human action which responds to the divine act and [word](#)" (CD IV/4, 128). Also see *CL*, 46.

‘the conversion of all who have a part in it’.<sup>143</sup> He rejected infant baptism for the reason that infants could not have the freedom of responsible obedience and conversion and that it is lacking in biblical evidence.<sup>144</sup>

### 5.1.7.3.2 The Lord’s Supper

Calvin viewed the Lord’s Supper as an instrument which the Spirit uses to deepen our faith.<sup>145</sup> The Lord’s Supper “can more forcefully than any other means quicken and inspire us both to purity and holiness of life, and to love, peace, and concord.”<sup>146</sup> It is “medicine for the sick, solace for the sinners, alms to the poor.”<sup>147</sup> When we are in the middle way between God and the world, “it is to make us go on forward, to drive still to our God” (Spelling is modernized).<sup>148</sup>

Wesley held that the Lord’s Supper played the role of causing the first deep conviction, namely the very beginning of our conversion with God.<sup>149</sup> The Lord’s Supper is “a means of conveying to men either preventing, or justifying, or sanctifying grace, according to their several necessities.”<sup>150</sup> It is noteworthy that Wesley admitted that unbelievers participate in the Lord’s Supper for their conversion.

Barth regarded the Lord’s Supper as ‘the Renewal of Christian Life’.<sup>151</sup> The Lord’s Supper is the thanksgiving which responds to the presence of Jesus Christ in his self-sacrifice rather than a means of sanctification.<sup>152</sup> It is called the action of actions and typifies the unity with Christ of the community.<sup>153</sup> Calvin and Barth confined participation in the Supper to believers.

### 5.1.7.4 Church Discipline

Calvin regarded “discipline and the correction of vices” as indispensable to our sanctification as the nerves that are essential to uphold the body in a healthful state.<sup>154</sup> For tolerable offences, mutual encouragement, advice and warning were used, while for serious

---

<sup>143</sup> K. Barth, *The Christian Life*. Tr. By J. Strathearn McNab (London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1961), p. 134. Hereafter it is written *CL*.

<sup>144</sup> *Ibid.*, p.41; *CL*, 165. For further study, see *CL*, 179-195.

<sup>145</sup> Letter to the King of France; October 1557; LC 3, 480, 376.

<sup>146</sup> *Institutes* 4.17.38.

<sup>147</sup> *Institutes* 4.17.42.

<sup>148</sup> *Sermons on the Epistle to Timothy & Titus by John Calvin*, (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth & Trust, reprinted in 1983, first published in 1579), p.1060.

<sup>149</sup> *Works* 1, 279.

<sup>150</sup> *Works* 1, 280.

<sup>151</sup> *CD IV/2*, 658.

<sup>152</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>153</sup> *CD IV/3*, 761.

<sup>154</sup> Letter to the protector Somerset; LC 2, 229, 197.



offences, excommunication was applied. For Calvin, church discipline was “a means of preserving the purity of the Church’s teaching and the believers’ efforts towards sanctification.”<sup>155</sup>

Wesley saw discipline as necessary for continual spiritual growth.<sup>156</sup> Teaching and discipline were regarded as more durable than preaching, in the sense that without them preaching is simply begetting children for the murderer.<sup>157</sup> Church discipline has three general rules: “avoiding all known sin, doing good after his power, and attending all the ordinances of God.” Generally, the exclusion of a member out of the society is done “in the most quiet and inoffensive manner.” But in case “the offence is great, and there is danger of public scandal,” it was publicly declared that they were no longer members of our society.<sup>158</sup> The end of discipline is “to nurture the reshaping of their character into Christ-likeness.”<sup>159</sup> For this end, he organized the class meetings, bands, penitent bands, and select societies.<sup>160</sup>

Barth considered “education, right (the law), and custom,” as the instrument of their learners’ sanctification.<sup>161</sup> “The community is edified and upbuilt through the reciprocal ministry of its individuals.”<sup>162</sup> Through this law of love for the community, all the members of God’s people “serve and help and uphold and comfort and admonish” one another by the power of the Holy Spirit.<sup>163</sup> By those actions, they function as instruments for the sanctification of the Christian community.

### 5.1.7.5 Faith

Calvin regarded faith as the only means by which God “leads us into the light of the Gospel.”<sup>164</sup> “God communicates himself to us in his Son, and offers himself to be enjoyed in him” by faith.<sup>165</sup> Repentance and forgiveness are attained “by faith.”<sup>166</sup> Faith cleanses our hearts<sup>167</sup> and enables us to have a personal relationship with the living God by lifting us up to God’s presence in Christ.<sup>168</sup> This relationship transforms the life of believers.

---

<sup>155</sup> Wendel, *op. cit.*, p. 298.

<sup>156</sup> Thoughts Upon Methodism 1: *Works* 7, 258.

<sup>157</sup> *Works* 3, 144.

<sup>158</sup> Sermon CVII. On God’s Vineyard 3, 3: *Works* 7, 209.

<sup>159</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>160</sup> A Plain Account of the People Called Methodists, II-VIII: *Works* 253-261.

<sup>161</sup> *Ethics*, p. 363.

<sup>162</sup> *CD IV/2*, 627.

<sup>163</sup> *CD IV/2*, 815, 816.

<sup>164</sup> *Institutes*, 3.1.4.

<sup>165</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Jn. 4:14.

<sup>166</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.19.

<sup>167</sup> Sermon on Eph. 1:17-18; SEC, 102.

<sup>168</sup> Sermon on Eph. 3:14-19; SEC, 295.

Faith generates strength to practise God's will.<sup>169</sup> Faith engrafts us into the death of Christ in order that we might "derive from it a secret energy, as the twig does from the root."<sup>170</sup> In this sense, faith can be said to be a means of sanctification, but Calvin did not say so because faith is God's gift which is generated by the Spirit rather than a human deed which man can manipulate.

For Wesley, "faith in general is the most direct and effectual means of promoting all righteousness and true holiness; of establishing the holy and spiritual law in the hearts of them that believe."<sup>171</sup> Though not more meritorious than any other of our actions, our faith in Christ is *the means and instrument* whereby we embrace and receive the promises of pardon (my emphasis).<sup>172</sup> A fruit of faith is peace and freedom from the power of all kinds of sins.<sup>173</sup> Since our sins were cleaned by faith in Jesus Christ, "we have peace with God" (Rom. 5:1.)

For Barth, faith is the basis and essence of all transformation or renewal of our life. The repentance of faith necessarily results in conversion.<sup>174</sup> To believe is to turn from "the sloth which allows the sinfulness of our own works to remain"...to the delight and willingness, "which derives from the knowledge of God's will."<sup>175</sup> Faith is "the apprehension and affirmation of the divine justification." This faith is "the birth and life of the new man who can and will do what is good and well-pleasing to God." As a dying of the old man and birth of the new, "faith is actually and literally our temporal orientation, preparation, and exercise, and therefore our sanctification for eternal life."<sup>176</sup> Faith is acknowledgment of Jesus Christ, obedience to Him, and confession of Him. For Barth, faith is the essence of sanctification rather than a means of sanctification because it is not our possession but God's gift in the sense that no Christian could continue his faith without God's continuous supply of the Holy Spirit.<sup>177</sup>

## 5.1.8 Relation with Other Doctrines in the *Ordo Salutis*

### 5.1.8.1 Regeneration and Sanctification

For Calvin and Barth, regeneration, repentance, and conversion is roughly equivalent to

---

<sup>169</sup> Sermon Eph. 1:17-19; SEC, 101.

<sup>170</sup> *Comm.* on Gal. 2:20.

<sup>171</sup> Sermon XXXVI, 3, 2: *Works* 5, 465; also see Frank Baker, ed., *The Works of John Wesley* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1984ff), 2: 41.

<sup>172</sup> *The Principles of A Methodist Father explained* II. 3. (3): *Works* 8, 830.

<sup>173</sup> Sermon XVIII. The Marks of the New Birth 1, 4: *Works* 5, 214.

<sup>174</sup> *CD* II/2, 772.

<sup>175</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>176</sup> *CD* II/2, 773.

<sup>177</sup> Karl Barth, *The Holy Ghost and the Christian Life*, tr. by R. Birch Hoyle (London: Frederick Muller Limited. 1938), pp., 48-52.

sanctification.<sup>178</sup> Of course, Calvin noted that regeneration is “the beginning of the spiritual life,”<sup>179</sup> but it is less clear than Wesley’s view that regeneration is only the beginning of sanctification.<sup>180</sup> Calvin concluded that in our hidden consciousness, the initial regeneration precedes faith, but in our consciousness, faith precedes sanctification.<sup>181</sup> For Wesley, regeneration commences with justification by faith.<sup>182</sup>

### 5.1.8.2 Justification and Sanctification

Calvin believed that whereas justification is what Christ has done for us (substitution), sanctification is what Christ does in us through the power of the Spirit.<sup>183</sup> Calvin mentioned that “Christ justifies no one he does not sanctify”<sup>184</sup> and “the grace of justification is not separated from regeneration, although they are things distinct.”<sup>185</sup> As Christ cannot be divided into parts, justification and sanctification are so united together in Him that they are inseparable.<sup>186</sup> Justifying faith inevitably accompanies sanctification.<sup>187</sup> We are justified in order to worship God in the holiness of life.<sup>188</sup> Sanctification is the aim of justification.

For Wesley, sanctification is “in some degree, the immediate fruit of justification but, nevertheless, is a distinct gift of God,” and has a totally different nature from justification.<sup>189</sup> While justification implies “what God does for us through his Son,” sanctification means “what he works in us by his Spirit.”<sup>190</sup> Sanctification comes prior to final justification, while repentance is antecedent to initial justification.<sup>191</sup> True holiness cannot precede justification by faith.<sup>192</sup> Both inward and outward holiness subsequent to

---

<sup>178</sup> Ralph Del Colle, “John Wesley’s Doctrine of Grace in Light of the Christian Tradition” in *International Journal of Systematic Theology* Vol. 4 no. 2 (2002): 183; Dawn DeVries, “What is Conversion?,” in *How Shall We Witness?: Faithful Evangelism in a Reformed Tradition*, ed. by Milton J Coalter and Virgil Cruz (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), p.32.

<sup>179</sup> *Institutes* 2.3.6.

<sup>180</sup> *Works* 1, 225.

<sup>181</sup> See 2.2.7.4 Faith and Sanctification.

<sup>182</sup> *Works* 5, 169

<sup>183</sup> *Institutes* 3.11.6.

<sup>184</sup> *Institutes* 3.16.1.

<sup>185</sup> *Institutes* 3.11.11.

<sup>186</sup> *Institutes* 3.11.6; *Comm.* on Isa. 59:20, *CO* 37.351-53.

<sup>187</sup> *Comm.* on Rom. 8:13. “...it is equally true and certain, that all who are justified are called by the Lord, that they may live worthy of their vocation.”

<sup>188</sup> *Comm.* Rom. 6:2 (p. 168).

<sup>189</sup> Sermon V. 2. 1 : *Works* 5, 56.

<sup>190</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>191</sup> A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion, Part I, 2, 2: *Works* 8, 50-51.

<sup>192</sup> A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion, Part I, 2, 2: *Works* 8, 51.

faith are “the ordinary, stated condition of final justification.”<sup>193</sup> “It is undoubtedly true, that nothing avails for our final salvation without *καινή κτίσις* ‘a new creation,’ and consequent thereon, a sincere, uniform keeping of the commandments of God.”<sup>194</sup>

For Barth, the events of salvation are regarded as happening simultaneously. He did not accept the *ordo salutis* as a temporal sequence of them. Justification and sanctification are only different aspects of the *simul* of the one reconciliation event.<sup>195</sup> Justification, which is the objective reality of reconciliation, becomes visible in sanctification, which is the subjective reality of reconciliation. Sanctification is regarded as “a sign and testimony” of reconciliation.<sup>196</sup> In God’s intentional order, sanctification is superior to justification, for it is the purpose of reconciliation. God’s intention to save us is to make us holy people. In the structural order of reconciliation, justification is superior to sanctification.<sup>197</sup>

### 5.1.8.3 Predestination, Assurance, and Sanctification

For Calvin, whoever is predestined to salvation is sanctified because the end of predestination is sanctification. The assurance of election is based on the calling of the Spirit and one’s belief in Christ, not on his own good works.<sup>198</sup> For Wesley, predestination is universal, and election is conditional, while man’s sanctification depends upon his faith working by love in Christ.<sup>199</sup> Assurance is founded on the witnesses of both the Spirit and our spirit, which are necessary for sanctification.<sup>200</sup> It seems quite subjective in contrast to “the objective assurance conveyed by the Word and Sacraments,” in the sense that it is difficult for us to discern whether the two witnesses are true or not.<sup>201</sup> For Barth, the relation between predestination and sanctification is that all men are already elected in Jesus, and therefore they can be assured of their election. They should live a sanctified life as the elected.<sup>202</sup>

On double predestination, Calvin stressed God’s sovereignty of election and reprobation; Wesley emphasised the human free choice of his own destiny; Barth denied God’s reprobation of man and asserted God’s reprobation of Christ in place of humankind.<sup>203</sup> All of them agreed with the fact that the purpose of predestination is God’s

---

<sup>193</sup> A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion, Part I, 2, 8: *Works* 8, 56.

<sup>194</sup> A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Horne 2, 7: *Works* 9, 115.

<sup>195</sup> *CD*, IV/2, 502.

<sup>196</sup> *KD* I/2, 358f.

<sup>197</sup> *CD*, IV/2, 508.

<sup>198</sup> See 2.2.7.2 Predestination, Election, Calling and Sanctification.

<sup>199</sup> See 3.2.8.1 Predestination, Election, and Sanctification.

<sup>200</sup> See 3.2.8.4 Assurance and Sanctification.

<sup>201</sup> Cf. Collin W. Williams, *John Wesley’s Theology Today* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960), p. 203.

<sup>202</sup> *KD* II/2, 354.

<sup>203</sup> See 4.2.8.2 Predestination, Election and Sanctification.

glory due to the sanctification of man.

Considering the effect of predestination, Calvin maintained that predestination induced men to exert themselves for their salvation; Barth contended that predestination causes men to be grateful to God and enable them to live a free life in the direction of the Holy Spirit; Wesley noted that men should make strenuous efforts to get assurance and in order not to lose their assurance.<sup>204</sup> In contrast, Calvin and Barth thought little of the possibility of the loss of human salvation because they thought much of God's sovereignty and power.

### 5.1.9 Good Works and Sanctification

Calvin emphasised that good works are called fruits of repentance in the sense that "*repentance* is an inward renewal of the man, which manifests itself in the outward life, as a tree produces its fruit."<sup>205</sup> Repentance is "not attested by words" but "proved by conduct." "In the process of time, their works will make it evident, whether or not they have seriously repented."<sup>206</sup> Good works also are the fruit of fulfilling one's vocation.<sup>207</sup> In his commentary on 1 Jn 4:17, Calvin recognized our works as a secondary support for our assurance. The newness of life testified by good works<sup>208</sup> "serves to confirm confidence" as a secondary prop, while grace is primary support.<sup>209</sup> The children of God "prove themselves to be such by a pious and holy life, since by this evidence they showed that they differ from the children of the devil." "The fruit and adoption always appear in the life."<sup>210</sup> Nonetheless, Calvin held that we must found the certainty of faith only on Christ and God's grace rather than on our good works.<sup>211</sup>

For Wesley, good works are the fruits flowing out from the new birth and justification.<sup>212</sup> They are necessary for sanctification, given that "if a man willingly neglects them, he cannot reasonably expect that he shall ever be sanctified; he cannot grow in grace, in the image of God," nor "retain the grace," nor "continue in faith, or in the favour of God."<sup>213</sup> Good works are only conditionally necessary, "if there be time and opportunity for them, otherwise a man may be sanctified without them."<sup>214</sup> Conversely,

---

<sup>204</sup> See 3.2.8.5 Perseverance and Sanctification.

<sup>205</sup> *Comm.* on Mt. 3:8; Lk 3:8 (The Harmony on the Gospel Vol. 1, p. 171).

<sup>206</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 170-171.

<sup>207</sup> *Institutes* 3. 14. 9.

<sup>208</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Jn. 3:7 .

<sup>209</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Jn 4:17.

<sup>210</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Jn. 3:10.

<sup>211</sup> *Comm.* on 1. Jn 3:14.

<sup>212</sup> Cf. Kenneth J. Collins, *Scripture Way of Salvation: The Heart of John Wesley's Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), p.162. "

<sup>213</sup> Sermon XLIII, 'The Scriptural Way to Salvation' 3, 4: *Works* 6, 49.

<sup>214</sup> Sermon XLIII, 'The Scriptural Way to Salvation' 3, 13: *Works* 6, 52.

“faith is *immediately* and *directly* necessary to sanctification” (emphasis is his),<sup>215</sup> for at the moment a man believes, “with or without those fruits, yea, with more or less of this repentance, he is sanctified.”<sup>216</sup>

Barth delineated good works as an outward appearance of sanctification. Scripture tells us of God’s judgment of the bad works and his reward of the good works.<sup>217</sup> Good works can not sanctify us as well as they cannot justify us, for human works done to obtain merit are nothing less than bad works. Our works are good before God, only when they are done by faith in God’s grace. However, *sola fide* is not a doctrine to prevent Christians from doing good works as God’s command.<sup>218</sup> Good works commence with abandoning “the spirit of mammon and self-seeking.” When men do good works that God wants, they “will be Christians and true human beings.”<sup>219</sup> In this manner, Barth regarded doing good works as the evidence of true faith.

Briefly, Calvin and Barth regarded good works as the evidence of true faith, while Wesley viewed them as conditionally necessary to sanctification.

### 5.1.10 The Sphere of Sanctification

Calvin accentuated the sanctification of all spheres, e.g., “all things including the church, the state, society, and economics must be reformed according to the Word of God.”<sup>220</sup> He energetically and audaciously criticized “corruption in the church, tyranny in the polity, and inequitable wealth in the economy.”<sup>221</sup> On economic injustice, Calvin warned again a self-chosen revolutionary liberation from poverty. He admitted that there would also be a variety of levels of both the rich and the poor rather than one egalitarian society. While arguing that poverty should be solved by trade and the right to associate; he did warn against the lavish, merciless waste of wealth.

Wesley identified three characteristic principles of social sanctification: firstly, Christianity is a social religion; secondly, social reformation comes through individual transformation; and thirdly, it is a gift given by God, which concomitantly asks our

---

<sup>215</sup> Sermon XLIII, ‘The Scriptural Way to Salvation’ 3.13: *Works* 6, 52: cf. Kenneth J. Collins, *Scripture Way of Salvation: The Heart of John Wesley’s Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), p.168.

<sup>216</sup> Sermon XLIII, ‘The Scriptural Way to Salvation’ 3.13: *Works* 6, 52.

<sup>217</sup> *CD* IV/2, 586.

<sup>218</sup> *CD* IV/2, 587.

<sup>219</sup> K. Barth, “Jesus Christ and the Movement for social justice” (1911) in: G. Hunsinger. ed. *Karl Barth and Radical Politics* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976), p. 37.

<sup>220</sup> John C. Koedyker, “Theocracy is not Dead: Calvin and Khomeini” in *Reformed Review* Vol. 34. no. 2 (1981), p. 74.

<sup>221</sup> Nicholas Wolterstorff, “The Wounds of God: Calvin’s Theology of Social Injustice” in *The Reformed Journal*, Vol. 37, no. 6 (1987):21.

obedience to God's command, e.g., legal action,<sup>222</sup> lobbying, arguing and criticizing for important issues. Wesley used diverse ways for social sanctification: "Evangelical preaching," "education in class meetings, Methodist schools, Sunday schools," "publication of books," "criticism of war," "arguing and writing for tax reform," "preventing unnecessary pensions," "criticism of selling of votes," and "lobbying political leadership on behalf of abolition of slavery."<sup>223</sup>

Barth also stressed that Christianity is "a social religion, a religion of solidarity," while criticizing Luther for the individualistic tendency of Christianity.<sup>224</sup> Christianity is not "a matter of the closet" but that of society. This fact became clear given that God is called "our Father," not "my Father."<sup>225</sup> Accordingly, the church can and should actively and freely participate in the political field for the practice of Christ's lordship over the world, keeping in mind the distinction between the Gospel and any ideology or political system. Barth can be said to have a proclivity to socialism rather than American capitalism of the day, given his comment that anti-communism was "an evil greater than communism itself."<sup>226</sup> This is distinct from Calvin, who admitted capitalistic elements in his day. Barth also dealt with such social issues of the day as abortion, euthanasia, self-defence, the death penalty, war and work.<sup>227</sup>

## 5.2 The Contextual Analysis of the Korean Church

To apply this study to the Korean church, it is first necessary to analyze the context of the Korean church in detail from the perspective of sanctification.

Korean society has many religions. They include Shamanism (established for two thousand years), Buddhism (established for one thousand years), Confucianism (established for five hundred years), Catholicism (established for two hundred years) and Protestantism (established for one hundred years). These religions coexist peacefully in Korea. This religious plurality differs from the contexts of Calvin, Wesley, and Barth, who lived in Christian countries. The contextual analysis of the Korean church should be approached under the premise of religious plurality, which includes religious syncretism.

---

<sup>222</sup> Cf. Black, Robert Edwin concludes, "He was not opposed on principle to social legislation." *The Social Dimension of John Wesley's Ministry as Related to His Personal Piety* (Ph. D. diss. Union Theological Seminary, 1984. An Arbor: UMI, 1987), p. 179.

<sup>223</sup> Ronald H. Stone, *John Wesley's Life and Ethics* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2001), pp.227-228; "After Lord Mansfield's ruling in 1772 made slavery illegal in England" (p. 189).

<sup>224</sup> K. Barth, "Jesus Christ and the Movement for social justice," in G. Hunsinger. ed. *Karl Barth and Radical Politics* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976), p.34.

<sup>225</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>226</sup> K. Barth, *How I Changed My Mind: Introduction and Epilogue* by John D. Godsey (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1966), p. 47.

<sup>227</sup> For furthermore, see .4.2.10.5.2..3- 5 on this thesis.



## 5.2.1 The Affirmative Evaluation of the Korean Church

### 5.2.1.1 Quantitative Growth

Since the first Roman Catholic Church in Korea was established by Seung-Hun Lee in 1784<sup>228</sup> and the first Protestant missionary, Karl Friedrich August Gützlaff visited Korea in 1882,<sup>229</sup> the Korean Church has experienced remarkable development.<sup>230</sup> In 1995, Protestant Christians were 19.7 percent (8,760,000) of the total population (44,554,000) and Catholics 6.6 percent (2,950,730). In 2003, the Protestant Christians were about 21 percent (10,120,000) of the total population (47,000, 000). This is very positive when contrasted with the stagnant Japanese Church. According to the 1991 *Kirisutokyo nenkan* [Christian yearbook], the total Japanese Christian membership was 1,092,034, which was 0.88 percent of the population.<sup>231</sup> In 2001, it fell to 530,000, which was 0.4 percent of the total population.<sup>232</sup> The Korean Christian proportion relative to the total population is much higher than the Chinese Christian proportion, which is 0.5 percent (5,000,000) of the total population (over one billion).<sup>233</sup> Given that South Korea consists of plural religions, the increase of her Christian membership is “one of the marvels of modern history,” as Spencer Palmer puts it.<sup>234</sup> David L. Edwards’ confession that “no other nation in the world sees Christian evangelism which is so effective” is relevant<sup>235</sup>

Whether the growth of the Korean Church is directly linked with Christian sanctified life is not clear. Viewed socio-politically, growth does seem to be linked with the positive image of Christianity, largely created by the assistance to Koreans in need by American

---

<sup>228</sup> The Institute of Korean Church History Studies (IKCHS), *A History of Korean Church*, Vol. I (16C.-1918) (Seoul: The Christian Literature Press, 1989), pp. 71-74.

<sup>229</sup> *Ibid.*, p.129; Young-Hun Lee, *A History of Christianity in Korea* (Seoul: Concordia Press, 1985), pp. 57-69. cf. Nak-Heung Yang regards the first official Protestant missionary as H. N. Allen in 1884 in his *Reformed Social Ethics and Korean Presbyterian Churches* (Seoul: The Korean Society for Reformed Faith & Action, 1994, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1995), p. 128.

<sup>230</sup> According to Government Census Data in 1995, there were 10,321,000 Buddhists, 355,000 people of other religions, and 21,953,000 who follow no religion, among a total population of 44,554,000. *Year Book of Religions in Korea, 1996-7* (Seoul: Korean Religion & Society Research Institutes, 1993, 1995, 1997); for church growth during 1962-1995, see Changdae Gwak, “Ecclesiology and Membership Trends in the South Korean Churches,” Ph. D. diss. the University of Stellenbosch, 2000, pp. 115-117, and for the change of church membership during 1888-1906, see IKCHS, *A History of Korean Church*, p. 254, and for approximate statistics between 1900-1990, see J. S. Rhee, *Secularization and Sanctification*, *op. cit.*, p. 228, n. 1.

<sup>231</sup> *Kirisutokyo nenkan* [Christian Yearbook] (Tokyo: Kirisuto Shimbunsha, 1991).

<sup>232</sup> *Kidokshinmoon*, Oct., 23, 2002, p.14. (In Korean).

<sup>233</sup> Daniel J. Adams, “Church Growth in Korea: A Paradigm Shift from Ecclesiology to Nationalism,” in *Perspectives on Christianity in Korea and Japan: The Gospel and Culture in East Asia* ed. by Mark R. Mullins and Richard Fox Young (Lewiston/ Queenston/Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1995), p.14. Hereafter it is written *PCKJ*.

<sup>234</sup> Spencer T. Palmer, *Korea and Christianity* (Seoul: Hollym Cor., 1967), p.vi.

<sup>235</sup> David L. Edwards, *The Future of Christianity* (Wilton: Morehous-Barlow, 1987), p.234.

missionaries and the church. Christianity's equalitarianism seems to have contributed to the conversion of the lower class.<sup>236</sup> This means that love, hope and equality as the signs of sanctified life contribute to the growth of the church. Korean enthusiasm of bible studies and prayer meetings as a means of sanctification also help growth.

### 5.2.1.2 Enthusiasm for Meeting, Prayer, Praise, and Offering

Korean enthusiasm for religious meetings has contributed to the rapid growth of the Korean Church. Korean Christians attend their local church on Sunday,<sup>237</sup> Wednesday, and Friday. Daily early morning services are popular and a small group service called *Kuyeok Jebae* is held once a week to attract new members through preaching of the gospel.

The Korean daily dawn service, usually at five o'clock, is worthy of observation. The streets around big churches fill with cars and taxis from about four o'clock. Dawn prayer was introduced by Pastor Sun-Ju Kil at Jangdaehyun Church in Pyongyang in 1906. It has been not only a generative power of Korean church revival, but also an important motivation to induce the churches of the world to hold dawn services. Whenever Koreans faced difficult times, dawn service provided Christians with the spiritual power to overcome them in faith.<sup>238</sup>

Through frequent religious meetings, Korean Christians have armed themselves with God's word and prayer,<sup>239</sup> which are the two important means for sanctification. Diverse meetings, including the *Kuyeok* service, have provided them with opportunities to encourage one another to grow in the image of Christ, which is the aim of our sanctification. Various afflictions including war, poverty and military dictatorship were used as the means of sanctification in the providence of God. In other words, the growth of the Korean church has been based on God's word, prayer, meetings and God's providence. W. N. Blair holds that "Bible classes accounted for the rapid growth and revival of the

---

<sup>236</sup> Dr. Harold S. Hong, "Social, Political, and Psychological Aspects of Church Growth," in *Korean Church Growth Explosion* ed. by Ro Bong-Rin and Marlin L. Neslon (Seoul: Word of Life Press and Asia Theological Association), p.175; Myung-Gil Noh, *The Social Background of Religious Growth in Korea* (Seoul: Nathan Publishing Co., 1989), pp.104-106.

<sup>237</sup> According to Gallup Korea's survey of the rate of religious attendance of 18 countries during 1989-1991, Korean Christian rate of attendance of Sunday service is nearly 74 percent, which is the highest among 18 countries.. Gallup Korea, *The Religions and Religious Life of Koreans* (Seoul: Gallup Korea, 1998), pp.216-217.

<sup>238</sup> Kyum-II Na, "The Korean Church and Spiritual Great Awakening Movement- Dawn Prayer," *Ministry & Theology* vol. 52 (Apr., 1994).

<sup>239</sup> According to Gallup survey (1997), 64 percent of Korean Protestants prayed at least once a day and more than 50 percent read more than once a week, which are the highest in the world. Gallup Korea, *The Religions and Religious Life of Koreans* (Seoul: Gallup Korea, 1998), pp. 86-89.

Korean Church.”<sup>240</sup>

Also, the Korean Church is eager for praise and offering. William Black, an OMF missionary says, “There are not many such churches which have enthusiasm and make efforts for prayer, evangelism, praise, service for the church and offering like the Korean church.”<sup>241</sup> Offering contributed to educating church members, building a church and a world mission. Consequently, this enthusiasm must be a positive aspect of the Korean Church and helpful to her sanctification.

### 5.2.1.3 Enthusiasm for World Mission

According to Steve S. C. Moon, Korean missionaries were estimated at about 10,745 in 2002.<sup>242</sup> CGN TV Today (the Korean Religion Broadcast) reports that the number of Korean missionaries was estimated at about 13,000 in December 2005.<sup>243</sup> The Korean missionary movement has been progressing more strongly than would have been expected. Some features of the Korean mission include the prominent activities of women missionaries and the increase of lay missionaries.<sup>244</sup>

The Korean Church has contributed to the sanctification of the world through evangelization. The sanctification of the world implies that unbelievers in the world have the right relationship with Christ and are ruled by the gospel of Christ in the Holy Spirit.

### 5.2.1.4 Conservative Theological Disposition

Mr. A. J. Brown, who was general secretary of the Board of Foreign Mission of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A, described the early missionaries as a type of very conservative Presbyterian. They kept the Sabbath like Puritans and considered “dancing, smoking, and card-playing” as “sins in which no true follower of Christ should indulge,” and deemed “the higher criticism and liberal theology” to be “dangerous heresies.”<sup>245</sup> K. S. Latourette also mentioned that Korean Protestantism “tended to be theologically

---

<sup>240</sup> E. Brown, *The Reformed Spirituality of the Korean Christians* (Stellenbosch: The University of Stellenbosch, 1997), p. 31; B.W. Yoo, *Korean Pentecostalism: Its History and Theology*, Ph. D. Thesis, Birmingham University (Frankfurt am Main; Bern; New York; Paris: Peter Lang, 1987), p. 61.

<sup>241</sup> William Black (OMF missionary, a Scotchman), “Do the Korean Christians love their denomination rather than Jesus?,” *Ministry & and Theology* vol. 68 (Feb., 1995), p. 181. (In Korean).

<sup>242</sup> Steve S. C. Moon, “The Recent Korean Missionary Movement: A Record of Growth, and More Growth Needed,” *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, vol. 27, no.1 (Jan. 2003): 11.

<sup>243</sup> CGN TV Today, “Do You Know How Many Korean Missionaries there are?” <[http://www.cgntv.net/cgn\\_player/player.htm?vid=24005](http://www.cgntv.net/cgn_player/player.htm?vid=24005)> (Dec. 09, 2005). (In Korean).

<sup>244</sup> “Statement on the Mission of the Korean Churches in the New Millennium : Council of Presbyterian Churches in Korea International Consultation on Korean Churches’ Mission around the World, Seoul, Korea, 23-27 May 1999,” *International Review of Mission*, Vol.89,no.353 (Apr., 2000): 24.

<sup>245</sup> A. J. Brown, *The Mastery of the Far East* (New York: Scribners, 1919), p.540.

conservative.”<sup>246</sup> Under the direction of the conservative PCUSA, Pyung-yang Theological Seminary accepted Calvinism, the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Catechisms of the Presbyterian Churches, the infallibility of the Bible, a supernaturalistic interpretation of miracles and Christ’s redemption.<sup>247</sup>

The Presbyterian Church was very conservative in matters of faith. When the government ordered students to participate in Shinto shrine worship “as a symbol of their loyalty,”<sup>248</sup> Dr. G. F. McCune, headmaster of the Pyungyang Soongshil Junior College, and Mrs. V.V. Snook, headmistress of Soongui Girls High School refused the order.<sup>249</sup> The Southern Presbyterians closed their schools rather than attend Shinto shrine worship.<sup>250</sup> In 1920, *Dongahilbo* (a daily newspaper) criticized Shrine worship for conspicuous idolatry, and consequently its publication was indefinitely suspended.<sup>251</sup> From 1935 to 1945, nearly 200 local churches closed their doors and about 2000 people were arrested and more than 50 people died for rejecting shrine worship.<sup>252</sup> This manifests Presbyterians’ conservative disposition of faith, and shows Presbyterians seriously obeyed God’s prohibition of idol worship. It was the practice of sanctification as obedience to God’s command.

The conservative theological disposition of the Korean Presbyterian Church was manifested in the 38<sup>th</sup> General Assembly of Presbyterian Church of 1953. To keep the infallibility of the Bible, the General Assembly expelled Jae-Joon Kim from the ministry. J. J. Kim was a leader of liberal theologians, who directed the Choson Theological Seminary and denied the infallibility of the Bible and the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.<sup>253</sup> In this regard, M. G. Son’s notion that the Hanshin University established by J. J. Kim is “the true succession of the Calvinistic and Presbyterian tradition”<sup>254</sup> is mistaken, given that

---

<sup>246</sup> Kenneth Scott Latourette, *op. cit.*, p.423; Sook-Jong Lee is of the opinion that the early missionaries represented the conservative streams of Protestantism. “A Study of the Relationship of the Korean Church to the Indigenous Culture of Korea,” *The Asia Journal of Theology*, Vol. 9, no. 2 (1987): 231.

<sup>247</sup> Pyeong-Seh Oh, “Keeping the Faith Pure,” in *Korean Church Growth Explosion* ed. by Ro Bong-Rin and Marlin L. Neslon (Seoul: Word of Life Press and Asia Theological Association, 1984), pp. 214-215.

<sup>248</sup> K. S. Latourette, *op. cit.*, p.416

<sup>249</sup> Pyeong-Seh Oh, *op. cit.*, pp.214-215.

<sup>250</sup> K. S. Latourette, *op. cit.*, p.416.

<sup>251</sup> IKCHS, *A History of the Korean Church*, pp. 287-288.

<sup>252</sup> Dr. Harold S. Hong, “Social, Political, and Psychological Aspects of Church Growth,” in *Korean Church Growth Explosion* ed. by Ro Bong-Rin and Marlin L. Neslon (Seoul: Word of Life Press and Asia Theological Association), p.180; Pyeong-Seh Oh, *op. cit.*, p.224;

<sup>253</sup> Yang Sun Kim, *History of the Korean Church: In the Ten Years Since Liberation, 1945-1955*, tr. By Allen D. Clark, from *Hankuk Kidokkyo Haebang Sipyeonsa* (Seoul: The Board of Religious Education, Korean Presbyterian Church, 1956), p.82

<sup>254</sup> Myoung-Gul Son, *Korean Churches in Search of Self-identity, 1930-1970: An Examination of Some Protestant Efforts during the Period of Japanization, National Division, and Resurgence* (Ph. D. diss., Southern Methodist University. Ann Arbor: Xerox University Microfilms, 1974), p. 275.

Calvin admitted the infallibility of the Bible.<sup>255</sup> Ostracizing J. J. Kim was an unavoidable decision for the purification of church doctrines. On 7<sup>th</sup> of May in 1992, Sun-Hwan Pyun was expelled from his Methodist denomination because he recognized the possibility of salvation outside the Church.<sup>256</sup> This demonstrated the conservative tendency of the Korean Church once again.<sup>257</sup> Up to now, the conservative churches have formed the main-stream of the Korean Church in its number and influence.

Briefly, the conservative disposition of the Korean Church has contributed to the sanctification of doctrines and life.

### 5.2.1.5 Enthusiasm for Education

Early Korean Christians thought that western education was a way to make the country strong. They learned new science in such modern schools as *Baejaehakdang* and Ehwa Girl's School, which were established in 1886 by foreign missionaries.<sup>258</sup> By 1910, there were some 800 Christian schools all over Korea, accommodating more than 41,000 students.<sup>259</sup> Such a trend contributed to cultivating talented men for Korean modernization by the synergism with Confucianism, which respects learned, successful worldly men.<sup>260</sup> Early Korean Protestantism was imported mainly through the American missionaries. By 1950 the range of Christian education was expanded to train Christian physicians abroad to help with urgent medical care.<sup>261</sup> Christian schools helped Koreans learn western knowledge and techniques, especially of medical science.<sup>262</sup>

According to J. H. Grayson, at the present time “forty universities and 293 schools claim a Christian origin, including three of the five top universities” in South Korea.<sup>263</sup> Christianity has led Korean enthusiasm for modern education and has contributed to promoting Christian intellectuals and has encouraged Koreans to assimilate highly-developed American science, resulting in Korea's valuable human resources.

Enthusiasm for Korean Church education has contributed to social sanctification, by expanding the Christian world view in Korean society.

---

<sup>255</sup> *Institutes* 1.7.4; 1.7.5.

<sup>256</sup> *Chongkyoshinmoon [Religion Newspaper]*, no. 1467. (Mar. 20, 2000). (In Korean).

<sup>257</sup> Cf. Moon-Jang Lee, “Experience of Religious Plurality in Korea: Its Theological Implications,” *International Review of Mission*, Vol.83, no. 351 (1999):411.

<sup>258</sup> *A History of the Korean Church, Vol. I*, p. 289.

<sup>259</sup> B.S. Kim, *The Korean Society and the Protestant churches* (Seoul: Han Wool Publishing Co., 1995), pp.40-41.

<sup>260</sup> Furthermore, see Chai-Sik Chung, *Korea: The Encounter Between the Gospel and Neo-Confucian Culture* (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1997), pp. 1-44.

<sup>261</sup> *The International Review of Missions* 38 (Jan., 1949):8-10.

<sup>262</sup> Kenneth Scott Latourette, *op.cit.*, p.423.

<sup>263</sup> James Huntley Grayson, *Korea- A Religious History* (New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 1989, revised 2002), pp.168-169.

### 5.2.1.6 Participation in Social Reformation

In 1896, Jae-Pil Suh, Chi-Ho Yun and Chang-Ho Ahn, with other Christian intellectuals, organized the Independent Club in order to secure the independence of Korea by reforming corrupt society and overcoming feudalism.<sup>264</sup> Early Korean Christians were more concerned about the welfare of their country than non-Christians. Until the end of the nineteenth century, foreign missionaries cooperated politically with Korean Christians.<sup>265</sup> However, as the message from the Secretary of State was sent to missionaries,<sup>266</sup> they turned around and declared the “depolitication” of the church.<sup>267</sup>

Many Christians joined “Shinminhoe” (The New Peoples’ Association), which was formed in 1907 to establish a new republic by renewing people and improving education and industry.<sup>268</sup> Shinminhoe members involved in the Conspiracy Trial of 1912 were helped by missionaries after being arrested by police for an incident fabricated by Japan to weaken Korean Christianity. As a result, the estrangement between missionaries and Korean Christians decreased.<sup>269</sup> In 1908 a Christian, In-Hwan Jang shot at D. W. Stevens, who had said “because Koreans are so stupid and ignorant, they are not entitled to have an independent country.”<sup>270</sup> In 1909 a Catholic, Jung-Keun Ahn assassinated Itou, the first Governor-General of Choson.<sup>271</sup> In the same year, a Christian, Jae-Myeong Yi failed in an attempt to assassinate Wan-Yong Lee, the prime minister of Choson, who betrayed his own country.<sup>272</sup> After 1908, Christians began economic restrictions against Japan. They boycotted Japanese goods, evaded tax and founded international trade companies such as *Sangmudongsa*.<sup>273</sup> Some Christians participated in an armed fighting movement in *Kando* (Northern Province from Choson) in 1910.<sup>274</sup>

In 1919, Korean Christians actively participated in the March First Movement, which was “a nationwide peaceful protest demonstration” proclaiming Korean Independence.<sup>275</sup>

---

<sup>264</sup> Nak-Heoung Yang, *Reformed Social Ethics and the Korean Church*: Sandra Wawrytko ed., Vol.21 *Asian Thoughts and Culture* (New York etc.: Peter Lang Publishing Co., 1997), p.110. Hereafter it is written as *RSEK*.

<sup>265</sup> Chung-Shin Park, *Protestantism and Politics in Korea* (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 2003), p.31.

<sup>266</sup> John M. B. Sill’s circular letter, “To Citizens of the United States present in Korea,” May 11, 1897.

<sup>267</sup> *RSEK*, p.113.

<sup>268</sup> Man-Kil Kang, *A Study of Korean Nation Movement History* (Seoul: Hankil Sa, 1985), pp. 117-118.

<sup>269</sup> IKCHS, *A History of the Korean Church*, Vol I, pp. 319-323.

<sup>270</sup> Cf. *Korean Daily News*, Mar. 25, 1908.

<sup>271</sup> IKCHS, *A History of the Korean Church*, Vol. I (Seoul: The Christian Literature Press, 1989), p. 336.

<sup>272</sup> *Korean Daily News*, Dec. 23, 1909.

<sup>273</sup> IKCHS, *A History of the Korean Church*, Vol I, pp. 348-349.

<sup>274</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 353-354.

<sup>275</sup> Sang-Heung Lee, “Preaching for the Upbuilding of the Church in Transition,” Ph.D. thesis, The University of Pretoria, 2004, p. 185.



More than two million people took part in the movement.<sup>276</sup> Christians mobilized people and provided refuge: 7,509 were killed, 15,961 were injured, and 19,525 were arrested by Japanese police.<sup>277</sup> Of those arrested, Christians made up 17.6 percent (3,426), although Christian membership was just 1.5 percent of the total population.<sup>278</sup> This was in contrast to the Buddhists 1.1 percent (220) and Ch'ondoists 11.8 percent (2,297), which proved Christians' strong social responsibility. As a result of the March First Movement, Christianity was recognized as a national, not foreign, religion.<sup>279</sup> Christian intellectuals now began an enlightenment campaign.

After emancipation from Japan on August 15, 1945, Korean Christians participated in the establishment of the new Korean government. Though some Christian parties in North Korea were dissolved by the Communists shortly after they were established, in South Korea, Syng-Mahn Rhee, a Methodist, was elected as President in 1948.<sup>280</sup> Four years later he was re-elected President due to the official support of the Korean Church. Rhee, however, appointed many Japanese collaborators to high positions, which caused distrust. After Rhee's illegitimate amendment of the constitution for his third presidential election in 1956, *The Christian Press* objected to the candidates' attempted use of the churches for their election. The newspaper asked the church to play a prophetic role by criticizing "the injustice of the state."<sup>281</sup> Some Christian politicians were corrupt and one government officer attempted to shut down an influential daily newspaper because of its criticism of government.<sup>282</sup> Due to economic decay and corruption in the fourth presidential election in March 15, 1960, college students, high school students and other citizens demonstrated intensely in the street.<sup>283</sup> Police fire killed one hundred and eighty students and wounded more than five thousand. Finally, Rhee had no choice but to resign as president on April 19, 1960. The church now began to criticize Rhee's government and seek to reform it.<sup>284</sup> The United Association of Korean Churches compared the April Revolution with the March First Movement of 1919.

The disorder due to the inability of the Second Republic led to the military coup by General Chung-Hee Park in May 15, 1961. When Park suggested the extension of his military rule four more years, the Korean National Council of Churches objected and asked

---

<sup>276</sup> J. S. Rhee, *op. cit.*, p. 263.

<sup>277</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>278</sup> IKCHS, *A History of the Korean Church*, Vol II, p. 38.

<sup>279</sup> Kyung-Bae Min, *A History of Korean Christianity Social Movement* (Seoul: Korea Christianity Publishing Co., 1987), p. 187.

<sup>280</sup> *RSEK*, p.136.

<sup>281</sup> *The Christian News*, Apr. 23, 1956.

<sup>282</sup> Pyung-Ik Kim, "The Social Involvement of the Korean Church," *Christianity Thoughts*, Vol. 69, no. 6, p. 36.

<sup>283</sup> Alan Thomas Wood, *Asian Democracy in World History* (New York & London: Routledge, 2004), p. 55.

<sup>284</sup> *The Christian News*, May 2, 1960.



Park to keep his previous promise.<sup>285</sup> Finally, Park withdrew his proposal and retired until he ran for the 1963 presidential election, which he won.

When Park hurried to restore relations with Japan, on July 1, 1965 Kyung-Jik Han, Jae-Joon Kim, Won-Yong Kang and Seok-Hun Ham, with more than two hundred church leaders, issued a statement opposing the move as it was against the people's will.<sup>286</sup> The *Hapdong* Denomination, the largest of the conservative Presbyterian Church, decided to pray for the objection to the "normalization."<sup>287</sup> While not denying Christian social responsibility, it emphasised an individual rather than collective dimension of the church to resolving political problems. "When each Christian believes and lives according to God's Word," social reformation is accomplished, for "the Bible contains all the answers to the human and social problems." This was the editorial policy of the denominational newspaper, *The Christian Times*.<sup>288</sup> When President Park attempted to amend the constitution in 1969 to allow a third term, the *Hapdong* denomination pleaded with the church, "Do not pretend to be spiritual, acquiescing in the tyranny of the ruler in fear of death." *The Hapdong* community also reproved those who attacked the rulers "without praying for them" too.<sup>289</sup> When Park announced a plebiscite for the amendment of the constitution, some leaders including Jae-Joon Kim, Suk-Hun Ham and Hyong-Kyu Park issued a statement opposing the amendment as unjust and corrupt.<sup>290</sup> *The Christian Times* criticized the churches for compromising with the rulers "to secure some interests."<sup>291</sup> Park was elected as President for a third term. Still not content, he used the Yushin Constitution to reinforce his power eternally, and established "The National Council for the Promotion of Unification," to elect the President as a representative of the people. In fact, it was a "rubber stamp" to elect the candidate of the ruling party.<sup>292</sup> Park declared martial law to accomplish his plan.

In December 1973, a group composed of politicians and professors, including liberal church leaders, began to collect one million signatures to amend the Yushin constitution. The movement was persecuted by the Emergency Measures I and II. In 1974, Bong-Ho Son, an adjunct professor at Chongshin Seminary pointed out that evil institutes and structures "have much greater and more formidable power than individuals can have," and emphasised that Christians should actively participate in social reformation.<sup>293</sup> He held

---

<sup>285</sup> *Ibid.*, Aug. 22, 1960; April 24, 1961.

<sup>286</sup> *The Christian Press*, July 9, 1965.

<sup>287</sup> *The Christian Times*, July 12, 1965.

<sup>288</sup> *Ibid.*, June 21, 1965.

<sup>289</sup> *Ibid.*, April 19, 1965.

<sup>290</sup> *Chosen Ilbo, Hanguok Ilbo*, August 24, 1969.

<sup>291</sup> *The Christian Times*, September 13, 1969.

<sup>292</sup> *RSEK*, pp.146-147.

<sup>293</sup> Bong Ho Son, "The Problem of Christian Social Ethics," in *Presbyterian Theological Quarterly*, Vol. 41, no.3 (1974):85, 87, and 104.

that Christians “ought to criticize and try to reform the unrighteousness of any government or any party” because they “have a strong tendency to become unjust.”<sup>294</sup> He understood that the mission comprised not only the salvation of soul, but also the realization of social justice.<sup>295</sup> The way to realize God’s justice was by “standing on the side of the poor, the oppressed and the despised, and judging the oppressors.”<sup>296</sup> His insistence seems biblical to me. On the 18<sup>th</sup> of November of 1974, the KNCC issued a statement that when a corrupt government is against God’s will, the church ought to “refuse to cooperate with such government and rather ought to withstand it.”<sup>297</sup> In contrast to Christians, Buddhists generally did not express their resistance to the military dictatorship.<sup>298</sup> The reason might be that Park was a Buddhist.

Finally, on October 26, 1979, Park was assassinated by Jae-Kyu Kim, who was the director of the Central Intelligence Agency of Korea. After a short period of disorder, General Doo-Hwan Chun came to power in 1980. His style of rule was exactly the same as Park’s. The Korean Catholic Church fought for workers’ rights during this period.<sup>299</sup> The demand for democracy, combined with Chun’s promise to serve a single term saw him retire in 1987.<sup>300</sup> At that time, the “Priests for the Realisation of Justice” of the Catholic Church was very active to make Dae-Jung Kim president.<sup>301</sup> Due to the competition between Dae-Jung Kim and Young-Sam Kim, General Tae-Uh Roh, who was an associate General close to Doo-Hwan Jun, was elected President in 1987.<sup>302</sup> Since 1988, Korean society has been democratic. In 1989, Kyung-Suk Suh and his colleagues organized the Citizens’ Coalition for Economic Justice, and after 1990, Bong Ho Son and other Christian leaders formed an election-watch group and contributed to just elections.<sup>303</sup> Christian participation in democratization improved the image of Christianity and resulted in the growth of the conservative churches.<sup>304</sup>

---

<sup>294</sup> Bong Ho Son, “Mission and the Social Justice,” in *Presbyterian Theological Quarterly*, Vol. 41, no.4 (1974): 70-71.

<sup>295</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 69-71.

<sup>296</sup> *Ibid.*, p.71.

<sup>297</sup> KNCC; The Committee for Human Rights, *The Movement for the Democratization in the 1970s, vol. 1* (Seoul: 1987), pp. 506-508.

<sup>298</sup> James Huntley Grayson, *Korea-A Religious History* (New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 1989, revised 2002), p.167.

<sup>299</sup> Russell Feldmeier, “The Church in the Defence of Workers’ Rights in the Republic of Korea,” *Pro Mundi Vita studies* 3 (1988): 12-20.

<sup>300</sup> Hong-Eyoul Hwang, “Searching for A New Paradigm of Church and Mission in A Secularized and Postmodern Context in Korea,” *International Review of Mission*, Vol.92, no.364 (Ja., 2003): 86.

<sup>301</sup> Brendan MacHale, “Conflicts within the Korean Church,” *Pro Mundi Vita studies* 9 (1989): 17-18.

<sup>302</sup> Alan Thomas Wood, *Asian Democracy in World History* (New York & London: Routledge, 2004), p. 55.

<sup>303</sup> *RSEK*, p. 156.

<sup>304</sup> Cf. Andrew Eungi Kim, “Christianity, Shamanism, and Modernization in South Korea,” *Cross Currents*, Vol.50, no.1-2 (Spr./Sum., 2000): 115.

In 1992, a Presbyterian elder, Young-Sam Kim was elected president. He dismantled “the association of military officers that had provided them with a political base” and democratized the army. He made Doo-Hwan Jun and Tae-Woo Roh stand trial in relation to the 12.12 and 5.18 coups and corruption during their presidency. In 1993 to eliminate corruption among the officials in the government Kim announced “the real-name financial transaction system.”<sup>305</sup> Unfortunately, towards the end of his term Kim suffered from the corruption of top leaders and a serious national economic crisis.<sup>306</sup>

Faced with war due to North Korea’s refusal to allow inspection of two nuclear waste sites by the International Atomic Energy Agency, some seven hundred thousand Christians assembled at the Youido Plaza in Seoul and prayed for Korean peace.<sup>307</sup> Thankfully, as North Korea accepted the inspection, the crisis subsided. On December 19 in 1996, KNCC sent 660 tons of rice from Bangkok to North Korea to help their food deficit.<sup>308</sup> In 1997, for the first time, a Roman Catholic, Dae-Jung Kim was elected president as a leader of the opposition. He salvaged the Korean economy and made an effort to establish peace on the Korean peninsula. D. J. Kim proclaimed: “to be a Christian is to fight on behalf of the oppressed and to make necessary sacrifices.”<sup>309</sup> Late in his presidency, he was confronted with “allegations of scandal” relating to members of his own family.<sup>310</sup> Y.S. Kim and D.J. Kim as Christian Presidents contributed to the realization of social justice and the democratization of Korean society. On 23rd of September in 2004, Moo-Hyun Roh’s government issued the act of prohibition of buying and selling sex, and dismantled brothels.<sup>311</sup>

On the other hand, from the mid-1990s, as the negative result of globalized capitalism, the problems of homelessness, unemployment, and illegal migrant workers appeared in Korean society. Since then, the Korean churches have supported migrant workers. KNCC organized “the Korean Churches’ Mission Committee for Migrant Workers” in 1992. Among the 159 organizations supporting migrant workers in 2003, 121 were Christian, indicating that the Korean Church has made efforts to protect them “from various work-

---

<sup>305</sup> Wi-Jo Kang, *Christ and Caesar in Modern Korea: A History of Christianity and Politics* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997), p.141.

<sup>306</sup> Alan Thomas Wood, *Asian Democracy in World History* (New York & London: Routledge, 2004), pp.55-57.

<sup>307</sup> Wi-Jo Kang, *Christ and Caesar in Modern Korea: A History of Christianity and Politics* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997), p.148.

<sup>308</sup> “NCC Ships Food to North Korea,” in *Christian Century* 114 (Ja., 1997): 43.

<sup>309</sup> An address given at Emory University, March 31, 1983. Quoted by Kosuka Koyama, “Building the House by Righteousness,” in *ETWP*, p.138.

<sup>310</sup> Alan T. Wood, *Asian Democracy in World History* (New York & London: Routledge, 2004), p. 55.

<sup>311</sup> *Kyunghyangshinmun [A Daily Newspaper]*, Sep. 23, 2004.

<<http://news.media.daum.net/society/affair/200409/nocut/v742152.html>>.

related human rights violations”<sup>312</sup>.

Christian participation in socio-political reformation sometimes seems to have been ineffective, but it is never meaningless and should be regarded as responsible Christian action for social sanctification.

### 5.2.1.7 The Efforts for the Unity of the Churches

At the early stage of the Protestant mission (1887-1910), Protestant Christians translated the Bible into Korean. In 1905, four Presbyterian missions and the two Methodist missions joined to form “The General Council of Protestant Evangelical Mission” in Korea. They issued *The Christian News*, common hymns, common textbooks for Sunday school, and cooperated in educational and medical fields.<sup>313</sup>

After the divisions of the church during the 1950s, the Korean churches regarded the unity of the church as a virtue of faith, in other words, the sign of sanctification. Such perception enabled the church to struggle continually for unity.<sup>314</sup> In 1960, the Koryo and Hapdong groups were unanimously united.<sup>315</sup> However, in the Assembly of 1962, Pyung-Hun Park criticized the Assembly for deciding to break off its relationship with the ICCC and established the *Hoheon* group, a new denomination.<sup>316</sup> In 1963, the Koryo group split from the Hapdong group because of the abolition of the Koryo theological seminary and the latter’s exclusive supremacy over the former.<sup>317</sup> This disunity resulted from poor administration and the leaders’ attitudes rather than from any doctrinal or theological issue.

After the division of 1959, the Seungdong group and the Yeondong group attempted to unite in 1967. The former asked the latter to withdraw from the WCC and the KNCC, and to accept the Calvinist Orthodox theology. But the latter refused and regarded Calvinistic theology as fundamentalism. Consequently, the attempts at union failed because of theological differences.<sup>318</sup> H. M. Yim notes that the motive for the union was “the ecclesiastic supremacy,” which was “not desirable in view of the ecumenical spirit.”<sup>319</sup> Though his notion is pertinent in the sense that the movement for unity has a self-centred

---

<sup>312</sup> Guen-Seok Yang, “Globalization and Christian Responses,” *Theology Today*, Vol.62, no.1 (Apr., 2005): 45-46.

<sup>313</sup> B.W. Yoo, *Korean Pentecostalism: Its History and Theology*, (Ph. D Thesis, Birmingham University. Frankfurt am Main; Bern; New York; Paris: Peter Lang, 1987), pp.42-52.

<sup>314</sup> Kyung-Bae Min, *A History of the Formation of the Korean National Church* (Seoul, 1988: Yonsei University Press, the third edition), pp.55, 106-110.

<sup>315</sup> Hee-Mo Yim, *Unity Lost-Unity to be Regained in Korean Presbyterianism: A History of Divisions in Korean Presbyterianism and the Role of the Means of Grace* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH Eupopäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1996), p.114.

<sup>316</sup> *Ibid.*, p.115.

<sup>317</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.117-118.

<sup>318</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.122-124.

<sup>319</sup> *Ibid.*, p.126.

element for the expansion of their own denominations, his view seems to neglect the importance of theological purity in the unity of the church.

On the other hand, after the Korean Methodist Church's repeated schism and unity between the pro-Japanese *Puheung* group, and the *Jaegun* group, which claimed the withdrawal of all of them after liberation, the two groups were united in February in 1978.<sup>320</sup>

In 1965, the PROK (Kijang group) and the Tonghap group attempted without success "to organize a Presbyterian Federation to promote dialogue, fellowship, evangelization and service,"<sup>321</sup>. In 1970, the Tonghap group tried to organize a "Presbyterian Council" with the Hapdong group and the Koryo group, but failed. Finally, in 1981 the Tonghap, Koryo, Daesin, and Kijang groups succeeded in organizing the "the Consultation of the Korean Presbyterian Churches" (Changnohyup), whose aim was "to succeed to enhance the tradition of the Presbyterian Church in Korea, to promote fellowship amongst member denominations to meet to discuss common interests."<sup>322</sup> In 1992, the Consultation accepted as a member the Kaehyuk group,, which had been separated from the Hapdong group since 1971,.

In 1992, the Hapdong and other anti-WCC groups organized the "Consultation of Jesus Presbyterian Churches" (Yechanghyup), emphasizing common faith and doctrine centering around the Westminster Confession of Faith and the 12 Creeds.<sup>323</sup> In September, 2005, the 90<sup>th</sup> General Assembly proclaimed the unconditional union of the Hapdong and the Kaehyuk groups,<sup>324</sup> making the Hapdong group the largest denomination in Korea. This union has a great significance as the unity in a homogeneous theological line. In case that theological line is different, the unity movement hardly goes beyond temporary events or religious ceremonies. In this sense, the union between Hapdong and Kaehyuk can be said to be a unity in truth, which overcame political conflict.

Though the Korean Church's efforts for unity were not always successful, efforts themselves should be evaluated affirmatively. The union between the Hapdong and the Kaehyuk denominations, in particular, can be said to be the practice of sanctification in the sense that unity is the mark of sanctified life.

---

<sup>320</sup> Hae-Yon Kim, *A History of Korean Church* (Seoul: Sungkwangmunhwasa, 1993, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1997), pp.337-340.

<sup>321</sup> Kyung-Bae Min, *A History of the Formation of the Korean National Church* (Seoul: n.p., 1988), p.109.

<sup>322</sup> The Agreement of the Korean Presbyterian Churches, Article II.

<sup>323</sup> H.M. Yim, *op.cit.*, p.128.

<sup>324</sup> *Kidokshinmun*, Sep. 29, 2005. "The Denomination, Union with Kaehyuk Denomination, Decision with Lightening Speed" (in Korean).

## 5.2.2 The Negative Elements of the Korean Church

### 5.2.2.1 The Stagnation of Growth since the Early 1990s

According to government statistics, the growth rate of the Korean Church was 3.9 percent in 1991, 0.6 percent in 1992 and minus 4 percent in 1993 making the decline of the Korean Church membership apparent.

C. D. Gwak explicates the causes as “socio-political reasons, an inadequate response to social changes, problems in the church itself, and the secularization of the church.” Interestingly, an unholy Christian life was considered as one of the reasons.<sup>325</sup> Y. G. Hong specifies two causes for this stagnation. The first cause is analyzed as contextual change including “religious pluralism, social mobility, and the economic prosperity of Christians, political and social stability, the success of Buddhism, and an increased range of leisure activities.”<sup>326</sup> The second cause is “the downgrading of the church’s social credibility” resulting from many events that blemished the social image of Korean Protestantism in the 1990s.<sup>327</sup> These included one Christian chairman’s imprisonment for embezzling money from his conglomerate, the corruption of some mega church’s senior pastors, and the corruption of some influential politicians.<sup>328</sup> During the period, one broadcasting programme reported intensively on the ethical corruption of mega Christian church pastors. The distrust of the church and Christians has led to the stagnation of church growth.<sup>329</sup> In part, this has something to do with the deficiency of Christian sanctified life.

### 5.2.2.2 The General Attitude of Life

#### 5.2.2.2.1 The Discrepancy between Faith and Life

J. K. Park cites Christian moral corruption as a reason why Christian membership in South Korea has decreased recently.<sup>330</sup> S. H. Myung asserts that the Korean Church’s hope depends upon overcoming the dual dilemma between faith and life.<sup>331</sup> K. J. Han added,

---

<sup>325</sup> Chang-Dae Gwak and Jurgens Hendriks, “An Interpretation of the Recent Membership Decline in the Korean Protestant Church,” *Missionalia*, Vol.29, no.1 (Apr., 2001): 55.

<sup>326</sup> Young-Gi Hong, “Revisiting Church Growth in Korean Protestantism: A Theological Reflection,” *International Review of Mission*, Vol. 89 no. 353 (2000): 191; cf. Bong-Rin Ro, “The Korean Church: Growing or Declining?,” *Evangelical-Review-of-Theology* 19 (Oct., 1995):350-351.

<sup>327</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>328</sup> *Ibid.*, p.201, n.10.

<sup>329</sup> Cf. Gallup Korea, *Research Report on the Church Activities and Religious Consciousness of Korean Protestants* (Seoul: Gallup Korea, 1998).

<sup>330</sup> A Talk with Jong-Ku Park, Sung-Hun Myung, “Will the Korean Church grow again?,” *The Pastoral Monthly* (Seoul: The Pastoral Monthly Co., Ltd.) vol. 4 (2004): 58.

<sup>331</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 64.



“One of the weak points of the Korean church is that Korean Christians do not practice Christian ethics.”<sup>332</sup> The reality of the Korean Church is “where there is corruption, there are Christians.” The fourth Gallup Korea’s survey reports that 73.8 percent of Korean Protestants practise love and mercy to some extent, but only 7.9 percent of religionists practise religious virtues very well.<sup>333</sup> Among common people’s requests to Protestantism, the practice of love towards neighbours is the first (4.4 percent) and to avoid private desires and materialism is the fifth (2.1 percent).<sup>334</sup>

Accordingly, the Korean Church needs to teach more strongly that saving faith accompanies good works (James 2:22). Living faith works with love (1 Thess 1:3).

#### 5.2.2.2 The Excessive Pursuit of Worldly Success

C. D. Gwak believes, “Korean society is suffering a moral crisis due to materialism and the ideology of success and the progress that capitalism produces.”<sup>335</sup> Y. Y. J. Lee notes that under the influence of the American missionaries, Korean converts came to identify secular material success as “the most obvious sign of divine blessing.”<sup>336</sup> This view is due to the literal interpretation of the Old Testament, where God told Israelites they would be blessed if they obeyed the commandments, and cursed if not (especially Deut. Chap. 28-30). Prosperity theology<sup>337</sup> taught that the curse was removed because Jesus Christ bore our curse on the cross. Although prosperity theology contributed to Christians’ active response to poverty and hardships,<sup>338</sup> it undeniably promoted Christian secularization.<sup>339</sup>

---

<sup>332</sup> Kyung-Chik, Han, “The Present and Future of the Korean Church,” in *Korean Church Growth Explosion* ed. by Ro Bong-Rin and Marlin L. Neslon (Seoul: Word of Life Press and Asia Theological Association), p.363.

<sup>333</sup> Gallup Korea, *The Fourth Comparative Survey (2004): Korean Religions and Religious Consciousness-The Religions Study Comparing the Results of the ‘84, ‘89, ‘97, ‘04’s Surveys]* (Seoul: Gallup Korea, 2004), pp. 118-120. Hereafter it is written Gallup Korea (2004).

<sup>334</sup> *Ibid.*, p.149.

<sup>335</sup> Chang-Dae Gwak and Jurgens Hendriks, “An Interpretation of the Recent Membership Decline in the Korean Protestant Church,” *Missionalia*, Vol. 29, no.1 (Apr., 2001): 64.

<sup>336</sup> Yvonne Young-ja Lee, “Religious Syncretism and a Postimperial Source of Healing in Korea,” in *Religion and Social Policy* ed. by Paula D. Nesbitt (Walnut Creek, Lanham, New York, Oxford: Altamira Press, 2001), p. 230; cf. James H. Grayson, “Elements of Protestant Accommodation to Korean Religious Culture: A Personal Ethnographic Perspective,” *Missiology* 23 (Ja., 1995): 54,56.

<sup>337</sup> It indicates “a contemporary theological teaching which stresses that God always blesses his people materially, with wealth and health, as well as spiritually when they have a positive faith and are obedient to him”. Bong-Rin Ro, “Statement on Prosperity Theology and Theology of Suffering,” *Evangelical-Review-of-Theology* 20 (Ja., 1996):5.

<sup>338</sup> William H. Cook, *The Success, the Motivation, and the Bible* (Seoul: Jordan Publishing Co., 1984), pp.33-35; quoted, by Young-Hoon Lee, “The Case for Prosperity Theology,” *Evangelical-Review-of-Theology* 20 (Ja., 1996): 31.

<sup>339</sup> Y. H. Lee also admitted that “some Pentecostal Charismatic ministers caused some problem by preaching on and pursuing material prosperity and secular success”. Young-Hoon Lee, *ibid.*, p. 35.



Accordingly, it should be balanced by the view of the New Testament, which teaches us that if we live righteously and piously as Jesus' faithful disciples, we will experience suffering in this world (2 Tim. 3:12; cf. Mt.8:35; 13:9-13) and the reward for our good works will be given in heaven (Mat. 5:10-12; 6:20; Jn. 5:29; 1 Tim. 6:17-19).

This proclivity towards worldly success is also connected with shamanistic and Confucian traditions, where God is the instrument for worldly success rather than the object of pure worship. Many Christians earnestly pray for their children's entrance to a good university, family health and the prosperity of their business. Various forms of offerings are related to fulfilment of material wishes. For instance, *sowonhongeum* (the offering of petition) is a form of offering, in which Korean Christians devote money and a list of wishes to God. *Gamsahongeum* (the offering of gratitude) is the offering that they contribute to the church when such good fortunes as birth of babies, children's passing the university entrance examination, "prosperous business, and the return of health" comes to them.<sup>340</sup> This indicates that the motivation of their faith life is worldly success.

Regrettably, worldly prayer is more common than genuine Christ-like prayer. The aim of Christian life is to give glory to God through his sanctified character and life, not worldly success.

### 5.2.2.2.3 Quantitativism

William Black criticized the Korean Church for being excessively concerned about the number of her church members and the size of her church rather than her realistic relationship with Jesus Christ.<sup>341</sup> His critique is congruent with the result of the fourth Gallup Korea's survey (2004), which reported that 63.5 percent of Protestants and 74.5 percent of Catholics think that the church is more concerned about expanding her membership than pursuing truth.<sup>342</sup> Y. G. Hong also presents "the profiles of 15 Korean Protestant mega-churches in 2002," whose membership is more than 10,000.<sup>343</sup>

With reference to its cause, C. D. Gwak mentions that the quantitativism of the KPC is affected by American capitalism.<sup>344</sup> The capitalist principle makes the rich churches richer and the poor churches still poorer. Y.G. Hong ascribes the quantitativism of the KPC to the influence of "the North American enterprise culture" to prefer a bigger thing in quantity

---

<sup>340</sup> Andrew Eungi Kim, "Characteristics of Religious Life in South Korea: A Sociological Survey," *Review of Religious Research*, Vol.43, no. 4 (2002): 297; Andrew Eungi Kim, "Christianity, Shamanism, and Modernization in South Korea," *Cross Currents*, Vol.50, no.1-2 (Sum., 2000): 118.

<sup>341</sup> William Black, *op. cit.*, p. 183.

<sup>342</sup> Gallup Korea (2004).

<sup>343</sup> Young-Gi Hong, "Encounter with Modernity: the 'McDonaldization' and 'Charismatization' of Korean Mega-Churches," *international Review of Mission*, Vol. 92, no.365 (Apr., 2003): 240.

<sup>344</sup> Chang-Dae Gwak and Jurgens Hendriks, "An Interpretation of the Recent Membership Decline in the Korean Protestant Church," in *Missionalia* Vol. 29, no.1 (Apr., 2001): 63.

and size, and to her adaptation of the “church growth theology” into Korean modern cultural and social context.<sup>345</sup> This implies that mega-churches have made good use of “commodity and consumerism.” They have sold themselves to bring people to the church.<sup>346</sup>

B. H. Son argues that this indiscreet quantitativism can devastate the Christian heart. For example, the purity of the church is being seriously endangered for numerical growth because any member being disciplined by one church can join another church without any problem due to competitive quantitativism.<sup>347</sup> Quantitativism makes church discipline impossible even though it is necessary for sanctification. By corollary, excessive competition for unconditional church growth has aggravated individualism and separatism between local churches. It has also reduced the “credibility and respectability” of the church in society.<sup>348</sup> The immaturity of the church is seen in its search for growth regardless of its means.<sup>349</sup> In this respect, Dr. Sang Hoon Lee’s mention that the maturity of the KPC is more important than her quantitative growth seems to be relevant.<sup>350</sup>

Uncritical quantitativism without sanctification is undesirable for the Korean Church. The primary aim of church ministry should be “not growth but glorifying God” through our sanctified life.<sup>351</sup>

#### 5.2.2.2.4 Materialism

B. H. Son harshly criticizes materialism as “the anti-Christ of today.”<sup>352</sup> Contemporary people are indulged in material complacency and have a tendency to search for well-equipped churches with diverse instruments. To attract them, the churches spend much money on “large buildings, glittering interior decorations, well-practiced and expensively robed church choirs, and costly musical instruments.”<sup>353</sup> Consequently, only a little money is invested in social concerns. This is a point on which intellectuals criticize the church.

Another aspect of materialism is mammonism. According to the 2004 Gallup Korea’s survey, Korean Protestants’ concern about life is distributed into health (50.1 percent),

---

<sup>345</sup> Young-Gi Hong, *op.cit.*, p. 243.

<sup>346</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>347</sup> Bong-Ho Son, “Some Dangers of Rapid Growth,” in *Korean Church Growth Explosion* ed. by Ro Bong-Rin and Marlin L. Neslon (Seoul: Word of Life Press and Asia Theological Association, 1984), pp.341-342.

<sup>348</sup> Eun-Sik Cho, “Korean Church Growth in 1970s: Its Factors and Problems,” *The Asia Journal of Theology*, Vol.10, no.2 (1996): 356.

<sup>349</sup> Bong-Ho Son, *op.cit.*, p.346.

<sup>350</sup> Sang-Hoon Lee, “After Church Growth, Then What?,” *Ministrial Formation* 41 (1988): 5.

<sup>351</sup> Young-Gi Hong, “Revisiting Church Growth in Korean Protestantism: A Theological Reflection,” *International Review of Mission* 89 no.353 (2000): 198.

<sup>352</sup> Bong-Ho Son, “Some Dangers of Rapid Growth,” in *Korean Church Growth Explosion* ed. by Ro Bong-Rin and Marlin L. Neslon (Seoul: Word of Life Press and Asia Theological Association, 1984), p.336.

<sup>353</sup> *Ibid.*, p.343.

money (29.8 percent), and religion (16.9 percent).<sup>354</sup> This shows us the worldliness and materialism of Korean Protestants. Many young Christians often skip Sunday worship to earn money. As Y. G. Hong puts it, the materialism and secularism of the Korean Church “has attracted the largest segment of its membership from the middle-class.”<sup>355</sup> As Mammon destroys Korean souls, the important assignment of the Korean Church becomes the need to disconnect Christians from their attachment to money.<sup>356</sup> Materialism contrasts with Christian sanctified life, one of whose marks is a simple and moderate lifestyle.

The root of materialism is related to Christian unbelief in the next world. 41.9 percent of the Korean Protestants and 71.5 percent of the Catholics said “yes” to the statement that heaven is in this world, not the next world.<sup>357</sup> This shows us that many Korean Christians do not believe in God’s judgment of their lives after death. Accordingly, the church needs to inculcate in her members faith in the next world and God’s judgment. Meditation of the next world as emphasised by Calvin is asked of Korean Christians.

#### 5.2.2.2.5 Libertinism

Libertinism existed in the early churches. Paul warned the saints of Corinth of sexual immorality (1 Cor. 6:18). Peter mentions that having sexual freedom is to become a slave of depravity and it will be judged by God (2 Pet. 2:10; 18-19). Jude warns that those who pollute their bodies will be destroyed by the judgment of God (Jude 1:7-16). Revelation warns that those who commit adultery will suffer intensely (Rev.2:22). Calvin harshly criticized moral Libertines with such expressions as “dumb animals,” “a stupid ass,” “notorious swine,” “a dog in heat,” and a “public epidemic.”<sup>358</sup> Korean society is not exceptional.

According to “2000 MBC youth white paper,” 5.3 percent of 1,500 high school students surveyed had had a sexual experience and 84 percent of them replied that if a boy and a girl love each other, they can have sexual intercourse.<sup>359</sup> “A Survey of Korean Cultural Consciousness” reports that 50.7 percent of 426 Christians surveyed believe in premarital purity and 33.8 percent of them would have a premarital sexual relation if they were going to marry, and 15.5 percent of them think that marriage and and sexual relations

---

<sup>354</sup> Gallup Korea (2004), pp.104-105.

<sup>355</sup> Young-Gi Hong, “Revisiting Church Growth in Korean Protestantism: A Theological Reflection,” *International Review of Mission* Vol. 89, no.353 (2000):191.

<sup>356</sup> Cf. Bong-Rin Ro, “South Korea: Bankrupting the Prosperity Gospel,” in *Christianity Today* 42 (Nov., 1998): 61. He mentions, “Money has been the cancer eating away at integrity within the church.”

<sup>357</sup> Gallup Korea (2004), p.113.

<sup>358</sup> John Calvin, *Treatises Against the Anabaptists and Against the Libertines* (trans. Benjamin Wirt Farley; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1982) 298, 308, 299, 238–239, 282, 204, cf. 210.

<sup>359</sup> “2000 MBC Youth White Paper” (1999.10.05-11.14), quoted by *Christian Unity Newspaper*, Feb. 6, 2000. (In Korean).

can be treated separately. In the case of non-Christians, the results are 30.6 percent, 42.2 percent, and 27.2 percent to each question.<sup>360</sup> N. K. Kang reports that 29.2 percent of Korean married men and 21.4 percent of married women tolerate extramarital intercourse.<sup>361</sup> The content of the Korean Kinsey Report (2005) is more shocking. It reports that 78.0 percent of adult men and 15.0 percent of adult women experienced extramarital intercourse. 15.0 percent of adult men have a fixed partner besides their wives. Korean sexual immorality is rife and leads to a loss of the inheritance of the kingdom of God, unless we repent of it.

### 5.2.2.3 The Attitude of the Community

#### 5.2.2.3.1 Radical Political Sanctification: Minjung Theology

*Minjungsinhak* (meaning, the Theology of the People) is an indigenous Korean theology begun by Korean Christians in America and imprisoned theologians in South Korea after the mid-1970s. Similar to Latin American Liberation Theology, it stresses giving hope to the poor, oppressed people of Korea (*Minjung*),<sup>362</sup> but is different from liberation theology in that it has no connection with Marxism. The *minjung* is distinct from the proletariat in Marxist terminology; it is a term to express those who are “economically poor, politically weak, socially deprived, but culturally and historically rich and powerful” as the subject of Korean history.<sup>363</sup> Korean *Minjung* has *han*, which is “the cluster of suffering experience.”<sup>364</sup> To put it in more detail, it means:

a sense of unresolved resentment against injustices suffered, a sense of helplessness because of the overwhelming odds against, a feeling of total abandonedness, a feeling of acute pain of sorrow in one’s guts and bowels making the whole body writhe and wriggle, and an obstinate urge to take revenge and to right the wrong.<sup>365</sup>

Resolving *han* is liberation and sanctification in view of *Minjung* theology. *Han* cannot be solved without justice. This differs from forgiveness or salvation in traditional theology.<sup>366</sup>

---

<sup>360</sup> Hanshin University Academy Theology Institute, “Korean Cultural Consciousness.” <<http://blog.daum.net/rew21c/2100472>> (May 7, 2005).

<sup>361</sup> Nam-Kyo Kang, “Extramarital Intercourse and Adultery.” <<http://cafe.daum.net/561120>> (Nov. 5, 2001)

<sup>362</sup> Jung-Young Lee, “Minjung Theology: A Critical Introduction,” in *An Emerging Theology in World Perspective: Commentary on Korean Minjung Theology* ed. by Jung Young Lee (Mystic Connecticut: Twenty-Third Publications, 1988), p.3. Hereafter it is written *WPKMT*.

<sup>363</sup> *Ibid.*, p.4.

<sup>364</sup> *Ibid.*, p.8.

<sup>365</sup> Young-Hak Hyun, “Three Talks on Minjung Theology,” *Inter-Religio* 7(Spring, 1985):7.

<sup>366</sup> Jung-Young Lee, *op. cit.*, p.10.

It is *dan* to resolve han. Dan means “to cut off the chain of han that creates vicious circles of violence and repression” through participating in “the cosmic Eucharist”.<sup>367</sup> It works in the four stages of soteriology of minjung theology. The first stage is “to realize God in our heart” and worship him. The second stage is “to allow the divine consciousness to grow in us.” The third stage is “to practice what we believe in God.” The fourth stage is “to overcome the injustice through transforming the world.”<sup>368</sup> Liberating the minjung in the activity of the Holy Spirit is “the establishing of the Messianic Kingdom on earth,”<sup>369</sup> which is the core of minjung theology.

The Bible is read as the story of the liberation of the oppressed Minjung. The liberation of the minjung is compared to the liberation of the Hebrews who were oppressed under the Egyptians.<sup>370</sup> Moses, Esther, and David are compared with the heroes who fought against the Japanese Empire.<sup>371</sup> Minjung theologians in the 1970s recognized that the Christian mission is “to stand with God in opposition to the oppressive political powers” and called it *Missio Dei*.<sup>372</sup> The suffering of the minjung is construed as the cross of Jesus and their liberation as the resurrection of Jesus.<sup>373</sup> Furthermore, the minjung as the subject of historical transformation is identified with Jesus.

The representative theologians of minjung theology are Kwang-Sun Suh, Nam-Dong Suh, and Byung-Moo Ahn. Most minjung theologians deeply assimilated into their thoughts the political theology of Karl Barth and Dietrich Bonhoeffer, who were members of the German Confessing Church, into their thoughts.<sup>374</sup> As their theology grew out of the experience of the minjung such as “torture in prisons,” “dehumanization in factories and farms,” it had the power to strike the Korean people to the heart.<sup>375</sup> Methodologically, they cannot avoid “the Marxist analysis of the socioeconomic structures” to reverse traditional social, economic, and political orders, though they did not choose a violent revolution.<sup>376</sup> This is the reason why minjung theology is called one of the radical political

---

<sup>367</sup> *Ibid.*, p.11; Hong-Eyoul Hwang, “Searching for A New Paradigm of Church and Mission in A Secularized and Postmodern Context in Korea,” *International Review of Mission*, Vol.92, no.364 (Ja., 2003): 91.

<sup>368</sup> Jung-Young Lee, *op.cit.*, p.11.

<sup>369</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>370</sup> James Huntley Grayson, *Korea-A Religious History* (New York: Routledge Curzon, 1989, revised 2002), pp.166-167.

<sup>371</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 148.

<sup>372</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 149.

<sup>373</sup> David Kwang-Sun Suh, “*Minjung* Theology: The Politics and Spirituality of Korean Christianity,” in *WPKMT*, pp.145-146.

<sup>374</sup> Nam-Dong Suh, “Historical Reference for a Theology of Minjung,” in *Minjung Theology: People as the Subjects of History*, ed. by the Commission on Theological Concerns of the Christian Conference of Asia (Maryknol, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1983), p.158.

<sup>375</sup> Jung-Young Lee, “Minjung Theology: A Critical Introduction,” in *WPKMT*, p.8.

<sup>376</sup> *Ibid.*, p.19.

theologies like liberation theology.

As is observed above, minjung theology is a practical theology for social justice. The true source of minjung theology is not the Bible, which is used only as a reference, but the experience and history of the minjung. For example, such minjung struggles for liberation as the rebellion of the Mangyi and Mangsoyi (1176 C.E), the rebellion of Manchuk in 1198 C.E., the Kyung-Rae Hong's peasant rebellion, and so on are regarded as the manifestation of the Jesus event.<sup>377</sup> Jesus events are understood "not only through the study of the historical Jesus in the gospel but also through the cosmic Christ who acts in the Holy Spirit." The living Christ has been working in Korean history through the Holy Spirit.<sup>378</sup> Not the written Bible but the direct act of the Holy Spirit in Korean history is the main resource of minjung theology. In this regard, minjung theology deviates from orthodox Christianity and is in line with the WCC's emphasis on universal and inclusive Pneumatology rather than exclusive Christology.<sup>379</sup>

To them, sanctification does not mean the recovery of the image of God but "the liberation of the minjung" suffering from the oppression of rulers and the rich, and "the realization of social justice." In terms of the realization of social justice, their view of sanctification seems to be rather reasonable, but in terms of the recovery of the image of God, their view of sanctification cannot be accepted. Their view is not founded on the right hermeneutic of the Bible. Their doctrine of God, Christ, and the Spirit does not centre on the text of the Bible but on the minjung and their context. Their identifying the minjung with Jesus is disrespectful because the minjung is not innocent like Jesus. Minjung theology is a kind of anthropocentric theology, in which the desire of the minjung is the centre of theology. Viewed in light of Calvin's theology, it is an unbalanced view that material concern takes precedence over spiritual concern and this life takes preference over the next.

Recently, their influence is decreasing because the needs of the Korean people have generally been satisfied by Korea's rapid democratization. K. S. Suh calls Korean society of the 1970s a "minjung society", but calls Korean society of the 1990s a "citizens" or "middle class."<sup>380</sup> Minjung theology now focuses on the establishment of peace and reunification of the Korean peninsular, the realization of social justice, the coexistence with other religions, dialogue with a Third World theology, and the partnership with Korean feminist theology.<sup>381</sup>

---

<sup>377</sup> *Ibid.*, p.12.

<sup>378</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>379</sup> *Ibid.*, p.20.

<sup>380</sup> David Kwang-Sun Suh, *op.cit.*, p.157.

<sup>381</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.157-158; For the critique of Minjung theology, see Chai-Sik Chung, "Global Theology for the Common Good: Lessons from Two Centuries of Korean Christianity," *International Review of Mission*, Vol.85, no.339 (1996):533-534.



Briefly, their view of sanctification is excessively biased to social justice rather than salvation of the soul and is built on unbiblical foundations. Nonetheless, the theories of minjung theologians and their followers' practice contributed to the fall of the Korean military dictatorship and to an awakening of the irregularities of American capitalism. Hence, the Korean conservative church needs to take a more active attitude to reforming Korean society according to a more biblical principle rather than minjung theology.

### 5.2.2.3.2 Evasion from Reforming the World and Compromise with the World

From 1901 to 1910 foreign missionaries declared a noninterventionist political policy and taught Korean Christians not to participate in the independence movement.<sup>382</sup> Most foreign missionaries were politically inclined to Japan's policy, except for a few like Herbert.<sup>383</sup> E. S. Cho notes that the Great Revival of 1907 contributed to the "depoliticization" of the Korean Church.<sup>384</sup> In 1931, Japan began to force Shrine worship upon Koreans. At the beginning, the Presbyterian Church in Korea refused it because the Northern Presbyterian Mission regarded Shrine worship as a kind of idolatry. However, the Catholic Church and the Methodist Church, the Seventh-Day Adventist Church, the Holiness Church, the Salvation Army, and the Anglican Church regarded it as "a ritual that expressed patriotism and loyalty to the state."<sup>385</sup> They allowed their church members to accept it as a citizen's duty.<sup>386</sup> From 1938 many Christian schools closed in protest against Shrine worship.<sup>387</sup> Though refusing it for a long time, the 27<sup>th</sup> General Assembly of Presbyterian Church in Korea decided in 1938 to agree to Shrine worship under the enforcement of Japan.<sup>388</sup> After 1938 the Korean Church leaders were corrupt and betrayed its proper faithfulness to God and supported Japanese policy.<sup>389</sup>

When Chung-Hee Park suggested the amendment of the constitution to prolong his term, the Association of Conservative Churches including Hyung-Yong Park, Yoon-Sun Park, Yong-Gi Cho, Joon-Gon Kim, Jang-Hwan Kim and Yoon-Chan Kim supported the

---

<sup>382</sup> *Christian News*, Vol. 5, No. 40 (1910.10.3); Lak-Geoon George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea* (Seoul: Yonsei University Press, 1980), pp. 414-415.

<sup>383</sup> "Herbert's Address," in *Korea Daily News*, Aug.27, 1907.

<sup>384</sup> Eun-Sik Cho, "The Great Revival of 1907 in Korean: Its Cause and Effect," *Missiology*, Vol.26, no.3 (July, 1998): 297.

<sup>385</sup> *RSEK*, p.125; in 1936 the Vatican issued instructions to allow Korean believers to participate in Shrine worship. *Dae Pan Daily Newspaper*, Korean Version, Aug. 2, 1936.

<sup>386</sup> Yang-Son Kim, "The Enforcement of the Shrine Worship and Persecution," in *Korean Christianity and the Problem of Shrine Worship*, ed. by Syng-Tae Kim (Seoul: The Institute of Korean Church History Studies, 1991), p. 28.

<sup>387</sup> Sung-Gun Kim, "The Shinto Shrine Issue in Korean Christianity under Japanese Colonialism," *A Journal of Church and State* 39 (1997): 506.

<sup>388</sup> *Ibid.*, p.518.

<sup>389</sup> Cf. IKCHS, *A History of Korean Church*, pp.301-323.



amendment for the sake of national security.<sup>390</sup> When President Park made the Yushin Constitution, *The Christian Times* published an editorial supporting it for three consecutive weeks.<sup>391</sup> The reason was that it would promote Korean democracy and help reunify the country.

At that time, one Chongshin Seminary professor wrote an article supporting complete separation of the state and the church. According to his article, Christians can participate in politics as individuals, but the church should not get involved. Furthermore, he criticized the church's political participation in "the March First Movement," "the objection to the normalization of the diplomatic relationship between Korea and Japan", and "the debate on the Yushin constitution."<sup>392</sup> However, he did not regard the conservative church's support of President Park's proposal to amend the constitution as political participation. It is not certain whether this was his own opinion or whether it was influenced by the threatening situation. Anyway, his view that Japanese rule was from God was controversial considering the cruelty of Japanese rule. Regrettably, at that time the general trend of the conservative church leaders was to support J. H. Park.<sup>393</sup> In 1974, the conservative non-KNCC group issued a statement that "it was 'unbiblical' for the Christians to issue anti-governmental statements and to participate in critical demonstrations" on the basis of St. Paul's commandment of Romans 13.<sup>394</sup> They insisted that the commandment of Romans 13 on people's obedience to the rulers should be "unconditional." Accordingly, the church should concentrate on "saving souls through evangelism," not political struggle.<sup>395</sup> This attitude was kept during the fifth Republic of Korea of Doo-Hwan Chun.

As Gwak puts it, the conservative evangelical churches have lacked "a consistent concern for socio-political responsibilities," which resulted in the loss of social credibility of the church.<sup>396</sup> In contrast, the Korean Catholic Church grew in her membership due to both her "continued credibility" among common people and "the lack of serious

---

<sup>390</sup> KNCC; The Committee for Human Rights, *The Movement for the Democratization in 1970s*, vol.1 (Seoul, 1987), p.82.

<sup>391</sup> *The Christian Times*, November 4, 11, 18, 1972.

<sup>392</sup> Eui-Hwan Kim, "The Problem of Korean Church's Involvement in the Politics," in *Shinhak Jinam* (March, 1973):25, 50. In contradiction to this critique, just three years ago, Kim had asked the Korean church "to participate in social reality as the redeemed, criticizing her evasive attitude from the world" in his *Challenged Conservative Theology* (Seoul: Word of Life Books, 1970), pp.179-185. In "An Introduction to Modern Theology", he regarded Moltmann's stress on the social participation of the church as his theological contribution. Eui-Hwan Kim, *An Introduction to Modern Theology* (Seoul: Kaehyukjueuishinhaenghyuphoe, 1989), pp. 78-79.

<sup>393</sup> *RSEK*, p.152.

<sup>394</sup> *The Christian Times*, "A Proclamation on the Present Situation by Anti-communist Christians," December 7, 1974; *RSEK*, p.153.

<sup>395</sup> *Ibid.*, November 30, 1974.

<sup>396</sup> Chang-Dae Gwak and Jurgens Hendriks, "An Interpretation of the Recent Membership Decline in the Korean Protestant Church," *Missionalia*, Vol.29, no.1 (Apr., 2001): 62.

disaffection and polarisation among its original members.”<sup>397</sup>

### 5.2.2.3.3 Separatism

As William Black points out, the Korean church has divided into a large number of small denominations. There are a variety of causes of the schisms. Divisions stem from the “Agreement on Division of Territory” between the Presbyterian Church in the USA, the Southern Presbyterian Church in the USA, the Presbyterian Church in Australia, the Presbyterian Church in Canada, the Methodists Episcopal Church in the USA, and the Southern Methodists Episcopal Church in the USA.<sup>398</sup> Though the purpose of this agreement was for the efficacy of mission, which functioned properly at first, different theological backgrounds and management differences resulted in the schism of the 1930s and 1950s.<sup>399</sup>

Another cause of the present KPC’s fissionable tendency is the Korean Christians’ reaction to the Japanese pressures to worship at Shinto shrines.<sup>400</sup> The Presbyterian Church in Korea (*Koryō*) centred around Sang-Dong Han, who took a hard line against those who attended shrine rituals, and officially organized a new denomination because other Presbyterian Churches refused to repent “the compromise on shrine worship” in 1954.<sup>401</sup> At this time, the Machenian missionaries and the International Council of Christian Churches (ICCC) supported the Koryo group.<sup>402</sup> The conflicts between the Machenian missionaries and the missionaries of the Northern Presbyterian Church led to the separation of the Koryo group.<sup>403</sup> Hyung-Nyong Park criticized their separatist insistence, and appealed for repentance.<sup>404</sup>

In 1954, as the result of the debate around the liberal theological thoughts of Jae-Joon Kim, the liberal group centred around the Choson Seminary was separated from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church and officially a new Assembly in the name of the Presbyterian Church in the Republic of Korea (PCROK), in which the Canadian

---

<sup>397</sup> Brendan MacHale, “Conflicts within the Korean Church,” *Pro Mundi Vita studies*, vol. 9 (1989): 19.

<sup>398</sup> “Agreement on Division of Territory,” *Annual Meeting of the General Council of Protestant Evangelical Missions in Korea* (Oct., 1909), pp. 32-34, quoted by IKCHS, *History of Korean Church* Vol. I, pp. 216-217.

<sup>399</sup> Cf. Suh David Kwang-Sun, “Towards a Political Economy of Mission from the Expansion of Christendom to *Missio Dei*,” in *PCKJ*, p.192.

<sup>400</sup> James Huntley Grayson, “The Shinto Shrine Conflict and Protestant Martyrs in Korea, 1938-1945,” in *Missiology* 29 no 3 (Jl., 2001): 287.

<sup>401</sup> *Ibid.*, p.302; James Huntley Grayson, *Korea-A Religious History* (New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 1989, revised in 2002), p.163; Hee-Mo Yim, *Unity Lost-Unity to be Regained in Korean Presbyterianism: A History of Divisions in Korean Presbyterianism and the Role of the Means of Grace* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH Eupopäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1996), pp.76-85.

<sup>402</sup> H.M. Yim, *op. cit.*, pp.82-83.

<sup>403</sup> *Ibid.*, p.85.

<sup>404</sup> *Ibid.*, p.84.

Mission Board participated, came into being.<sup>405</sup> H. M. Yim views the schism as “an irrational, emotional struggle.”<sup>406</sup> However, his view seems improbable, because its radical cause was the difference of theological opinions between the conservative group and the liberal group. On the other hand, in 1959, because of the differences of opinion about the World Council of Churches, the General Assembly of the Korean Presbyterian Church was divided into the *Tonghap* group, which was for the WCC, and the *Hapdong* group, which was against the WCC.<sup>407</sup> The Korean National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) centred around *Koryo* and *Hapdong*, rejected the WCC for being liberal and pro-communist. It was influenced by Carl McIntire who was in charge of the ICCC group.<sup>408</sup> While the ICCC group and the Orthodox Presbyterian Mission supported the Korean NAE, the Northern Presbyterian Mission and IMC (International Mission Council) supported the KNCC (Korean National Church Council), which was in line with the WCC.

The three denominations (Koryo, Hapdong, and Tonghap) separated mainly because of theological differences, but since then, many other denominations split for political reasons. The Directory of the Churches in Korea reports that in 1993, “the number of Protestant denominations in Korea is 165.” Among them, there are 130 Presbyterian denominations and 35 other denominations.<sup>409</sup> This separatism is for the Korean church to solve, for unity is an important mark of Christian sanctification.

#### 5.2.2.3.4 Individualism

As J. H. Grayson points out,<sup>410</sup> individualism in the Korean church hampers union with other churches. The finance of the local church tends to be used to build a grander church edifice rather than be invested for denominational projects and service for weak people.<sup>411</sup>

Gwak mentions the individual tendency of the KPC in the following text.

The church has suffered the loss of Christian unity due to excessive competition and conflict among neighbouring churches for increasing membership (congregational extensionalism) and group egoism expressed in individualistic congregationalism, denominationalism,

---

<sup>405</sup> *Ibid.*, p.96.

<sup>406</sup> *Ibid.*, p.97.

<sup>407</sup> Rhee-Gwan Kim, *A History of the Korean- American Church Division* (Seoul: Christian Literature Press, 1995), pp.94-100.

<sup>408</sup> H.M. Yim, *op. cit.*, pp. 104-105.

<sup>409</sup> Directory of the Churches in Korea, 1994 (Seoul, 1993)

<sup>410</sup> James Huntley Grayson, *Korea-A Religious History* (New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 1989, revised 2002), p.165.

<sup>411</sup> Cf. John H. Leith, “John Calvin and Stewardship,” *Journal for Preachers*, Vol. 9, no. 1 (1985): 6. He emphasises the stewardship of the church in the using of church resources.

separatism, regionalism and nationalism...this loss has accelerated the fragmentation of modern Korean society.<sup>412</sup>

In relation to the cause of individualism, Kwang-Sun Suh views Nevius' mission policy as one of the causes, which consisted of "self-support, self-propagation, and self-government." Such a policy of self-reliance promoted "an individualistic church-centred competitiveness."<sup>413</sup> Another important cause is the production of excessive theological students from too many theological colleges.<sup>414</sup> They cannot but be self-centred while living within a competitive ministry. The number of local churches is estimated at 60,000.

M. J. Ahn describes the negative effects of competitive individualism as follows. First, it makes the mission an accessory to satisfy egoism of local churches.<sup>415</sup> Secondly, it has been the object of common people's criticism and has resulted in the diminution of her membership. Thirdly, excessive individualism tends to be heretical when it lapses into self-righteousness and egotism. Fourthly, the egoism of local churches makes it impossible for believers to serve society as the light and salt of the world because they are bound to the church.<sup>416</sup>

Briefly, individualism is a problem that the Korean church should overcome in the Holy Spirit because it prevents the unity of the local churches.

#### **5.2.2.4 Theological Problems of the Doctrine of Sanctification**

##### **5.2.2.4.1 Antinomianism**

Calvin and Wesley objected to antinomianism. For them, to do away with the law is to do away with the will of God because we find it in the law. Where there is no the law, there is neither divine nor human governance.

The Korean conservative church has acknowledged the law, especially the moral law as the Word of God, which is the main means of sanctification. However, *Guwonpa* (Salvation Sect)<sup>417</sup> has a strong antinomian tendency. Their view of salvation is based on faith as "intuitive understanding" of perfect forgiveness by faith in Jesus' blood. It is

---

<sup>412</sup> Chang-Dae Gwak and Jurgens Hendriks, "An Interpretation of the Recent Membership Decline in the Korean Protestant Church," *Missionalia*, Vol. 29, no.1 (Apr., 2001): 65.

<sup>413</sup> Kwang-Sun Suh, "Towards a Political Economy of Mission from the Expansion of Christendom to *Missio Dei*," in *PCKJ*, pp.191-192.

<sup>414</sup> Syng-Ho Kim, *The Korean Church After Ten Years* (Seoul: Ecumenical Study, 2005), pp. 50-51.

<sup>415</sup> Myung-Hyuk Kim, "Korean Mission in the World Today and Its Problems," in *Korean Church Growth Explosion* ed. by Ro Bong-Rin and Marlin L. Neslon (Seoul: Word of Life Press and Asia Theological Association), p.130.

<sup>416</sup> Myung-Joon Ahn, "The Theological Problems of the Korean Church," in M. J. Ahn, et al., *The Problem of the Korean Church and the Scheme to Overcome it* (Seoul: Ecomebiznet, 2006), p. 26.

<sup>417</sup> Formal name is Christianity Gospel Baptist Church.

lacking in faith as trust and conversion, which means human voluntary turning from sin in God's grace.<sup>418</sup> They viewed original sin as sin in the proper sense, which leads people to hell. Voluntary sin after conversion does not affect the salvation of one's soul.<sup>419</sup> Accordingly, if one realizes that his original sin is forgiven by Jesus' blood, one does not have to repent any actual sin.<sup>420</sup> That one continually repents is the evidence that he is not saved, for salvation is to believe that he is saved eternally.<sup>421</sup> Their view lacks the tension between already accomplished salvation and "yet" unachieved salvation, that is to say, they neglect the Pauline advice, "continue to work out your salvation with fear and trembling" (Phil. 2:12).

There is no room for the conception of sanctification as obedience to the law in their view of salvation. To them, salvation means "liberation from the yoke of the law", "liberation from religion", "liberation from the accusation of conscience."<sup>422</sup> As they think that believers are liberated from the law, they do not obey the law. "We finished the relation with the law, because we are under grace."<sup>423</sup> They criticize "dawn prayer, service rites, keeping the Lord's Day holy, tithes, and the elder and deacon system" (The translation is mine).<sup>424</sup> It implies that they refuse any kind of pious discipline. As they exclude all kinds of human efforts for sanctification, there is no morality or growth of Christian character in their religion. It is no less than the heresy of the early church that admits God in word, but denies him in action (Titus 1:16). Their insistence that there is no salvation except in their church is unbiblical.<sup>425</sup> This manifests their arrogance and exclusivity, which makes it impossible for them to cooperate with other churches. Their indiscriminate condemnation of the present local churches indicates the mark of their Christian immaturity in the light of sanctification.<sup>426</sup>

Briefly, Guwonpa's refusal to obey the law for sanctification is wrong, its antinomian tendency leads people into an immoral, unholy life and distorted relations with neighbours.

#### 5.2.2.4.2 A Legalistic Tendency

Jae-Duk Kim mentions that the Korean Church has an implicit legalistic tendency,<sup>427</sup>

---

<sup>418</sup> Dong-Sub Jung, "Why is Guwonpa a Heresy (4)," *Ministry & Theology* 68 (Feb. 1995): 224.

<sup>419</sup> Shin-Chan Kwon, *Love Another* (Seoul: Jungdongmunwhasa, 1982), p. 27.

<sup>420</sup> Dong-Sub Jung, "Why is Guwonpa a Heresy (4)," p. 225.

<sup>421</sup> Dong-Sub Jung, "Why is Guwonpa a Heresy (5)," *Ministry & Theology* 69 (Mar. 1995): 208, 209.

<sup>422</sup> Dong-Sub Jung, "Why is Guwonpa a Heresy (4)," p. 224.

<sup>423</sup> Shin Chan Kwon, *Liberation from Religion* (Seoul: Illyusa, 1977), p.43.

<sup>424</sup> Dong-Sub Jung, "Why is Guwonpa a Heresy (4)," p. 224.

<sup>425</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 221.

<sup>426</sup> Cf. Dr. Hyo-Sung Kim, ed., *A Data Book Concerning Modern Church Problems* (Seoul: Old time Faith, 2004), pp. 278-279.

<sup>427</sup> Jae-Duk Kim, "Holiness in the Triune God: Calvin's Doctrine of Sanctification with Special Reference to the Eschatological Dialectic Between Its Objective and Subjective Aspects, and with Application to the

especially the Korean Presbyterian Church which accepted Calvinism from conservative North American missionaries. Their understanding of Calvin's doctrine of sanctification reflects a biased view of sanctification.

American federal theology has influenced the Korean Presbyterian church to read the Old Testament literally.<sup>428</sup> The puritans in America identified themselves with Israel of the Old Testament, which had a right to take the land of Canaan. The contract, like that of the Israelites, says that if they obey the law, they will be blessed, while if they disobey the law, they will be punished. The American legal system was established on the law of the Old Testament.<sup>429</sup> Due to such an influence, Korean Presbyterians came to view Christian life legalistically. J. D. Kim describes the negative aspect of American Puritanism as emphasising "legal preaching" and "legal repentance" rather than Calvin's "evangelical repentance." Excessive stress on the human role in achieving subjective sanctification results in loss of joy and peace.<sup>430</sup> His analysis seems rather pertinent in the light of the context of the Korean church, whose sermons are generally faithful to the text of the Old Testament. This tendency is manifested in the result of the fourth Gallup Korea's survey (2004), in which 40.5 percent of Protestants and 50.8 percent of Catholics think that the church applies her rules to her members too strictly.<sup>431</sup>

The emphasis on human responsibility in sanctification is based on many biblical grounds in the New Testament (Matt. 7:6; Lk. 9:23; Phil.2:12; 1 Pet. 1:4-11; 3 Jn. 11; Rev. 2:5, 10, 16, 25; 3:3, 19; 21:7; 22:12). However, the important point is that objective sanctification should be emphasised prior to subjective sanctification.

The Korean Presbyterians learn that they are saved by faith in the grace of God in Christ and they are taught that Christians should do good works as the evidence of their salvation. Consequently, the new Korean Presbyterians are instructed to do pious works too soon after conversion. Due to their efforts and the compulsion of other more established believers, they become superficial Christians, but their inner being is slow to change. This leads to a measure of hypocrisy in that they appear to be credible Christians in church, but not necessarily in society. This dualism of Christians resulted in the stagnation of church growth.

#### **5.2.2.4.3 A Bias to Gradualness Rather Than Instantaneousness**

Hyung-Nyong Park, who was a representative theologian of the Korean Conservative

---

Calvinist Doctrine of the Korean Presbyterian Church," Ph. D diss., The University of Bristol, 2002, p. 228f.

<sup>428</sup> Nak- Joon Paik, *The History of Protestant Mission in Korea 1832-1910* (Seoul: Yonsei University Press, 1973), p.383. (In Korean).

<sup>429</sup> J. Winthrop, "A Model of Christian Charity," in *The Foundation of Massachusetts: Historians and the Source*, ed. by Edmund S. Morgan (Indianapolis: Bobbs Merrill, 1964), pp.202-204.

<sup>430</sup> Jae-Duk Kim, *op. cit.*, p.255.

<sup>431</sup> Gallup Korea (2004), p.132.



Church, taught the gradualness of sanctification, but did not teach the instantaneousness of sanctification.<sup>432</sup> “Sanctification is a long process continuing for one’s whole life.”<sup>433</sup> “Believers are incessantly sanctified by the Holy Spirit of God.”<sup>434</sup> Park mentioned that “sin does not rule believers any longer” and “a radical change in their relation and attitude of sin happened to them.”<sup>435</sup> However, he did not develop a systematic doctrine of definitive sanctification.<sup>436</sup> Still, Calvin stressed instantaneous sanctification in his commentary on Mic. 4:3; Ps. 81:4; Isa. 65:25; Jonah 3:6-8; Hag. 2:7-10; Acts 9:1-6, Park did not refer to instantaneous sanctification at all. Park’s emphasis on the doctrine of sanctification is to obey perfectionism, to insistently use the means of sanctification and to maintain the balance between antinomianism and legalism.<sup>437</sup>

A biased emphasis on gradual sanctification has the danger of inclining towards legalism to pursue sanctification by human cooperative efforts with the common grace of God in the case of Israel’s people, if it is not balanced by instantaneous and definitive sanctification by the extraordinary grace of God. The negligence of instantaneous and definitive sanctification tends to lead the believers to a pessimistic view of sanctification due to human submission to the strong power of sin. It also inclines to head towards the next world rather than to overcome the power of sin in this world.

#### 5.2.2.4.4 Mysticism

According to E. Glenn Hinson, mysticism relates to human inner life rather than outward activities. It is the life in which one falls “head over heels in love with God.” It pursues our union with God in deep contemplation.<sup>438</sup> Contemplation needs “loving attentiveness to God,” who is “immanent in the created order” (Psalm 19:1-8). At the same time, it depends upon God’s searching the world for his lost children. In this regard, mysticism does not exclude God’s grace. Contemplation is “to open ourselves to God’s gracious energies.”<sup>439</sup> It involves all our senses: “seeing, hearing, tasting, touching, smelling, feeling, and perceiving.” Mystics feel God’s presence, or “pleasant fire,” strangely warming the

---

<sup>432</sup> Yong-Hwa Na, “A Developmental Evaluation of Hyung-Nyong Park’s Theology,” *Presbyterian Theological Quarterly* 252 (1997): 80.

<sup>433</sup> *The Complete Collection of H. N. Park*, V (Seoul: Hankuk kidokkyo kyoyuk yonkuwon, 1988), p. 346.

<sup>434</sup> *Ibid.*, p.340.

<sup>435</sup> *Ibid.*, p.339.

<sup>436</sup> Dr. Kwang-Ryul Kim, *Salvation and Sanctification in Christ* (Seoul: Chongshin University Press, 2000), p. 305. n. 57.

<sup>437</sup> *The Complete Collection of H. N. Park*, V (Seoul: Hankuk kidokkyo kyoyuk yonkuwon, 1988), pp.351-52, 358-366, 383.

<sup>438</sup> E. Glenn Hinson, “The Contemplative View” in *Christian Spirituality: Five Views of Sanctification* edited by Donald L. Alexander (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1988), pp.171-172.

<sup>439</sup> *Ibid.*, p.174.

heart.<sup>440</sup> Hinson's view of mysticism is close to quietistic mysticism.

In Korea, one who is possibly in line with Hinson's view is Yong Do Lee (1900-1930), who is said to be a representative mystic in Korean church history. According to D. S. Yoo, Lee's revival movement was "powerful enough to shake entire churches in Korea, though his ministry period was just two or three years."<sup>441</sup> H. N. Park alluded to the fact that Y. D. Lee was "biased towards experience rather than doctrine and spoke of mysticism and contemplation in his favourite phrase and behaved abnormally."<sup>442</sup> S. K. Jung regards Y. D. Lee's preaching as "mysticism based emotion and experience in line with Schleiermacher."<sup>443</sup> D. S. Yoo described Lee's mysticism as enthusiasm for Korean love and shamanistic mysticism.<sup>444</sup> Yoo's assessment of Lee is quite positive in contrast to the former's, given that he viewed Lee's enthusiastic mysticism as Korean theology indigenized adequately for Koreans.<sup>445</sup>

For Y. D. Lee, sanctification meant the completion of "unconditional and impartial love embracing everyone,"<sup>446</sup> which is given in our union with Christ. "When I become unity with the Lord by love, my doing becomes the Lord's doing, the completion of my faith comes through the fact that I am in the Lord and He is in me, the time is the time of the completion."<sup>447</sup> (The translation is mine) The summit of sanctification is the completion of our mystic union with Christ, which implies our living in the spiritual realm of the resurrected Christ.<sup>448</sup> It is the state of perfection that I am dead and the Lord lives in me, and that "I become empty"<sup>449</sup> and "a ball, which the Lord plays at his will."<sup>450</sup> This union is achieved by beholding the Lord with faith and a single mind.

The Principle of this unity in which I am engulfed in the Lord's love  
and the Lord is engulfed in my faith! Oh, my eyes, behold the Lord.  
Behold only the Lord with single mind. Let us look at the Lord

<sup>440</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 175; Bernard, "Sermon LXXXIII on the Song of Songs," in *Varieties of Mystic Experience*, ed. Elmer O'Brien (New York: Mentor-Omega, 1964), p.105.

<sup>441</sup> Dong-Sik Yoo, *The History of the Korean Methodist Church Thought* (Seoul: Junmangsa, 1993), p. 221.

<sup>442</sup> Hyung-Nyong Park, *The Selection and Criticism of Theological Difficult Questions* (Pyongyang: Pyongyang Presbyterian Theological College, 1935), p. 828.

<sup>443</sup> Sung-Ku Jung, "The History of the Korean Church Sermon) IV (1920-30)- Centering on the Evaluation and Critique of Rev. Lee Yong-Do's Sermons," *Presbyterian Theological Quarterly* 197 (Spr., 1983): 141.

<sup>444</sup> Dong-Sik Yoo, *op. cit.*, p. 230.

<sup>445</sup> *Ibid.*, p.232.

<sup>446</sup> Bong-Bae Park, "Pastor Yong Do Lee's Mysticism of Love and Its Ethicality]. *Theology and World* 4 (1978): 59.

<sup>447</sup> Jong- Ho Byun, ed., *The Diary of Pastor Yong-Do Lee*, p.210.

<sup>448</sup> Dong-Sik Yoo, *op.cit.*, p. 224.

<sup>449</sup> Jong-Ho Byun, ed., *The Collected Letters of Rev. Lee Yong Do* (Seoul: Simoowon, 1953), p. 104.

<sup>450</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 134.

without taking our eyes off Him. The Lord captured by my sight will live peacefully in me.<sup>451</sup> (The translation is mine).

Our union with Christ was accomplished by our participation in the cross and resurrection of Jesus.<sup>452</sup> The mode of sanctification was mainly self-denial to flesh and worldliness.<sup>453</sup> Lee considered death to self as the only means, way, or principle of sanctification as completion.<sup>454</sup> The main means of sanctification was prayer and meditation. “Meditation and prayer are the keys to the gate of mystical living.”<sup>455</sup> Lee seems to have acknowledged the second blessing for perfection, given the statement that he experienced regeneration by overcoming the devil while he had been praying on 24<sup>th</sup> of October in 1928 in Tong-chun of Kang-won Province.<sup>456</sup> He regarded “gossiping, envy, factional rivalry, complaint, anxiety, separation and selfishness” as the sin in the church, while considering faith, love and humility as the marks of the sanctified.<sup>457</sup> His soteriology can be classified into four stages. The first stage is the state of the church in which Christians learn ecclesiastical authority and doctrines and practice of the church. The second is the stage of discipline and cultivation to destroy the flesh and sinfulness. However, one realized that it is impossible. The third stage is to realize justification by faith. The fourth is the stage of love. He comes to perfection in only sacrificial love, which is experienced in communion with God.<sup>458</sup> His mysticism was oriental and Korean shamanistic in the sense that he accepted the idea of *muh* (emptiness) due to Taoism and accepted the oracles of those who were possessed by a spirit.<sup>459</sup>

Regrettably, he was involved in “the Prophecy Movement of Choon-Myung Han and so on” or the *ipryu* faction, which was the prayer meeting centred around Choon-Myung Han, Nam-Joo Paik, Ho-Bin Lee, Myung-Hwa Yoo and Yoo-Shin Lee, who are said to have been fascinated by the thoughts of Emmanuel Swedenborg.<sup>460</sup> Carelessly, Y. D. Lee acknowledged the prophecy of M. H. Yoo, a woman possessed with a spirit as that from the Holy Spirit.<sup>461</sup> However, some of the prophecies of M. H. Yoo and C. M. Han turned

---

<sup>451</sup> Jong- Ho Byun, ed., *The Diary of Pastor Yong-Do Lee*, p.45.

<sup>452</sup> Jong- Ho Byun, ed., *Faith, Hope, Love- Collected Letters of Y. D. Lee* (Seoul: Simoowon, 1967), p.145.

<sup>453</sup> Jong-Ho Byun, *A Biography of Pastor Yong- Do Lee* (Seoul: Simoowon, 1958), pp.28-31.

<sup>454</sup> Jong- Ho Byun, ed., *Faith, Hope, Love- Collected Letters of Yong Do Lee* (Seoul: Simoowon, 1967), p.115.

<sup>455</sup> Jong-Ho Byun, ed., *The Collected Letters of Rev. Lee Yong Do* (Seoul: Simoowon, 1953), p. 60.

<sup>456</sup> Jong-Ho Byun, ed., *The Biography of Pastor Lee Yong- Do* (Seoul: Simoowon, 1958), pp.28-31.

<sup>457</sup> Jong- Ho Byun, ed., *The Diary of Pastor Yong-Do Lee* (Seoul: Shinsaengkwan, 1966), pp.13ff, 63-69.

<sup>458</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.140-142.

<sup>459</sup> Dong-Sik Yoo, *The History of the Korean Methodist Church Thought* (Seoul: Junmangsa, 1993), p. 232.

<sup>460</sup> In-Seo Kim, “A Report of Investigation of the Inside Story of Yong-Do Church. *Faith Life*, 1934, May.

<sup>461</sup> V. W. Peters, “Simeon, A Christian Korean Mystic,” *Korean Mission Field* (Oct., 1936): 219; Yong-Kyu Park, “The Issue of Pastor Yong-Do Lee and His Hereticalness,” *Presbyterian Theological Quarterly*. 244 (Oct., 1995):42.

out to be false. Y. D. Lee was also condemned because of his involvement and sympathy with them.<sup>462</sup> *Kidokshinbo* (The Weekly News of the Korean Presbyterian Church) judged them “Jezebel’s group.”<sup>463</sup> When the Korean Church asked Lee to resign from his ministry, he refused. In spite of Lee’s opposition, Han’s group established *Chosun Yesu Kyohoe* (The Korean Jesus Church) in 1933.<sup>464</sup>

To sum up, Lee’s doctrine of sanctification was based on mystical union with the suffering Christ. Owing to the context of his day, he emphasised the suffering Christ rather than resurrected Christ working powerfully in believers. Lee’s mysticism had a positive aspect because it deeply touched the hearts of people of the day. However, the problem is in that he was emotionally biased rather than objective and depended excessively upon the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit rather than rational judgment, and failed to discern the false prophecy of those who claimed to be the descended Lord. His view of love sometimes seems to be lacking in justice and discretion. In the means of sanctification, he neglected church discipline, while emphasizing the Lord’s Supper, prayer, and the Word. His mysticism was too otherworldly to maintain the balance between social responsibility and the meditation of the next world.

#### 5.2.2.4.5 Spiritualistic Enthusiasm

In the early 1990s, some eschatological sects in Korea began to preach the end of the world and *huguh* (the coming of *parousia*). Jang- Lim Lee, founder of the Tami Missionary Church, predicted the end of the world on the 28th of October in 1992, but when his prediction failed to occur, his 8,000 members disbanded. Before the time, he tried to leave Korea with the funds of his church, but he was arrested. A charismatic 18-year old, Pang-Ik Ha, who was a founder of the Daverra Church, predicted the end of world in October in 1992, but when it failed to occur, his group disbanded.<sup>465</sup>

These people were very similar to the spiritualistic enthusiasts of Wesley’s time in their predictions of the end of the world, the denial of our responsibility in this world, and the claim of our sanctification when meeting with Christ. One remedy for over enthusiasm is to keep an eschatological tension between already accomplished salvation and not yet accomplished salvation. Another remedy is to be faithful to the Bible, which reads, “No one knows about that day or hour, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father” (Mat.24:36).

---

<sup>462</sup> Y. K. Park, *ibid.*, pp.43-53.

<sup>463</sup> “Be careful of Jezebel’s group,” *Kidokshinbo*, Dec. 14, 1932.

<sup>464</sup> IKSCHS, *A History of the Korean Church*, Vol. II, p.192; J.H. Byun, *Biography*, p. 252.

<sup>465</sup> James Huntley Grayson, *Korea-A Religious History* (New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 1989, revised 2002), pp.166-167.

### 5.2.2.5 Syncretistic Sanctification

Korea is a country with plural religions, namely, Confucianism, Buddhism, Shamanism, and so on. Such religions have developed over a long time, influencing one another. Accordingly, one needs to understand their influence upon Christianity, especially upon the doctrine of sanctification of Christianity. Barth's view that Christian faith is not one of the many religions, but the true religion as a response to God's unique self-revelation<sup>466</sup> seems to be relevant in dealing with this issue.

#### 5.2.2.5.1 Hananim-Worship

Hananim indicates the Lord in Heaven, the Creator and Ruler of the Universe. It is a compound word of "Hana" (meaning, "one") or Hanul (meaning, "sky" or "heaven") and "nim" (as an honourable suffix, meaning is Master).<sup>467</sup> Hanul means both "light" and "sacred." According to Wi-Jo Kang, Hananim in Korea accords with the Indo-European etymologies of "Zeus" and "Deus."<sup>468</sup> In the Tankun Myth,<sup>469</sup> which is the oldest legend since the foundation of ancient Korea, Hananim is called Hwan-in, the Lord of Heaven, the Father of Hwan-ung, who is the Father of Tangun, who is a founder of ancient Korea.<sup>470</sup> Hananim has been regarded as the chief God among all Korean gods from the beginning of Korea.<sup>471</sup> Early Korean missionaries assumed Hananim in Tangun myth as the concept according to the God of Christianity.<sup>472</sup> In this vein, Hananim as the supreme God of Christianity contributed to the rapid growth of the Korean Church by being accepted by Koreans without any conflict.

The Korean emperors offered sacrifices to the Heavens twice a year, and additionally notified the fact to the deity if there was "any notable and radical change in the laws, or any change in the name of dynasties."<sup>473</sup> "At times of great disaster, such as cholera, plague, drought, and famine," the emperor ordered people "to purify themselves" and go to

---

<sup>466</sup> CD I/2, 325-359, especially 326.

<sup>467</sup> Spencer T. Palmer, *Korea and Christianity* (Seoul: Hollym Cor., 1967), pp.7-8.

<sup>468</sup> Wi-Jo Kang, "Indigenous Tradition of Korean Religions," *Sinhaknondan*, 14:194. (In Korean).

<sup>469</sup> In this myth, the Son of Hwan-in (God), Hwan-ung, descended from Heaven with his servants who control rain, wind and cloud, and founded God's city on Tae-baek mountain and governed its people. Then a bear came and asked him to make her a woman. So he transformed her into a woman and married her. She gave birth to Tankun, who found Choson (ancient Korea) at Asatal. Iljontoseoyeonkukaebal-wiwonhoe, *The History of Korea for Middle School Students*, Vol. 1 (Seoul: Kuksapyunchanwiwonhoe, 2001), p.26.

<sup>470</sup> Jung-Young Lee, "Concerning the Origin and Formation of Korean Shamanism," *Numen* 20 (Aug., 1973):149-150.

<sup>471</sup> Jung Suck Rhee, *op. cit.*, p.233, especially see note no.26.

<sup>472</sup> Spencer T. Palmer, *op. cit.*, p.90.

<sup>473</sup> H.G. Underwood, *The Religions of Eastern Asia* (New York: n.p., 1910), pp.115-117; J. S. Rhee, *op. cit.*, p.234.

the high hills and other places, and “pray to the Heavens.”<sup>474</sup> As Heaven is believed to accept worship by the pure, serious purification was required of the participants. This purification is the characteristic of sanctification in Hananim worship. J. S Rhee links purification with Koreans’ preference for wearing white clothes.<sup>475</sup>

Briefly, Hananim worship greatly contributed to the Korean understanding of God in the Bible, but the Tangun myth has an unsolved syncretistic problem because it threw Korean people into confusion about whether God is the grandfather of Tangun or the Father of Jesus Christ. It is not easy to assume only the concept of God from the Tangun myth, while excluding its historicity amongst other things. In this regard, Christianity and the Tangun faith still struggle with each other. Another problem is that purification by one’s efforts shown in Hananim worship is different from purification by faith in the blood of Christ through the Holy Spirit.

#### 5.2.2.5.2 Shamanism

Y. J. Lee mentions the syncretism called “shamanic Korean Protestantism,” in which Protestantism has incorporated original “shamanic traditions and faith” and has appeared in the form of Pentecostalism, whose distinction is healing, prayer meetings, exorcism, and seeking the way to solve “life’s hardship among the disinherited.”<sup>476</sup> 45.1 percent of Protestants and 52.0 percent of Catholics think that their names relate to human destiny.<sup>477</sup> This phenomenon shows that Korean Christians have a shamanistic view of their destiny. Some shamanistic Christians participate in *kut*, a shaman rite in order to solve their problems by consoling the souls of their dead relatives. Many Christians consult shamans or Christian prophets to know their future. Though they know that such behaviours are prohibited in the Bible, they do not stop them easily because shamanism has influenced Korean hearts for a long time.<sup>478</sup> Generally, Confucianism relates to men and high class, shamanism relates to women and low class.<sup>479</sup> In 1994, shamans numbered approximately 120,000 persons, “of whom 80,000 were women and 40,000 men.” In 1997, 600,000 shamans were recorded. An estimated three million Koreans regularly consult fortune-

---

<sup>474</sup> H.G. Underwood, *ibid.*, p.106.

<sup>475</sup> J. S. Rhee, *op. cit.*, p.236.

<sup>476</sup> Yvonne Young-ja Lee, “Religious Syncretism and a Postimperial Source of Healing in Korea,” in *Religion and Social Policy* ed. by Paula D. Nesbitt (Walnut Creek, Lanham, New York, Oxford: Altamira Press, 2001), p.228, 231.

<sup>477</sup> Gallup Korea (2004), p.109.

<sup>478</sup> Dr. Harold S. Hong, “Social, Political, and Psychological Aspects of Church Growth,” in *Korean Church Growth Explosion* ed. by Ro Bong-Rin and Marlin L. Neslon (Seoul: Word of Life Press and Asia Theological Association), p.181.

<sup>479</sup> Cf. C.S Song, “Building a Theological Culture of People,” in *An Emerging Theology in World Perspective: Commentary on Korean Minjung Theology* ed. by Jung Young Lee (Mystic Connecticut: Twenty-Third Publications, 1988), p. 125.



tellers.<sup>480</sup> There are more fortune-tellers than pastors in South Korea.<sup>481</sup>

Korean traditional religious consciousness is *gibok shinang* similar to *Jehe chobok*. The latter means “eliminating harmful evil forces, while invoking good useful forces”. This was incorporated into Pentecostalism, whose characteristics are tongues, healing, prophecy exorcism, and God’s blessings.<sup>482</sup> On the other hand, such a tendency to seek material blessing has been connected with liberal theology, or minjung theology, which aims to enhance the wealth and position of lone and powerless people.<sup>483</sup> Nam-Dong Suh and Chi-Ha Kim attempt to synthesize Christianity and *Donghak* or *Chondokyo* to construct minjung theology.<sup>484</sup> This shows us the syncretistic tendency of minjung theology with traditional religions. J. Y. Lee suggests that through the mutual transformation between Christianity and shamanism “we hope to see an age of harmony and mutual co-existence in which all religions work together for the peace, happiness and goodness of all people in divine care and love.”<sup>485</sup> His suggestion, however, seems to be dangerous because of its syncretistic tendency.<sup>486</sup>

Briefly, as J. S. Rhee puts it, the shamanistic view of sanctification is liberation through exorcism by shamans from the spirits who possessed people. This liberation brings them peace, health, and blessing. As it is generally indifferent to morality, shamanistic infiltration of the Korean Church is problematic.<sup>487</sup> James H. Grayson posits that due to shamanistic direct influence, *simryung puheung-hoe* (spiritual revival meeting) often came to focus on healing rather than on getting newcomers or on moral regeneration.<sup>488</sup> However, Grayson’s view seems irrelevant because *puheung-sa* (revivalist) generally emphasises repentance at first and later practises healing, which is in line with the Biblical

---

<sup>480</sup> Andrew Eun-Gi Kim, “Characteristics of Religious Life in South Korea: A Sociological Survey,” *Review of Religious Research*, Vol.43, no. 4 (2002): 292.

<sup>481</sup> James Huntley Grayson, *Korea-A Religious History* (New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 1989, revised 2002), p.219.

<sup>482</sup> Jung-Young Lee, “Relationship Between Christianity and Shamanism in Korea: A History Perspective,” *The Asia Journal of Theology* Vol. 10, No. 2 (1996): 343.

<sup>483</sup> Yvonne Young-Ja Lee, *op.cit.*, pp. 234-235.

<sup>484</sup> Jung-Young Lee, “Minjung Theology: A Critical Introduction,” in *An Emerging Theology in World Perspective: Commentary on Korean Minjung Theology* ed. by Jung Young Lee (Mystic Connecticut: Twenty-Third Publications, 1988), p.16.

<sup>485</sup> Jung-Young Lee, “Relationship Between Christianity and Shamanism in Korea: A History Perspective,” *The Asia Journal of Theology*, Vol. 10. No. 2 (1996): 346.

<sup>486</sup> Cf. James T. Bretzke also argues that “the issues of the proper uses of shamanism and the legitimate dangers of syncretism have not yet been completely resolved.” James. T. Bretzke, “Cracking the Code: Minjung Theology as an Experience of the Holy Spirit in Korea,” *Pacifica* 10 (Oct., 1997): 330.

<sup>487</sup> “A characteristic of Shamanism is a lack of consciousness of social responsibility, and non-practice of love and justice”. Eun-Sik Cho, “Korean Church Growth in 1970s: Its Factors and Problems,” *The Asia Journal of Theology*, Vol.10, no.2 (1996): 353.

<sup>488</sup> James H. Grayson, “Elements of Protestant Accommodation to Korean Religious Culture: A Personal Ethnographic Perspective,” *Missiology* 23 (Ja., 1995): 53.

order. The problem lies in the way of healing, not in neglecting repentance. In many cases *puheung-sa* uses “techniques verging on hypnotic” in healing,<sup>489</sup> which is distinct from the power of the Holy Spirit. The core of the problem is that their life’s motivation is the acquisition of self-centred worldly success rather than giving glory to God through a holy life.<sup>490</sup> For such a purpose, spirits are soothed or driven out of people by shamans.<sup>491</sup> It is a far cry from the biblical concept of sanctification as the recovery of the image of God. Such a phenomenon stems from the wrong interpretation of the Bible, namely, the biased interpretation of the material aspect of God’s blessing as mentioned in minjung theology.

### 5.2.2.5.3 Taoism

The first organized Taoism was imported to the kingdom of Koguryo from China in A.D.624.<sup>492</sup> Because the founder of Taoism, Laotsze, was not regarded as a god and its temple had not been built in Korea, it was completely assimilated into shamanism in the forms of fortune-telling, “prayer to the seven stars of the Great Bear”, amulets and *pung-su* (geomancy for graves and houses).<sup>493</sup> The theory of Pung-su that the position of ancestors’ graves influences the fortunes of their posterities has been believed by many Koreans.<sup>494</sup> According to the 2004 Gallup Korea’s survey, 55.7 percent of Koreans consider Pung-su theory as true.<sup>495</sup> Taoism has also influenced oriental medical science. One belief is that one will live long by taking mountain ginseng, deer antler, or bear’s gall bladder. The other is *Kyung Rak*, which means the paths of *chi* circulating through the human body as special nerve parts show the signs of illness for acupuncture.<sup>496</sup> Another way to a long life is to absorb natural *chi* (energy) through controlled breathing or meditation.<sup>497</sup> Chi Kong (hypogastric breathing) has been applied in oriental marshal arts. Yon Kaesomun (?-660) of the Koguryo and Hwarang groups of Silla were Taoists.<sup>498</sup>

In terms of sanctification, perfection in Taoism is harmony with nature, through which people can attain long life and find their true self. Its way is to abstain from pleasures of the flesh, to purify oneself by giving up envy and hate, and to experience the liberation of

---

<sup>489</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>490</sup> Cf. Eun-Sik Cho, *op.cit.*, p.353.

<sup>491</sup> Cf. Andrew Eungi Kim, “Christianity, Shamanism, and Modernization in South Korea,” *Cross Currents*, Vol.50, no.1-2 (Spr./Sum., 2000): 116.

<sup>492</sup> James Huntley Grayson, *Korea-A Religious History* (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2002), p. 51.

<sup>493</sup> J. S. Rhee, *op.cit.*, pp.252-279.

<sup>494</sup> Moon-Jang Lee, “Experience of Religious Plurality in Korea: Its Theological Implications,” *international Review of Mission*, Vol.83, no. 351 (1999):401

<sup>495</sup> Gallup Korea (2004), p.112 (in Korean).

<sup>496</sup> Dr. Hee-Soo Jung, “*Chi* Philosophy and Christianity, Its Acceptation and Critique,” *Ministry & Theology* 77 (Nov., 1995): 75.

<sup>497</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>498</sup> Grayson, *op.cit*, p.52.

the soul by meditating diligently. It can be said to be a way to inner peace and growth of character.<sup>499</sup> However, such a view differs from the Christian view in the sense that the latter meditates on the truth revealed in Christ in the presence of the Holy Spirit, while the former is focused on the control of breathing. Their reclusiveness differs from the active calling of Christianity.<sup>500</sup> The similarity between the two is that self-denial and self-discipline are the means of sanctification. Christians need to be cautious about the chi movement because chi is not the truth or the God of Christianity or the power of the Holy Spirit, but natural energy.

#### 5.2.2.5.4 Buddhism

Buddhism was introduced into Kokuyo in A.D. 372, into Bakje in A.D. 384, and into Silla in A.D. 535 for the protection of their royal houses.<sup>501</sup> In 1995, the membership of the Korean Buddhists was estimated at 10,321,000, which is 23.2 percent of the total population and is almost equivalent to the combined membership of Catholicism and Protestantism.<sup>502</sup>

Originally, Siddhartha Gautama (BC 560-620), the founder of Buddhism, taught that supreme enlightenment (bodhi) is the way to perfect liberation (nirvana) from worldly desires, self-deception, and ignorance.<sup>503</sup> He attained divine awakening through deep meditation, not ascetic practices. He taught that the way to attain spiritual awakening is the noble Eightfold Path; right view, right intent, right speech, right conduct, right means of livelihood, right endeavour, right meditation and right concentration.<sup>504</sup> This is similar to the teaching of St. Paul (Phi. 4:8), which reads, “Finally, brethren, whatever is true, whatever is honorable, whatever is right, whatever is pure, whatever is lovely, whatever is of good repute if there is any excellence and if anything worthy of praise, let your mind dwell on these things.” *Yulban* (Nirvana) is defined as liberation from any attachment to desire or agony, and a release from the cycle of reincarnation.<sup>505</sup> The Buddha is “the Holy One who has conquered all lust, anger, and delusion, dispelled all sensuous desire, all yearning for personal existence, and all ignorance,” that is “the Perfectly Enlightened

---

<sup>499</sup> Dr. Hee-Soo Jung, *op.cit.*, p.77.

<sup>500</sup> Herrlee G. Creel, *Chinese Thought from Confucius to Mao Tse-tung* (Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press, 1953), p.100.

<sup>501</sup> C. S. Chung, *Korea: The Encounter Between the Gospel and Neo-Confucian Culture* (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1997), p.22.

<sup>502</sup> *Yearbook of Religions in Korea* 1993,1995, 1996-7.

<sup>503</sup> Dong-Gook University, *Introduction to Buddhism* (Seoul: Dong-gook Univ. Press, 1986), pp.10-45.

<sup>504</sup> E.A.Burt, ed., *The Teaching of the Compassionate Buddha* (New York: New American Library, 1955), p.29; pp.172-173; David Bentley-Taylor and Clark B. Offner, “Buddhism,” in Sir Norman Anderson ed., *The World’s Religions* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1985), pp.172-173.

<sup>505</sup> Donald. K. Swearer, *Buddhism* (Nile, IL: Argus Communication, 1977), p.45.

One”.<sup>506</sup> After his death, Buddhism was divided into two schools; the Therayada school imitating Gautama’s strict self-discipline and the Mahayana school believing in Bodhisattvas, who save common people, which emerged four centuries after Gautama’s death.<sup>507</sup> Bodhisattva is “one whose essence is perfect knowledge (bodhi) and greatly resolves to postpone his progression to Nirvana to help all other sentient beings with whom he feels interrelated.”<sup>508</sup> Buddhism gradually began to be mystified and popularized, and some Hindu beliefs like metempsychosis of six worlds by *Karma* (the law of cause and result) were tolerated.<sup>509</sup> As a result, their view of human destiny is fatalistic because they think present life is the result of the previous life. Nirvana is said to disconnect the chain of metempsychosis through the noble Eightfold Path. Though Gautama did not claim divine status, he was idolized and worshipped as a god.<sup>510</sup>

*Gwan-yin* Bodhisattva, “the Lord Who Looks Down from Above,” who listens to every prayer, was popular with Korean Buddhists.<sup>511</sup> Pure Land Buddhism, which was introduced to Korea by Wonhyo in the 7th century A.D., taught that people could attain happiness both in this life and in the next life through chanting a short formula prayer to Amitabha Buddha 10 times or more, because salvation comes by the grace of Amitabha.<sup>512</sup> This is similar to the teaching of Acts (Acts 2:21; 4:10). This buddhistic convention infiltrated the Korean Church and induced believers to pray as they make an incantation. Such a tendency is prevalent in the Korean Catholic Church and seems problematic because of its impersonal aspect. Jesus warned that those who call him the Lord without sincerely doing the will of God cannot enter heaven (Mat. 7:21).

Christianity and Buddhism can be compared in six ways. Firstly, similarities and differences in the commandments are as follows. The Buddhists have five commandments for the novitiate: first, do not kill any life, secondly, do not steal, thirdly, do not commit adultery, fourthly, do not lie, and fifthly, do not drink alcohol excessively, or take addictive drugs. These commandments are similar to the latter part of Christianity’s Ten Commandments (from the sixth to the tenth commandment). There are no Buddhist commandments similar to the former part of the Ten Commandments. Buddhism’s latter

---

<sup>506</sup> Robert C. Lester, *Buddhism: The Path to Nirvana* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1987), p. 60

<sup>507</sup> Tissa Weerasingha, *Buddhism: A Missionological Approach*, M.A. diss. Fuller Theological Seminary (Ann Arbor: UMI, 1984), p.6. For more, see Richard A. Gard, ed., *Buddhism* (New York: George Braziller, 1961), pp.29-41.

<sup>508</sup> *Ibid.*, p.28,81.

<sup>509</sup> Cf. Dong-Gook University, *Introduction to Buddhism* (Seoul: Dong-gook Univ. Press, 1986), pp.160-167.

<sup>510</sup> Richard Robinson, trans., *Chinese Buddhist Verse* (London: Greenwood Publ., 1954), p.48.

<sup>511</sup> Robert C. Lester, *Buddhism: The Path to Nirvana* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1987),p.73.

<sup>512</sup> Dong-Gook University, *Introduction to Buddhism* (Seoul: Dong-gook Univ. Press, 1986), pp.183f; Dr. Yun Sung-Bum holds that Buddhism’s view of the next life consisting of a Pure Land of Joy and the terrifying hell is similar to that of Christianity, and it affects the expansion of Christianity positively. Sung-Bum Yun, *Christianity and Korean Thought* (Seoul: The Christian Literature Society, 1964), pp.248-250.

five commandments for the higher ordination are ascetic,<sup>513</sup> unlike Christianity's. The Korean Canon School emphasises studying the Buddhist canon as a means of sanctification while obeying the commandments, as with Christianity. Secondly, Buddhistic fundamental truth consists of stopping every sin, accumulating virtue, and purifying one's heart.<sup>514</sup> It is similar to the doctrine of Christian sanctification, except that Theravada Buddhism attains awakening by one's efforts and meditation, while Christianity reaches holiness by faith in Christ and obedience to the commandments by God's grace. Thirdly, Buddhists are passive about participating in social reformation because they think that everything is illusion, so they do not want their concentration on enlightenment to be disturbed by worldly affairs. In contrast, Christianity is active in social reformation and challenging worldly affairs because it is a way to expand the rule of God in this world. Fourthly, Buddhism teaches that perfection is possible through the noble Eightfold Path, while Christianity says that it is not possible in this life, except Wesley's perfection. Fifthly, Buddhism depicts the marks of the unenlightened as ignorance, desire, greed, hatred and delusion.<sup>515</sup> This is similar to those of Christianity. The marks of the enlightened are wisdom, freedom and mercy. Emphasis on wisdom rather than love is different from Christianity. Sixthly, in Buddhism sin causes "self-inflicted punishment by the fact of its bringing suffering upon oneself",<sup>516</sup> while in Christianity, sin brings punishment by God.

Briefly, Buddhistic fatalistic view of life due to metempsychosis has influenced the fatalistic view of sanctification of the Korean Church. In line with the doctrine of predestination, Korean Christians tend to think everything is the will of God. Buddhistic negative and passive views of the world were reflected in Christianity's tendency to pursue the next world rather than reforming society during turbulent periods.<sup>517</sup> Christian reclusive sects have such a tendency. This pessimistic tendency of social sanctification needs to be corrected. Their view of the means of sanctification is a legalistic self-discipline and meditation. Hence, the church needs to teach converts from Buddhism unconditional grace of God and faith in Christ.

### 5.2.2.5.5 Confucianism

Confucianism was introduced to Korea in A.D. 372. It became the main principle by which

---

<sup>513</sup> They are as follows: "Not to take food from noon to the next morning, not to adorn their bodies with anything other than the three robes, no to participate in or be spectator to public entertainments, no to use high or comfortable beds, not to use money." Robert C. Lester, *Buddhism: The Path to Nirvana* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1987), p.91.

<sup>514</sup> Christmas Humphreys, *Buddhism* (London: Penguin Books, 1951), pp.72-73.

<sup>515</sup> Robert C. Lester, *Buddhism: The Path to Nirvana* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1987),p. 79.

<sup>516</sup> *Ibid.*, p.82.

<sup>517</sup> Bong-Ho Son is also of the opinion that Buddhism has influenced Koreans to "prefer to separate religion from politics." B. H. Son, "Can the Evangelist Ignore Socio-Political Issues?," *Transformation* 8 (1991): 17.

the country was ruled in the Choson dynasty.

The Confucian view of sanctification is an orderly mind and good human relationships. This order is grounded on the principle that heaven is higher than earth. Man is the embodiment of the heavenly mind and the earthly body. Perfection is to rule human self and society according to the will of heaven. This is accomplished by steady self-discipline, whose fruits are “human-heartedness, righteousness, ritual observing disposition, wisdom and trustworthiness”.<sup>518</sup> The Confucian view of nature is that perfection is achieved gradually through self-discipline, the study of canons and experience. It is not instantaneous like “a sudden flash of mystical enlightenment” through meditation of Buddhism as the way to perfection.<sup>519</sup> The prime virtue among them is *jen* (human-heartedness or perfect virtue)<sup>520</sup>, which represents genuine “humanity as the reflection of Heaven”, namely *Tao*.<sup>521</sup> The starting points of *jen* are *chung* and *shu*. *Chung* is “to do one’s best for the sake of others” and *shu* (gentleness) is “not doing to others what one does not wish them to do to one’s self”.<sup>522</sup> This is similar to Jesus’ teaching (Mt.7:12). *Jen* is accomplished by incessantly subduing one’s self and recovering the ritual disposition in every act.<sup>523</sup> *Yi* (righteousness) is “the delimitation of the (moral) means according to the circumstances.”<sup>524</sup> Generally, *li* is “humbling oneself to pay respect to others; putting others first and oneself second”.<sup>525</sup> *Li* (the ritual observing disposition) means the way to apply the order of heaven and earth to all human relationships, for example, parents and children, king and subject, the elder and the younger, man and woman, brother and sister, friend and friend.<sup>526</sup> It is “a certain standard of action set up to represent righteousness” and “the moral means” for the occasion.<sup>527</sup> In other words, it is “the general principle of social order”.<sup>528</sup> *Chih* (wisdom) is “the understanding of human-heartedness and righteousness and ritual conducts”.<sup>529</sup> The *hao jan chih ch’i* of Mencius is achieved “by

---

<sup>518</sup> Confucius, *The Analectics*, D. C. Lau, tr., (London: Penguin Book, 1979), XV:7. Hereafter it is written *Analectics*.

<sup>519</sup> *Analectics* XV:30; Herrlee G. Creel, *Chinese Thought from Confucius to Mao Tse-tung* (Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press, 1953), p.38.

<sup>520</sup> Fung Yu-Lan, *A Short History of Chinese Philosophy*, ed. by Derek Bodde (New York and London: The Free Press, 1966), p.43.

<sup>521</sup> Cf. W. M. Tu, “On the Mencian Perception of Moral Self-Development,” *The Monist* 61 (1968): 72-81.

<sup>522</sup> *Analectics*, XV: 23; XII:2; Fung Yu-Lan, *The Spirit of Chinese Philosophy*, E.R.Hughes, tr., (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Truber & Co., Ltd, 1947), p.17; cf. Lin Yutang, ed., and tr., *The Wisdom of Confucius, Liki, XXXII* (New York: Random House, 1938), p.186.

<sup>523</sup> *Analectics*, XII:1.

<sup>524</sup> Fung Yu-Lan, *ibid.*, p.18.

<sup>525</sup> *Ibid.*.

<sup>526</sup> Lin Yutang, ed., and tr., *The Wisdom of Confucius* (New York: Random House, 1938), p.216.

<sup>527</sup> Fung Yu-Lan, *op.cit.*, p.21

<sup>528</sup> Lin Yutang, *op.cit.*, p.208.

<sup>529</sup> Fung Yu-Lan, *op.cit.*, p.18.



understanding the Tao and accumulating righteousness”. *Ch’i* means the morale of valour. It is cultivated by righteousness.<sup>530</sup>

The Tao is described as the way that man should go, or the way that a man lives, or the law that man should follow.<sup>531</sup> The most important requirement in practising Tao is *sung* (Sincerity), which means the attitude to practise sincerely what is right and good.<sup>532</sup> According to the degree of the realization of the heavenly virtues, one is classified according to five requirements. First, the virtuous man is the most popular designation, a man who rules himself and others. Secondly, the benevolent man is a man who has fully realized his heavenly virtues. Thirdly, the great man is a man who has overcome his egoistic self. Fourthly, the wise man is a man who has fully developed every heavenly nature. Fifthly, the holy man is a man who has fully developed his heavenly virtues and to have realized them in human society.<sup>533</sup> In this respect, a perfect man in Confucianism is the virtuous man or the holy man. Ideal society is an orderly society. Confucius called correct governance, “the rectification of names,” which means, “Let the ruler be ruler, the minister be minister, the father be father, the son be son.”<sup>534</sup> The Great Learning (one of the Chinese classics) suggests five logical orders to rule over the state: appreciating the nature of things, extending one’s knowledge, cultivating one’s self, making an ordered harmony in one’s own family, and governing one’s own state.<sup>535</sup>

Pertaining to religious syncretism, Y. Y. J. Lee notes that North American Protestantism was mixed with Korean neo-Confucian traditions, and formed “Confucianized Korean Protestantism.” In the early stage of missionary work, the Korean church insisted upon segregated seating for men and women according to Confucian custom. Confucianized evangelical Protestants have imitated “the religious and political policies of oppressive rulers” and know how to secure “materialistic wealth and higher social status.”<sup>536</sup> They have “a more hierarchical and patriarchal tendency than mainline American Protestants” due to the Confucian emphasis on classism and sexism.<sup>537</sup> Women

---

<sup>530</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.24-27.

<sup>531</sup> Soo-Ki Hong, “The Problem caused by the Contact of Early Korean Christianity and Confucianism (I),” *Presbyterian Quarterly Review* 194 (1982):47; Herrlee G. Creel, *Chinese Thought from Confucius to Mao Tse-tung* (Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press, 1953), p.33.

<sup>532</sup> Soo-Ki Hong, *ibid.*, p.48.

<sup>533</sup> Keun S. Lee, “Anthropology of Early Confucianism,” in: *Metaphysics and Anthropology in the Oriental Philosophy* (Seoul, n.p., 1986), pp.193, 201-203.

<sup>534</sup> *Analects*, XII:11;XIII:3.

<sup>535</sup> The Great Learning section 1, in E. R. Hughes, tr. *The Great Learning and The Mean in Action* (London: J.M.Dent and Sons Ltd., 1942), p.146.

<sup>536</sup> Yvonne Young-ja Lee, “Religious Syncretism and a Postimperial Source of Healing in Korea,” in *Religion and Social Policy* ed. by Paula D. Nesbitt (Walnut Creek, Lanham, New York, Oxford: Altamira Press, 2001), p. 228.

<sup>537</sup> *Ibid.*; also see James H. Grayson, “Elements of Protestant Accommodation to Korean Religious Culture: A Personal Ethnographic Perspective,” *Missiology* 23 (Ja., 1995): 50-51.

are alienated from powerful positions, for example, those of pastor and elder; and the lay believers often tend to be uncritically loyal to the pastors.<sup>538</sup> Furthermore, their loyalty to the Almighty, Highest God seems to relate to the Confucian tradition of emphasising loyalty to their king. Y J Lee's view is reasonable in terms of the fact that Christianity and Confucianism are male-centred religions in their organization. However, Y. J. Lee's view seems to neglect the fact that Christianity's political system is based on the example and teaching of the early church written in the Bible (Acts 1:13; 6:5; 15:2,6 and 25). Man's dominant authority over woman is based on the Bible (1 Cor.11:3; Eph.5:23; 1 Tim. 2:11-12), not Confucian tradition. Order and authority in the church are based on the Bible rather than Confucianism. Of course, it is wrong is that Confucianism has neglected women and children. The equalitarianism before the Christian God has shaken Confucian male-centred and patriarchal systems and has driven Korean society towards a democratic system.<sup>539</sup> Nevertheless, the Presbyterian Church in Korea, which is a similar political system similar to the Confucian hierarchy, has grown more than any other Congregational Church.<sup>540</sup>

On the other hand, some Confucianized Korean Protestants tend to revalue positively the practice of ancestor worship. Y. Y. J. Lee ascribes such a trend to their beliefs that the secular authority and power are held by "their Confucian officer ancestors."<sup>541</sup> The belief is due to the serious misunderstanding of the condition of the dead, who are under the judgment of God from the perspective of reformed theology.

Briefly, the Confucian view of sanctification is to rule self and others according to the will of Heaven. This is similar to the Christian view, but lacks the help of the Holy Spirit, faith in Jesus' redemption, a personal God and his grace, and the next life. Due to the influence of Confucianism, Korean Protestants accustomed to the marks of sanctification such as love, sincerity, politeness, moderation, faithfulness, humility and generosity, accept freedom and joy stemming from unconditional forgiveness. Also, they know the marks of sinfulness such as indulgence, condemnation of others, deceit, glibness, pretence, and carelessness, which are regarded as what Confucius hates.<sup>542</sup> Confucianized Christians tend simply to emphasise human efforts to accumulate such virtues and to give up evil. Confucianism believes that human discipline and education can cultivate human virtues on

---

<sup>538</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>539</sup> Sook-Jong Lee, "A Study of the Relationship of the Korean Church to the Indigenous Culture of Korea," *The Asia Journal of Theology*, Vol. 9, no. 2 (1987): 241.

<sup>540</sup> Cf. Yim Sung-Bihn also considers "the distinctive elements of Presbyterianism" corresponding to Korean tradition as an important reason for the growth of the Korean Presbyterian Church. "Presbyterian Groups Grow Rapidly in Korea," *Christian Century* 113 (Sep.-Oct, 1996): 888.

<sup>541</sup> Martina Deuchler, *The Confucian Transformation of Korea: A Study of Society and Ideology* (Cambridge: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University Press, 1992), p. 175. Quoted by Y.Y.J. Lee, *op.cit.*, p. 230.

<sup>542</sup> Lin Yutang ed., and tr., *The Wisdom of Confucius* (New York: Random House, 1938), p.196.

the grounds of their view of human nature as fundamentally good.<sup>543</sup> Accordingly, the Korean Church needs to emphasise the work of the Holy Spirit for inward change of the saints rather than simple self-discipline for sanctification.

#### 5.2.2.5.6 The Unification Church

The Unification Church was founded by Sun-Myoung Moon in 1954. It is a representative heresy in South Korea, which interprets the Bible selectively. Its doctrine of sanctification is to purify the corrupt blood in the human body through S. M. Moon's selection of suitable marital partners, which is called the sacred ceremonies of marriage.<sup>544</sup> This view originates from Moon's peculiar interpretation of original sin. According to their doctrine, human blood was corrupted by Eve's sexual relations with Satan, who appeared to her in the form of a snake. Satan's blood was physically transmitted to human descendants through sexual relations. Jesus was sinless and succeeded in saving human souls by his death, but failed to save human bodies because he did not marry a sinless woman to give birth to pious descendants. This is the reason why S. M. Moon had to come to save the human body as the Lord of the Second Advent instead of Jesus.<sup>545</sup>

Physical purification is accomplished by *Pigarm*, which is a way to recover the purity of one's blood through sexual relations with the other sex who had had sexual relations with Moon.<sup>546</sup> S. Matczak interpreted the physical salvation of the Unification Church as the basis of the political, economic, and social salvation.<sup>547</sup> H. W. Richardson views the Unification Church in a positive light as an indigenized Christianity.<sup>548</sup> However, Moon's doctrine of sanctification is an unbiblical heresy. His religion is a mixture between Christianity and Korean shamanism. In 1994, the Unification Church had a membership of 550,000 followers in Korea, with 1,216 ministers and 502 churches.<sup>549</sup>

---

<sup>543</sup> Mencius said, "There is no man who is not good, as there is no water which does not flow downwards". Quoted by Fung Yu-Lan, *op.cit.*, quoted by Lin Yutang, ed., and tr., *The Wisdom of Confucius* (New York: Random House, 1938), p.276.

<sup>544</sup> James Huntley Grayson, *Korea-A Religious History* (New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 1989, revised 2002), p.211.

<sup>545</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>546</sup> Cf. Dong-Ju Lee, "Why do we call the Unification a Heresy?," *Ministry & Theology* 70 (Apr., 1995), p.209. In 1957 Dr. Sa-Hun Shin disclosed the lineage of a circle of *Pigarm*. Moon's *Pigarm* was traced to Deuk-Eun Jung, who was a disciple of Kuk-Ju Hwang. *Ibid.*, p. 208.

<sup>547</sup> Matczak, S., *Gott in der christliche Tradition und in der Vereinigungskirche*, Moefellden-Walldorf, 1979, p.41; D. J. Lee, *op.cit.*, p. 205.

<sup>548</sup> Recharadson, H. W., *Theologische Aspekte der Vereinigungskirche*, in: *Neuen Religionen-Heil oder Unheil*, hg.v.K.E.Becker/H.P.Schreier (London:n.p., 1982), p. 36f; D. J. Lee, *op.cit.*, p. 206.

<sup>549</sup> James Huntley Grayson, *Korea-A Religious History* (New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 1989, revised 2002), p.211.

## 5.3 A Reformed Doctrine of Sanctification for the Korean Context

### 5.3.1 Balanced Theological Views on the Doctrine of Sanctification

#### 5.3.1.1 The Balance between the Grace of God and Human Responsibility

Sanctification is God's work, which is supported by the statement that "God will sanctify the believers wholly so that their whole spirit, soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of Christ" and the statement that "He who calls you is faithful, and he will do it" (1 Thess. 5:23-24). Jesus asked God to sanctify his disciples (Jn. 17:17). Sanctification was also described as the work of Christ (Jn.17:19; 1Cor.1:30; Eph. 5:26; Heb. 2:11; 10:10,14; 13:2), and especially as the work of the Holy Spirit (Rom. 15: 16; 2 Thes. 2:13; 1 Pet. 1:2 and 1 Cor. 6:11).

Positional sanctification is accomplished "once and for all" when we believe in Christ as our Saviour (Heb. 10:29; and 1 Cor. 6:11). Real sanctification is, however, an ongoing work of God (1 Thes. 5:23). At the same time, sanctification is delineated as human responsibility. Christians must remain in a sanctified state (1 Tim. 2:15; 1 Thes. 4:7) by living in conformity to their holy state (*cf.* Eph. 5:3-5). It means that they must struggle with sin (Rom. 6:19, 22), pursue (Heb. 12:14), and achieve (2 Cor. 7:1) holiness (Heb.12:10). Believers are thus both passive and active in their sanctification.

The Korean Church has the two extreme views on sanctification. One is that by God believers were predestined for salvation and are already sanctified in Christ. Therefore, they do not have to struggle with sanctification. The other is that believers must achieve their sanctification themselves because they cannot enter heaven without it. The former leads to antinomianistic libertinism, while the latter results in pessimism because of human sinfulness. The latter is also in danger of the "ethicization" of sanctification, which deals with their outward behaviours only, not inward holiness. It necessarily leads to Pharisaism. Accordingly, the Korean church needs to maintain the balance between God's grace and human responsibility in order to awake human sinfulness as well as to ensure salvation.<sup>550</sup> It implies the view that they are sanctified both inwardly and outwardly, by accepting the initiative and dynamicity of grace that work in them.

#### 5.3.1.2 Harmony between Spirituality and Rationality

---

<sup>550</sup> Cf. Han-Su Lee, "Re-illumination of the Theology of Hyung-Nyong Park," *Presbyterian Theological Quarterly*, serial no. 268 (Spr., 2002):173-177. (In Korean).

Augustus Nicodemus Lopes points out the problems of our contemporary Neo-Pentecostals as follows.

There are pastors who presume to have control over the Holy Spirit, and to bestow him through the laying on of their hands, to cast him upon people by blowing upon them, etc. These super-pastors even determine when the Spirit will heal or act, for they schedule healing and liberation meetings in advance, things which not even the Lord Jesus and his apostles did.<sup>551</sup>

Such an attitude towards the Holy Spirit is prevalent in Korea. It ought to be censured because the Lord of our work is not us, but God.

For sanctification, we must focus on the Word rather than on any miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit because the Word is the primary means of sanctification. All spiritual gifts and signs need to be examined with the Bible because the Spirit never works in contradiction of what he has revealed in the Bible. True spirituality does not mean irrational ecstasy; it is rather based on rationality. Spirituality goes beyond rational limits on the basis of rationality.

Calvin criticized spiritualists for neglecting the written word of God and thinking too much of the immediate guide of the Holy Spirit. Wesley also attacked enthusiasts for considering their dream, vision, and experience as God's revelation, and criticized their antinomian tendency.<sup>552</sup> Their critiques of spiritualistic enthusiasts can be applied to the Korean enthusiasts. If the proper interpretation of the Bible had been given to those who believed the time-limited eschatology that was prevalent in the Korean Church, they could have prevented the psychological and monetary harm that resulted from the movement. Christian prophecy prevalent in the local church or prayer retreat centres, which is similar to the direct revelation of the Holy Spirit or the shamanistic prophecy, should be recognised and censured by theologians and pastors through strict investigation of its unbiblical and syncretistic tenets.

### **5.3.1.3 Maintaining the Balance between Antinomianism and Legalism**

Antinomians claimed that Christians do not need the law because they are under the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit, and were convinced that they were already perfect in holiness due to Christ's perfect redemption. However, such claims are wrong in light of the Bible.

---

<sup>551</sup> Augustus Nicodemus Lopes. "Calvin, Theologian of the Holy Spirit: the Holy Spirit and the Word of God," *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology* 15 (1997), p. 47.

<sup>552</sup> See, '5.1.1 Their Responses to the Theological Trends of Their Times' on this thesis.

Calvin emphasised the third use of the law for Christian life. Though the law cannot sanctify us alone, when the Holy Spirit uses it, it becomes a precious means of sanctification. Sanctification is accomplished by the Holy Spirit through his use of the Word.

Sanctification is not automatically accomplished, it is achieved through our active participation in using the means of grace, e.g., reading the Bible, studying the Bible, service, prayer, works of mercy, the Lord's Supper, baptism, fasting, communion with other Christians and so on. It is very dangerous to depend solely upon the guidance of the Holy Spirit for sanctification. The diligent means of grace keeps us from withdrawing from a holy condition.

In order to avoid being too legalistic, the Korean Church needs to emphasise the objective sanctification accomplished in Christ. Recognition that God has already achieved our sanctification in Christ, and of God's sovereign work that will fulfil it in our life through His Spirit, can reduce legalistic obsession and a hypocritical lifestyle.<sup>553</sup> The Korean Presbyterians see good works as a sign of salvation, so they try to do as many good works as possible. Their efforts were, however, accomplished mainly in the realm of individual piety rather than the works of mercy or social reform. Human failings lead them to be hypocritical or to give up their efforts for sanctification.

God's sanctifying grace should be sufficiently emphasised prior to our obedience to the law.<sup>554</sup> The way to reach our subjective sanctification is not through some obsessive self-examination, but through free obedience to God's guidance.

### **5.3.1.4 Maintaining the Balance between Instantaneousness and Gradualness**

The Korean Presbyterian Church has emphasised gradual rather than instant sanctification. It means sanctification is achieved by our consciousness efforts with God's common grace through the consistent use of the means of sanctification. However, we need God's extraordinary grace for sanctification because of "the wickedness and perversity of our flesh" as Calvin mentioned.<sup>555</sup> Instantaneousness is mainly ascribed to the first conversion of sinners by God's strong power, but it can also be ascribed to the lapsed Christians, who are invited to return to God. It is God's extraordinary grace, which is given to the elect. In this regard, it relates to the sovereignty of God and his predestination. If we only stress instantaneous sanctification, we will neglect human responsibility to use the means of grace diligently. Conversely, if we only stress gradual sanctification which depends upon

---

<sup>553</sup> Cf., Jae-Duk Kim, *op. cit.*, pp.228-232.

<sup>554</sup> Cf. L. J. Richard posits that "without the indwelling Spirit, the Gospel could lead only to positivism or legalism." Lucien Joseph Richard, *The Spirituality of John Calvin* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1974), p. 180.

<sup>555</sup> See '5.1.4.3 Gradualness and Instantaneousness.'



human cooperation, we tend towards pessimism when we submit to the power of sin.

Accordingly, the Korean Church should emphasise both instantaneousness and gradualness.

## 5.3.2 Sanctification in Individual Life

### 5.3.2.1 The Proper Motivation of Christian Life

The aim of most Korean Christians is worldly success, which is the inheritance of shamanism, Confucianism, and American capitalism, but not the Bible. Such a worldly motivation of Christian life makes believers take advantage of God as an instrument for their worldly happiness. As James H. Grayson puts it, Korean Christians expect material blessings as the reward for their good works or faithful religious life, just as shamanists try to obtain worldly blessings from *Sansin* (the Mountain God) by propitiating him.<sup>556</sup> In this respect, the real lord of their life is still selfish desire, not God. This is the most serious problem facing Korean Christians, and the main reason that unbelievers distrust the church. The Christians' desire for worldly success leads them to lifestyles similar to those of unbelievers.

In view of sanctification, the motivation of our life is to bring glory to God, not to obtain worldly success for us. We are not our possession, but God's possession. What we possess in this world are gifts from God. One day, we must account before God of our use of the resources that we received from him. The proper recognition of the motivation of our life enables us to use our gifts, time, energy, resources for the glory of God. In order not to forget our life for the glory of God, we need to meditate on our future before God, deny ourselves and bear our cross. As L. J. Richard puts it, sanctification is "found only by adopting an attitude of contempt towards" the world.<sup>557</sup>

### 5.3.2.2 Simple and Moderate Lifestyle

A simple lifestyle is the way to moderate our excessive desires in order to devote ourselves to the Lord. An extravagant lifestyle distracts us from meditating upon God and the next world. It also invokes unnecessary competition in our lives. A moderate lifestyle enables us to save extra-money for others and the work of the Lord, while the Neo-liberal globalization policy is widening the gap between the rich and the poor.<sup>558</sup>

As Calvin admonished the Genevan people to live so, Christians should live diligently

---

<sup>556</sup> James H. Grayson, "Elements of Protestant Accommodation to Korean Religious Culture: A Personal Ethnographic Perspective," *Missiology* 23 (Ja., 1995): 55.

<sup>557</sup> Lucien Joseph Richard, *The Spirituality of John Calvin* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1974), pp.175-176.

<sup>558</sup> Guen-Seok Yang, "Globalization and Christian Responses," *Theology Today*, Vol.62, no.1 (Apr., 2005): 41.

for the Lord, not for the purpose of self-glory and complacency. A simple lifestyle helps us live as light and salt in the midst of our selfish society. A capitalistic society necessarily produces relatively poor people. It needs a generous Christian lifestyle, which means donating our own things to the poor in conformity to the teaching of the Bible (Deut. 15:7ff; Gal.2:10; 1 Tim. 6:17-18). To make our lifestyle simple is a way to help and love others.<sup>559</sup>

Another aspect of a moderate life is sexual purity. Though modern people tend to be liberal in sexual relationships, the Bible says that our body is the temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 6:9) and the instrument of righteousness (Rom. 6:13). Hence, the church should guide the saints to the purification of the Holy Spirit and advise them not to expose themselves to obscene environments, e.g., obscene internet sites, pornographic video tapes and lascivious phone chatting.

A simple and moderate lifestyle is the mark of sanctified life,<sup>560</sup> which is necessary for contemporary Korean Christians.

### 5.3.2.3 Committing Self-Anxiety to the Lord with Faith

Modern people suffer from uncertainty due to the “radical discontinuities and fragmentations” which modernity produces.<sup>561</sup> Uncertainty is a state that people find very hard to tolerate. It makes them anxious about their future and leads them to adhere to worldly materialism and success in order to sooth their anxious hearts. Accordingly, if the church fails to help the saints have the assurance of heaven and God’s gracious sovereignty to guide them, she cannot expect any sanctified life from her members. Christians’ firm faith in God’s power looking after them enables them to commit their anxiety about life to God, to love their neighbours with their hearts, and to hope in the final salvation of God. Strong faith in Jesus’ redemption and his power in overcoming sin and Satan’s power is the origin of our sanctification. This faith results from listening to the word of God. When they listen to God’s word, the Spirit generates faith in their hearts. The faith to entrust their anxiety to God is produced by experiencing God’s unconditional care of his children or some reward given when they obey the commandments of God. Accordingly, the church should help the saints practise faith by preaching, bible study, or the witnesses of God’s

---

<sup>559</sup> Cf. Young-Gi Hong also holds that “the lifestyles of Christian disciples should be simple, sharing and serving, as well as repenting from selfishness, pride, and materialism.” Young-Gi Hong, “Revisiting Church Growth in Korean Protestantism: A Theological Reflection,” *International Review of Mission*, Vol. 89, no.353 (2000): 196.

<sup>560</sup> John H. Leith also describes the simple life as “a hallmark of the Reformed life-style”. John H. Leith, *Introduction to the Reformed Tradition: a Way of Being the Christian Community* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981), p.230.

<sup>561</sup> Young-Gi Hong, “Encounter with Modernity: the ‘McDonalization’ and ‘Charismatization’ of Korean Mega-Churches,” *International Review of Mission*, Vol. 92, no.365 (Apr., 2003): 249.

grace in life.

Committing anxiety to God in faith (Ps. 37:5; 55:22; Pro.16:3; Mt.6:25-34; Phil.4:6; 1Pet. 5:7) and putting our hope in God, not in wealth, are ways to foster love towards neighbours and to do good works (1 Tim.6:17-19). They are the marks of a sanctified character.

### **5.3.2.4 Making Disciples**

A problem of the Korean Church is the separation between faith and life. Though there are many Christians in Korea, there are not many disciples. This results from quantitativism and materialism. The local churches have struggled to get many newcomers, but have not taught them discipleship for fear that they will leave the churches. The pursuit of quantitative growth has produced dualistic Christians, in other words, nominal Christians. They are good Christians in church, but often not good citizens. Consequently, the Korean Church cannot wield social influence and spiritual power in the current situation.<sup>562</sup>

To solve dualism, the church should maintain the balance between quantitative and qualitative growth. Good quality generally produces quantitative growth.<sup>563</sup> Good quality signifies the maturity of church members. Mature Christians means the true disciples of Jesus Christ. They are not only Christians in their church but also good witnesses to Jesus in their society. Their words and deeds are largely congruent with their confession of faith. They do not avoid their cross even when it damages their property and fame. According to the teaching of Jesus, they pursue love, justice, and peace in their fields. Henceforce, the Korean Church, through the example of its leaders, should focus on making disciples, not only on quantitative growth.

## **5.3.3 Sanctification in Political, Social Life**

### **5.3.3.1 Stewardship for Community and Environment**

Sanctification is the recovery of the image of God, which includes our appropriate relationship with our natural environment. God created us as stewards to rule over this world as his substitutes (Gen.1:26-28) and to manage his belongings, which include ourselves, our society, and God's created nature. This stewardship consists of self-control and our service to society and nature in accordance with God's will (Lk 12:42ff.; Tit. 1:7; 1 Pet. 4:10). The image of God involves our rule over this world, which is wielded in the form of preservation and management, not exploitation.<sup>564</sup>

---

<sup>562</sup> Young-Gi Hong, "Revisiting Church Growth in Korean Protestantism: A Theological Reflection" *International Review of Mission*, Vol. 89, no.353 (2000):196.

<sup>563</sup> Christian A. Schwarz, *Natural Church Development* (Beds: BCGA, 1996), p.68.

<sup>564</sup> Cf. Hong-Suk Choi, "Reformed Approach for the Preservation of Creation Order," *Presbyterian*

In his time, Calvin's doctrine of stewardship had a practical usefulness in the Genevan experience of floods of refugees that strained the resources of the city. Our world today is also experiencing great population growth, shortages of some resources, and probably permanent damage to agricultural soil, air and water because of careless management of the earth, the destruction of the ozone layer, and the treatment of effluent waste from nuclear reactors.<sup>565</sup> Korea's rapid industrialization resulted in serious pollution of the environment. Now is the time when stewardship should be more important than quantitativism.<sup>566</sup> While quantitativism and materialism deprive nature of its resources, stewardship restrains our excessive desire to be rich.<sup>567</sup> In the reformed perspective, this world will be preserved even after the second coming of Jesus Christ, not by being destroyed, but transformed.<sup>568</sup> Accordingly, Korean Christians need to participate in the preservation of the environment by joining forces with all people on earth, including people with different religious backgrounds and concerns.<sup>569</sup>

In addition to environmental problems, abortion is one of the big problems facing Korean society. In 1993, 4,110 embryos or fetuses were aborted a day, 171 an hour, 2.85 a minute, and 1 a 21 seconds.<sup>570</sup> According to statistics of 2005, aborted fetuses were estimated as 1.5 -2.0 million a year, meaning that a foetus was aborted every 3 - 4 seconds. Korea became the country with the second highest abortion rate.<sup>571</sup> 85.1 percent of Korean women and 96.6 percent of 237 legal professionals polled agree to abortion. However, given that Elizabeth said, "Blessed are you among women, and blessed is the child you will bear!" when Mary went to Elizabeth soon after Gabriel left her (Lk. 1:38-42), we can see that a fertilized egg was regarded as a life.<sup>572</sup> Accordingly, preventing the conception of a fertilized egg or aborting embryos ends life. Hence, the Korean church should object to all kinds of abortion and some medical means of birth control. Religious groups fear that "cloning will lead to designer babies and embryo screening." The Vatican condemned

---

*Theological Quarterly*, Vol.59, no. 3 (Au.,1992):132. (In Korean).

<sup>565</sup> Cf. Chai-Sik Chung, "Global Theology for the Common Good: Lessons from Two Centuries of Korean Christianity," *International Review of Mission*, Vol.85, no.339 (1996):535; Suk-Ho Moon, "The Korean Church and Environment Preservation Problem],” *Presbyterian Theological Quarterly*, Vol.59, no. 3 (Au.,1992):8.

<sup>566</sup> Cf. Eun-Sik Cho, "Korean Church Growth in 1970s: Its Factors and Problems,” *The Asia Journal of Theology*, Vol.10, no.2 (1996): 359.

<sup>567</sup> Suk-Ho Moon, *op. cit.*, p.15.

<sup>568</sup> Hong-Suk Choi, *op. cit.*, pp.129-130. (In Korean).

<sup>569</sup> Eun-Sik Cho, *op. cit.*, p.536.

<sup>570</sup> Chun-Ki Han, "The Bible and Abortion,” *Presbyterian Theological Quarterly*, Vol.61, no. 1 (sp., 1994): 221. (In Korean).

<sup>571</sup> Jung-Jae Lee, "Journalist, Jung Jae Lee's Blog." <<http://blog.joins.com/jjyeehik>> (January 10, 2006); "The Reason Refusing Abortion," <<http://www.reportworld.co.kr/data/358/F357546.html>> (In Korean).

<sup>572</sup> *Ibid.*, p.231.

cloning “comparing it to the medical experiments done by Nazis in World War II.”<sup>573</sup> Cloning differs from artificial insemination on the point that the former is to produce an embryo by removing the nucleus from the unfertilized egg and planting the nucleus of the somatic cell in it, the latter is a combination between a sperm and an egg in a tube. The destruction of the embryo through cloning is tantamount to killing a man.<sup>574</sup> Fortunately, no human clone has been reported yet.

Briefly, Christians will be judged by God about our stewardship in this world. If our deed serves our community and nature according to God’s will, we will be praised; if not, we will be rebuked (Lk. 16:1ff.). This stewardship is an important aspect of sanctified life.

### **5.3.3.2 Social Order and Authority**

Modern people abhor authoritarianism, so most leaders try to show themselves not to be authoritarian. However, not to be authoritarian is not the same as denying appropriate authority. God approves of authoritative systems in our society ruling the world. For example, parents, teachers, pastors and civil servants serve their children, church members and citizens with authority. As Calvin put it, the image of God in man expresses itself in orderly relation to his fellow creatures and his environment.<sup>575</sup> As genuine order is “a reflection of God’s glory” as the mark of sanctified life, Christians should esteem all kinds of just authorities to maintain social order.<sup>576</sup>

In the democratic age, the authority of leaders stems from their ability and character to induce the support of their voluntary followers, and not on insistence or orders. The conventional “one-directional, hierarchical way of communication” is not adequate for globalized and information-oriented society. Accordingly, leaders need to improve “interactive communication relationship.”<sup>577</sup> The members of an organization ought to esteem their elected leader, as long as he does not lead them astray.

The Korean church needs to teach Christians to respect the authority of decent leaders.

### **5.3.3.3 Participation in Social Justice**

Until now, the tendency has been that those who are concerned with social justice are not concerned with personal piety, and those who are concerned with personal piety are hostile to the church’s involvement in the pursuit of social justice. We should, however, find the balance between the two. Sanctification is the recovery of God’s image. As God’s rule is

---

<sup>573</sup> “Korean Cloning Feat Stirs Religious Cancer,” *Christian Century*, Vol.121, no.5 (Mar., 2004): 16.

<sup>574</sup> *Alabama Baptist*, May 9, 2002.

<sup>575</sup> Calvin, *Comm. Jn.*, 17:11; CO, 51, 208-209; *Institutes* 1.15.4.

<sup>576</sup> Lucien Joseph Richard, *The Spirituality of John Calvin* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1974), p. 112.

<sup>577</sup> Guen-Seok Yang, “Globalization and Christian Responses,” *Theology Today*, Vol.62, no.1 (Apr., 2005): 44.

righteous, human rule, especially Christian rule should be righteous. This is the origin of Christian participation for social justice in the perspective of the doctrine of sanctification. God rules this world by Christians' speech and action based on biblical principles in the Holy Spirit. It is the way for God to extend the kingdom of God. It can be understood in the same perspective that the church is the light and salt of the world. That is, it explains the function of the church to keep the world from the corruption of sin and injustice. Andre Bieler describes it as follows.

The faithful presence of the church is indispensable to social life and all its aspects. The church ought to be a leaven inspiring and generating social, political, and economic life. If the church is dead, if the church exists but is not the community of the members of the body of Christ, if the church is present but does not impart to society as a whole the impulse of her constant regeneration by God's Word, the church herself co-operates in the propagation of social disorder.<sup>578</sup>

Social reformation is the goal of soul salvation and a means of soul salvation. The goal of Christian life is to give glory to God through our good work, namely sanctification, which comprehends pious works and merciful works and our works for social justice.

Unfortunately, H. N. Park did not stress social concern as the duty of the church.<sup>579</sup> Y. H. Na argues that Park concentrated on the next world rather than this world in his doctrine of the next world<sup>580</sup> and consequently, the Korean conservative church makes little of social responsibility.<sup>581</sup> Conversely, D. M. Chang holds that H. N. Park participated in the March the First Movement and was imprisoned because of his sermon related to political resistance to Japan and his objection to Shrine worship. Later, Park criticized Eui-Hwan Kim as a Neo-evangelist, who insisted that Christianity should respond to social issues.<sup>582</sup> This fact showed that there is the difference between Parks' early and later thoughts.<sup>583</sup> Though Chang's analysis generally seems relevant, he misses the point that E. H. Kim manifested a conservative political standpoint in 1973 and in his book, *An Introduction to*

---

<sup>578</sup> Biéler André, *The social humanism of Calvin*, tr. by Paul T. Fuhrmann (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1965), p. 96; cf. *Institutes* 4.20.2.

<sup>579</sup> *The Complete Collection of H. N. Park, VI. Ecclesiology* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Seoul: Hankuk kidokkyo kyoyuk yonkuwon, 1988), pp. 52f.

<sup>580</sup> *The Complete Collection of H. N. Park, VII. The Doctrine of the Next World* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Seoul: Hankuk kidokkyo kyoyuk yonkuwon, 1988), pp. 45-46.

<sup>581</sup> Yong-Hwa Na, "A Developmental Evaluation of Hyung-Nyong Park's Theology," *Presbyterian Theological Quarterly* 252 (1997): 85.

<sup>582</sup> H. N. Park, *The Complete Collection of H. N. Park*, IX, p.108.

<sup>583</sup> Dong-Min Chang, "The Theology of Dr. Hyung-Nyong Park," *Kidokkyosasang* (Mar., 2002): 145-148; *A Study of H. N. Park's Theology* (Seoul: Institute of Korean Church History Studies, 1998), p.426, pp.307-314.



*Modern Theology* (1989) criticized Neo-evangelism, by comparing it with evangelism.<sup>584</sup>

The interpretation of Romans 13 was the point at issue. The non-KNCC group construed it as unconditional obedience to the rulers, while the KNCC construed it as limited and conditional obedience to the rulers. The condition meant that the rulers should obey God's will to protect people and to promote their rights and peace and wealth. Otherwise, the church can and must resist the rulers. In my view, the early church seems to have cooperated with the rule of the Roman Empire rather than criticize her. But John the Baptist and all true prophets in the Old Testament strongly asked the rulers and people to follow only God and his justice, not any selfish power or unjustifiable interest. Jesus' order, "give Caesar what is Caesar's can be interpreted as his intention to protect people from the military attack of the Roman Empire. When the church faces an unjust regime, the church should play the role of God's prophet in opposing its excesses and demonstrating where necessary.<sup>585</sup> It is not cowardly evasion but a wise and realistic choice. We need to remember the destruction of Judea in A.D 90, in spite of Jewish political and military struggles against the Roman Empire. The church should be pure like a pigeon and wise like a snake in social reformation. It implies that on the one hand, the church should be active on social issues, but discreet.<sup>586</sup>

If Christians equip themselves with God's wisdom and power, their social sanctification will be accomplished in God's grace. Christians need to cooperate with citizens to reform society according to God's will, which does not contradict human rights and real happiness, for God created humankind and knows best the conditions for our happiness.

### 5.3.3.4 Leadership of Culture and Science

As S. H. Lee puts it, in the early Korean church the sermons on Christian life were attractive to Korean people because of Korean Confucian culture.<sup>587</sup> Education and medicine for the Korean people were the main strategies of the early missionaries. Korean Christianity has functioned as the transmitter of western civilization since the early

---

<sup>584</sup> Eui-Hwan Kim, "The Problem of Korean Church's Involvement in the Politics," in *Shinhak Jinam* (March, 1973): 25, 50; *An Introduction to Modern Theology* (Seoul: Kaehyukjueuishinhaenghyuphoe, 1989), pp.180-186.

<sup>585</sup> My view corresponds with the fourth of the six conditions of a legitimate revolution, which are suggested by modern Reformed theologians: 1) The cause must be just, 2) It should be the last resort, 3) It should be led by a lawful authority, 4) There should be a reasonable hope of victory, 5) A due proportion should exist between the good that may probably be accomplished and the probable evil effect, 6) It should be rightly conducted through the use of right means. Stephen Charles Mott, *Biblical Ethics and Social Change* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), pp. 187-190.

<sup>586</sup> Cf. Richard J., *Issues of Theological Warfare: Evangelicals and Liberals* (Grand Rapids: WmB. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1972), pp.199-200.

<sup>587</sup> Sang-Heung Lee, *op. cit.*, p.184.

missions.

However, recent Korean materialism and science threatened Korean Christianity. This phenomenon is undesirable in the perspective of sanctification, which is connected with our rule over the world according to God's will. As God is the origin of knowledge, Christians can lead the culture and science of the world in the Spirit. When those follow the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the sanctification of the world will be achieved gradually. Christians should not close themselves to the worldly field, but they should be led and directed by the Spirit. Wisdom from God enables Christians to transform and rule the world as the substitutes of God. This is the basis of the sanctification of the world. When Christians become the leaders of the world through their service and ability, the Korean Church will increase in membership and will give glory to God.<sup>588</sup>

On the other hand, J. H. Grayson suggests that Korean Christians need to create Korean forms of Christian culture, i.e., art, music and architecture.<sup>589</sup> The reason why Buddhism is familiar to Koreans is that it created Korean Buddhism in arts, sculpture, literature and building. Assimilating itself into Korean tradition, Buddhism could be recognised as a Korean religion. Grayson's suggestion is in accordance with Y.G. Hong's proposal that one of the urgent assignments of the Korean Church is "the contextualization of the gospel with an understanding of Korean culture and modern culture."<sup>590</sup> Christianity should keep the purity of her essential doctrines, but her religious expression needs to reflect traditional Korean style. It will be a way to prevent its alienation from Korean tradition and to secure a firm and deep seat in the Korean disposition. We need to abandon an exclusive attitude to regard Korean culture as uncivilized and idolatrous. While preserving essential Christian doctrines, the Korean church needs to participate in creating Korean Christian culture.

### 5.3.4 The Sanctification of the Church: Purity and Unity

#### 5.3.4.1 Preserving the Truth of the Bible

In modern times, same-sex relationships, abortion, euthanasia, the ordination of gay and lesbian pastors, and the cloning of human beings, pose serious challenges for theological anthropology. If any of them are allowed, the identity of the church as faithful to the Bible will be lost. The Korean Church has prohibited those unbiblical attempts up to now. In this

---

<sup>588</sup> A Talk with Jong-Gu Park, Sung Hun Myung, "Will the Korean Church grow again?," in *The Pastoral Monthly* (Seoul: The Pastoral Monthly Co., Ltd.) 4 (2004): 64. (In Korean).

<sup>589</sup> James Huntley Grayson, *Korea-A Religious History* (New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 1989, revised 2002), p.169.

<sup>590</sup> Young-Gi Hong, "Revisiting Church Growth in Korean Protestantism: A Theological Reflection," *International Review of Mission*, Vol. 89, no.353 (2000):199.

sense, the Korean Church is still conservative in the practice of faith.

The Ecumenical movement must be based on biblical doctrine, not human thought and opinion. John Calvin mentioned that the marks of the true church are the true preaching of the words of God, and the ministering of Sacraments.<sup>591</sup> Wesley aptly noted that the uniqueness of Jesus Christ for our salvation, the Trinity, and original sin are the doctrines to be conserved for true Christianity.<sup>592</sup> H. N. Park described the basic truths of Christianity as “the Trinity, Christ’s divinity, the personality of the Holy Spirit, the inspiration of the whole Bible, miracles, the substitute suffering and death of Christ, His resurrection and ascension, His physical and glorious second advent, resurrection and judgment of everyman, and heaven and hell.”<sup>593</sup> (The translation is mine). Park’s statement of basic Christian doctrines is more specific than those of Calvin and Wesley. With such essential doctrines, the union of the church is based on our confession of “one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all” (Eph.4:5). Unity is confirmed by our participation in one loaf which symbolizes Christ’s body and one Baptism by one Spirit (1 Cor. 10:17; 12:13). The protection of Christianity’s essential doctrines is crucial for the conservation of true Christianity, even though diverse opinions of unessential issues can be tolerated for the sake of unity.<sup>594</sup> Accordingly, the unity of the church is the unity in the agreement on essential doctrines.<sup>595</sup> In this sense, heresies must be continuously investigated and eradicated in the Church, and religious syncretism should be restrained, though it is painstaking. My view is supported by the result of the fourth Gallup Korea’s survey (2004), which reports most Koreans (91.2 percent) deem the problem of pseudo religions to be serious.<sup>596</sup>

As Calvin and Wesley pointed out, the purification of church doctrines in accordance with the Bible is vital to sanctification, for we become holy by truth (John 17: 17). In the light of purification of doctrines, the schism of the Korean Presbyterian Church between Hapdong, Kijang and Tonghap seems to be unavoidable because of their theological differences. In any case, the essential truth of Christianity must be purely preserved by the

---

<sup>591</sup> *Institutes* 4.1.9.

<sup>592</sup> Geoffrey Wainwright, “Schisms, Heresies & The Gospel: Wesleyan Reflections on Evangelical Truth & Ecclesial Unity,” in *Ancient & Postmodern Christianity: Paleo-Orthodoxy in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Essays in Honor of Thomas C Oden*, ed., by Kenneth Tanner & Christopher A. Hall (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2002), pp. 191-192.

<sup>593</sup> *The Complete Collection of H. N. Park*, XIII (Seoul: Hankuk kidokkyo kyoyuk yonkuwon, 1988), p. 304.

<sup>594</sup> *Institutes* 4.1.12; 4.2.1; William G. Rusch mentions that the unity in the New Testament is “a unity that presupposes diversity.” William G. Rusch, *A Movement Towards Church Unity Ecumenism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), p.4.

<sup>595</sup> The Korean Presbyterian Church chose the 12 Creeds of the Presbyterian Church and the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms. Kil-Sung Kim, *Reformed Theology and the Church* (Seoul: Chongshin Univ. Press, 1996), p.56.

<sup>596</sup> Gallup Korea (2004), p.138. (In Korean).

church for purposes of sanctification.

#### 5.3.4.2 Self-Denial for Unity and Cooperation

A survey of opinions for the development of cooperation in the Korean Church, showed four solutions. First, it is to prevent the church from being split into too many denominations (52.9 percent). Secondly, it is to promote the quality of pastors (30.5 percent). Thirdly, it is to abolish the self-centred individualism of the local churches (29.2 percent). Fourthly, it is for pastors to give up quantitativism.<sup>597</sup> It is remarkable that two of the four opinions relate to the unity of the church, indicating that the future of the Korean Church depends upon her unity. Unfortunately, H. N. Park did not deal with the unity of the church in his ecclesiology.<sup>598</sup>

The unity of the church is “at the heart of the Christian faith” and is “God’s will for his people.”<sup>599</sup> This is delineated in Jesus’ prayer to ask the Father for the unity of his disciples in the triune God (Jn. 17:22-23). Accordingly, if a matter is not concerned with truth, it must not be a cause of the split of the church.<sup>600</sup> Self-conceit, pride and self-centred desire can cause the church to split.<sup>601</sup> As Calvin, Wesley and Barth held, self-denial is necessary for church leaders to keep oneness in Christ. Now is the time to deny ourselves to maintain unity in Christ, not the time to split the church for our own benefit. In Korean Christian history, if self-denial had been practised, the split between the Koryo group and the other group could have been avoided. The recent union between the Kaehyuk denomination and the Hapdong denomination is very encouraging. To keep this union together needs our self-denial and rational concession in conformity to Jesus’ humility and patience.

The unity of the church does not only mean one visible structure, namely, one denomination, but also the interdependence and cooperation between the local churches, which are spiritually one body of Christ.<sup>602</sup> Accordingly, as Y. G. Hong aptly puts it, the local churches should keep a symbiotic relationship with one another, maintaining the balance between “independency and interdependency” to build the kingdom of God. This organic relationship is found in the early churches, including house churches (Acts 2:47;

---

<sup>597</sup> *Kiddokgongbo [Christianity Public Newspaper]* p. 8. (Sept. 1994). Quoted by Rhee-Kwan Kim, *A History of the Korean- American Church Division* (Seoul: Christian Literature Press, 1995), p. 115.

<sup>598</sup> *The Complete Collection of H. N. Park, VI. Ecclesiology* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Seoul: Hankuk kidokkyo kyoyuk yonkuwon, 1988), pp. 185-188; Yong-Hwa Na, “A Developmental Evaluation of Hyung Nyong Park’s Theology,” *Presbyterian Theological Quarterly* 252 (1997): 83-84.

<sup>599</sup> William G. Rusch, *A Movement Towards Church Unity Ecumenism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), p.16.

<sup>600</sup> Calvin, *Institutes*, 4.1.12.

<sup>601</sup> Calvin, *Institutes*, 4.1.16.

<sup>602</sup> Cf. Calvin, *Institutes*, 4.1.5.

9:31; 11:22, 26; 14:27).<sup>603</sup> In this vein, Korean mission agencies and missionaries need to cooperate with one another<sup>604</sup> with mission agencies and missionaries from other countries on the mission field as well.<sup>605</sup> It is time that we need partnership, that is to say, the consciousness that “we are made partners together with Christ in the ministry” for God’s kingdom. Large churches should make efforts “to establish a mutually supportive relationship with smaller churches” for the expansion of God’s kingdom.<sup>606</sup>

#### 5.3.4.3 Maintaining the Balance between Institutionalism and Individualism

Institutionalism is defined as the view that approaches the church primarily in terms of its visible structures, especially the rights and powers of its office. According to Avery Dulles, the church as an institution stresses “teaching, sanctifying and governing.” This is ascribed to the Roman Catholic Church of the late Middle Ages and the Korean mega churches.<sup>607</sup> The tendency of modern Christianity is closer to individualism than institutionalism according to the individual trend of modern society.<sup>608</sup> The fourth Gallup Korea’s survey (2004) reports that 72.5 percent of Korean Protestants and 83.9 percent of Korean Catholics believe that they have only to practise what is right in their view rather than practise what is laid down by religious institutions.<sup>609</sup> Religious individualism is the tendency of individuals to disconnect “the substantive tenets” from “any formalized set of doctrines or creeds,” and reassemble them to construct individual religious views.<sup>610</sup> Individualism is based on the freedom of faith and conscience.<sup>611</sup> In the present time, satellite broadcasting and internet broadcasting are accelerating individualism by enabling individuals to listen to their favourite sermon and participate in their favourite service.

---

<sup>603</sup> Young-Gi Hong, “Revisiting Church Growth in Korean Protestantism: A Theological Reflection,” *International Review of Mission*, Vol. 89, no.353 (2000): 198.

<sup>604</sup> “Statement on the Mission of the Korean Churches in the New Millennium: Council of Presbyterian Churches in Korea International Consultation on Korean Churches’ Mission around the World, Seoul, Korea, 23-27 May 1999,” *International Review of Mission*, Vol.89, no.353 (Apr., 2000): 26-27.

<sup>605</sup> Steve S. C. Moon, “The Recent Korean Missionary Movement: A Record of Growth, and More Growth Needed,” *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, Vol. 27, no.1 (Jan. 2003): 14.

<sup>606</sup> Young-Gi Hong, *op. cit.*, p.198.

<sup>607</sup> Avery Robert Dulles, *Models of the Church* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1974), p.42.

<sup>608</sup> Robert Wuthnow mentions that “individuation in ideology and individuation in social structure seems to be prominent features of modern society.” See Robert Wuthnow, “Sociology of Religion,” in Neil J, Smelser ed., *Handbook of Sociology* (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1988), pp. 473-509; Lucien Joseph Richard, *The Spirituality of John Calvin* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1974), pp.184-185.

<sup>609</sup> Gallup Korea (2004), pp.115-116.

<sup>610</sup> Robert Wuthnow, *op. cit.*, p.485.

<sup>611</sup> Wolfgang Beinert, “Die Rezeption und ihre Bedeutung für Leben und Lehre der Kirche,” in Beinert ed., *Glaube als Zustimmung. Zur Interpretation Kiirchlicher Rezeption-vorgänge* (Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder Verlag, 1991), p.43. “Innerster Grund der Legitimatät von Nicht-Rezeption lehramtlicher Weisungen durch Individuen ist...theologisch *der Primat des Gewissens und die Freiheit des Glaubensaktes*”

To preserve pure truth, we must avoid two extremes of institutionalism and individualism. Institutionalism should be avoided because it tends to inhibit individuals from performing their critical theological work, to oppress the freedom of individual conscience and to compel people to “blind conformity.”<sup>612</sup> Individualism should be avoided because it tends to be disordered and to deviate from orthodox doctrine. Mauren Junker-Kenny is of the opinion that the more “the civil and private adaptation of the church,” that is, individualism, flourishes, the more important the institutional church becomes. His opinion seems pertinent, given that the institutional church is needed to offer “an identifiable interpretation and model of the contents of the Christian faith.”<sup>613</sup> To prevent “diffusion and syncretism” due to individual interpretation of the Bible, the limitation of the institutional church is necessary. However, the institutional church and her theologians do not have to “thwart the chance of being enriched and challenged by other expressions of the Christian life.”<sup>614</sup> Individual sanctified experience in the Spirit, if based on the Bible, does not have to be neglected, for it enhances the vitality of the church.

In terms of the means of sanctification, institutionalism relates to the view that if anyone participates in the rituals of the church like the Eucharist and Baptism, he or she will be automatically sanctified, while individualism relates to the view that individual real experience in the work of the Holy Spirit is necessary for sanctification. The former is found in the Roman Catholic Church, while the latter is found in the Pietists and spiritualistic sects. Of course, in the light of subjective sanctification, the view of the latter is germane, given that the nominal Christians who belong to the institutional church can be transformed into real Christians only through the work of the Spirit on their inner hearts and outward acts. However, the Holy Spirit generally works on the hearts of the saints through the means of sanctification established in the institutional church. Hence, the function of the institutional church should not be neglected.<sup>615</sup>

Accordingly, the Korean Church needs to maintain the balance between individualism and institutionalism for proper sanctification.<sup>616</sup>

---

<sup>612</sup> Gabriel Daly, “Which Magisterium is authentic?,” *Concilium* 148 (8/1981): 52-55, 53.

<sup>613</sup> Maureen Junker-Kenny, “The Individualization of Faith Modernization, Church Authority, and the Given Truth of the Gospel,” in *Practical Theology-International Perspectives*, ed. by Friedrich Schweitzer and Johannes A. van der Ven (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1999), p. 223; Dietrich Rössler, “Die Einheit der Praktischen Theologie,” in Karl-Ernst Nipkow, Dietrich Rössler, and Friedrich Schweitzer ed., *Praktische Theologie und Kultur der Gegenwart: Ein International Dialogue* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1991), pp.48-49.

<sup>614</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 232-233.

<sup>615</sup> Cf. Calvin held that “the abandonment of the church is always fatal,” for she is the mother of every believer as far as the Spirit works in her. *Institutes*, 4.1.4.

<sup>616</sup> Cf. Lucien Joseph Richard, *op. cit.*, p. 179,184.



#### 5.3.4.4 Purification from Syncretism

*Minjung* theology, which sometimes identifies the spirits of the dead with the Holy Spirit, who is the subject of sanctification, is seriously flawed.<sup>617</sup> Hyun-Kyung Chung regards the Han-ridden spirits as “agents through whom the Holy Spirit has spoken Her compassion and wisdom for life.”<sup>618</sup> The most dangerous threat of religious syncretism is that it eliminates the unique Christian aim of centring on the Spirit of Christ. To keep the pure view of the Holy Spirit, it is necessary for the Korean Church to keep the sound doctrine of sanctification. Furthermore, it should be cautious of the fact that *minjung* theology adopted “the Marxist analysis of the socioeconomic structures.”<sup>619</sup> The Bible does not deny capitalism, though capitalism is inclined to social injustice in certain economic respects. Accordingly, any element of materialistic communism should be eliminated from the Korean Church.

The syncretistic danger inherent in the Pentecostal Church is that it functions similarly to shamanism in healing the sick and prophesying the future. Prophecy, healing, tongues, and the ecstatic experience of spirit possession need to be checked to ascertain whether they are from the Holy Spirit or from other spirits.<sup>620</sup> If they are from the Holy Spirit, those gifts can contribute to our sanctification; otherwise, they will lead Christians to other spirits far away Christ. Furthermore, Christian life, in view of sanctification, ought to focus on the recovery of God’s image beyond our physical need and psychological satisfaction. It is a fundamental way to avoid the temptation of shamanism. In addition, *chi* in modern Korean society is not the Holy Spirit.

Syncretism stemmed from Confucianism as ancestor worship. The Korean Catholic Church suffered five major persecutions by the Choson government: the *Sinyu* Persecution of 1801, the *Urhae* Persecution of 1815, the *Cheonghae* Persecution of 1827, the *Kihae* Persecution of 1839, and the Great Persecution between 1866 and 1871. Ironically, though the early Catholic believers suffered due to their rejection of ancestor worship, in 1940 the Korean Catholic Church allowed ancestral rites, that is, “bowing before a corpse, a tomb or a picture of the deceased; burning incense in front of a corpse or memory of the

---

<sup>617</sup> Yvonne Young-Ja Lee, “Religious Syncretism and a Postimperial Source of Healing in Korea,” in *Religion and Social Policy*, ed. by Paula D. Nesbitt (Walnut Creek, Lanham, New York, Oxford: Altamira Press, 2001), p. 236.

<sup>618</sup> Hyun-Kyung Chung’s presentation at the Seventh Assembly of the World Council of Churches in Canberra, Australia in February 1991, quoted by Daniel J Adams, “Ancestors, Folk Religion, and Korean Christianity,” in *PCKJ*, p. 110.

<sup>619</sup> Jung-Young Lee, “Minjung Theology: A Critical Introduction,” in *An Emerging Theology in World Perspective: Commentary on Korean Minjung Theology*, ed. by Jung Young Lee (Mystic Connecticut: Twenty-Third Publications, 1988), pp.18-19

<sup>620</sup> Cf. Chai-Sik Chung, “Global Theology for the Common Good: Lessons from Two Centuries of Korean Christianity,” *International Review of Mission*, Vol.85, no.339 (1996):532.

deceased.”<sup>621</sup> The Korean Protestant Church was divided on this issue. One group approved of ancestral rites and the other disapproved.<sup>622</sup> The former, the mainstream, regards ancestor worship as an affectionate remembrance of ancestors, which is to keep God’s commandment of honouring our parents. The latter, non-mainstream, views it as idolatry because ancestor worship includes bowing to the spirits of their ancestors.<sup>623</sup> Among the former, there are Young-Tai Pyun, Sung-Bum Yun, and Yong-Gi Cho.<sup>624</sup> In the Korean protestant Church, Confucian *chesa* (ancestral ceremony) has been continually replaced by *Ch’udo yebae* (Christianised ancestral memorial rituals).<sup>625</sup>

Syncretistic things characteristic of Buddhism and Shamanism, such as sacred image worship, fortune telling and choice of a lucky day should be abolished as the practice of sanctification in daily life. Buddhistic pessimism about social sanctification can only be overcome by the power of the Holy Spirit. Purified from syncretistic religious customs and views, sanctification should be based on our right relationship with God revealed in the Bible.

The doctrine of physical sanctification through the *Pigarm* of the Unification Church has been confidently rejected by the Korean Church up to now.

Briefly, the Korean Church needs to emphasise three aspects. Firstly, God is the only origin of blessing. Secondly, the motivation of our life is to give glory to God through our sanctified life. Thirdly, every syncretistic teaching and practice that is not based on the Bible should be abolished.

## 5.4 Conclusion

In this thesis I analysed, criticised and compared the doctrines of sanctification of the three theologians with one another, and applied the results obtained through this research to the Korean context analysed from the perspective of sanctification.

In ‘Chapter 1 Introduction’, I represented the importance of sanctification in the Korean context; gave the reason for choosing the three theologians; and defined “reformed”, the purpose and the goals of this thesis, and research method and procedure.

In ‘Chapter 2 Calvin and Sanctification’, I analysed Calvin’s doctrine of sanctification

---

<sup>621</sup> Myung-Huk Kim, “Historical Analysis of Ancestor Worship in the Korean Church,” in *Christian Alternatives to Ancestor Practices*, ed. by Bong Rin Ro, (Seoul: Word of Life Press/Asian Theological Association), pp.167-168.

<sup>622</sup> *Ibid.*, p.169.

<sup>623</sup> *Minutes of the Sixty-Ninth General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Korea* (Seoul: General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Korea, 1984), pp.339-341.

<sup>624</sup> Daniel J. Adams, “Ancestors, Folk Religion, and Korean Christianity,” in *PCKJ*, pp.100-102.

<sup>625</sup> Cf. James Huntley Grayson, *Korea-A Religious History* (New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 1989, revised 2002), p.166.

and assessed it in view of the Bible.

The positive aspects of Calvin's view of sanctification can be summarized as follows. In the means of sanctification, the balance between the Word and the Spirit should be maintained, for the Spirit works through the Word. Justification and sanctification are distinct, but inseparable. Sanctification is God's work, which accompanies human responsible participation in God's initiative of grace. The Christian is not saved by the institutional device of the church as the Roman Catholic Church insists, but needs to learn the sound teaching of the Bible through the pastors of the Church and be disciplined by the programme of the Church. The reality of our sanctification is hidden in the resurrection of Jesus Christ, but our temporary sanctification is visible in the world by our good works and the fruit of the Holy Spirit. The first conversion of the believer is definitive and instantaneous, but gradual in the whole process of sanctification. Instantaneous sanctification depends upon God's extraordinary grace. Our faith is the primary evidence of sanctification, and good works are the secondary evidence. Asceticism and quietism are undesirable because we have the freedom to enjoy earthly things and the duty to participate enthusiastically in this world in view of occupational calling. The sphere of sanctification is the whole of human life. In the relationship between state and church, the two extremities of theocracy and anarchy must be avoided.

Some negative aspects in Calvin are as follows. 1 Calvin's definition of sanctification is too broad because it includes regeneration, repentance, conversion, and sanctification. Though the theologians of his times generally worked in this manner, his conception needs a more clear distinction because "great confusion arises from this ambiguity of terms." 2 Calvin's teaching on the image of God is rather narrow. He denied that the image of God includes human dominion. 3 His dualistic anthropology was influenced more by Platonism rather than by the Bible. The Bible teaches the unity of both soul and body. 4 Calvin's standpoint that we were sanctified because Christ "has presented us to his Father in his own person"<sup>626</sup> can be legitimate only when his humanity comprises, represents and substitutes our corrupt humanity. However, Christ's humanity represented and substituted our corrupt humanity, but did not embrace it, because his humanity was sinless and ours, sinful. Hence, the sanctification of Christ is connected only with forensic sanctification of our status, but not with the factual transformation of our nature. 5 In the relationship between the Law and the Spirit, the dynamic role of the Spirit needs to be stressed more. 6 Calvin's view of occupational calling is not adequate for modern society because modern society is "no longer a static, but a mobile system" governed by an unavoidable mobility between occupations.<sup>627</sup> 7 In Calvin's theology, the cosmic dimension of sanctification, i.e.

---

<sup>626</sup> Jn.17:19.

<sup>627</sup> Klaus Bockmuehl, "Protestant Ethics: The Spirit and the Word in Action," *Evangelical Review of Theology* 12 (1988):100.

the renewal of the universe as the new heaven and the new earth is underexposed. 8 Calvin's insistence that evil rulers are raised by God in order to punish the wickedness of people is unsound.<sup>628</sup> 9 Calvin's thought that obstinate believers in false religion deserve to be repressed by the sword is not biblical because the New Testament leads us rather to use persuasion to lead unbelievers to Christ.

In 'Chapter 3 Wesley and Sanctification', Wesley's doctrine of sanctification was analysed and criticised from a reformed and biblical view.

Its positive aspects can be summarised as follows. 1 Wesley presented the possibility of Christian social ethics by preparing a position for human responsibility in the frame of *sola gratia* and establishing an ethical subject by forming ethical ego. 2 His maintenance of a balance between gradualness and instantaneousness in sanctification shows the harmony between human effort and God's gift in Christian perfection. 3 His view of sanctification is optimistic in the sense that we can overcome the power of sin because grace is more powerful than sin. 4 His teaching of final justification by good works can be helpful to reform the moral corruption of Christian life, though it has the risk of inclining to the loss of the stability of justification and to justification by faith and works. The necessity of repentance awakes the saints to watch out for all kinds of sins. 5 His efforts for social sanctification and their fruits are exemplary to contemporary Christians. 6 Sanctification by faith seems as probable as justification by faith. 7 His efforts to keep the unity with the Church of England are noteworthy in our days when unity instead of schism is strongly asked. 8 His recommendation of using the diverse means of grace is helpful in avoiding quietism and enthusiasm. 9 His objection to formalism of religion is valid. 10 His stress on human free will or his responsibility to accomplish salvation contributed to world mission.

The negative aspects can be delineated as follows. 1 Wesley's claim that prevenient grace is bestowed on all the people due to Christ's atonement, and removes guilt from original sin when we are born into this world, seems unreasonable. For it is the same as saying that Christ's atonement is effective to all Gentiles before Christ's death. Rather, it is more reasonable to ascribe prevenient grace to common grace due to God's mercy. 2 According to Wesley, 1 John 3:9 reads, "He doth not commit sin," not "True: Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin *habitually*." However, as ποιει can be translated into simple present action or present continuous action, his insistence is not always right. 3 Wesley's view that inbred sin subsists no more because the evil root of sin is destroyed seems self-contradictory given his view that at any time, inbred sin can recur to even the entirely sanctified.<sup>629</sup> 4 His standpoint that a real Christian does not sin is exceedingly high for the common Christian. 5 The fact that Romans 7:7-13 is all in the past tense, but 14-25 is in the present tense, is because it is not the description of a pre-Christian state, but

---

<sup>628</sup> *Institutes* 4.20.25.

<sup>629</sup> Sermon XIV. The Repentance of Believers 1, 20: *Works* 5, 165; Telford, ed. *Letters*, Vol. 5, 203-204.

of present Christian experience. Therefore, Wesley's view of present perfection cannot be supported by Paul's statement.<sup>630</sup> 6 The teaching of perfection in this life is apt to lead people to "subjectivism, moralism," "self-righteousness, and fanaticism."<sup>631</sup> 7 As Charles Wesley pointed out, John Wesley's excessive stress on repentance and experience may lead people to a hysterical experience or an attitude of pretence.<sup>632</sup> 8 Perfection has the danger of causing the perfected person to think wrong that he is infallible in discerning the will of God. 9 With respect to perseverance, Wesley's interpretation of some biblical passages is incorrect.<sup>633</sup>

In 'Chapter 4 Barth and Sanctification', Barth's view of sanctification can be described as follows.

The positive aspects are: 1 Barth presented the personal and relational categories, which are adequate to present "the dynamics of reconciliation within covenant", instead of concepts like the cleaning of corrupt human nature or the elevation of human nature or the second blessing. The image of God is not a quality or something inherent to man, but the proper human relationship with God, fellowmen, and self. Grace is not that of an impersonal power to change human nature, but the gift of God, which offers man the freedom, which empowers him to be a faithful covenant partner of God. 2 He protested against individualism, sectarianism and secularism, by emphasising that the purpose of individual sanctification is not in itself but in service of the sanctification of the world. 3 His emphasis on the objective aspect of the doctrine of sanctification offers us the assurance and security of our salvation because it awakens us to focus not on our subjective feeling, but on the work of God, which was already accomplished and is being accomplished and will be accomplished in Jesus. 4 His emphasis on the sovereignty of God in the process of sanctification strengthens the line of Reformed theology against Arminianism and Pelagianism. 5 Through his struggle with liberalism he converted the criterion of judgment from human experience, philosophy, and science to the Bible. 6 It may be his contribution to interpret  $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$  as the faithfulness of Christ. We live in our belief in His faithfulness. 7 His accentuation of freedom can be helpful to deliver the doctrine of sanctification from the snare of legalism and quietism. 8 His theological ethics as sanctification does not depend on any moral principle or any passages of the Bible, but on God's command in the presence of the Spirit. This offers dynamicity to Christian life. 9 It is a peculiar insight to consider the incarnation of Christ as the most basic and important sacrament of God.

---

<sup>630</sup> See 3.3.2.2. Negative Assessment no. 6.

<sup>631</sup> Cf. Tyron Inbody, "Where United Methodists and Presbyterians Differs on Sanctification," *Journal of Theology* 105 (2001): 97.

<sup>632</sup> W. Stephen Gunter, *The Limits of "Love Divine": John Wesley's Response to Antinomianism and Enthusiasm* (Nashville, TN: Kingswood, 1989), p.153. He concluded that "hysteria was diabolical."

<sup>633</sup> See 3.3.2.2. Negative Assessment no. 10.

The negative aspects of his view of sanctification can be explained as follows. 1 Barth ignored the human subjective decision of whether a person will accept Jesus as his Saviour and Lord by regarding all the people as saved and exalted in Christ's person, irrespective of their faith in Jesus. He neglected the statements of the Bible referring to the human subjective decision and the destiny of the reprobated. Unavoidably, it resulted in a tendency towards universal salvation. 2 His regarding of the obedience of Christ as the true reality of our sanctification makes our own role sanctification relatively insignificant. Though he sometimes noted human subjective sanctification, his view of sanctification is excessively objective due to his Christological understanding. 3 The subjectivity of man cannot be found in Barth's view. According to his analogy between our humanity and Christ's, our humanity cannot have any subjectivity because the humanity of Christ does not have any decisive power and authority over His divinity. The subjectivity of man is different from that of Christ's humanity as understood by Barth because human subjectivity is the foundation of God's judgment upon us. 4 His view that the Bible is not identified with the Word of God is so radical as to contradict reformed theology. 5 As he denied the third use of the Law in sanctification, his ethics cannot provide general guidance for people. His rejection of the Decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount as a fundamental moral Law seems to reflect his antinomian inclination. 6 His rejection of the history of original sin contradicts Paul's statement of it. Also, his view, which regards sin as human rejection of the Gospel, is unreasonable, for it means that those who do not hear the Gospel cannot be sinners. 7 Barth insisted that Christ's sanctification was firstly applied to him. However, the self-sanctification of Christ is not His purification of His sin but of our sin. His sanctification is His preparation as high priest for the whole sacrifice. 8 It is disrespectful to disregard baptism and the Lord's Supper as sacramental means of grace, viz., a means of sanctification. 9 His view of sanctification lacks the change of disposition, namely, harmonious personality, while Calvin and Wesley dealt with the change and growth of Christian character. Our practical, orderly life between soul and body was not found in Barth.

In Chapter 5, the views of Calvin, Wesley, and Barth were compared with one another from the perspective of sanctification. Their views were analysed and criticised from a biblical and reformed perspective. As the result of this research, a reformed doctrine of sanctification was formulated, which can be stated as follows.

Sanctification is defined as the restoration of the image of God. God's image is the right inner relation between spirit and body, between intelligence, affection, and will as well as the right outer relations with God, neighbour, and creatures.<sup>634</sup> Unfortunately, this image was lost due to Adam's fall. It can be restored by receiving Jesus Christ as one's

---

<sup>634</sup> Cf. Yong-Hwa Na, "A Developmental Evaluation of Hyung Nyong Park's Theology," *Presbyterian Theological Quarterly* 252 (1997):78. His view of the image of God is almost congruent to mine.



saviour and by being justified and sanctified. The restoration of inner order in sanctification can be described as the growth of a Christian character. It is manifested by the fruit of the Holy Spirit such as faith, hope, and love, which can be born by the fullness of the Holy Spirit.

Our right relationship with neighbours cannot be accomplished by human efforts. Social transformation commences with individual transformation, which is achieved by the work of the Holy Spirit in accordance with the Word of God in the spiritual community, namely, the church.

With reference to the subject of sanctification, the Holy Spirit unites us with Christ by generating faith in our hearts. This does not imply that there is no room for human participation in sanctification. In sanctification, the maintenance between the grace of God and human responsibility is necessary. Human factual sanctification appears in the fruit of the Spirit. As a representative of the fruits, our love towards God is expressed through our pious works and our love towards neighbours through merciful works.

The objective aspect of sanctification is that sanctification was already accomplished in Christ and is being accomplished in the Spirit and will be accomplished in the eschaton. Its subjective aspect is our active participation in the sanctification of Christ. It implies that through our faith and obedience, our character is transformed into the image of Christ.

In regard to the gradualness and the instantaneousness of sanctification, it is a gradual process to resemble the image of Christ in our unity with Christ. The sinful aspect of our nature continuously dies on the cross of the Lord, and the new and holy aspect grows in His resurrection. This process is a whole life process, that is, generally gradual. However, our sanctification can be remarkably promoted by God's instant intervention as in the case of Saul, it is usually applicable to one's first definitive conversion, but can also be ascribed to concurrent conversions in life.

In the strict sense Sanctification is imperfect in this life, but perfection as pure purpose should be pursued in this world. Sanctification is visible in human good works and the fruit of the Spirit, though it is imperfect and temporary. Its reality is trans-historical and invisible in this world.

The modes of sanctification are diverse: awakening to conversion, self-denial, meditation of the next world, bearing the cross, and so on. Their functions are similar to the means of sanctification.

As the means of sanctification, the Lord's Supper and Baptism are the ways to enable us to experience the unity with Christ. Participation in the Lord's Supper helps us remember and imitate the death of the Lord and His humility and faithful life. It exhorts us to repent of our pride and deny our self-centred lives. Baptism helps us recognize our unity with Christ, in other words, our participation in His death and resurrection. It is the Holy Spirit who unites us with Christ when we participate in the ceremony of baptism. The core

of the means of sanctification is the Word of God. Inward and outward obedience to the Word of God is sanctification. The Word of God designates mainly the written word. Accordingly, the illumination and direction of the Holy Spirit appear through the Bible. Although the dynamic work and guidance of the Spirit need to be received affirmatively, we should be cautious of the direct revelation of the Spirit and a time-limited eschatology, which prophesies the date of the *eschaton*. At the same time, the third use of the Law needs to be emphasised, and antinomianism should also be rejected. Other means of sanctification are church discipline, the mutual communion among church members, prayer and faith.

Justification and sanctification should be distinguished, but not separated. Sanctification is the end of justification. Predestination and election contribute to our assurance of salvation and help us persevere and induce our efforts for sanctification. Good works are the fruits of sanctification and are conditionally necessary to our final salvation.

The sphere of sanctification is the whole of our life. Reformed theology heads towards the expansion of the kingdom of God in the whole human realm.

Those views of sanctification were reflected in ‘5.2 The Contextual Analysis of the Korean Church’.

In ‘5.2 The Contextual Analysis of the Korean Church’, I described the affirmative elements of the Korean Church as quantitative growth, enthusiasm for meetings, prayer, praise, and offering, enthusiasm for world mission, conservative theological disposition, enthusiasm for education, participation in social reformation, and the attempts for the unity of the churches. Five negative aspects were identified: the stagnation of growth since the early 1990s; some problems in the general attitude of life (the discrepancy between faith and life, the excessive pursuit of worldly success, quantitativism, materialism, and liberalism); some problems in the attitude of community (radical political sanctification-minjung theology, evasion from reforming the world and compromise with it, which was showed in conservative churches since 1919, separatism, individualism); theological problems of the doctrine of sanctification (antinomianism, a legalistic tendency, a bias to gradualness in the nature of sanctification, mysticism, and spiritualistic enthusiasm); and syncretistic sanctification in Hananim-worship, Shamanism, Taoism, Buddhism, Confucianism, and the Unification Church.

In ‘5.3 A Reformed Doctrine of Sanctification for the Korean Context’, I presented my view in four aspects: the balanced theological views on sanctification (the balance between the grace of God and human responsibility, harmony between spirituality and rationality, the balance between antinomianism and legalism, the balance between instantaneousness and gradualness); sanctification in individual life (the proper motivation of Christian life, simple and moderate lifestyle, committing self-anxiety to the lord with faith, and making disciples); sanctification in political, social life (stewardship for community and

environment, social order and authority, the participation of social justice, and leadership of culture and science); and the sanctification of the Church: purity and unity (preserving the truth of the Bible, self-denial for unity and cooperation, the balance between institutionalism and individualism, and purification from syncretism).

I suggest that in this process the central hypothesis of this thesis has been adequately demonstrated. A diligent application of these dimensions of sanctification would clearly be beneficial to Korean society.

Though I cannot claim to have all the answers, I hope that in some small way, this study will be helpful to the Korean Church in going forwards in the direction the Lord wants.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary Resources

- Barth, Karl. *Die Kirchliche Dogmatik I/1. Die Lehre vom Wort Gottes*. Zürich: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1932. ET. *Church Dogmatics I/1. The Doctrine of the Word of God*. New York: T. & T. Clark and Schribner, 1936. revised edition 1975.
- , *Die Kirchliche Dogmatik I/2. Die Lehre vom Wort Gottes*. Evangelischer Verlag 1939. ET. *Church Dogmatics I/2. The Doctrine of the Word of God*. New York: T. & T. Clark and Schribner, 1956 (Publishers remain the same for further. The Volumes of the Dogmatics and are not therefore cited).
- , *Die Kirchliche Dogmatik II/1. Die Lehre von Gott*, 1940; ET *Church Dogmatics II/1. The Doctrine of God*, 1957.
- , *Die Kirchliche Dogmatik II/2. Die Lehre von Gott*, 1942; ET *Church Dogmatics II/2. The Doctrine of God*, 1957.
- , *Die Kirchliche Dogmatik III/2. Die Lehre von Gott*, 1940; ET *Church Dogmatics III/2. The Doctrine of God*, 1961.
- , *Die Kirchliche Dogmatik III/3. Die Lehre von der Schöpfung*, 1945; ET *Church Dogmatics III/3. The Doctrine of Creation*, 1961.
- , *Die Kirchliche Dogmatik III/4. Die Lehre von der Versöhnung*, 1953; ET *Church Dogmatics III/4. The Doctrine of Creation*, 1961.
- , *Die Kirchliche Dogmatik IV/1. Die Lehre von der Schöpfung*, 1955; IV/2, 1956; IV/3-1, 1959; IV/3-2, 1960. ET. *Church Dogmatics IV/1. The Doctrine of Reconciliation*, 1956; IV/2, 1958; IV/3-1, 1963; IV/3-2, 1965.
- , *Die Kirchliche Dogmatik. IV/4 (fragment)*, 1968; ET *Church Dogmatics IV/4*, 1969.
- , “Against Abstract Anti-Communism; Answer to Brunner (1948).” In Clifford Green. *Karl Barth: Theologian of Freedom*. London: Collins Publishers, 1989, 297-300.
- , “An Exegetical Study of Matthew 28:16-20.” In Thomas Wieser, tr. *The Theology of the Christian Mission*. Gerald H. Anderson, ed. Nashville: Abingdon, 1961, 55-71.
- , “Christian Community and Civil Community.” In *Against the Stream: Shorter Post-War Writings 1946-52 from Christengemeinde und Bürgergemeinde*. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1946. tr. S. Godman and E. M. Delacour. London. SCM Press, 1954, 13-50. Hereafter it is written as AS.

- , “Jesus Christ and the Movement for social justice.” In G. Hunsinger, ed. *Karl Barth and Radical Politics*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976, 77-120.
- , “Moderne Theologie und Reichgottesarbeit,.” In *Vorträge und kleinere Arbeiten /905-1909*, ed. H.-A.Drewsand H.Stoevesandt GA 21. Zurich, 1992, 334-366.
- , “Rechtfertigung und Heiligung.” *ZdZ* 5(1927): 281-309.
- , “The Proclaim of God’s Free State.” In *God Here and Now*. Tr. P. van Buren. London: Harpers & Rem, 1964, 28-44
- , *Church Dogmatics, A Selection: With an Introduction by Helmut Gollwitzer*. Tr. and ed. by G. W. Bromiley. New York: Harry Torchbooks, 1962.
- , *Community, State and Church*. Tr. by W. Herberg, from *Christengemeinde und Bürgergemeinde*. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1946. Garden City: Doubleday, 1960.
- , *Das Wort Gottes und Die Theologie: Gesammelte Vorträge*. München: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1924.
- , *Der Römerbrief*. First edition, ed. Hermann Schmidt. In *Gesamtausgabe (GA)* 16. Zürich: TVZ, 1985.
- , *Der Römerbrief*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1922; Tr. E. C. Hoskyns. *The Epistle to the Romans*. 6<sup>th</sup> ed. Oxford University Press, 1933.
- , *Die Christliche Lehre nach dem Heidelberger Katechismus*. Zollikon - Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag A.G., 1948.
- , *Die Protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert*. Zurich: TVZ, 1946.
- , *Eine Schweizer Stimme: 1938-1945*. Zollikon-Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag A. G, 1945.
- , *Ethics*. G. W. Bromiley, tr. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1981.
- , *Evangelical Theology: An Introduction*. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979.
- , *God Here and Now*. Tr. Paul M. Van Buren. Vol. X of *Religious Perspectives*. Ed. by Ruth Nanda Anshen (10Vols.). New York: Harper & Rem, 1964.
- , *God, Grace and Gospel*. Tr. by J. Stratharn McNab. London: Robert Cunningham and Sons Ltd. Alva, 1959.
- , *How I Changed My Mind: Introduction and Epilogue by John D. Godsey*. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1966. p. 47.
- , *Karl Barth’s Table Talk*. Recorded and ed. by John D. Godsey. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1963. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd Ltd., 1963.

- , “Messages to Oppressed Christians from World-famous Leaders.” *The Spiritual Issues of the War* 112 (Dec. 26, 1941): 2.
  - , *Offene Briefe* 1945-1968. Ed. by Diether Koch. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 1984. GA 15. p. 210.
  - , *Prayer*, ed. Don E. Saliers. Tr. by Sara F. Terrien. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1985
  - , *Prayer and Preaching*, tr. by Sara F. Terrien. Guildford and London: SCM Press Ltd, 1964.
  - , *Rechtfertigung und Recht, Christengemeinde und Bürgergemeinde, Evangelium und Gesetz*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1998. p.29.
  - , *The Christian Life*. Tr. by J. Strathearn McNab. London: Student Christian Movement, 1961.
  - , *The Church and the Churches*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1936.
  - , *The Church and the Political Problem of Our Day*. New York: Charles Scriber’s Sons, 1939.
  - , *The Church and the War*. New York: Macmillan, 1944.
  - , *The Epistle to the Romans*. Tr, edwin C. Hoskyns, 6th ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.
  - , *The Faith of the Church: A Commentary on the Apostle’s Creed according to Calvin’s Catechism*, 1943. London: Collins, 1960.
  - , *The German Church Conflicition*. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1965.
  - , *The Holy Ghost and the Christian Life*. Tr. by R. Birch Hoyle. London: Frederick Muller Limited, 1938.
  - , *The Humanity of God*.Tr. J. N. Thomas and T. Weiser. Richmond. Va.: John Knox Press, 1960.
  - , *The Knowledge of God and the Service of God According to the Teaching of the Reformation, Recalling the Scottish Confession of 1560*. J. L. M Haire and Ivan Henderson. Tr. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1938.
  - , *The Teaching of the Church regarding Baptism*. London: SCM Press, 1948.
- CALVIN, JEAN. *Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia*. 59 Vols. Ed. by Guilielmus Baum/ Eduardus Cunitz/ Eduardus Reuss. Berolini, Apud C.A.Schetschke et Filium, 1863-1900. New York and London: Johnson Reprint Corporation. Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, G.m.b.H.



- , *Catechism 1538*. Tr. and annot. by F. L. Battles. Pittsburgh, 1972. 1974.
- , *Commentaries of The Library of Christian Classics*. Institute for the Christian Information & Data, 1999.
- , *Commentaries on A Harmony of The Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke by John Calvin*, tr. by the Rev. William Pringle. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949.
- , *Commentaries on the Book of Psalms by John Calvin*, tr. by the Rev. James Anderson, Vol.1 and 2 (5 Vols.). Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949.
- , *Commentaries on The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah and the Lamentations by John Calvin*. Tr. by the Rev. John Owen, 5 Vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1950.
- , *Commentaries on the Catholic Epistles by John Calvin*, tr. and ed. by the Rev. John Owen. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949.
- , *Commentaries on The Epistle of Paul The Apostle to The Corinthians by John Calvin*, Vol.2, tr. and ed. by the Rev. John Pringle. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1948.
- , *Commentaries on The Epistle of Paul The Apostle to The Philippians, Colossians, and Thessalonians*, tr. and ed. by the Rev. John Pringle. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1948.
- , *Commentaries on The Epistle of Paul to The Galatians and Ephesians by John Calvin*, tr. by the Rev. William Pringle. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1948.
- , *Commentaries on the Epistle to the Hebrews by John Calvin*, tr. and ed. by the Rev. John Owen. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949..
- , *Commentaries on the Epistle to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon by John Calvin*, tr. by the Rev. William Pringle. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1948.
- , *Commentaries on The First Book of Moses called Genesis by John Calvin*. Tr. by John King. Grand Rapid: Wm. B. Publishing Company, 1949.
- , *Commentaries on The First Twenty Chapters of the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel by John Calvin*, tr. by Thomas Myers, 2 Vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1948.
- , *Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses, Vol. 2 (4 Vols.)*. Tr. and ed. by the Rev. Charles William (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1948).
- , *Commentaries on the Twelve Minor Prophets by John Calvin*, tr. by the Rev. John Owen, 5 Vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1950.

- , *Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Isaiah*. 4 Vols. Tr. By William Pringle Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1948..
- , *Commentary on the Gospel according to John by John Calvin*, tr. by the Rev. William Pringle, 2 Vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949..
- , *Commentary on The Prophecy of Jeremiah*. 5 Vols. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1989. 4: 127.
- , “Draft Ecclesiastical Ordinances.” In *Theological Treatises*. pp. 60-61.
- , *Institutes* 1536 ed. Translated by Rev. Ed. and annotated by Ford Lewis Battle. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- , *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (1536). Tr. by Henry Beveridge SAGE Software Albany. Oregon © 1996.
- , *Sermons on Job with an Introductory Essay selected by Harold Dekker*. Tr. by Leroy Nixon. Grand Rapids: Baker use, 1979. p. 13.
- , *Sermons on Job*. First published In1574 Avon: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1993. p. 3.
- , *Sermons on Micah*. Tr. by Blair Reynolds. In *Texts and Studies In Religion*, Vol. 47. Lewiston/ Queenston/ Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1990. pp. 70-81.
- , *Sermons on the Acts of the Apostles*, ed. by W. Balke and W. H. Th Moehn. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verslag des Erziehungsvereins, 1994. Supplementa Calviniana, Vol. 8.
- , *Sermons on The Epistle to the Ephesians*. London: The Banner of Truth Trust. 1973. p. 101. Abbre. *SEC*.
- , *Sermons on The Epistle to Timothy & Titus*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth & Trust, 1579, 1983.
- , *Sermons on The Epistles to the Ephesians*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth & Trust, 1987.
- , *SERMONS ON THE GALATHIANS*. Books For The Ages AGES Software • Albany. OR USA Version 1.0 © 1998.
- , *The Covenant Enforced: Sermons on Deuteronomy 27 and 28*. Ed. by James B. Jordan Tyler: Institute for Christian Economics, 1990.
- , *The Gospel According To Isaiah: Seven Sermons on Isaiah 53 Concerning the Passion and Death of Christ*. Tr. by Leroy Nixon. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1953. p. 92.
- , “The Letter of John Calvin to the Brethren of France. November 1559.” In *Letters of John Calvin*. Vols. I-IV. Ed. by Bonnet, Jules. English Translation of Vols. I-II.

- Edinburgh, 1835-7. Vols. III-IV. Philadelphia, 1858.
- , *The Mystery of Godliness and Other Selected Sermons*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950.
  - , “The Necessity of Reforming the Church 1544.” In *Tracts and Treatises*. Tr. by H. Beveridge. Reprint. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1958. I: 205-256.
  - , *Treatises Against the Anabaptists and Against the Libertines*. Benjamin Wirt Farley. Trans. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1982.
- Wesley, John. *The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley. A.M; Enlarged from original Mss.. with Notes from Unpublished Diaries. Annotations. Maps. and Illustrations*. Ed. by Curnock, Nehemiah. 8 Vols. London: Epworth, 1909-1916.
- , *Explanatory Notes upon the New Testament*. Grand Rapid: Book House, 1981. First edition, London: William Bowyer, 1818. Abbr. *NT Note*.
  - , *Explanatory Notes upon the Old Testament* 3 vols. Bristol: published by William Pine, 1765. Abbr. *OT Note*.
  - , *John Wesley’s Notes On the Whole Bible the New Testament by John Wesley*. Original-Bristol, 1754. SAGE Software Albany. OR USA Version 1.0 ©, 1996.
  - , *Selected Letters of John Wesley*. Ed. by Gill. London: Epworth Press, 1956.
  - , *The Letters of John Wesley*. 8 Vols. Ed. by J. Telford. London: Epworth, 1931. *Letters*.
  - , *The Works of John Wesley*. Ed. by Thomas Jackson. London: Wesleyan Methodist Book Room. 1872. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2002.
  - , *The Works of John Wesley: Sermons*. Ed. by Albert C. Outler. Vol. 3 Nashville: Abingdon Press. 1985. p. 497.
  - , *Wesley’s Standard Sermon*. 2 Vols. Ed. by Edward H Sugden. London: Epworth Press, 1921.

## Related Resources

- Adam, Alford. *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (2vol.)..Vol. II. *Mittelalter und Reformationszeit*. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1968.
- Adams, Charles Francis. *The Antinomian Controversy*. New York: Da Capo Press, 1976.
- Adams, Daniel J. “Ancestors, Folk Religion, and Korean Christianity.” In *PCKJ*, 95-113.
- , “Calvin’s Understanding of the Holy Spirit and the Contemporary Church.” *Taiwan Journal of Theology* 11 (1989): 83-106.
- Adams, Daniel J. “Church Growth in Korea: A Paradigm Shift from Ecclesiology to

- Nationalism.” In *Perspectives on Christianity in Korea and Japan: The Gospel and Culture in East Asia* ed. by Mark R. Mullins and Richard Fox Young. Lewiston/Queenston/Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1995, 13-28.
- Alexander, Donald L., ed. *Christian Spirituality: Five Views of Sanctification* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1988).
- Allen, Rogers Charles. *The Concept of Prevenient Grace in the Theology of John Wesley*. Ph. D. diss. Duke University. Ann Harbor: University Microfilms, 1967.
- André, Biéler. *The social humanism of Calvin*. tr. by Paul T. Fuhrmann. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1965.
- Anselm of Canterbury, “*De conceptu virginali et de peccato originali*” 1099-1100. In *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archidp. Opera omnia*. Ed. By S. Schmitt Seckau. 1938ff.. 2:137-73
- Arminius, James. *The Writings of James Arminius*. I and II of 3 Vols. J. Nichols, tr. from *the Latin*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1956. Abbr. *Writings*.
- , *The Writings of James Arminius*. II of 3 Vols., tr. by J. Nichols (London: James Nichols, 1828).
- Armstrong, Brian G. “Response to Calvin’s Conversation to Teachableness.” In *Calvin and Christian Ethics: Fifth Colloquium on Calvin & Calvin Studies*. Ed. by Peter De Klerk. Grand Rapids: Calvin Studies Society, 1987, 79-82.
- Augustine. “De civitate Dei.” 14.11. In *Patrologiae cursus completes, series Latina*. Ed. by J.-P. Migne. Tournhout: Brepols, n.d. 41: 419.
- Badr, Habib. “Medium Quiddam: The Problematic Relation of General Election and Individual Salvation In Calvin’s Theology.” *Theological Review* 10 (Lebanon: The School, 1989): 21-65.
- Baker, Frank. *John Wesley and the Church of England*. London: Epworth Press, 1970. second edition, 2000.
- Balke, W. “Calvin and The Theological Trends of His Time.” In *Calvinus Reformator: His Contribution to Theology, Church and Society*. Potchefstroom: Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education, 1982, 48-68.
- Balthasar, Hans Urs von. *Karl Barth: Darstellung und Deutung seiner Theologie*. Cologne: Jakob Hegner Verlag, 1951.
- Bangs, Carl. *Arminius: A Study in the Dutch Reformation*. Grand Rapids: F. Asbury Press, 1985.
- Baranowski, Shelly. “The Primacy of Theology: Karl Barth and Socialism.” *Studies in*

- Religion*. Vol. 10, no. 4 (1981):451-461.
- Barrett, C. K. *The Gospel According to St. John*. London: Wiliam Clowes & Sons Limited, 1978.
- Barth, M. *Das Mahl des Herrn. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1987. tr. Rediscovering the Lord's Supper*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1988.
- Battles, Ford Lewis. *Calculus Fidei: Some Ruminations on the Structure of the Theology of John Calvin*. Grand Rapids: Calvin Theological Seminary. 1978.
- Baxter, J. Sidlow. *Christian Holiness Restudied and Restated Includes the Complete Text of A New Call to Holiness, His Deeper Works in Us, and Our High Calling*. Zondervan Publishing House, 1967.
- Baxter, Richard. *The Autobiography of Richard Baxter*. London: Dent, 1981.
- Baxter, Richard. *The Practical Works of the Rev. Richard Baxter. 23 Vols.: With a Life of the Author and a Critical Examination of his Writings by the Rev. William Orme*. London: James Duncan, 1830. 9:34.
- Bay, John S. "The Value of Works in the Theology of Calvin and Beza." *Sixteenth Century Journal*. Vol.4, no. 2 (1973): 77-86.
- Beinert, Wolfgang. "Die Rezeption und ihre Bedeutung für Leben und Lehre der Kirche," in W. Beinert ed., *Glaube als Zustimmung. Zur Interpretation Kiirchlicher Rezeption-vorgänge* Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder Verlag, 1991.
- Bell, M. Charles. "Was Calvin a Calvinist?" *Scottish Journal of Theology*. Vol.36, no.4 (1983): 535-540.
- Bence, Clarence. *John Wesley's Teleological Hermeneutic*. Ann Arbor. Mich.: University, 1982.
- Bennett, David. "How Arminian was John Wesley?" *The Evangelical Quarterly*. Vol. 72, no.3 (2000): 237-238.
- Bennett, John. *Christian Values and Economic Life*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954.
- Berkhof, H. *Christian Faith*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1979.
- Berkouwer, G. C. *Faith and Sanctification*. Tr. J. Vriend. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1952.
- , *The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth*. Henry R. Boer. Tr. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans PUBLISHING Company, 1956.
- , *Studies in Dogmatics: Sin*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1971.
- Bettish, Joseph. "Theology and Politics: Karl Barth and Reinhold Niebuhr on Social Ethics

- after Liberalism.” *Religion in Life* 48 (1979): 53-62.
- Beza, Theodore. *A Little Book of Christian Questions and Responses*. Tr. by Kirk M. Summers Allison Park. Pennsylvania: Pickwick Publications, 1986.
- Bielé, André. *La pensée économique et sociale de Calvin*. Geneva: George, 1961.
- Biggar, Nigel *The Hastening that Waits: Karl Barth's Ethics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Blic, Jacques de. “Le Peche originel selon saint Augustin.” *Rchérches de sciencere religieuse* 16 (1926): 97-119
- Bob, E, ed. *KARL BARTH: Makers of the Modern Theological Mind*. Patterson Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers Inc., 1972.
- Bockmuehl, Klaus. “Protestant Ethics: The Spirit and the Word in Action.” *Evangelical Review of Theology* 12 (1988):101-115.
- Bohatec, Josef. *Budé und Calvin; Studien zur Gedankenwelt des französischen Frühhumanismus*. Graz: Hermann Böhaus, 1950.
- , *Calvin und das Recht*. Graz: Hermann Böhlaus, 1934. p.24.
- , *Calvin's Lehre van Staat und Kirche: mit besonderen Beruchtsichtigung des Organismus gedankens*. Breslau: Marcus, 1937
- Bolich, Gregory G. *Karl Barth & Evangelicalism*. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980
- Borgen, Ole E. “John Wesley: Sacramental Theology No Ends without the Means.” In John Stacey, ed. *John Wesley: Contemporary Perspective*. London: Epworth, 1988, 67-82.
- Bouwsma, William J. “Calvin and the Dilemma of Hypocrisy.” In *Calvin and Christian Ethics: Fifth Colloquium on Calvin & Calvin Studies*. Ed. by Peter De Klerk. Grand Rapids: Calvin Studies Society, 1987, 1-13.
- , “Explaining John Calvin”. *Wilson Quarterly* 13 (1989): 68-75.
- , *John Calvin: A Sixteenth-Century Portrait*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Bray, John S. “The Value of Works In the Theology of Calvin and Beza.” *Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 4, no. 2 (1973): 77-86.
- Bretzke, James T. “Cracking the Code: Minjung Theology as an Experience of the Holy Spirit in Korea.” *Pacifica* 10 (Oct., 1997): 330.
- Brown, A. J. *The Mastery of the Far East*. New York: Scribners, 1919. .



- Brown, Dale. *Understanding Pietism*. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1979.
- Brown, E. *The Reformed Spirituality of the Korean Christians*. Stellenbosch: The University of Stellenbosch, 1997.
- Brümmer, Vincent. "Calvin, Bernard and the Freedom of the Will." *Religious Studies* 30 (1994): 437-455.
- Brunner E. *Dogmatics*. Olive Wyon, Tr. London: Lutterworth Press, 1949. I: 346-352.
- Bullinger, Heinrich. *The Decades*. Vol.6. Tr. by Thomas Harding Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1849-52..
- Burgess, Stanley M. and McGee, Gary B, ed. *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movement*. Grand Rapids: Regency Reference Library imprinted in Zondervan Publishing House, 1988..
- Burrows, O S B Aelred. "Wesley the Catholic.." *John Wesley: Contemporary Perspectives*. ed. by John Stacey with an introduction by Frank Baker. London: Epworth Press, 1988.
- Burton, Robert W. and Chiles, Robert E. ed. *John Wesley's Theology*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1982.
- Burt, E.A. ed. *The Teaching of the Compassionate Buddha*. New York: New American Library, 1955.
- Busch, Eberhard. *Karl Barth and the Pietists: the Young Karl Barth's Critique of Pietism & Its Response*. Forwarded by Donald W. Dayton. Tr. by Daniel W. Bloesch. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2004.
- , *Karl Barth und die Pietisten :Die Pietismuskritik des jungen Karl Barths und ihre Ervidierung*. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1978.
- , *Karl Barth: His life from letters and autobiographical texts*. Tr. By John Bowden. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1976.
- Cadier, Jean. *The Man God Mastered*. Tr. by O. R. Johnston London: Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1964.
- Cambel, Ted Allen. *John Wesley and Christian Antiquity: Religious Vision and Cultural Change*. Nashville: Kingwood, 1991.
- Cameron, Charles M. "Arminius-Hero, or Heretic." *Evangelical Quarterly* 64-3 (July, 1992): 213-217.
- Cannon, William Ragsdale. *The Theology of John Wesley: With Special Reference to the Doctrine of Justification*. Lanham and London: University Press of America, 1974.
- Carl III, William J. "The Decalogue in Liturgy, Preaching and Life." *Interpretation*. Vol.

- 43, no. 3 (1989): 267-281.
- Carter, Lindberg. "Do Lutherans Shout Justification but Whisper Sanctification?" *Lutheran Quarterly* ns. 13 (Spr., 1999): 1-20.
- Carruthers S. W. *The Westminster Confession of Faith: Being an account of the Preparation and Printing of Its Seven Leading Editions To which is appended a Critical Text of the Confession with Notes Thereon.* 8<sup>th</sup> ed. Manchester: R. Aikman & Son, 1923.
- Castellio. *Concerning Heretics.* Tr. by Roland Bainton, 1935. Reprinted in New York: Octagon, 1965.
- Cell, George C. *The Rediscovery of John Wesley.* New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1935.
- Cho, Eun-Sik. "Korean Church Growth in 1970s: Its Factors and Problems." *The Asia Journal of Theology.* Vol.10, no.2 (1996): 348-362.
- Cho, Eun-Sik. "The Great Revival of 1907 in Korean: Its Cause and Effect." *Missiology,* Vol.26, no.3 (July, 1998): 289-300.
- Christensen, Michael J. "Theosis and Sanctification: John Wesley' Reformulation of A Patristic Doctrine." *Wesleyan Theological Journal,* Vol.31, no.2 (1996): 71-94.
- Chung, Chai-Sik. "Global Theology for the Common Good: Lessons from Two Centuries of Korean Christianity." *International Review of Mission.* Vol.85, no.339 (1996): 523-538.
- , *Korea: The Encounter Between the Gospel and Neo-Confucian Culture.* Geneva: WCC Publications, 1997.
- , *Korea Church and Reformed Faith.* Seattle: Time Printing Inc., 1996.
- Clarke, Charles David. *A Still More Excellent Way: A Historical, Theological and Biblical Evaluation of John Wesley's Doctrine of Christian Perfection.* Ph. D. thesis. the Univ. of Potchefstroom, 1998.
- Cobb, Jr., John B. *Grace and Responsibility: A Wesleyan Theology for Today.* Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995..
- Cohen, Stas. "John Calvin on Predestination and Election: A Kantian Aid." *Journal of Religious Studies.* Vol. 14, no. 1-2 (Punjabi University, 1988): 152-157.
- Cole, G. "A Responsible Lifestyle in Old Testament Perspective: A Consideration of Some Popular Proposals." *The Reformed Theological Review.* Vol. 41. No. 1 (1982): 1-10.
- Colle, Ralph Del. "John Wesley's Doctrine of Grace in Light of the Christian Tradition."

- International Journal of Systematic Theology*. Vol. 4, no. 2 (2002): 172-189.
- Collins, Kenneth J. "A Hermeneutical Model For the Wesleyan *Ordo Salutis*." *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 19 (1984): 23-37.
- , "John Wesley's Critical Appropriation of Early German Pietism." *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 22 (1992): 69-90.
- , "Other Thoughts on Aldersgate: Has the Conversionist Paradigm Collapsed?." *Methodist History* 30 (1991): 10-25.
- , "The Continuing Significance of Aldersgate: A Response to 'John Wesley Against Aldersgate'." *Quarterly Review* 8 (1988): 90-99.
- , "The Motif of Real Christianity in the Writings of John Wesley." *The Asbury Theological Journal* 49 (Spr., 1994): 49-62.
- , *John Wesley: A Theological Journey*. Nashville: Abingdon Press. 2003.
- , *Scripture Way of Salvation: The Heart of John Wesley's Theology*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997.
- Colwell, John. *Actuality and Provisionality: Eternity and Election in the Theology of Karl Barth*. Edinburgh: Rutherford House Books, 1989.
- Come, Arnold. *An Introduction to Barth's Dogmatics for Preachers*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.
- Confucius, *The Analectics*, D. C. Lau, tr. London: Penguin Book, 1979.
- Cook, William H. *The Success, the Motivation, and the Bible*. Seoul: Jordan Publishing Co., 1984.
- Cooke, Charles L. *Calvin's Illness in John Calvin & the Church: A Prism of Reform*. Louisville in Kentucky: Westminster/ John Knox Press, 1990.
- Cottret, Bernard. *Calvin: A Biography*. First published in 1995 under the title: *Calvin Bibliographie*. Tr. M. Wallace McDonald. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2000. pp.9-10.
- Couenhoven, Jesse. "Grace as Pardon and Power: Pictures of the Christian Life in Luther, Calvin, and Barth." *Journal of Religious Ethics*. Vol. 28, no. 1 (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2000):63-88.
- Cox, Leo George. "Prevenient Grace - A Wesleyan View." *Journal of Evangelical Society* 12 (sum., 1969):143-149.
- , *John Wesley's Concept of Perfection*. Ph. D. diss. University of Iowa, 1959.
- Crabtree, David Foy. "Controversy In Context: Anne Marbury Hutchinson Against the

- Massachusetts Bay Colony.” *Andover Newton Quarterly*. Vol. 11 (1970): 27-34.
- Creel, Herrlee G. *Chinese Thought from Confucius to Mao Tse-tung*. Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Crow Jr., Earl P. “Wesley and Antinomianism.” *The Duke Divinity School Review* 31 (Win., 1966): 10-19.
- Cushman, Robert E. “Karl Barth on the Holy Spirit.” *Religion in Life* Vol., no.4 (1955): 566-578.
- Dakins. A. *Calvinism*. London: Duckworth, 1940.
- Davis, Kenneth. “No Discipline, No Church: An Anabaptist Contribution to the Reformed Tradition.” *Sixteenth Century Journal*. Vol. 13, no 4 (win, 1982):43-58.
- Dayton, Donald W. “Law and Gospel in the Wesleyan Tradition.” *Grace Theological Journal* 12 (1991): 233-243.
- De Klerk, B. & Van Rensburg, F. *The Making of A Sermon: A Practical guide to Reformed Exegesis and Preaching*. Potchesfstroom: PU vir CHO, 1999.
- Deuchler, Martina. *The Confucian Transformation of Korea: A Study of Society and Ideology*. Cambridge: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University Press, 1992.
- DeVries, Dawn. “What is Conversion?” In *How Shall We Witness?: Faithful Evangelism in a Reformed Tradition*. Ed. by Milton J Coalter and Virgil Cruz. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995, 27-46.
- Dicker, Gordon Stanley. *The Concept Simul Iustus Et Peccator in Relation to the Thought of Luther. Wesley and Bonhoeffer. and Its Significance for A Doctrine of the Christian Life*. Th. D Diss. Union Theological Seminary. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1955.
- Dieter, Melvin E, et al. *Five Views on Sanctification*. Grand Rapids: The Zondervan Corporation, 1987.
- , “Wesleyan Theology.” In *John Wesley: Contemporary Perspective*. London: Epworth, 1988, 162-175.
- , Dillenberger, John. *Martin Luther*. Garden City. NY: Anchor. 1961.
- Douglas, J. D. ed., *The New Bible Dictionary*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Downers Grove: Inter Varsity Press, 1980.
- Douglass, Jane Dempsey. “Christian Freedom In Calvin’s Theology: The Foundation and Significance of Christian Freedom.” *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*. Vol. 4, no.2 (1983):69-83.

- , *Women, Freedom and Calvin*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1985.
- , "Calvin's Teaching What Still Remains Pertinent?" *The Ecumenical Review* 39 (Ja, 1989) :23-34.
- , "What is Reformed Theology?" In *Princeton Seminary Bulletin* Vol. 11, no.1 (1990):3-10.
- , *Jean Calvin. les homes et les choses de son temps*. 7 Vols. Lausanne, 1899-1917; Neuilly, 1926-1927.
- Dowey Jr., Edward Atkinson. "Law in Luther and Calvin." *Theology Today* 41 (1984/85): 146-153.
- Doyle, R. C. "John Calvin, His Modern Detractors." *The Reformed Theological Review*. Vol. 42, no. 3 (1982): 74-83.
- Dulk, M. den. ...*Als Twee Die Spreken: Een manier om de heiligingsleer van Karl Barth te lezen*. Amsterdam: "s-Gravenhage, 1987.
- Dulles, Avery Robert. *Models of the Church*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1974.
- Eckardt Jr, Burnell F. "Bondage of the Will: Calvin and Luther." *Logia: A Journal of Lutheran Theology* 7 (1998): 23-30.
- Edwards, David L. *The Future of Christianity*. Wilton: Morehous-Barlow, 1987.
- Edwin, Black Robert. *The Social Dimension of John Wesley's Ministry as Related to His Personal Piety*. Ph. D. Diss. Union Theological Seminary, 1984. University Microfilm International, 1987.
- Eli, R. George. *Social Holiness: John Wesley's Thinking on Christian Community and its Relationship to the Social Order*. New York etc.: Peter Lang Publishing. Inc. 1993. p. 43
- Esser, H. H. "Calvins Sozialethik und der Kapitalismus." *Hervormde Teologies Studies* 48 (1992): 783-800.
- Evans, Eifon. "John Calvin: Theologian of the Holy Spirit." *Reformation and Revival*. Vol. 10, no. 4 (2001): 83-104.
- Feldmeier, Russell. "The Church in the Defence of Workers' Rights in the Republic of Korea." *Pro Mundi Vita studies* 3 (1988): 12-20.
- Ferguson, S. B. & Packer, J. *New dictionary of theology*. Electronic ed. Downers Grove IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 2000. c 1988.
- Ferguson, Sinclair B. and David F. Wright, ed. *New Dictionary of Theology*. Leicester:

Inter Varsity Press, 1988.

- Finger, Thomas. "An Anabaptist Perspective on Justification" of *Justification and sanctification in the Traditions of the Reformation: Prague V The Fifth Consultation on the First and Second Reformations Geneva 13-17/ 02 1998*. Geneva: World Alliance of Reformed Churches, 1999.
- Flew, R. N. *The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology*. Oxford University Press, 1934. p. 336.
- Forstman, H. Jackson. *Word and Spirit: Calvin's Doctrine of Biblical Authority*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1962. p. 61.
- Foxgrover, David. "Calvin as a Reformer: Christ's Standard-Bearer." In *Leaders of the Reformation*. Ed. by Richard L. DeMolen. London & Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1984, 178-210.
- Fuchs, Eric. "Providence and Politics: A Reflection on the Contemporary Relevance of the Political Ethics of John Calvin." *Louvain Studies*. Vol.10, no.3 (1985): 231-243.
- Fulop Timothy E. "The Third Mark of the Church? - Church Discipline In the Reformed and Anabaptist Reformations." *The Journal of Religious History*. Vol. 19, no. 1 (1995): 26-42.
- Fung Yu-Lan, *A Short History of Chinese Philosophy*. Derek Bodde ed. (New York and London: The Free Press, 1966.
- , *The Spirit of Chinese Philosophy*. E. R. Hughes, tr. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Truber & Co. Ltd, 1947.
- Ganoczy, Alexandre. *The Young Calvin*. Tr. by David Foxgrover and Wade Provo Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1987.
- George, Timothy, ed. *John Calvin & the Church: A Prism of Reform*. Louisville In Kentucky: Westminster/ John Knox Press, 1990. p.67.
- Gerrish, Brian A. "The Lord's Supper in the Reformed Confessions." *Theology Today* (1966): 225-258.
- , "Mirror of God's Goodness." *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 45(1981): 211-222.
- , "Sovereign Grace Is Reformed Theology Obsolete?" *Interpretation*. Vol. 57, no.1 (2003): 45-56.
- Goodwin, Charles H. "Setting Perfection too high: John Wesley's Changing Attitude Towards the London Blessing." *Methodist History* 36 (1988): 86-96.
- Graham, W. Fred. *The Constructive Revolution: John Calvin and his Socio-Economic*



- Impact*. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1971. pp. 98-104.
- , "Calvin and the Political Order: An Analysis of the Three Explanatory Studies." In *Calviniana: Ideas and Influence of Jean Calvin*. Rovert V. Schnucker, ed. Vol. X. of *Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies*. Ann Arbor in Michigan: Edward Brothers, 1988, 51-61.
- , *The Constructive Revolutionary: John Calvin and His Socio-Economic Impact*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1978.
- Grayson, James Huntley. "Cultural Encounter: Korean Protestantism and Other Religious Traditions." *International-Bulletin-of-Missionary-Research*. Vol. 25 no. 2 (Apr., 2001): 66-72.
- Grayson, James Huntley. "Elements of Protestant Accommodation to Korean Religious Culture: A Personal Ethnographic Perspective." *Missiology* 23 (Ja., 1995): 43-59.
- , "The Shinto Shrine Conflict and Protestant Martyrs in Korea, 1938-1945." *Missiology*. Vol. 29, no 3 (Jl 2001): 287-305.
- , Grayson, James Huntley. *Korea-A Religious History*. New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 1989. Revised in 2002.
- Green, Clifford Green. Karl Barth: Theologian of Freedom. Vol. 5 of *The Making of Modern Theology: 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Century Theological Texts*. 5Vols. London etc.: Collins Publishers, 1989.
- Greeves, F. *The Meaning of Sin* London: Epworth, 1956.
- Gross, J. *Geschichte des Erbsundendogmas*. 3:14-38; 68-78.
- Gründler, Otto. "John Calvin: Ingrafting in Christ." In *The Spirituality of Western Christendom. Introduction by Jean Leclercq*. Ed. by E. Rozanne Edler Kalamazoo. Michigan: Cistercian Publications Inc., 1976, 169-187.
- Guen-Seok Yang, "Globalization and Christian Responses." *Theology Today*, Vol.62, no.1 (Apr., 2005): 38-48.
- Gunter, W. Stephen. *The Limits of "Love Divine": John Wesley's Response to Antinomianism and Enthusiasm*. Nashville. TN: Kingswood, 1989.
- Gunton, Colin E. "Salvation." In *The Cambridge Companion of Karl Barth*. John Webster, ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000, 143-156.
- , *Becoming and Being: The Doctrine of God in Charles Hartshorne and Karl Barth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Gwak Changdae. *Ecclesiology and Membership Trends in the South Korean Churches*,

- Unpublished the University of Stellenbosch Ph. D Diss. (2000).
- Gwak, Chang-Dae and Hendriks, Jurgens. "An Interpretation of the Recent Membership Decline in the Korean Protestant Church." *Missionalia*. Vol. 29, no.1 (Apr., 2001): 55-68.
- Hall, Thor. "The Christian's Life: Wesley's Alternative to Luther and Calvin." *The Duke Divinity School Bulletin* 28 (1963): 111-126.
- Hamer, Jerome. *Karl Barth*. Tr. Dominic M. Maruca. Westminster & Maryland: The Newman Press, 1962.
- Han, Kyung-Chik. "The Present and Future of the Korean Church." In *Korean Church Growth Explosion* ed. by Ro Bong-Rin and Marlin L. Neslon. Seoul: Word of Life Press and Asia Theological Association, 1984, 348-370.
- Hannah, Vern A.. "Original Sin and Sanctification: A Problem for Wesleyans." *Wesleyan Theological Journal*. Vol. 2, no.2 (1983): 47-53.
- Harkness, Georgia Elma. *John Calvin: the Man and his Ethics*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1958. p. 74.
- Hart, Trevor A. "Humankind in Christ and Christ in Humankind: Salvation as Participation in Our Substitute in the Theology of John Calvin." *Scottish Journal of Theology*. Vol. 42, no.1 (1989): 67-84.
- Hartwell, Herbert. *The Theology of Karl Barth*. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1964.
- Hauerwas, Stanley. *Character and The Christian Life: A Study in Theological Ethics with a new introduction by the author*. San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1985. p.141
- Heideman, Eugene P. "Theocracy in the Reformation." *Reformed Review*. Vol. 34, no. 2 (1981): 81-88.
- Heitzenrater, Richard. *The Elusive Mr. Wesley: John Wesley His Own Biographer*. Nashville, 1984.
- Helm, Paul. "Calvin and Bernard on Freedom and Necessity: A Reply to Brümmer." *Religious Studies* 30 (1994): 457- 465.
- Helm, Paul. *Calvin and the Calvinists*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1982.
- Hendry, George S. "On being a Creature." *Theology Today* 38 (1981/82): 60-72.
- Henry, George S. *The Gospel of the Incarnation*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1958.
- Heron, A I C. "Barth, Schleiermacher and the task of dogmatics." *HTS* 56 -2&3 (2000): 391-408.

- Hershberger, Guy. *The Recovery of the Anabaptist Vision*. Scottdale: Herald Press, 1962.
- Hesselink, I. John. "Law & Gospel or Gospel & Law?: Calvin's Understanding of the Relationship." In *Calviniana*, 13-32.
- "Christ, the Law, and the Christian: An Unexplored Aspect of the Third Use of the Law in Calvin's Theology." In *Reading in Calvin's Theology*. ed. by Donald K. McKIM. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984, 179-191.
- Hodge, Charles. *Systematic Theology* II. III Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1977.
- Hodge. A. A. *Outlines of Theology*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson. 1880.
- Hodges, Zane C. "Legalism: The Real Thing." *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society* 9 (1996): 21-32.
- Hoitenga Jr., Dewey J. *John Calvin and the Will: A Critique and Corrective*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997.
- Hong, Harold S. "Social, Political, and Psychological Aspects of Church Growth." In *Korean Church Growth Explosion*, 171-181.
- Hong, Young-Gi. "Revisiting Church Growth in Korean Protestantism: A Theological Reflection." *International Review of Mission*. Vol. 89, no.353 (2000): 190-202.
- , "Encounter with Modernity: the 'McDonaldization' and 'Charismatization' of Korean Mega-Churches." *International Review of Mission*, Vol. 92, no.365 (Apr., 2003): 239-255.
- Höpfl, Harro. *The Christian Polity of John Calvin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Hordern William. "Is There a New Barth?" *Christian Advocate* VI, no. 7 (March 29, 1962).
- , "Recent Trends in Systematic Theology." *Canadian Journal of Theology* 7 (1961): 82-90.
- Horton, Michael S. "Calvin and the Law-Gospel Hermeneutic." *Pro Ecclesia*. Vol. 6, no. 1 (Northfield: Center for Catholic and Evangelical Theology, 1997): 27-42.
- Hughes, E. R., tr. *The Great Learning and the Mean in Action*. London: J. M. Dent and Sons Ltd., 1942.
- Hughes, P. E. "Jacques Lefèvred'Etapes c.1455-1536: Calvin's Forerunner in France." In *Calvinus Reformer* (1982): 93-108.
- Hughes, Philip E. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ., 1977.
- Humphreys, Christmas. *Buddhism*. London: Penguin Books, 1951

- Hunsinger, George, ed. *Karl Barth and Radical Politics*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press 1976.
- Hütter, Reinhard. Reforming Freedom: Reflections “after Veritas splendour” on Freedom’s Fate in Modernity and Protestantism’s Antinomian Captivity.” *Modern Theology*. Vol. 17, no. 2 (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 2001):117-161.
- Hwang, Hong-Eyoul. “Searching for A New Paradigm of Church and Mission in A Secularized and Postmodern Context in Korea.” *International Review of Mission*. Vol.92, no.364 (Ja., 2003): 84-97.
- Hyma, Albert. *The Life of John Calvin*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1943.
- Hynson, Leon Orville. *To Reform the Nation: Theological Foundations of Wesley’s Ethics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984.
- Hyun, Young-Hak. “Three Talks on Minjung Theology.” *Inter-Religio* 7 (Spr., 1985):7.
- Inbody, Tyron. “Where United Methodists and Presbyterians Differs on Sanctification.” *Journal of Theology* 105 (2001): 75-98.
- Jacobs, Paul. *Prädestination und Verantwortlichkeit bei Calvin*. Kassel: J. C. Oncken Nachf, 1937. Reprinted in Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968.
- Jean, Chelini and Chelini Blandine. *Histoire de l’Église. Nos racines pour comprendre notre présent*. Paris: Centurion, 1993.
- Jedin, H. *A History of the Council of Trent*. Vol. 2. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson, 1961.
- Jehle, Frank. *Ever against the Stream: The Politics of Karl Barth, 1906-1968*. Tr. by Richard and Martha Burnett. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2002.
- Jennings, Jr., Theodore W. “John Wesley Against Aldersgate.” *Quarterly Review* 8 (Fall, 1988): 3-22.
- Merwyn, S. Johnson, “Calvin’s Handling of the Third Use of the Law and Its Problems.” In *Calvinania*: 33-53.
- Johnson, William Stacy. *The Mystery of God: Karl Barth and the Postmodern Foundations of Theology*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997.
- , “Theology and the Church’s Mission: Catholic, Orthodox, Evangelical, and Reformed.” In Wallace M. Alston, Jr. & Michael Welker ed., *Reformed Theology: Identity and Ecumenicity*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Publishing Co, 2003, 65-81.
- Johnstone, Patrick and Jason, Mandryk. *Operation World*, 21<sup>st</sup> century edition.

- Harrisonburg, Virginia: R.R Donnelley & Sons, 2001.
- Jordan, James B, ed. *The Covenant Enforced: Sermons on Deuteronomy 27 and 28 by John Calvin*. Tyler. Texas: Institutes for Christian Economics, 1990.
- Jules Bonnet, ed. *Letters of John Calvin*. Tr. from the original Latin and French. Vols. 1-4. New York: Burt Franklin Reprints, 1972.
- Jüngel, E. *Karl Barth: A Theological Legacy*. Tr. by Garrett E. Paul. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1986.
- Jung-Young Lee, “Concerning the Origin and Formation of Korean Shamanism.” *Numen* 20 (Aug., 1973):135-160.
- Kang, Wi Jo. *Christ and Caesar in Modern Korea: A History of Christianity and Politics*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997.
- Keddie, Gordon J. “Calvin on Civil Government.” *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology* 3 (1985): 23-35.
- Keefer, Luke L.. “Characteristics of Wesley’s Arminianism.” *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 22 (1987): 88-100.
- Keesecker, William F. “The Law in John Calvin’s Ethics.” In *Calvin and Christian Ethics.: Fifth Colloquium on Calvin & Calvin Studies*. Ed. by Peter De Klerk. Grand Rapids: Calvin Studies Society, 1987, 19-49.
- Kelsay, John. “Prayer and Ethics: Reflection on Calvin and Barth.” *The Harvard Theological Review*. Vol. 82, no. 2 (1989):169-184.
- Kim, Andrew Eungi. “Characteristics of Religious Life in South Korea: A Sociological Survey.” *Review of Religious Research*. Vol.43, no. 4 (2002): 291-310.
- Kim, Andrew E. “Christianity, Shamanism, and Modernization in South Korea.” *Cross Currents*. Vol.50, no.1-2 (Sum., 2000): 112-119.
- Kim, Andrew E. “Korean Religious Culture and Its Affinity to Christianity: The Rise of Protestant Christianity in South Korea.” *Sociology of Religion*. Vol.61, no.2 (2000): 117-133.
- Kim, Jae Jin. *Die systematische Anatomie von Karl Barths Theologie*. Seoul: Handeul, 1998.
- Kim, Jae-Duk. “Holiness in the Triune God: Calvin’s Doctrine of Sanctification with Special Reference to the Eschatological Dialectic Between Its Objective and Subjective Aspects, and with Application to the Calvinist Doctrine of the Korean Presbyterian Church.” Ph. D. diss. The University of Bristol, 2002.
- Kim, Myung-Hyuk. “Korean Mission in the World Today and Its Problems”. In *Korean*

- Church Growth Explosion* ed. by Ro Bong-Rin and Marlin L. Neslon. Seoul: Word of Life Press and Asia Theological Association, 1984, 127-134.
- Kim, Sung-Gun. "The Shinto Shrine Issue in Korean Christianity under Japanese Colonialism." *A Journal of Church and State* 39 (1997): 503-521.
- Kim, Sung-Ho. *History of the Korean Evangelical Holiness Church*. The History Compilation Committee of the Korea Evangelical Holiness Church, ed. Chun-Hoi Heo, Hye-Kyung Heo. Tr. Seoul: Living Waters, 1998.
- Kim, Young Gwan. "Karl Barth's Reception in Korea: An Historical Overview." *Evangelical-Review-of-Theology*. Vol. 27, no 1 (Ja., 2003):73-85.
- Kim, Yang Son. *History of the Korean Church: In the Ten Years Since Liberation, 1945-1955*. Tr. by Allen D. Clark from *한국교회 형성사*. Seoul: The Board of Religious Education, Korean Presbyterian Church, 1956.
- Kim, Young-Bock "Korean Christianity as a Messianic Movement for the People" in *Minjung Theology*. Singapore: ACTC-CCA Publications, 1981.
- Kim, Yung Han. "The Identity of Reformed Theology in the Twenty-First Century". In Alston, Wallace M. Jr. & Welker, Michael. *Reformed Theology: Identity and Ecumenicity*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 2003, 3-19.
- Kirk, K. E, ed. *The Study of Theology*. London & Stoughton, 1939.
- Kisker, Scott. "Justified But Unregenerate? The Relationship of Assurance to Justification and Regeneration in the Thought of John Wesley." *Wesleyan Theological Society*. Vol.28, no. 1-2 (1993): 44-58.
- Klooster, Fred. H. *The Significance of Barth's Theology: An appraisal, with Special Reference to Election and Reconciliation*. Grand Rapids, Baker Book House, 1961.
- Knight, Henry Hawthorn III. *The Presence of God in the Christian life: A Contemporary Understanding of John Wesley's Means of Grace*. Ph. D. Diss. Emory University Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1987.
- Knight, John Allan. "John Fletcher's Influence on the Development of Wesleyan Theology in America." *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 13 (1978): 13-33.
- Knox, John. *The Works of John Knox*. 6 Vols. Ed. by David Laing. Edinburgh: Johnstone and Hunter, 1846-64. 3:363-364.
- Knudsen, Robert D. "Calvinism as a Cultural Force." In *John Calvin: His Influence In the Western World*. Ed. by W. Stanford Reid Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1982, 13-29.
- Koedyker, John C. "Theocracy is not Dead: Calvin and Khomeini." *Reformed Review*. Vol.



- 34, no. 2 (1981): 74-80.
- Kraeling, Emil. *The Old Testament Since the Reformation*. London: Lutterworth, 1955.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim. "The Contemporary Relevance of Calvin's Theology." In *Towards the Future of Reformed Theology: Tasks, Topics, Traditions*. Ed. by David Willis & Michael Welker. Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999, 323-338.
- Lamprecht, John Albert, *The Christocentric Message Today: A Study in Dogmatics with Reference to the Writing of Karl Barth*. Pretoria: UNISA D.D. Thesis, 1967.
- Lane, A. N. S. "Conversion: A Comparison of Calvin and Spener." *Themelios*. Vol. 13, no. 1 (1987-88): 19-21.
- Lategan, L. O. K. "The Significance of Calvin's Anthropology for Preaching on Ethical Themes." *Hervormde-teologiese-studies*. Vol. 54, no. 1 & 2 (1998):143-152.
- Latourette, Kenneth Scott. *Christianity in A Revolutionary Age: A History of Christianity in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries Vol. V. The Twentieth Century Outside Europe: The America, The Pacific, Asia, and Africa: the Emerging World Christian Community*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1969, 1976.
- Lauber, David. *Barth on the Descent into Hell: God, Atonement and the Christian Life*. Aldershot and Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Co., 1988, 2004.
- Lee, Jung-Young. "Minjung Theology: A Critical Introduction." In *An Emerging Theology in World Perspective: Commentary on Korean Minjung Theology*. ed. by Jung Young Lee. Mystic Connecticut: Twenty-Third Publications, 1988, 3-29.
- , "Relationship Between Christianity and Shamanism in Korea: A History Perspective." *The Asia Journal of Theology*. Vol. 10, No. 2 (1996): 333-347.
- Lee, Moon-Jang. "Experience of Religious Plurality in Korea: Its Theological Implications." *International Review of Mission*. Vol.83, no. 351 (1999): 399-413.
- Lee, Sang Hoon. "After Church Growth, Then What?" *Ministrial Formation* 41 (1988): 4-7.
- Lee, Sang-Heung. "Preaching for the Upbuilding of the Church in Transition." Ph. D. diss. The University of Pretoria, 2004.
- Lee, Sook-Jong, "A Study of the Relationship of the Korean Church to the Indigenous Culture of Korea." *The Asia Journal of Theology*. Vol. 9, no. 2 (1987): 230-247.
- Lee, Timothy S. "A Political Factor in the Rise of Protestantism in Korea: Protestantism and the 1919 March First Movement." *Church History*, Vol.69, no.1 (Mar., 2000): 116-142.

- Lee, Umphrey. *John Wesley and Modern Religion*. Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1936.
- Lee, Yvonne Young-ja. "Religious Syncretism and a Postimperial Source of Healing in Korea." In *Religion and Social Policy*. Ed. by Paula D. Nesbitt. Walnut Creek, Lanham, New York, Oxford: Altamira Press, 2001, 226-243.
- Leith, John H. *Introduction to the Reformed Tradition: a Way of Being the Christian Community*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981.
- , "John Calvin and Stewardship." *Journal-for-Preachers*. Vol. 9, no. 1 (1985): 2-7.
- , "Reformed Preaching Today." *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*. Vol.10, no.3 (1989): 224-257.
- , *John Calvin's Doctrine of the Christian Life*. Louisville: Westminster/ John Knox Press, 1989.
- , "Calvin's Theological Realism and the Lasting Influence of His Theology." In *Towards the Future of Reformed Theology: Tasks, Topics, Traditions*. Ed. by David Willis & Michael Welker. Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999, 339-345.
- Lester, Robert C. *Buddhism: The Path to Nirvana*. New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1987.
- Lin, Yutang, ed., and tr., *The Wisdom of Confucius*. New York: Random House, 1938.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *Ephesians: Word Biblical Commentary*, Vol. 42. Dallas: Word Books Publisher, 1990.
- Lindström, Harald. *Wesley and Sanctification: A Study in the Doctrine of Salvation*. Francis Asbury Publishing Company. Inc, 1980.
- Lombard, J. C. *Die Leer van die Heiligmaking by Karl Barth*. Kampen: Vrije Univ. diss., 1957.
- Lopes, Augustus Nicodemus. "Calvin, Theologian of the Holy Spirit: the Holy Spirit and the Word of God." *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology* 15 (1997): 38-49.
- Lose, David J. "Luther and Calvin on Preaching to the Human Condition." *Lutheran Quarterly* 10 (1996): 281-318.
- Lovin, Robin W. *Christian Faith and Public Choices: The Social Ethics of Barth, Brunner, and Bonhoeffer*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Luther, Martin. *Two Kinds of Righteousness*. Tr. by Lowell J. Satre. In John Dillenberger, ed. *Martin Luther: Selections from His Writings*. New York: Doubleday, 1951, 86-98.
- , *Works*. Vol. 26. Tr. by Jaroslav Pelikan. St. Louis: Concordia, 1963.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. *After Virtue: A Study In Moral Theory*. Second edition. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984.

- Macken SJ, John. *The Autonomy Theme in the Church Dogmatics: Karl Barth and His Critics*. Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- MacKinnon, Malcolm H. "Part I: Calvinism and the Infallible Assurance of Grace". *The British Journal of Sociology* 39 (1988): 143-210.
- Mackintosh, Hugh Ross. *Types of Modern Theology: Schleiermacher to Barth*. London & Glasgow: Collins Clear-Type Press, 1937, 1964.
- Maddox, Randy L, ed. *Aldersgate Reconsidered*. Nashville: Kingswood Books, 1990.
- , *Responsible Grace: John Wesley's Practical Theology*. Nashville: Kingwood Books, 1994.
- Marcel, Pierre. "The Relation between Justification and Sanctification In Calvin's Thought." *The Evangelical Quarterly* 26 (1954): 132-145.
- Marquardt, Friedrich Wilhelm. *Theologie und Sozialismus, Das Beispiel Karl Barths*. Munich, Kaiser, 1972.
- Mattke, Robert A.. "The Baptism of the Holy Spirit as Related to the Work of Entire Sanctification." *Wesleyan Theological Journal*. Vol. 5, no.1 (1970): 22-32.
- Maureen Junker-Kenny. "The Individualization of Faith: Modernization, Church Authority, and the Given Truth of the Gospel." In *Practical Theology-International Perspectives*. Ed. by Friedrich Schweitzer and Johannes A. van der Ven. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH Eurpaischer Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1999, 219-243.
- Mbennah, Emmanuel D and Vorster, J M (Potchefstroom Univ. for Christian Higher Education), "The Influence of Arminian conception of Predestination on the 18<sup>th</sup>-century Wesleyan revival." *Studia historiae ecclesiasticae*. Vol. 24, no.1 (1998): 161-187.
- McCormack, Bruce L. *Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology, Its Genesis and Development 1909-1936*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- McGrath, A. E. "Humanist elements In the early Reformed doctrine of justification." *Archiv-fur-Reformationsgeschichte* 73 (1982): 5-20.
- , *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*. 2 Vols. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986. 2:37.
- , *A Life of John Calvin: A Study in the Shaping of Western Culture*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990.
- McKee, Elsie Anne. "Calvin's Teaching on the Elder Illuminated by Exegetical History." In *John Calvin & the Church: A Prism of Reform*. Ed. by Timothy George. Louisville in Kentucky: Westminster/ John Knox Press, 1990, 147-155.

- McKim, Donald K. "John Calvin: A Theologian for an Age of Limits." In *Reading in Calvin's Theology*. Ed. by Donald McKim. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984, 291-310.
- McNeile, Alan H. *The Gospel According to St. Matthew*. London: Macmillan & New York: St. Martin's Press, 1915, reprinted in 1965.
- McNeill, John T, ed. *The Library of Christian Classics*. Vol. xx. *Calvin: Institutes of the Christian Religion in Two Volumes*. Tr. by Ford Lewis Battles. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960.
- Melanchthon, Philip. *Loci communes* 1555. Tr. and ed. by Clyde L. Manschreck. *Melanchthon on Christian Doctrine: Loci Communes 1555*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965. Paperback edition. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1982. VI. 'On Original Sin'.
- Mews, Stuart. "Neo-orthodoxy, liberalism and war 1914-18: Karl Barth, P T Forcyth and John Oman." In Derek Baker, ed., *Studies in Church History*. Vol. 14 of *Renaissance and Renewal in Christian History*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1978, 361-375.
- Meylan, Edward F. "The Stoic Doctrine of Indifferent Things and the Conception of Christian Liberty in Calvin's *Institutio religionis chrisianae*." *The Romanic Review* 29 (1937): 135-145.
- Migliore, Daniel. "Reforming the Theology and Practice of Baptism." In *Towards the Future of Reformed Theology: Tasks, Topics, Traditions*. Ed. David Willis & Michael Welker Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999, 494-511.
- Milne, Douglas J. W. "A Barthian Stricture on Reformed Theology-The Unconditionality of the Covenant of Grace", *The Reformed Theological Review*, Vol. 55 (S-D, 1996): 121-133.
- Moon, Steve S. C. "The Recent Korean Missionary Movement: A Record of Growth, and More Growth Needed." *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*. Vol. 27, no.1 (Jan., 2003): 11-14,16-17.
- Moore, D. Marselle. "Development in Wesley's Thought on Sanctification and Perfection." *Wesleyan Theological Journal*, Vol.20, no.2 (1985): 29-53.
- Mueller, David L. *KARL BARTH*. Bob E. Patterson, ed. Peabody: Hendrikson Publishers Inc., 1972.
- Mueller, W. *Church and State In Luther and Calvin*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1954.
- Mulholland, Kenneth B. "From Luther to Carey: Pietism and the Modern Missionary Movement." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 156 (1999): 89.

- Muller, Richard A. *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms Drawn Principally from Protestant Scholastic Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985. p.123.
- Munday, Paul. "John Calvin and Anabaptist on War." *Brethren Life and Thought* 23 (1978): 243
- Murray, John "Definitive Sanctification." In *Collected Writings of John Murray*. Vol.2. Edinburgh: Banner Truth Trust, 1977, 277-304.
- , Murray, John. *Principles of Conduct: Aspects of Biblical Ethics*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957. reprinted in 1964.
- Naphy, William. G. *Calvin and the consolidation of Genevan Reformation*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1995. p. 18.
- Ngun, Richard. "A Survey of the Role of the Law in Sanctification among Selected Calvinists." *Stulos Theological Journal* Vol. 8, no 1/2 (2000): 45-71.
- Niebuhr, R. *An Interpretation of Christian Ethics*. New York: Meridian Books, 1956.
- Niesel, Wilhem. *The Theology of Calvin*. Tr. by Harold Knight Grand Rapids: Baker Book House. 1980. First published by Lutterworth Press in 1956.
- Nuttall, Geoffrey F. *The Holy Spirit In Puritan Faith and Experience*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946.
- Oh, Pyeong-She. "Keeping the Faith Pure". In *Korean Church Growth Explosion* ed. by Ro Bong-Rin and Marlin L. Neslon. Seoul: Word of Life Press and Asia Theological Association, 1984, 211-230.
- Osborne, Grant R. *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1991.
- Osterhaven, M. Eugene. "John Calvin: Order and the Holy Spirit." *The Reformed Review*. Vol. 32 (1978-79): 23-44.
- Otterness, Omar G, "The Doctrine of Sanctification in the Theology of Karl Barth." Ph. D. diss. Chicago University, 1969.
- Otto, T. Hans. *The Ethics of Gospel and Law: Aspects of the Barth-Luther Debate*. Ph. D. thesis. Yale Univ. An Arbor: UMI, 1968.
- Outler, Albert Cook, ed. *John Wesley*. London & New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- , "Beyond Pietism: Aldersgate in Context." *Motive* (May 1963):12.
- , "The Place of Wesley in the Christian Tradition." In Kenneth E. Rowe Metuchen, ed. *The Place of Wesley in the Christian Tradition*. NJ: The Scarecrow Press, 1976, 11-38.

- Paik, Nak- Joon. *The History of Protestant Mission in Korea 1832-1910*. Seoul: Yonsei University Press, 1973.
- Palmer, Russell W. "Methodological Weakness in Barth's Approach to Ethics." *The Journal of Religious Thought*. Vol. 26, no. 1 (1969): 70-82.
- Palmer, Spencer T. *Korea and Christianity*. Seoul: Hollym Cor., 1967.
- Paquin, René. "Calvin and Theocracy In Geneva: Church and World In Ordered Tasks." *ARC* 28 (2000): 91-113.
- Park, Chung-Shin. *Protestantism and Politics in Korea*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 2003.
- Parker, T. H. L. "Calvin in His Age." Vol.1. *The Biography of Calvin of Articles on Calvin and Calvinism: A Fourteen-, Volume Anthology of Scholarly Articles*. Ed. by Richard C. Gamble. New York & London: Garland Publishing. Inc., 1992, 100-107.
- , "John Calvin". In Hurbert Cunliffe-Jones, ed. *A History of Christian Doctrine*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark Ltd., 1978, 387-399.
- , "The Approach to Calvin". *Evangelical Quarterly* 16 (1944):165-172.
- , *Calvin's Preaching*. Louisville: Westminster/ John Knox Press. 1992.
- Pembroke, Neil. "From Self-Doubt to Assurance: The Psychological Roots of John Wesley's Early Spiritual Development." *Journal of Psychological and Christianity* no.13 (1994): 242-252.
- Peters, V. W. "Simeon, A Christian Korean Mystic." *Korean Mission Field* (Oct., 1936): 218-219.
- Pettegree, Andrew. "Prophets without Honour? Michael Servetus and the Limits of Tolerance." *History Today* 40 (1991): 40-45.
- Pierre, Chaunu and Dosse, François. *L'instant éclaté. Entretiens*. Paris: Aubier-Histoires, 1994.
- Pitkin, Barbara. "Nothing but Concupiscence: Calvin's Understanding of Sin and *Via Augustini*." *Calvin-Theological-Journal* 34 (1999): 347-369.
- Polman, A D R. *Barth*. Calvin D. Freeman, tr. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1968.
- Prolingheuer, Hans. *Der Fall Karl Barth 1934-1935*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1977.
- Puffenberger, William. V. *The Word of God and Hermeneutics in The Theologies of Karl Barth and Gehard Ebeling*. Ph. D. Diss. Boston University Graduate School. Ann



- Arbor: UMI Dissertation Information Service, 1968.
- Pyne, Robert A.. "Antinomianism and Dispensationalism." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 153 (Jan., 1996): 141-154
- Rae, Simon. "Calvin, Natural Law and Contemporary Ethics: a Brief Note." *The Reformed Theological Review*. Vol. 30, no.1 (Ja.-Ap., 1971): 14-20.
- Rainbow, Jonathan H. "Double Grace: John Calvin's View of the Relationship of Justification and Sanctification." *Ex Auditu* 5 (1989): 99-105.
- Raitt, Jill. "Three Inter-related Principles in Calvin's Unique Doctrine of Infant Baptism." *The Sixteenth Century Journal*. Vol. 11. no. 1 (1980): 51-61.
- Ramey Jr, Robert H. & Johnson, Ben Campbell. *Living the Christian Life: A Guide to Reformed Spirituality*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992.
- Ramm, Bernard, *After Fundamentalism: The Future of Evangelical Theology*. Toronto: Fitzhenry & Whiteside Ltd, 1983.
- Rattenbury, J. Ernest. *The Conversion of the Wesleys*. London: The Epworth Press, 1938.
- Rays, Richard. *The Faith of Jesus Christ*. Chico. CA: Scholars, 1983.
- Reed, Rodney L. "Calvin. Calvinism and Wesley: The Doctrine of Assurance In Historical Perspective." *Methodist History*. Vol. 32, no.1(1993): 31- 43.
- Reid, W. Stanford. "John Calvin, Early Critic of Capitalism 1." *The Reformed Theological Review* 43 (S-D, 1984): 74-81.
- , "John Calvin, Pastoral Theologian." *The Reformed Theological Review*. Vol.42, no.3 (S-D, 1982): 65-73.
- , "John Calvin: the father of capitalism." *Themelios*. Vol.8, no. 2 (Jan., 1983): 19-25.
- Richard, Lucien Joseph. *The Spirituality of John Calvin*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1974.
- , "John Calvin and the Role of the Church in the Spiritual life." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 11 (1974): 477-500.
- Ro, Bong-Rin. "South Korea: Bankrupting the Prosperity Gospel." *Christianity Today* 42 (Nov., 1998): 58-61.
- , "Statement on Prosperity Theology and Theology of Suffering." *Evangelical-Review-of-Theology* 20 (Ja., 1996): 3-94.
- Robertson, A. T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*. New York, 1914.
- Rohls, Jan. "Reformed Theology-Past and Future". In Wallace M. Alston, Jr. & Michael Welker, *Reformed Theology: Identity and Ecumenicity*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B.

- Eerdmans Publishing Co, 2003, 34 - 45.
- Rolston III, Holmes. "Responsible Man in Reformed Theology: Calvin versus the Westminster Confession." *Scottish Journal of Theology*. Vol. 23, no. 2 (1970): 129-156.
- Rorem, Paul. "Calvin and Bullinger on the Lord's Supper: Part I: The Impasse." *Lutheran Quarterly*. Ns. 2 (1988): 155-184.
- Rosato, Philip J. *Karl Barth's Theology of the Holy Spirit: God's Noetic Realization of the Ontological Relationship between Jesus Christ and All Men*. Tübingen, Fotodruck Präzis Barbara v. Spangenberg KG, 1976.
- Rössler, Dietrich. "Die Einheit der Praktischen Theologie." In Karl-Ernst Nipkow, Dietrich Rössler, und Friedrich Schweitzer ed., *Praktische Theologie und Kultur der Gegenwart*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1991, 43-51.
- Röthlisberger, Hugo. *Kirche am Sinai - Die Zehn Gebote In der christlichen Unterweisung*. Zurich: Zwingli, 1965.
- Runyon, Theodore. "The Role of Experience in Religion." *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion* 31 (1992):187-194.
- Rusch, William G. *A Movement Towards Church Unity Ecumenism*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.
- Sangster, W. E.. *The Path to Perfection: An Examination & Restatement of John Wesley's Doctrine of Christian Perfection*. 1943. London: Epworth Press. Reissued, 1984.
- Schnucker, Robert V. ed. *Calviniana: Ideas and Influence of Jean Calvin*. Vol. X of *Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies*. Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers. 1988.
- Schroeder, H. J. *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent: Original Text with English Translation*. St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1941, fourth printing, 1961.
- Scott, Rodin R. *Evil and Theodicy in the Theology of Karl Barth*. New York etc.: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc, 1997.
- Selinger, Suzanne. *Calvin against Himself: An Inquiry in Intellectual History*. Hamden. Ct.: Archon [The Shoestring Press]. 1984. pp.56-58.
- Sharp, C. E. "Motives for Seeking Christ." *The Korean Mission Field*, Vol. 2, No. 10 (Aug., 1906):182-183.
- Sharp, Larry D. "The Doctrine of Grace in Calvin and Augustine." *The Evangelical Quarterly*. Vol. 52, no. 2 (1980): 84-96.
- Shriver, Donald W. Jr. and Knox, E. Richard. "Taxation in the History of Protestant Ethics." *The Journal of Religious Ethics* (Atlanta: Scholars Press. 1985):134-160.

- Smart, James D. *The Divided Mind Theology, Karl Barth and Bultmann, 1908-1933*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967.
- Smeeton, Donald D. "Calvin's Conflict with the Anabaptists." *Evangelical-Quarterly* 54 (Ja.-Mr., 1982):46-54.
- Smith, Gary Scott. "The Reformation: Luther, Calvin, and the Anabaptists." In *Building a Christian World View. Vol.2. The Universe, Society and Ethics*. Ed. by W. Andrew Hoffercker. Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1988, 221-255.
- Smith, Robert Doyle. "John Wesley and Jonathan Edward on Religious Experience: A Comparative Analysis." *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 25 (1990): 130-146.
- Smith, Timothy L. "George Whitefield and Wesleyan Perfectionism." *Wesleyan-Theological- Journal*19 (Spr., 1984): 63-85.
- Snyder, Howard A. "John Wesley. A Man For Our Times." *Christian Today* 16 (1972): 8-11.
- Son, Bong- Ho. "Can the Evangelist Ignore Socio-Political Issues?." *Transformation* 8 (1991): 15-19.
- , "Some Dangers of Rapid Growth." In *Korean Church Growth Explosion*. Ro Bong Rin and Marlin L. Neslon, ed. Seoul: Word of Life Press and Asia Theological Association, 1984, 333-347.
- Son, Myoung-Gul. *Korean Churches in Search of Self-identity, 1930-1970: An Examination of Some Protestant Efforts during the Period of Japanization, National Division, and Resurgence*. Ph. D. diss., Southern Methodist University. Ann Arbor: Xerox University Microfilms, 1974.
- Song, C. S. "Building a Theological Culture of People". In *An Emerging Theology in World Perspective: Commentary on Korean Minjung Theology* ed. by Jung Young Lee. Mystic Connecticut: Twenty-Third Publications, 1988, 119-134.
- Sproul, R. C. *Grace Unknown: The Heart of Reformed Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1997.
- Spross, D. B. "The Doctrine of Sanctification in the Theology of Karl Barth." *Wesleyan Theological Journal*. Vol. 20, no. 2 (1985): 54-76.
- Stauffer, Richard. "Calvin". In *The Biography of Calvin. Vol. I of Article on Calvin and Calvinism: A Fourteen-, Volume Anthology of Scholarly Articles*. Ed. by Richard C. Gamble New York & London: Garland Publishing. Inc., 1992.
- Steinmetz, David C. *Calvin in Context*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

- Stoever, William K. B. "Nature. Grace and John Cotton: The Theological Dimension In the New England Antinomian Controversy." *American Society of Church History* 44 (1975): 22-33.
- Streater, David. "The Significance of John Calvin Today." *Churchman*. Vol. 113, no.3 (London: Vine Books, 1999): 215-231.
- Stringer, J. Harrison. "The Promise of Sanctification: A Study in a Famous Wesley Passage." *The London Quarterly & Holborn Review* 180 (1955): 26-36.
- Stroup, George W. "Reformed Identity in an Ecumenical World." In *Reformed Theology: Identity and Ecumenicity*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 2003, 259-268.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. *A Challenge to the New Perspective, Revising Paul's Doctrine of Justification with an Essay of Donald A. Hagner*. Downers ILL: InterVarsity Press, 2001.
- Suh David Kwang-Sun, "Towards a Political Economy of Mission from the Expansion of Christendom to *Missio Dei*." In *PCKJ*, 189-197.
- Suh, Chul-Won. *The Creation-Mediatorship of Jesus Christ. A Study in the Relation of the Incarnation and the Creation*. Ph.D. diss. Amsterdam, 1982.
- Suh, David Kwang-Sun. "Minjung Theology: The Politics and Spirituality of Korean Christianity." In *PCKJ*, 143-162.
- Suh, Nam-Dong "Historical Reference for a Theology of Minjung." In *Minjung Theology: People as the Subjects of History* ed. by the Commission on Theological Concerns of the Christian Conference of Asia. Maryknol, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1983, 155-184.
- Swearer, Donald. K. *Buddhism*. Nile, IL: Argus Communications, 1977.
- Sweetland, William Ernest. *A Critical Study of John Wesley as Practical Thinker and Reformer*. Ph. D. diss. Michigan State University. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1955.
- Tappert, Theodore G, ed. *The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.
- Tawney, R. H. "Religious Thought on Social and Economic Questions in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." *The Journal of Political Economy*. Vol. 31, no. 6 (1923): 804-825.
- Taylor, David Bentley- and Offner, Clark B. "Buddhism." In Sir Norman Anderson ed., *The World's Religions*. Leichester: Inter-Varsity Press, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1985, 169-190.

- Taylor, Jeremy. "Of Certainty of Salvation." Vol. 3 of *The Whole Works of the Right Rev. Jeremy Taylor (15 Vols): With a Life of the Author and a Critical Examination of His Writings by Reginald Heber*. London: J. Moyes, 1928.
- Taylor, Vincent. *Forgiveness and Reconciliation*. London: Macmillan and Co. limited, 1960.
- Templin, J. Alton. "The Individual and Society in the Thought of Calvin." *Calvin Theological Journal* 23 (1988): 161-177.
- Theron, P. F. "The kingdom of God and the theology of Calvin": Response to the paper by prof. J. H. van Wyk. *In die Skriflig*. Vol. 35, no.2 (2001): 207-213.
- Thimme, Ludwig. *Kirche, Sekte und Gemeinschaftsbewegung vom Standpunkt einer Christlichen Soziologie*. Schwerin indem Mecklenburg: Bahn, 1925.
- Thompson, John. *The Holy Spirit in the Theology of Karl Barth*. Allison Park: Pickwick Publications, 1991.
- Tillich, Paul. *Love, Power, and Justice*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1954.
- , *Systematic Theology III*. New York & Evanston: Harper & Row, 1967.
- Toner, Nicolaus. "The Doctrine of Original Sin According to Augustine of Rome" *Augustiniana* 7 (1957): 100-117, 349-66, 515-30. .
- Toon, Peter. *Foundations for Faith: An Introduction to Christian Doctrine Justification and Sanctification*. Westchester: Crossway Books and London: Marshall Morgan & Scott, 1983.
- Torrance, James. "Interpreting the Word by the Light of Christ or the Light of Nature?: Calvin, Calvinism, and Barth." In *Calviniana*: 258.
- Torrance, T. F. *Karl Barth, Biblical and Evangelical Theologian*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996, 2555-267.
- , *KARL BARTH; An Introduction to His Early Theology, 1910-1931*. London: SCM PRESS LTD, 1962.
- Torrey, Charles C. *The Four Gospels. Our Translated Gospels*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, New York: D. McKay Co., 193-.
- Troeltsch, E. *Protestantism and Progress: A Historical Study of the Relation of Protestantism to the Modern World*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1958.
- Tu, W. M. "On the Mencian Perception of Moral Self-Development," *The Monist* 61 (1968): 72-81.
- Tuttle, Robert G. *John Wesley: His Life and Theology*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan

- Publishing House, 1978.
- Tylenda, Joseph N. "Calvin's First Reformed Sermon? Nicholas Cop's Discourse-1 November 1533." *Westminster Theological Journal* 18 (1975-76): 300-318.
- Un, Joon-Kwan. "After Church Growth in Korea: Search for an Alternative Ecclesial Model." *International Journal of Practical Theology*. Vol 1, No.1 (1997): 161-171.
- Van der Walt, Jansie. *Calvin and His Times*. Wetenskaplike Bydraes of the Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education Series F: Institute for Reformational Studies F2 Brochures. Number 32 Potchefstroom: PUP, 1985.
- Van Til, Cornelius. *Christianity and Barthianism*. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian & Reformed Pub. Co., 1962.
- , *Karl Barth and Evangelicalism*. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian & Reformed Pub. Co., 1964.
- Van Wyk, J. H. "John Calvin on the Kingdom of God and Eschatology." *In die Skriflig*. Vol. 35. no.2 (2001): 191-205.
- Vanderschaaf, Mark E. "Predestination and certainty of salvation In Augustine and Calvin." *Reformed Review* , Vol. 30. no.1 (1976): 1-8.
- Von Harnack, Adolf. *Das Wesen des Christentums: Neuauflage zum Fünzigsten Jahrestag des Ersten Erscheinens mit Einen Geleitwort von Rudolf Bultmann*. Stuttgart: Ehrenfried Klotz Verlag, 1950.
- Von Zinzendorf, Nicholas. *Sixteen Discourses on the Redemption of Man by the Death of Christ. Preached at Berlin*. London: Printed for James Hutton, 1742.
- Wainwright, Geoffrey. "Perfect Salvation in the Teaching of Wesley and Calvin." *Reformed World*. Vol. 40, no.2 (1988): 898-909.
- Wall, Donald D. "Karl Barth and National Socialism, 1921-1946." *Fides et historia* 15 (1983): 80-95.
- Wallace, Ronald S. *Calvin, Geneva, and the Reformation*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1988.
- , *Calvin's Doctrine of the Christian Life*. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1959.
- , Wallace, Ronald S. *Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Pr, 1995.
- Ward, W. R. "The Socialist Commitment in Karl Barth." In *Religious Motivation: Biographical and Sociological Problems for the Church Historian*. Vol. 15 of Derek Baker ed., *Studies in Church History*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1978, 453-465.



- Weber, Max. *Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus, 1904-1905*. tr. Talcott Parsons. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1978.
- Weber, Otto. *Foundations of Dogmatics* 1. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishin Co, 1981.
- Webster, John. *Barth*. London & New York: Continuum, 2000.
- , “Introducing Barth.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Karl Barth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- , *Barth’s Ethics of Reconciliation*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- , *Barth’s Moral Theology: Human Action in Barth’s thought*, edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- Wellhausen, J. *Das Evangelium Mattaei: uberstzt und erkalrt*. Sic., Rheimer, 1904.
- Wendel François. “Justification and Predestination in Calvin.” In *Reading In Calvin’s Theology*. Ed. by Donald McKim. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984, 153-178.
- , *Calvin: The Origins and Development of His Religious Thought*. Tr. by Philip Mairet. London: Collins, 1963.
- Wernle, P. *Der Evangelische Glaub. III. Calvin*. Tübingen. 1919.
- Whidden, Woodrow W. “Wesley on Imputation: A Truly Reckoned Reality or Antinomian Polemical Wreckage.” *The Asbury Theological Journal*. Vol. 52, no. 2 (1997): 63-70.
- Whiling, Frank, ed. *John and Charles Wesley*. New York: Paulist Press, 1981.
- White, Robert. “Oil and Vinegar: Calvin on Church Discipline.” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 38 (1985): 25-40.
- Whitefield, George. *Letters...for the Period 1734-1742*. London: Epworth, 1976.
- Wilcox, Pete. “Conversion in the Thought and Experience of John Calvin.” *Anvil*. Vol. 14, no. 2 (1997):113-128.
- Wileman, William. *John Calvin: His Life, His Teaching, and His Influence*. In *Books For The Ages*. AGES Software • Albany. OR USA Version 1.0 © 1998.
- Williams, Collin W. *John Wesley’s Theology Today*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960.
- Williams, Ernest Claude. “A Critical Appraisal of the Grenzfall in Karl Barth’s Ethics.” M.A. diss. the University of South Africa, 1981.
- Williams, Kevin F.. “‘To be capable of God...’ John Wesley’s understanding of ‘Christian Perfection’ as the link between his theology and his spirituality.” *Studia historiae ecclesiasticae*. Vol. 23, no. 1-2 (1997): 15-38.

- Williams, R. D. "Barth on the Triune God." In S. W. Sykes, ed., *Karl Barth: Studies of his Theological Method*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979, 147-193.
- Williams, Rowan "Barth, War and the State." In Nigel Biggar, ed. *Reckoning with Barth: Essay in Commemoration of the Centenary of Karl Barth's Birth*. London & Oxford: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd, 1988, 170-190.
- Willis, David. "A Reformed Doctrine of the Eucharist and Ministry and its Implications for Roman Catholic Dialogue." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*. Vol. 21, no.2 (1984): 295-309.
- Willis, Robert E. *The Ethics of Karl Barth*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971.
- Winecoff, David K. "Calvin's Doctrine of Mortification." *Presbyterion: Covenant Seminary Review* 13 (Saint Louis: Covenant Theological Seminary, 1987): 85-101.
- Winthrop, J. "A Model of Christian Charity." In *The Foundation of Massachusetts: Historians and the Source*, ed. Edmund S. Morgan. Indianapolis: Bobbs Merrill, 1964, 202-204.
- Witvliet, John D. "Baptism as a Sacrament of Reconciliation in the Thought of John Calvin." *Studia Liturgica*. Vol. 27, no. 2 (1997): 152-165.
- Wolf, Ernst. "Die Königsherrschaft Christi und der Staat." In *Theologische Existenz heute* 64 (Munich, 1958): 20-72.
- Wolterstorff, Nicholas. "The Wounds of God: Calvin's Theology of Social Injustice." *The Reformed Journal*. Vol. 37, no. 6 (1987): 14-22.
- Wood, Alan Thomas. *Asian Democracy in World History*. New York & London: Routledge, 2004.
- Wood, Arther Skevington. *The Contribution of John Wesley to the Theology of Grace*. Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship. Inc, 1975.
- Wood, Laurence W. "Pentecostal Sanctification in Wesley and Early Methodism." *Wesleyan Theological Journal*. Vol. 34, no.1 (1999): 24-63.
- Wright, David. "The Ethical Use of the Old Testament in Luther and Calvin: A Comparison." *Scottish Journal of Theology*. Vol. 36, no 4 (1983): 463-489.
- Wuthnow, Robert. "Sociology of Religion." In Neil J, Smelser ed. *Handbook of Sociology*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1988.
- Yang, Nak Heong. *Reformed Social Ethics and the Korean Church*: Sandra Wawrytko ed., Vol.21 *Asian Thoughts and Culture*. New York etc.: Peter Lang Publishing Co., 1997.
- Yim, Hee-Mo. *Unity Lost-Unity to be Regained in Korean Presbyterianism: A History of*

- Divisions in Korean Presbyterianism and the Role of the Means of Grace*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH Eupopäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1996.
- Yoo, B.W. *Korean Pentecostalism: Its History and Theology*, Ph. D. thesis, Birmingham University. Frankfurt am Main; Bern; New York; Paris: Peter Lang, 1987.
- Young, Francis. "The Significance of John Wesley's Conversion Experience." In *John Wesley: Contemporary Perspectives*. Ed. by John Stacey with an introduction by Frank Baker. London: Epworth Press, 1988, 37-46.
- Zachman, Randall. C. "Calvin as Analogical Theologian." *Scottish Journal of Theology*. Vol.51, no. 2 (1998):162-187.
- , "Theologian In the service of piety: A New Portrait of Calvin." *The Christian Century* 114 (Chicago: Christian Century Co., 1997): 413-418.
- Ziegler, Donald J. "Marpeck versus Bucer: A Sixteenth Century Debate over the Uses and Limits of Political Authority." *Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies 2*(St. Louis: Foundation for Reformation Research, 1971): 95-107.

## Korean Resources

- Ahn, Myung-Jun. "The Theological Problems of the Korean Church]. In M. J. Ahn, et al., *The Problem of the Korean Church and the Scheme to Overcome it*]. Seoul: Ecomebiznet, 2006, 15-34.
- Byun, Jong-Ho. *The Diary of Pastor Yong-Do Lee*. Incheon: Chosuk Publishing, 1986.
- , *The Collected Letters of Pastor Lee Yong Do*. Seoul: Shimoowon, 1934..
- Cha, Jae-Myung. *A History of Choson Christianity Presbyterian Church*. Seoul: Shinmunnaekyoedang, 1928.
- Chang, Dong-Min. "The Theology of Dr. Hyung-Nyong Park." *Kidokkyosasang* (Mar., 2002): 142-150.
- , *A Study of H. N. Park's Theology*. Seoul: Institute of Korean Church History Studies, 1998.
- Choi, Hong-Seok. "Machen's Understanding of Man expressed in *The Christian View of Man*." *Presbyterian Theological Quarterly*. Vol. 68, no. 3 (fall, 2001): 275.
- Gallup Korea. *Religion and Religious Life of Koreans*. Seoul: Gallup Korea, 1998.
- , *Research Report on the Church Activities and Religious Consciousness of the Korean Protestants*. Seoul: Gallup Korea, 1998.
- , *The Fourth Comparative Survey (2004): Korean Religions and Religious Consciousness*

- *The Religions Study Comparing the Results of '84, '89, '97, '04's Surveys*. Seoul: Gallup Korea, 2004.
- Gard, Richard A. ed., *Buddhism*. New York: George Braziller, 1961.
- Hong, Soo-Ki. "The Problem caused by the Contact of Early Korean Christianity and Confucianism (I)," *Presbyterian Theological Quarterly* 194 (1982): 35-50.
- IljongToseoYeonkuKaebalWiwonhoe. *The History of Korea for Middle School Students*. Vol. 1. Seoul: Kuksapyunchanwiwonhoe, 2001.
- IKCHS (The Institute of Korean Church History Studies). *A History of Korean Church*. Vol. I (16C.-1918). Seoul: The Christian Literature Press, 1989.
- Jung, Dong-Sub. "Why is Guwonpa a Heresy? (4)." *Ministry & Theology* 68 (Feb. 1995).  
-, "Why is Guwonpa a Heresy? (5)." *Ministry & Theology* 69 (Mar., 1995).
- Jung, Hee-Soo. "Chi Philosophy and Christianity, Its Reception and Critique." *Ministry & Theology* 77 (Nov., 1995): 75.
- Jung, Sung-Ku. "The History of the Korean Church Sermon IV (1920-30) –Centering on the Evaluation and Critique of Rev. Lee Yong-Do's Sermons." *Presbyterian Theological Quarterly* 197 (Spr., 1983): 124-159.
- Kang, Man Kil. *A Study of Korean Nation Movement History*. Seoul: Hangilsa, 1985.
- Kang, Wi-Jo. "Indigenous Tradition of Korean Religions." *Theological Forum* 14:194.
- Kim, Eui-Hwan. "The Problem of Korean Church's Involvement in the Politics," *Presbyterian Theological Quarterly* (March, 1973):25-32, 50ff.  
-, *Challenged Conservative Theology*. Seoul: Word of Life Books, 1970.  
-, *An Introduction to Modern Theology*. Seoul: Kaehyukjueuishinhaeng-hyuphoe, 1989.  
-, "Pietism, Reformed, and Liberalism." *Digital Shinhakjinam (Presbyterian Theological Quarterly)* 156 (Spr.,1972): 4-5.
- Kim, Hae-Yon. *A History of Korean Church*. Seoul: Sungkwangmunhwasa, 1993, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1997.
- Kim, Hyo-Sung, ed. *A Data Book Concerning Modern Church Problems*. Seoul: Old time Faith, 2004.
- Kim, Kil-Sung. *Reformed Theology and the Church*. Seoul: Chongshin Univ. Press, 1996.
- Kim, Myung-Hyuk. "Historical Analysis of Ancestor Worship in the Korean Church." In Bong Rin Ro, ed. *Christian Alternatives to Ancestor Practices*. Seoul: Word of Life Press/Asian Theological Association, 1985.

- Kim, Rhee Gwan. *A History of the Korean- American Church Division*. Seoul: Christian Literature Press, 1995.
- Kim, Syng-Ho. *The Korean Church After Ten Years*. Seoul: Ecumenical Study, 2005.
- Kim, Yung-Han. *Von Barth bis Moltman: Eine reformatorische Aufhellung zu den Hauptströmungen der Gegenwartstheologie*. Seoul: The Christian Literature Society, 1982.
- Lee, Han-Su. "Re-illumination of the Theology of Hyung-Nyong Park," *Presbyterian Theological Quarterly*, serial no. 268 (Spr., 2002): 173-177. (In Korean).
- Lee, Young Hun. *A History of Christianity in Korea*. Seoul: Concordia Press, 1985.
- Min, Kyung-Bae. *A History of the Formation of the Korean National Church*. Seoul: Yonsei University Press, 1988. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition.
- Moon, Suk-Ho. "The Korean Church and Environment Preservation Problem." *Presbyterian Theological Quarterly*. Vol.59, no. 3 (Au., 1992): 8-17.
- Na, Kyum-Il. "The Korean Church and Spiritual Great Awakening Movement- Dawn Prayer." *Ministry & Theology* 52 (April, 1994).
- Na, Yong-Hwa. "A Developmental Evaluation of Hyung Nyong Park's Systematic Theology." *Presbyterian Theological Quarterly* 252 (1997): 60-87.
- Noh, Myung-Gil. *The Social Background of Religious Growth in Korea*. Seoul: Nathan Publishing Co., 1989.
- Park, Bong-Bae. "Yong Do Lee's Mysticism of Love and Its Ethicality." *Theology and World* 4 (1978): 59.
- Park, Hae-Kyung. "The Problem of the Korean Church and the Scheme to Overcome it: the Establishment and Education of Evangelical Pastoral Theology. In M. J. Ahn, et al., *The Problem of the Korean Church and the Scheme to Overcome it*. Seoul: Ecomebiznet, 2006, 53-70.
- Park, Hyung-Nyong, *The Complete Collection of H. N. Park*, VI, IX, and XIII. Seoul: Hankuk kidokkyo kyoyuk yonkuwon, 1978, 1988.
- Park, Jong-Gu and Myung, Sung Hun. "Will the Korean Church grow again." *The Pastoral Monthly* 4 (2004): 58.
- Park, Keon-Taek. "What is Reformed?" *Presbyterian Theological Quarterly* 257 (Win., 1998): 191-217.
- Park, Yong-Kyu. "The Issue of Pastor Yong-Do Lee and His Hereticalness." *Presbyterian Theological Quarterly* 244 (Oct., 1995): 38-57.

Schaff, Philip, ed. *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Vol. V Saint Augustine: Anti-Pelagian Writings*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1987.

Shin, Bok-Yoon. "The Significance of the Theology of Hyung-Nyong Park in the Perspective of the Korean Conservative Theology History." *Theology Thoughts* 25 (Sum., 1979): 27-45.

Yoo, Dong-Sik. *The History of the Korean Methodist Church Thought*. Seoul: Jeonmangsa, 1993.

Yun, Sung-Bum. *Christianity and Korean Thought*. Seoul: The Christian Literature Society, 1964.

### **Anonymous Book, Journals & Newspapers**

"Agreement on Division of Territory." In *Annual Meeting of the General Council of Protestant Evangelical Missions in Korea* (Oct., 1909): 32-34.

"Be careful of Jezebel's group." *The Christian Times*. Dec. 14, 1932.

"NCC Ships Food to North Korea," in *Christian Century* 114 (Ja., 1997): 43-44.

"Presbyterian Groups Grow Rapidly in Korea," in *Christian Century* 113 (Sep.-Oct, 1996): 888.

"Selling and Buying Sex Special Law, 138 Arrested at the First Day." *Kyunghyang Daily Newspaper*. September, 23. 2004.

"Statement on the Mission of the Korean Churches in the New Millennium : Council of Presbyterian Churches in Korea International Consultation on Korean Churches' Mission around the World, Seoul, Korea, 23-27 May 1999." *International Review of Mission*, Vol.89, no.353 (Apr., 2000): 23-27.

"The Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in U.S.A." *The Korean Information Papers*, Feb. 12, 1908,

*Alabama Baptist*, May 9, 2002.

*Christian Unity Newspaper*. Feb. 6, 2000.

*Introduction to Buddhism*. Seoul: Dong-gook Univ. Press, 1986.

*Kiristutokyo nenkan*. [Christian Yearbook]. Tokyo: Kirisuto Shimbunsha, 1991.

*Korea-A Religious History*. New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2002.

*Religion Newspaper*. No. 1467 (March 20<sup>th</sup>, 2003).



*The International Review of Missions*. 38 (Jan., 1949):8-10.

*Year Book of Religions in Korea, 1996-7*. Seoul: Korean Religion & Society Research Institutes, 1993, 1995 and 1997.

## Secondary Resources

Barth, K. "An Outing to the Bruderholz." In *Fragments Grave and Gay*. London, 1971.

-, A Letter to Great Britain from Switzerland. London, 1941.

Barth, Peter. "Die biblische Grundlage der lehre Prädestinations bei Calvin." In *De l'élection éternelle de Dieu*. Ed. by Martinus Nijhoff. Geneva: Editions labor et Fides, 1936.

Bernard. "Sermon LXXXIII on the Song of Songs." In *Varieties of Mystic Experience*, ed. Elmer O'Brien. New York: Mentor-Omega, 1964.

Beza, Theodore. *Tractationes*, 3 Vols. Geneva, 1570-1582.

Bremmer, R. H. "Enkele karakteristieke trekken van Calvijns theologie." *Gereformeerd Theologisch Tijdschrift*, Vol. 44 (1943): 552.

Busch, Wilhelm. "Die Innere Bedrohung Der Evangelischen Kirche." *Licht und Leben* 61 (1950): 132ff.

Dannert, H. "Die Evangelisation." *Licht und leben* 40 (1928):357. In *KP*, p.161.

Kingdon, Robert M. "La Réforme protestant vue comme révolution sociale. le cas de Genève." *Les Réformes enracinement socio-culturel. XXVe colloque International d'eties humanistes Tours. 1er-13 juillet 1982*. Études réunies par Bernard.

Letters from John Fletcher to Lady Huntingdon. May 9. 1763: Fletcher Vol. II. p. 85 Manchester. Methodist Archives.

Piette, Maximin. *John Wesley in the Evolution of Protestantism*. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1937. Tr. by J. B. Howard from *La Réaction de John Wesley dans l'Évolution du Protestantisme*, 1925. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1927.

Ritschl, Albrecht. *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation. The Positive Development of the Doctrine*. Tr. ed. by H. R. Mackintosh and A.B. Macaulay Edinburgh: T. & T Clark, 1902. Chap. 3.

S.A Moffett's letter to Dr. Ellinwood. Nov, 1

Schick, E. *Die Botschaft des Pietismus in den theologischen Kämpfen der Gegenwart*, 2nd ed., 1939.

Tribble, H. W. *The Doctrine of Sanctification in the Theology of Karl Barth*. London:

Edinburgh, 1937.

Tyerman, Luke. *The Life and Times of the Rev. John Wesley*. Vol. 3 of 3 Vols. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1871.

Underwood, H.G. *The Religions of Eastern Asia*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1910.

## Internet Resources

“Denomination, Union with Kaehyuk Denomination, Decision with Lightning Speed.” The Christian Times. September 29, 2005. <<http://www.kidok.co.kr/>>.

“Do You Know How Many Korean Missionaries Are?” *CGN TV Today*. <[http://www.cgntv.net/cgn\\_player/player.htm?vid=24005](http://www.cgntv.net/cgn_player/player.htm?vid=24005)> (December 09, 2005).

Lee, Jung-Jae. “Journalist, Jung-Jae Lee’s Blog.” <<http://blog.joins.com/jjyeehik>> (January 10, 2006).

“The Reason Refusing Abortion.”

<<http://www.reportworld.co.kr/data/358/F357546.html>>.