

## 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 deplors 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. Ursula 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 indem 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 II/2, 189.

<sup>259</sup> CD II/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 /1905-1909*, 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 interrelated.<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 vihsou/ cristoû 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 (dia pi, stewj vihsou/ cristou) 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 ἠγγράμενος, 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.