

TH
SP 32

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE SOTERIOLOGY OF

H. ORTON WILEY AND KARL BARTH

By

ROYAL SPEIDEL

B. A., Westmar College, LeMars, Iowa

B. D., Evangelical Theological Seminary, Naperville, Ill.

A Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SACRED THEOLOGY
In
The Biblical Seminary in New York

New York, N. Y.
April, 1965

**BIBLICAL SCHOOL OF
THEOLOGY LIBRARY
HATEFIELD, PA.**

OUTLINE

INTRODUCTION

Problem Defined
Definitions
Method of Procedure
Justification of the Study
Basic Sources

CHAPTER I ANALYSIS OF H. ORTON WILEY'S SOTERIOLOGY

Introduction

- A. Problem of Sin
 - 1. Nature of Sin
 - 2. Consequences of Sin

- B. The Objective Soteriology of H. Orton Wiley
 - 1. Approach to Objective Soteriology
 - 2. Terminology of Objective Soteriology
 - 3. Nature of Objective Soteriology
 - 4. Scope of Objective Soteriology

- C. The Subjective Soteriology of H. Orton Wiley
 - 1. Approach to Subjective Soteriology
 - 2. Nature of Subjective Soteriology
 - a) Vocation
 - b) Christian Righteousness
 - c) Christian Sonship
 - d) Christian Perfection or Entire Sanctification
 - 3. The Role of Man in Subjective Soteriology
 - a) Place of Man
 - b) Responsibility of Man

Summary

CHAPTER II ANALYSIS OF KARL BARTH'S SOTERIOLOGY

Introduction

- A. Problem of Sin
 - 1. Nature of Sin
 - 2. Consequences of Sin

p40

- B. The Objective Soteriology of Karl Barth
 - 1. Approach to Objective Soteriology
 - 2. Terminology of Objective Soteriology
 - 3. Nature of Objective Soteriology
 - 4. Scope of Objective Soteriology

- C. The Subjective Soteriology of Karl Barth
 - 1. Approach to Subjective Soteriology
 - 2. Nature of Subjective Soteriology
 - 3. The Role of Man in Subjective Soteriology 167
 - a) Place of Man
 - b) Responsibility of Man

Summary

CHAPTER III SOTERIOLOGIES OF H. ORTON WILEY AND KARL BARTH COMPARED AND CONTRASTED

Introduction

- A. Problem of Sin Compared and Contrasted
 - 1. Nature of Sin Compared and Contrasted
 - 2. Consequences of Sin Compared and Contrasted

- B. The Objective Soteriologies Compared and Contrasted
 - 1. Approach of Objective Soteriology Compared and Contrasted
 - 2. Terminology of Objective Soteriology Compared and Contrasted
 - 3. Nature of Objective Soteriology Compared and Contrasted
 - 4. Scope of Objective Soteriology Compared and Contrasted

- C. The Subjective Soteriologies Compared and Contrasted
 - 1. Approach to Subjective Soteriology Compared and Contrasted
 - 2. Nature of Subjective Soteriology Compared and Contrasted
 - 3. The Role of Man in Subjective Soteriology Compared and Contrasted
 - a) Place of Man
 - b) Responsibility of Man

Summary



INTRODUCTION

Problem Defined

The purpose of this thesis is to compare and contrast the soteriologies of H. Orton Wiley and Karl Barth. Primary emphasis is given to the subjective aspects of the doctrine. In concentrating on the subjective aspects of the doctrine, the motive is to discover man's responsibility in salvation.

Definitions

The term "soteriology" refers to the totality of man's being brought into fellowship with God. Therefore, it includes the work that God has done and is doing for man through Jesus Christ and the work that God is doing upon man through the Holy Spirit. Soteriology also involves the response of man to the work of God through Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit.

"Objective" soteriology has reference primarily to the work that God has done and is doing through Jesus Christ. "Subjective" soteriology has a twofold meaning. On the one hand, it refers to the work of God upon man through the Holy Spirit. On the other hand, it refers to the response that man makes to the work of God upon him through the Holy Spirit.

Method of Procedure

The soteriology of each writer is analyzed. Then, the two viewpoints, in their various aspects, are compared

and contrasted. An analysis of the Arminian exponent, Wiley, is made first. That of Karl Barth follows.

A brief analysis of each writer's view of sin, as it is related to soteriology, is made, within the soteriological analysis. This is followed by an analysis of objective soteriology; a study of objective soteriology is necessary because the nature and scope, particularly the latter, of objective soteriology determine the nature and scope of subjective soteriology. Subsequently there is an analysis of subjective soteriology itself.

Justification of the Study

The importance of the subject of soteriology ought to be stated since it is basic in this paper. This thesis presupposes that soteriology is of "decisive importance" in Christian thought and faith.¹ Therefore, a study of this subject approximates the subject itself in importance.

In justifying this study, mention needs also to be made of the scholars whose views of soteriology are being studied. The value in studying the author, Karl Barth, is reflected in an evaluation of his major writings, Kirchliche Dogmatik. It is written that this work is "the most formidable and massive work of theology since the Summa Theologica of Thomas Aquinas."² The writings of H. Orton Wiley

¹Roger Hazelton, "Salvation," Handbook of Christian Theology, ed. Marvin Halverson and Arthur A. Cohen, (Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company, 1958), p. 336.

²Thomas F. Torrance, Karl Barth, (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1962), p. 18.

are not as widely known as Barth's. However, he is worthy of study because he gained rather wide recognition in the United States, and high regard was held for him by theologians of diverse thought. Carl F. H. Henry has written that H. Orton Wiley "was both the peer of theologians in the Church of the Nazarene and one of the ablest articulators of Arminianism in current theological dialogue as a whole."¹ A comparative study of Barth and Wiley is worthy because the former is considered generally to be an exponent of Calvinism, while the latter is considered to be an exponent of Arminianism. Because Calvinism and Arminianism represent two major schools of thought in theology, a comparative study of respective exponents is worthy.

Basic Sources

The basic sources for analyzing the soteriology of H. Orton Wiley are his three volumes titled Christian Theology (primarily volume II). Although this set was published in 1952, it was written already in 1940.² Wiley wrote a commentary on the book of Hebrews which was also used. These four volumes, along with the devotional book - God Has the Answer, compose, perhaps, Dr. Wiley's primary writings.³

¹"Dr. H. Orton Wiley," The Herald of Holiness, October 4, 1961, p. 12.

²Cf. the date of the Introduction in Christian Theology, vol. 1.

³Pasadena College News Bureau. November 14, 1957.

The basic sources of the prolific Karl Barth are the three parts of volume IV of Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of Reconciliation. The English translations have been used. Although it was the Der Roemerbrief (2nd ed., 1921) by Barth that shook the world, it is not a basic source for soteriology.¹ The reason is that Barth's thought on soteriology was not developed until he worked on The Doctrine of Reconciliation which was written during the period of 1953-1959.²

¹Torrence, p. 17.

²Fred Klooster, The Significance of Barth's Theology, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1961), p. 77.

³Ibid., p. 80.

CHAPTER I

ANALYSIS OF H. ORTON WILEY'S SOTERIOLOGY

Introduction

Consideration is going to be given first to Wiley's understanding of sin as it is related to soteriology. The next section is a presentation of the objective soteriology of Wiley. This will be followed by Wiley's subjective soteriology.

A. Problem of Sin

1. Nature of Sin

The definition that generally describes Wiley's view of sin is: "Sin...is self-separation from God in the sense of decentralization, the place which should be occupied by God being assumed by self."¹ Sin is both an act and a state. It is an act in that man actively usurps the status and role of God in the world. Sin is also a state of guilt in which man exists before God.

2. Consequences of Sin

The consequences of sin are twofold. Necessarily resultant from sin are guilt and penalty. These two consequences are related to each other; however, the latter

¹H. Orton Wiley and Paul T. Culbertson, Introduction to Christian Theology, (Kansas City, Missouri: Beacon Hill Press, n.d.), p. 170.

receives the primary emphasis in soteriology.

Because sin is a dethroning of God in an act of rebellion against God, it must be punished. This punishment is the penalty of sin. Hence, "Penalty...in all its forms is God's reaction against sin, and is based ultimately on His holiness."¹

The chief penalty of sin is death.² This penal death involves the physical, temporal and eternal. However the "spiritual death is the chief factor...."³ The spiritual death is temporal. During this life on earth man lacks "fellowship with God" if he is spiritually dead. This lack of fellowship is his penalty on earth for rebelling against God. This could be summarized as follows: Sinning man lives in a state of sin which is, in essence, a state of guilt because of rebellion against God. This state of guilt has a concomitant and resultant severance of man's fellowship with God which is called spiritual death. Severance or spiritual death is man's penalty for sinning.

God desired fellowship with man to be restored. But this could not come to be until the penalty for man's sin was paid. The paying of this penalty is the subject to be covered in the next section, objective soteriology.

¹H. Orton Wiley, Christian Theology, II (Kansas City, Missouri: Beacon Hill Press, 1952), 91.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., II, 93.

B. The Objective Soteriology of H. Orton Wiley

1. Approach to Objective Soteriology

In his theological schema, Wiley discusses objective soteriology within the doctrine of Christology. He uses the term "atonement" to describe objective soteriology. Wiley's starting point on atonement is with the concept of sacrifice. His discussion begins by analyzing the chronological developments of the Old Testament sacrificial system. Sacrifice is the historical background of the atonement. The meaning of sacrifice can be seen in this statement:

...the slaying of the sacrifice and reference to the significance of death is a fundamental concept of the Old Testament. Following this, the offering of the blood had a two-fold significance: it was a representation of the pure life which the sinner should have; and it was an atonement made expiatory through death only.¹

The New Testament conception of sacrifice is "simply the completion of that foreshadowed in the Old Testament."² Hence, the emphasis in the atonement is upon sacrifice. Christ as priest offered a "real objective sacrifice to God" but the emphasis is still upon the sacrifice rather than upon Christ.³

2. Terminology of Objective Soteriology

ATONEMENT means "the whole economy of our Lord's sacrificial ministry, with special emphasis upon the virtue

¹Ibid., II, 221.

²Ibid., II, 225.

³Ibid., II, 226.

of the sacrifice."¹ The word "atonement" comes from the Greek word "katallasein" (καταλλάσσειν), which means "to exchange, to change the relation of one person to another, generally...an exchange of enmity for friendship."² The term "atonement" includes both Godward and manward aspects. The idea of atonement involves several categories within it. "Phases" of the atonement are "expiation, propitiation, redemption, reconciliation..."³ These phases will now be discussed.

RECONCILIATION is "that aspect of the finished work of the atonement which expresses the restored fellowship between God and man."⁴ Reconciliation refers to the state of peace existing between God and man. This state of peace is preceded by an estrangement between man and God.

EXPIATION is "the doing away with guilt and the cancelling of the obligation to punishment."⁵ This work is done by the sacrificial death of Jesus. However, it has reference to the "active phase of Christ's priestly work." This means that expiation has reference to the "offerer rather than... the offering." Expiation refers to Christ as priest rather than as sacrifice.⁶ Satisfaction has a similar meaning; however, it has reference to the "law and the honor of the

¹Ibid., II, 217.

²Ibid., II, 290.

³Ibid., II, 217.

⁴Ibid., II, 291.

⁵Ibid., II, 295.

⁶Ibid., II, 288.

Lawgiver" while expiation has reference to guilt and to the One before whom the guilt is borne.

PROPITIATION refers to "appeasing the wrath of an offended person, or to atone for offenses." As a sinner one is exposed to the wrath of God but in Christ the "wrath of God" is propitiated.¹ Propitiation has reference to the active phase of Christ's work. Therefore, Christ is the propitiator rather than the propitiated. In propitiation, Christ brought "God near to men."²

REDEMPTION represents the "buying back, or laying down a purchase price for the deliverance of men from the bondage of sin."³ There are both objective and subjective aspects to redemption. In an objective sense the "purchase price has been paid for all mankind." Men are objectively freed. However, subjectively, redemption applies to the individual. In this sense it "is provisional and is made effective only through faith."⁴

SATISFACTION expresses the "relation which the work of Christ sustains to the demands of law and justice."⁵

INCARNATION is separate from atonement. Although it is related to atonement, it is not a part of it.⁶ The

¹Ibid., II, 229.

²Ibid., II, 228.

³Ibid., II, 292.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., II, 294.

⁶Ibid., II, 291.

"death of Christ" is "the center of the atoning work," and it is "flanked by the incarnation and the resurrection on either side."¹

3. Nature of Objective Soteriology

In his historical discussion of the atonement, Wiley implies that there are three basic viewpoints that have been held. Another contemporary scholar states the same thing in these words:

In the history of the church three major doctrines have been held--the ransom theory for the first thousand years, the Anselmic and the Abelardian since that time.²

Wiley presents an eclectic view of atonement. He defends both satisfaction and moral influence theories. Therefore, Wiley somewhat classifies his viewpoint when he writes this of the various theories of atonement: "The Arminians aimed at a middle ground between the extremes of the penal satisfaction theory and the moral influence theories."³

The basic "ground or occasion of atonement" is "the existence in the world of both original and actual sin, together with the necessity for propitiation."⁴ Beyond this the atonement is grounded in two other necessities (Wiley lists three but the first and the third are very similar⁵).

¹Ibid., II, 241.

²William, Hordern, The Case for a New Reformation Theology, (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959), p. 142.

³Wiley, II, 241.

⁴Ibid., II, 273.

⁵Ibid., II, 272-76.

The atonement was necessary because of the nature and the claims of God. God is Holy Love. Hence, by His very nature, God could not have fellowship in love with "sinful beings." Yet, the dynamic love of God "yearned" for this fellowship with His creatures.¹ The atonement is therefore based upon the love of God rather than upon His wrath. The other necessity in which the atonement is grounded is that of "governmental necessity." At the beginning God constructed a moral government. It is impossible for God to break this government without giving "license to sin." Thus, God could not set aside the execution for the penalty of sin. Either God had to punish man who sinned against Him or He had to maintain "public justice" by providing a substitute for men. Christ became the sacrifice which was a substitute for penalty.²

There is a "vital principle" in the atonement. God must become immanent in the "innermost consciousness" of man. Because of man's sin there is a separation between man and God. Therefore, this immanence was not possible before the atonement. This contact between God and the consciousness of man is possible only through Jesus Christ.³

"The pre-existent Logos is the ground of unity between Christ and the face, and therefore a fundamental factor in the atonement."⁴ The Incarnate Logos represents the vital

¹Ibid., II, 273.

²Ibid., II, 275.

³Ibid., II, 277.

⁴Ibid., II, 276.

principle in another respect. The pre-existent Logos was the creator of all things. Man was created and constituted by Him so that he must express the holiness of the Logos. As a sinful being, man was unable to express this holiness. So the Incarnate Logos, through assuming the nature of man, provided the necessary holiness. Hence, the necessary link between God and man was provided. For this reason he is able to create men anew.¹ The restoration of the Holy Spirit is a

further aspect of this vital principle in atonement.... As depravity is a consequence of the deprivation of the Spirit, so the bestowal of the Spirit restores man's inner spiritual relations with God.²

Wiley's constant emphasis in relating the Incarnation to the atonement is upon the Incarnate Logos. It is the Word as flesh, and not, the Word becoming flesh that is important in the atonement. Therefore, the atoning importance of the Incarnate Logos is in its being "applied to its culmination in the death on the cross."³ [Italics mine.]

The work of the Incarnate Logos and the work of the Holy Spirit reflect the objective and subjective aspects of the atonement. The historic Christ has done the objective work while the Holy Spirit in the lives of men does the subjective work.⁴

¹Ibid., II, 278.

²Ibid., II, 279.

³Ibid., II, 279.

⁴Ibid., II, 280.

Wiley considers his view of atonement as "vicarious expiation." It is vicarious in that One person endured suffering "instead of another."¹ Expiation was possible because the Incarnate One was "God and man."

His human nature involved the penal suffering of which the divine was incapable; and the Divine Person gave infinite worth to the sacrifice.²

In the process of atonement the heavenly wasn't impaired nor was the human omitted.

Wiley does not apparently see certain aspects of his view of atonement as objectionable as some do. By putting an emphasis upon the love of God and divine justice, he apparently believes that the emphasis is properly placed. One of Walter Hordern's arguments against this view of the atonement is that it emphasizes the justice of God more than the love of God. Hence, the Biblical picture of the loving family relationship is not maintained. However, this objection cannot be raised against Wiley. Whether or not the emphasis upon the "blood of Christ" is a "crudely mythical element(s)" perhaps would be of little concern to Wiley. He would probably retort that it may be offensive but it is necessary.

4. Scope of Objective Soteriology

The atoning work of Jesus Christ is universal in its extent. This means that Christ's sacrificial offering makes salvation a possibility for men universally. "Beneath that

¹Ibid., II, 282.

²Ibid.

sprinkled blood, mercy is extended to all mankind."¹

There are two bases upholding the universality of atonement. One is the reason of man. The second, and the most important, is Scripture (e.g. Matt. 20:20 and I Tim. 2:6).² There are three kinds of Scriptural teaching that verify the universality of the atonement:

- a) those that speak of atonement in universal tones,
- b) those that indicate that the atonement is to be proclaimed universally (therefore the possibility of universal acceptance is apparently implied),
- c) those that say Christ died for even men who may perish.³

While the atonement is universal in regard to race, it is at the same time conditional in regard to individuals. Unless a person responds and accepts the atoning work of Christ it will not be efficacious for him.

There are accompanying doctrines that provide consistency for conditional atonement. "Moral freedom and prevenient grace" fit hand-in-hand with requiring a response from man before the atonement's benefits are extended to him.⁴

When the atonement is not accepted by a certain individual there is only one alternative for God. That is to reject that person.

The reason that this person is rejected is that "there remaineth no sacrifice for [his] sins."⁵ Therefore rejection

¹Ibid., II, 288.

²Ibid., II, 295.

³Ibid., II, 296.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., II, 239.

comes not because a person is necessarily immoral, without faith, etc., but, simply, because he has no provision to be freed from the guilt of his sin.

C. The Subjective Soteriology of H. Orton Wiley

1. Approach to Subjective Soteriology

Subjective soteriology is discussed in the context of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. The areas of grace, righteousness (justification by faith), sonship and sanctification are the larger categories in Wiley's subjective soteriology. Each of these areas composes a chapter within Part IV. Except for the first chapter on the person of the Holy Spirit, the remaining chapters pertain to subjective soteriology.

Basically the approach of H. Orton Wiley to subjective soteriology could be characterized as "evangelical."¹ It begins with vocation which is the call of God to man through the Holy Spirit. Vocation is a work, the first, of grace. Grace is necessary in order to bring man to accepting the work of God in Christ; however, there must be human cooperation in order for the grace of God to be efficacious. The vocation of man is followed by his repentance, saving faith and conversion. The subsequent "steps" leading to man's salvation are the regeneration of his character, his adoption by

¹Kenneth K. Kanzter said in a course in soteriology that the evangelical position on soteriology basically contains the ideas of: "predestination, election, calling, conversion, repentance, faith, justification, adoption, union with Christ, regeneration, sanctification, assurance, perseverance, glorification."

God and the assurance that he is saved.¹ Perhaps the point at which Wiley's soteriology is least evangelical is at the doctrine of sanctification. He has a strong emphasis upon that doctrine.

2. Nature of Subjective Soteriology

a) Vocation

The first step in the subjective aspect of soteriology is "Gospel Vocation." This is a proclamation that comes to the individual through the Holy Spirit.² This call or vocation is both "indirect or universal" and "direct or immediate." The former is in the form of a "secret influence exerted upon the consciences of men, apart from the revealed Word as found in the Holy Scriptures."³ The latter is made, specifically, through the Scriptures.

This call is closely related to predestination and election. Election is receiving the call and then responding to it. Thus, being elected is contingent upon accepting the universal call of God. Predestination is simply God's gracious purpose to save man. Thus it stands over against the Calvinist view that asserts predestination as being God's purpose both to save and to damn men.⁴ Election differs from predestination in that the former implies a choice but the

¹Wiley, II, 431.

²Ibid., II, 334.

³Ibid., II, 335.

⁴A. Mitchell Hunter, The Teaching of Calvin (Westwood, N. J.: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1950), p. 109.

latter does not. In Wiley's words "...predestination is God's general and gracious plan of saving men, by adopting them as children through Christ; election pertains to the chosen ones who are holy and blameless before Him in love."¹ Hence, the elect are chosen upon their acceptance of the "conditions of the call."²

The beginning of salvation, subjectively, is this call to man. It is a universal call including three aspects: "the proclamation, the conditions upon which the offer of salvation is made, and the command to submit to the authority of Christ."³ The agent of the call is the Holy Spirit and the Word (probably meaning the Bible) is the instrument. When the Holy Spirit calls a person through the Word that person is "awakened." The person becomes conscious that his sinful self is doomed. It is important to realize that the Holy Spirit works through the Word, but it is not restricted to it. "Awakened" is a general theological term while "conviction" is more specific. Conviction has reference to the personal responsibility for one's guilt. The word "conviction" has two further involvements: (1) it affects the conscience as well as the reason and (2) it involves a sense of hope and not despair. (The Spirit not only reveals the sinfulness of human hearts, but the fullness and freeness of

¹Wiley, II, 337.

²Ibid., II, 339.

³Ibid., II, 340.

salvation through Christ.¹⁾

Wiley's thought of the Arminian perspective on "effectual calling" carries with it the idea that all men are called, and it involves the fact that all men are genuinely given the grace to accept that call if they so desire. As was stated before, the call carries with it a contingency. The call may be resisted or accepted. And, even when it is accepted, it may be rejected later.

Concerning "prevenient grace" Wiley writes that the grace of God is infinite and cannot be limited to His redemptive work. Hence, prevenient grace is operative prior to the work of redemption. Prevenient grace is the grace that goes "before" and prepares the soul for the beginning of salvation. Wiley writes that "it may be defined, therefore, as the manifestation of the divine influence which precedes the full regenerate life."² Wiley sees prevenient grace to be substantiated as an accepted Christian doctrine in the whole Bible as well as by the Church Fathers.

The author's thought on prevenient grace presupposes the total depravity of man. Hence, he asserts that everything done in man before regeneration is due to the work of God. And, this working of God's grace upon man, prior to his regeneration, is called a state of prevenient grace. There is a progression of steps in this state. The Spirit

¹Ibid., II, 343.

²Ibid., II, 346.

of God leads a man from one step of advancement to another. Somewhere along the line, man's spirit begins to co-operate with the Holy Spirit. The free will of man responds. However, even after the spirit of man begins to assert itself, the grace of God continues to be given in order to bring man to a salvation in Jesus Christ.

According to Wiley's view of Arminianism, every man in some sense has the grace of God unless he has quenched the Spirit. He quotes Wesley to support the idea that the natural conscience of man is the work of God.

Reference has been made to man's co-operating with the Holy Spirit. Wiley's position is that synergism, human-divine co-operation, is a basic truth of Arminianism. However, the emphasis is always on divine grace. This is done for two reasons: (1) the work of preliminary grace is deeply rooted in the nature of man, and (2) "the influence of the Spirit connected with the Word is irresistible as claiming the attention of the natural man. He may resist it, but he cannot escape it."¹ Wiley seems to be saying that the Holy Spirit is given primary emphasis because He is simply the primary mover in this whole matter. However, in another place he asserts that salvation is all of grace because the Holy Spirit is the initiator. But, on the other hand, the human will is a co-operator because it must accept the grace offered. There are four propositions in regard to the relation of prevenient grace and the human will:

¹Ibid., II, 355.

- (1) Preventive grace is exercised upon the whole man.
- (2) Preventive grace is exercised with the view that man is a free and responsible being.
- (3) Preventive grace is exercised upon man with the view that he is enslaved by sin.
- (4) Continuous co-operation between the grace of the Spirit and the human will merges preventive grace into saving grace.¹

Wiley asserts that repentance is "fundamental" to a system of Christian thought. It is "introductory to the state of salvation."²

On a definition of repentance, it is not easy to determine Wiley's thought. He lists a series of definitions given by other men (and many of these are different from each other), then he implies that his definition is to be found in the quotations he has given. At any rate, it seems that he consents to an involved definition which includes conviction of sin and contrition, and it leads to "sincere resolutions of amendment."³

Again the author thinks that both the divine and human elements are involved in repentance. God is the "author" of repentance. However, man does the repenting. God makes it possible to repent. Because man is totally depraved, preventive grace is necessary for repentance. God leads man to repentance. There are two involvements in this. First, grace helps man to be sorrowful for sin. Secondly, God makes it possible, through grace, to confess sin. The

¹Ibid., II, 356.

²Ibid., II, 358.

³Ibid., II, 359.

last step of repentance is, however, the act of man's responding to the Holy Spirit.

There is a state of penitence that is subsequent to repentance. It is a consequence of the act of repentance. Wesley is quoted in an attempt to substantiate the need for a penitent state.¹ Continued repentance and faith are as necessary after entering the Kingdom of God as they are for entering.

Repentance is a necessity for salvation. The Lukan account of Jesus' words "except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish" (Luke 13:3) are given as a basis for this proposition. Requiring repentance is not some arbitrary demand of God's. Rather it is necessary because of the nature of sin itself. Wiley defines sin as "rebellion against God." Therefore "there can be no salvation...without a renunciation of sin..."²

Wiley understands faith to be of three types: faith in general, saving faith which is the condition of salvation, and faith which is a grace of the Christian life.

Faith in general is defined as a principle whereby man accepts something unseen as existing. The primary element in this faith is trust. It is a trusting in something that is at least somewhat rationally supportable. Thus, knowledge is involved. Furthermore, this "faith operates in

¹Ibid., II, 362.

²Ibid., II, 363.

the emotional and volitional life to the degree that the fact or proposition believed is judged to be important."¹ There are degrees in faith. These various degrees are not attributable to a rational understanding, but rather to the strength of faith itself.²

Saving faith is not a different kind than general faith. Rather, it is that which is considered as the condition for salvation. There is both the divine and the human element in this faith, and faith is not only positive and outreaching, but also, and prior, it is a self-emptying faith. Saving faith involves the whole man. Thus, it is not simply a matter of the mind, nor of feeling, nor of the will. Furthermore, saving faith is based upon the truth of the Scriptures. And, lastly, saving faith is closely related to good works. Wiley's view of Arminianism is that it denies "the merit of good works" but insists that they are a "condition of salvation."³

Faith is not merely a matter of entering into salvation. It is something vitally present with the regenerate man. Saving faith becomes a constant faith within the Christian life.⁴

The author sees conversion "in its truest scriptural meaning" as a pivotal point at which a person turns from sin

¹Ibid., II, 366.

²Ibid., II, 367.

³Ibid., II, 373.

⁴Ibid., II, 375.

to God. Thus conversion signifies the instant of justification and adoption.¹

b) Christian Righteousness

It has been previously stated that Wiley titles the chapter on justification by faith "Christian Righteousness." He calls this doctrine "a cardinal doctrine" that occupies "a controlling position in the entire Christian system."² In terms of time, the act of justification is seen as having a punctiliar nature.

The author's method of developing the "Definitions of Justification" is to state several definitions expressing different viewpoints are given. Then, (through some indeterminate methodology), he takes various elements of these definitions to arrive at his definition. He affirms that

'justification is that gracious and judicial or declarative act of God, by which He pronounces those who believingly accept the propitiatory offering of Christ, as absolved from their sins, released from their penalty, and accepted as righteous before Him.'³

The Scriptures have within them a variety of terms as being synonymous with justification, e.g. "righteous, nonimputation of sin, reckoning or imputation of righteousness."⁴ However, the meanings of the terms are slightly different. Two passages from Romans (3:24-26 and 4:5-8) are considered as "classical passages on justification"

¹Ibid., II, 376.

²Ibid., II, 379.

³Ibid., II, 381. These are Wiley's quotation marks.

⁴Ibid., II, 381.

which portray St. Paul's position. It is implied that Paul developed his idea on the doctrine from the words of our Lord.

Wiley asserts that evangelical justification refers to an accusation of guilt and condemnation. This type of accusation can only be justified by way of pardon. This pardoning is done by God. It is not done by "legal fiction" but rather by "judicial action."¹ And this judicial action is through the work done by Jesus Christ.

Justification is both act and state. It is an act of God whereby men are declared to be just or righteous; it is a state of man, into which he is introduced as a consequence of this declaration.²

The assertion is made that the Scriptures use terms which indicate "an act, an act in process, an act as fully accomplished or perfected, and a state following the accomplishment of the act."³

The Nazarene theologian views justification as bringing about a relative change. This means that it does not bring a change within the individual. Rather it involves an external, objective change. Justification is to be distinguished from sanctification. The former implies "what God does for us," while sanctification implies "what God does in us."⁴ Another distinction that can be made in terms of the nature of the change that accompanies these two

¹ Ibid., II, 383.

² Ibid., II, 384.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid., II, 381.

matters is this: "justification is an actual change in relationship to God, while sanctification is a change in the moral nature of the individual."¹

"Justification is a forensic or judicial act."²

The word "justification" comes from the law court. Therefore, it is to be seen in the context of a legal proceeding. Thus, in the theological sense, the term is to be understood as judicial too. God, as a judge, pardons the penalty and pronounces the person righteous. But, within this imagery, God the ruler is, also, to be seen. As the Ruler, he forgives the sin of his subjects. Hence, there is a negative factor, as well as a positive one, involved. Negatively, sins are forgiven and positively, pardon is granted.

Justification, as an act, is puntiliar in nature. It is a comprehensive, instantaneous act. Hence, "it is not a sentence extending through years."³ Justification is a comprehensive work. This implies that it is effective for pardoning all the sins in the life of a person.

It is the author's viewpoint that the nature of justification and the ground of justification are closely related. In his interpretation, the evangelical perspective of justification involves three factors:

- (1) "Divine justice must be fully satisfied through the propitiatory work of Jesus Christ.
- (2) God fully accepts this meritorious work as sufficient.

¹Ibid., II, 387.

²Ibid., II, 389.

³Ibid., II, 394.

- (3) These two ideas must be jointly implemented so that it is possible "for God as Ruler and Judge, to show mercy in the forgiveness of sins, on terms consistent with justice."¹

The method by which the work of Jesus Christ is related to justification is through imputation. The author carefully points out that the Greek word λογίζουαι which means "to reckon or to account," is never used in the sense of attributing to one person the deeds of another.² Rather, it refers specifically to accounting the deeds that the person has done himself. It is the Scriptural point of view, and that of the Reformers, that the term "justification by faith alone" means the "imputation of faith for righteousness."³ If a person has faith (properly directed, etc.), it will be accounted or reckoned to him as righteousness. There are other specific involvements in this matter that the author emphasizes.

- (1) It is faith itself, as a personal act of the believer, that is imputed for righteousness.
- (2) Faith is not righteousness itself; rather it is the condition for righteousness.
- (3) A justifying faith must be a specific faith in Jesus Christ (in his propitiatory work) rather than some general faith.

c) Christian sonship

When one is justified by God because of his faith in Jesus Christ, he is concomitantly adopted by God as a son. Christian Sonship includes regeneration, adoption and assurance.

¹Ibid., II, 395.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., II, 400.

"The term regeneration is derived from the Greek word palingenesia (παλιγγενεσία or παλιγγενεσία), which is compounded of πάλιν 'again' and γένεσις 'to be,' so that the word means literally 'to be again.'"¹ Regeneration has reference to the renewal of a person by virtue of being justified. This renewal brings to man the moral nature with which man was originally created. This moral nature corresponds with the image of God. Regeneration differs from justification. The former involves the renewing of the moral nature while the latter involves the canceling of guilt and removing penalty. Wiley gives the following for a definition of regeneration: "it is a communication of life by the Spirit, to a soul dead in trespasses and sins."²

There are two aspects to the work of regeneration. It is an active work of God. It is, also, a passive work of man.

Along with regeneration comes, also, a new relationship with God. There are three more important ramifications to this new relationship with God, which are:

- (1) Regeneration makes possible a personal knowledge of God.³
- (2) Regeneration gives a new revelation of God in Christ (The argument is that since Christ is the highest revelation of God, man can know God fully only when Christ is revealed in man).
- (3) Regeneration makes a new source of power in the Holy Spirit accessible to man.⁴

¹ Ibid., II, 403.

² Ibid., II, 407.

³ Ibid., II, 425.

⁴ Ibid., II, 426.

The second discussion within this chapter is entitled "Adoption." Adoption is viewed as "the declaratory act of God, by which upon being justified by faith in Jesus Christ, we are received into the family of God and reinstated in the privileges of sonship."¹ Thus, adoption seems to have significance on the Godward side rather than from the perspective of man. There are several "Benefits of Adoption" for man:

- (1) status of a son,
- (2) recognized filial confidence that a son has,
- (3) a type of unity with Christ,
- (4) a joint ownership with Christ in all that is his, and
- (5) the right to eternal life.²

The last major discussion within this twenty-eighth chapter has to do with assurance. Wiley's expression is the "Witness of the Spirit." By this is meant "that inward evidence of acceptance with God which the Holy Spirit reveals directly to the consciousness of the believer."³ It is the author's conviction that the Scriptures have many evidences of people who experienced the witness of the Holy Spirit.

There are two involvements in the witness of the Spirit. Besides being a witness of the Holy Spirit, it is also a witness of our spirit. The first has reference to the direct stimulus of the witness that the Spirit of God makes upon us. Wiley finds support for his doctrine both in the Scriptures and in John Wesley's writings. Wiley's argument can be stated in the form of a rhetorical question:

¹Ibid., II, 428.

²Ibid., II, 430.

³Ibid.

Would God leave us without a witness (in darkness) in such an important matter as this? The second involvement in assurance is the testimony of our own spirits. This has reference to our becoming consciously aware that we are justified and adopted. Thus it is primarily a confirmatory and passive matter. However, it is exceedingly important, although it does follow the first in occurrence.¹

Assurance is as common to salvation as adoption. Hence, as adoption is universally available, so is assurance. However, different people have different experiences of the witness of the Spirit.²

d) Christian Perfection or Entire Sanctification

The author's contention is that the scriptures and history substantiate the truth of the Christian doctrine of sanctification. He writes about "Holiness as the New Testament Standard of Christian Experience" and that the scriptures testify "that Entire Sanctification Is a Second Work of Grace."³ About the historical witness to the doctrine, he writes that "the doctrine of Christian perfection has come down to us from apostolic days as a sacred and uninterrupted tradition through all the Christian centuries."⁴

A distinction is made between two, sometimes confused

¹Ibid., II, 433-35.

²Ibid., II, 438.

³Ibid., II, 442.

⁴Ibid., II, 449.

terms, i.e., holiness and sanctification. Holiness refers to the moral state of a person while sanctification refers to the act by which he is made holy.¹

Entire sanctification is an act of God whereby a Christian is "made free from original sin or depravity..."² Both as an act and as a state, sin is removed in this life. This means that man can overcome the act of sinning through entire sanctification. It also means that man is freed from the state of guilt before God. But "the consequences of sin...will be removed only at the time of the resurrection."^{3,4} Wiley defends his viewpoint that acts of sin are eliminated in this life. "To call innocent mistakes in judgment, lapse of memory, and a lack of understanding due to weakened human powers sin is to open the floodgates to all kinds of actual sin."⁵ Positively, man devotes himself entirely to God in entire sanctification. Entire sanctification is an instantaneous act and wrought by the Holy Spirit.

There is a distinction between justification and sanctification. Justification is the work of Jesus Christ done for us while the latter refers to the work of Jesus Christ done in us. Furthermore, justification is an instantaneous

¹Ibid., II, 464.

²Ibid., II, 466.

³Wiley, H. Orton, The Epistle to the Hebrews, (Kansas City, Missouri: Beacon Hill Press, 1959), p. 209.

⁴E. J. Carnell said in a chapel sermon at Wheaton College, Illinois in 1962 that anyone who claims to be free from sin either is a liar or has a bad memory.

⁵Wiley, The Epistle...p. 209.

act while sanctification has a progressiveness to it. There is an initial sanctification that is concomitant with justification. But there is an entire sanctification which is subsequent to it.¹

The difference between regeneration and sanctification is more subtle than that between justification and sanctification. The difference is that regeneration has reference to the spiritual life in general while sanctification has reference to the moral state of that spiritual life. Original sin continues to exist during the state of regeneration until entire sanctification. However, Wiley points out that the grace that comes through regeneration is not blended with original sin. In the sense that holiness is generated within the life at regeneration, it is the beginning of sanctification. However, there is a distinction between regeneration and initial sanctification. "Regeneration is the impartation of life, and initial sanctification is the cleansing from guilt and acquired depravity."² The life that regeneration imparts is a life of love. And entire sanctification purifies the will so that this love becomes supreme. Concerning the time that must elapse between regeneration and sanctification is relative according to the experience of the individual. God's time is the present while the person may seek to procrastinate this sanctifying

¹Wiley, Christian Theology, II, 470.

²Ibid., II, 476.

experience. There is a series of "means and agencies" by which God does this sanctifying:

- (1) The love of God is the "originating cause."
- (2) The blood of Jesus Christ is the "meritorious or procuring cause."
- (3) The Holy Spirit is the "efficient cause."
- (4) Truth is the "instrumental cause."
- (5) Faith is the "conditional cause."¹

Between initial and entire sanctification there is a time of the work of grace called "progressive sanctification." This is marked by a series of phases, each one being consummated in an instantaneous experience. Initial sanctification cleanses the "acquired pollution," while entire sanctification cleanses inherited or original sin.² Because sin is both an act and a state it is reasoned that sanctification must also have two aspects to it.

Sanctification is both gradual and instantaneous. There is a preparatory work in which the Holy Spirit is working upon the life of the Christian. When that person is ready to submit to the commands of God, then instantaneously he is sanctified.

Entire sanctification is both instantaneous and continuous. It is instantaneous in its completion, but it must continue. A continuous work of cleansing must proceed by faith in the work of Jesus Christ. Wiley terms entire sanctification the "fulness of redemption."³ He claims that

¹Ibid., II, 478-79.

²Ibid., II, 481.

³Ibid., II, 487.

it is a "cleansing of the heart from all sin."¹ The essential aspect of entire sanctification is the purifying of the believer's heart from all acquired sin. Wiley's high view of man's possibilities comes to light when he asserts that "the carnal mind, or the sin that dwelleth in the me of the soul--the principle in man which has actual affinity with transgression, this is abolished by the purifying work of the Spirit..."² He also states that in entire sanctification there is "the utter destruction of the carnal mind."³

Besides a negative work, entire sanctification also does a positive work. Created within the believer is an entire devotion to God. But, it is more than the human self-devotion. It is also the receiving of the power of the Holy Spirit which devotes the person to God. Holiness consists of both the purgation of sin and the devoting of oneself wholly to God. Hence, there is a degree of synergism in sanctification.⁴

The doctrine of Christian perfection refers more to the positive element of devoting oneself to God while entire sanctification, primarily, has reference to the negative element of cleansing. There are several implications of the doctrine of Christian perfection:

¹Ibid., II, 487.

²Ibid., II, 488.

³Ibid., II, 491.

⁴Ibid.

- (1) It is made available through grace and not law.
- (2) Perfection is relative--having reference to man's possibility of perfection rather than to God's absolute perfection.
- (3) Christian perfection is "probationary" in that it "is always under ethical law, and hence must be guarded by constant watchfulness and maintained by divine grace."¹

The following paragraph is worth quoting in that it sets forth the basic import of the doctrine:

We may conclude, then that nothing is clearer from Scripture than that there is a perfection which may be attained in this life of perfect love, or the loving God with all the heart, soul, mind, and strength; that this perfection of love has no reference to the degree or quality of love, but to its purity or quality; that this state of perfect love is a consequence of the purification of the heart from all sin, so that love remains in soleness and supremacy; that this purification is accomplished instantaneously by the baptism with the Holy Spirit; that the resultant state of perfect love is regarded as adulthood in grace, in that the believer enters into the fulness of privilege under the New Covenant; and last, in that love is the fulfilling of the law, this state of pure or perfect love, is known as Christian perfection.²

Several distinctions will help in understanding Wiley's thought on perfection:

- (1) Purity and maturity are different. "Purity is the result of a cleansing from the pollution of sin; maturity is due to growth in grace."³
- (2) Infirmities are to be distinguished from sins. Sins are advertent disobedience to God's law while infirmities are inadvertent transgressions.
- (3) Temptation is reconcilable with perfection. The perfect can be tempted without sinning.

Wesley offers Wiley a satisfactory explanation for the "Evidences of Christian Perfection." That explanation

¹Ibid., II, 500.

²Ibid., II, 506.

³Ibid.

is that there is the same testimony of the Holy Spirit in entire sanctification as there is in justification.¹

3. The Role of Man in Subjective Soteriology

a) Place of Man

Man has a significant place in subjective soteriology. However, here man's place is both as an object and the subject. Man is acted upon by the Holy Spirit, and he acts on his own behalf. The Holy Spirit "calls" the object through "prevenient grace." In repentance, the positive response to calling, man is the subject. He does the acting. If man responds to the Holy Spirit's calling, God justifies him. But, justification is done entirely for man. Man is the passive object whom God justifies apart from man in Himself. If man is justified, he remains the object in the next soteriological step which is regeneration. But, as an object, he becomes the one upon (or in) whom the work is done. In the last four steps toward salvation, i.e. adoption, assurance, sanctification and Christian perfection, the dialectic of man's place is maintained. Adoption is activity within God but for man. However, in assurance, man is the center of activity both actively and passively. The Holy Spirit acts upon man and man's spirit witnesses within himself. In sanctification and Christian perfection, man again moves from a place of passivity to one of activity. Man is sanctified by God within himself. Thus, man is the object for

¹H. Orton Wiley, Christian Theology. (Kansas City, Mo.: Beacon Hill Press, 1963), II, 514, citing Wesley, Plain Account, pp. 79, 118.

whom action is taken. But, in Christian perfection, action is taken upon man and by man himself.

b) Responsibility of Man

Man's responsibility in receiving salvation must be seen in the context of God's grace. Because of man's total depravity, he can accept no responsibility in salvation except as he is aided by the Holy Spirit.¹ However, human effort does have a definite place "in order to secure compliance with the conditions...by which man may be saved."² A plea is made for a type of synergism. "There is a human co-operation with the divine Spirit...."³

There are, however, doctrines of subjective soteriology which require less responsibility of man than other doctrines. The doctrines of vocation and prevenient grace are two such doctrines. Here the emphasis is upon the Holy Spirit's work upon man. Through vocation and prevenient grace man is sought to exert his effort to fulfill his responsibility. In themselves, vocation and prevenient grace are the work of the Holy Spirit requiring no responsibility of man.

Man's responsibility follows the vocation and the work of prevenient grace. The first responsibility of man is to repent. Man must see the wrong of his sins, be sorry for them, confess them and turn "from sin to God" bearing

¹Ibid., II, 362.

²Ibid., II, 367.

³Ibid., II, 495.

the fruits of repentance. "The power (to repent) indeed is given to him (man) of God, but the act is necessarily his own."¹ Man has the responsibility not only of the act of repentance, but, also for sustaining the state of penitence throughout life.

Man has the responsibility of having a saving faith in the work of Christ. The "primary element in faith is trust; hence saving faith is a personal trust in the Person of the Savior."² If man is to gain salvation, he must have this trust, which is faith. This trust or faith requires human effort as well as being a gift of God.

The subsequent doctrines of subjective soteriology, i.e., justification, regeneration, adoption and assurance are primarily the work of the Holy Spirit. This work may be accomplished in or for man by the Holy Spirit, but, nevertheless, it is done by the Holy Spirit (or by the Father).

Christian perfection or entire sanctification also involves a responsibility of man. It requires man's devoting of himself to God. Although the strength to devote the self comes from God, nevertheless, man must put forth the effort to trust in God in order to receive the strength.

¹Ibid., II, 362.

²Ibid., II, 367.

SUMMARY

Sin is the separation of the self, in the sense of relationship, from God. As a consequence of man's sin he must be punished. This punishment is tridentate, but has a primary aspect which is spiritual death; this is temporal.

The objective soteriological work of Jesus Christ, through his atoning death, has its basis upon the concept of sacrifice. The atoning death of Jesus Christ was necessary because sin existed in the world. God's love, which desired fellowship with man, and faithfulness, which was toward His established moral government, also necessitated the atonement. The atoning work of Jesus Christ is universal in its extent; this is verifiable both by reason and the Scriptures.

Every man is subjectively and efficaciously called through God's grace by the Holy Spirit to accept the benefits of Jesus Christ's atoning death, and this call may be accepted or rejected. If a man heeds God's call he will necessarily repent, i.e. be sorry for his sins and desire to make amends for them. A person will have faith or trust in the atoning efficacy of Jesus Christ's work. The faith will bring the man pardon through the justification of God. Consequently that man's moral nature will be regenerated, and God will adopt him as son. The Holy Spirit will impress upon this person the reality of his adoption, hence there will be assurance that this has happened.

CHAPTER II

ANALYSIS OF KARL BARTH'S SOTERIOLOGY

Introduction

The basic method of treatment in this chapter is the same as that of the preceding chapter. Barth's understanding of the problem of sin will be discussed first. An analysis of Barth's thinking on objective soteriology will follow. Finally there will be an analysis of his thought on subjective soteriology and the chapter will conclude with a summary.

Although the minutiae of Karl Barth's doctrine of salvation cannot easily be categorized into a neat pattern, there is a general pattern that is discernible. Without distorting Barth's thought, the method of treatment outlined in the first paragraph can be followed. Barth himself presents the following outline for his thought on soteriology:

- (1) ...knowledge of the sin of man... (problem of sin),
- (2) ...knowledge of the event in which reconciliation is made... (objective soteriology),
- (3) ...knowledge of the work of the Holy Spirit in... the community, and of the being of Christians in Jesus Christ... (subjective soteriology).¹

¹Karl Barth, The Doctrine of Reconciliation, trans. G. W. Bromiley (Church Dogmatics; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956), IV, Part I, 79.

A. Problem of Sin

Karl Barth considers the doctrine of sin as part of the doctrine of reconciliation. He writes negatively that sin is not to be given "a treatment which is independent, self-originating and self-contained."¹ However, considering that we have stated Barth's position on this, it is legitimate if we do separate sin from the soteriological sections. This separation is done simply to facilitate comparison in chapter three and not to show disagreement with Barth.

1. Nature of Sin

Sin is due to man's opposition to God by breaking the covenant.²

...man is called to hold to the grace of His creator, to be thankful for it, to bow to it and adapt himself to it, to honor it.... And the essence of sin is that he does not do this. He denies and despises and hates grace and breaks...the law of the covenant.³

2. Consequences of Sin

The consequences of sin for man is that man needs to be turned to God. Because of sin man is in need of being turned away from serving himself toward serving God. Barth writes that "...man has need of conversion to God...."⁴

This can be stated in the sense of reconciliation too. In this sense, man needs to be reconciled to God. It is significant to Barth that it is not God who needs to be

¹Ibid., IV, Part II, 139.

²Ibid., IV, Part II, 141.

³Ibid., IV, Part I, 140.

⁴Ibid., IV, Part I, 138.

reconciled to man, "...but men need reconciliation with Him...".¹ Because something has come between God and man, reconciliation was needed to bring the creature and the Creator together again.² Sin necessitated the reconciliation of man to God.

B. The Objective Soteriology of Karl Barth

1. Approach to Objective Soteriology

Barth begins his doctrine of reconciliation on the concept of the covenant. God had established a covenant with man. Man was unfaithful but God could not be unfaithful. As a result, God acted to bring about a reconciliation.

Barth defines reconciliation as "God's crossing the frontier to man..."³ Through this "crossing the frontier" man is "received by Him and reclaimed as His possession and hidden in Him and sustained by Him and addressed and treated as His friend and indeed His Child."⁴ Reconciliation was an act by God for man.

Jesus Christ is central to the doctrine of reconciliation. Barth writes that "our task is so to present the doctrine of reconciliation that it is always clear that it has to do wholly and utterly with Jesus Christ..."⁵

¹Ibid., IV, Part I, 74.

²Klooster, p. 84.

³Barth, IV, Part I, 82.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., IV, Part II, 125.

As Jesus Christ is related to the doctrine of reconciliation, He is related to soteriology. He is "the beginning and the middle and the end" of objective soteriology.¹ Negatively, soteriology cannot be separated from Christology. Or to put it another way: soteriology "can never escape the tendency to commend itself in relation to Christology."²

Barth categorized objective soteriology into three series of three sections. Each section begins with a discussion of a basic Christological "aspect." These basic Christological aspects are that Jesus Christ is "very God, very man, and very God-man..."³ These Christological discussions are "the key to the whole. From each of the three aspects suggested it will be our starting point and will necessarily control all the developed details."⁴ A discussion of sin follows the Christological discussion of each section. This is a "natural place" for the doctrine of sin.⁵ It is in the knowledge of Jesus Christ that we see man as a sinner and come to know sin. The third discussion in each section pertains to the work that God has done for man through Jesus Christ. These discussions include the subjects of justification, sanctification and calling.⁶

¹Ibid., IV, Part I, 125.

²Ibid., IV, Part I, 124.

³Ibid., IV, Part I, 128.

⁴Ibid., IV, Part I, 138.

The sovereign act of atonement made by God through Jesus Christ is a significant factor in objective soteriology. It is through the atonement made in Jesus Christ that we are "to realize fearlessly and indefatigably...the possibility of life and knowledge..."¹

It is important that brief consideration be given to Barth's doctrine of election. Barth does not discuss the doctrine of election as part of the doctrine of reconciliation, but traditional theology has considered the doctrine of election as part of the doctrine of salvation. Barth does, however, see the doctrine of election as the "connecting link" between the doctrine of God and the doctrine of reconciliation.² In the doctrine of election we turn from the Deity of God to the Humanity of God.³

2. Terminology of Objective Soteriology

Barth does not use the traditional soteriological terminology. For example, the doctrine of election was related in the last section is not placed within the doctrine of reconciliation itself is another example. Generally, theologians do not "speak of reconciliation as a structural part of the system of dogmatics."⁴ However, Barth does consider reconciliation as a major doctrine in his dogmatics.

¹Ibid., IV, Part I, 81.

²Klooster, p. 39.

³Karl Barth, The Humanity of God, trans. Thomas Wieser and John Newton Thomas (Richmond, Virginia: John Know Press, 1962), p. 51.

⁴Klooster, p. 78.

"Conversion" is a term that Barth uses quite synonymously, though not identically, with reconciliation. Conversion is a part of objective soteriology. As such it is in the past tense. The conversion of a man to God was accomplished.¹

Atonement is included as part of the doctrine of reconciliation. As such, atonement is the means by which man is converted to God. This is accomplished in Jesus Christ.² Jesus Christ as very God and very man "is the atonement as the fulfillment of the covenant."³ Therefore, it is obvious that the act of the atonement is God's act. Man's righteousness as a result of the atonement is God's righteousness. Atonement is God's righteousness. "Everything depends on Him. It does not depend at all on what man had or has or will have to contribute..."⁴

The term "Jesus Christ" predominates in Barth's doctrine of reconciliation. "Jesus Christ" represents that person who was the center of the reconciliation of man. Hence, Jesus Christ is also central to objective soteriology. Barth's understanding of Jesus Christ as He is related to reconciliation will be discussed at length in the following section titled "Nature of Objective Soteriology."

¹Barth, IV, Part I, 130.

²Ibid., IV, Part I, 101.

³Ibid., IV, Part I, 122.

⁴Ibid., IV, Part I, 83.

Justification, sanctification and calling are the primary categories in objective soteriology. Justification is the divine verdict or judgment upon the sin of man. Sanctification is the divine direction that has come to man through Jesus Christ. Calling is the divine promise of God that was given to man in and through Jesus Christ. Each of these objective soteriological categories will be discussed individually at length in the subsequent section.

3. Nature of Objective Soteriology

a) Christology

Barth asserts that Christology should control the whole doctrine of reconciliation. On this basis, he begins each of his three parts of volume IV with a discussion on some Christological "aspect."

Barth's beginning each part with a Christological discussion is the basis for beginning this section on the nature of objective soteriology with a presentation of Barth's Christology as it relates to the doctrine of reconciliation.

The content of the doctrine of reconciliation "is the knowledge of Jesus Christ who is (1) very God...(2) very man...and (3) in the unity of the two the guarantor and witness of our atonement."¹ Jesus Christ as "very God" is the Christological aspect that precedes part I. Jesus Christ as "very man" and Jesus Christ as "very God and very man" are the Christological aspects in the opening sections of

¹Ibid., IV, Part I, 79.

parts II and III respectively.

Within each of these sections is interwoven both the person and the work of Jesus Christ. The reason is that "Jesus Christ exists in the totality of His work."¹ This means that Jesus Christ is both the totality of His being and work. Hence the doctrine of atonement and Christology are inseparable.² Historically the work and person of Jesus Christ have been treated separately in theological discussion. Above this separation, Barth writes, "We have to ask again whether there is in the New Testament any precedent for this division of approach and concept."³ Thus for Barth the work and nature of Jesus Christ are interwoven without distinction in the Christological discussions.

Not only does Barth interweave the work and natures of Jesus Christ but also the natures and states of Jesus Christ are interpreted in the "light" of each other.⁴ Traditionally theological discussion has separated the nature and states of Jesus Christ. But Barth interweaves them making them both integral parts of a whole.

The first Christological aspect is Jesus Christ as very God. Through this Christocentric emphasis Barth has in mind that "God Himself" was in Jesus Christ. It is "God

¹Ibid., IV, Part I, 124.

²Ibid., IV, Part I, 123.

³Ibid., IV, Part I, 126.

⁴Ibid., IV, Part I, 133.

Himself who in Christ confronts us."¹ Therefore, God's reconciliation "is not the deed of a man, namely, Jesus of Nazareth; it is the deed of God in Him."² In Barth's words: "Jesus Christ is Himself God as the Son of God the Father and with God the Father the source of the Holy Spirit, united in one essence with the Father by the Holy Spirit."³ We see in Jesus Christ as very God the God who humbles Himself.⁴ This matter of becoming a man involved God's "hazarding of His own existence as God."⁵ In His becoming a man the "nature and essence" of God is seen. The "nature and essence" of God is seen in that he can and is willing to give Himself up to share "creaturely limitation..." and the "...suffering of the human creature...". This God is different from self-exalting false gods which "are all reflections of a false and all too human self-exaltation."⁶

In Jesus Christ as very God it is "God Himself who actively intervenes, Himself taking His cause with and against and for man, the cause of the covenant, and in such a way...that He Himself becomes man."⁷ The God who humbles

¹G. C. Berkbouwer, The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Erdmans Publishing Company, 1956), p. 123.

²Ibid., p. 127.

³Barth, IV, Part I, 129.

⁴Ibid., IV, Part I, 79.

⁵Ibid., IV, Part I, 72.

⁶Ibid., IV, Part I, 130.

⁷Ibid., IV, Part I, 128.

Himself, intervening for man, is the God of reconciliation.

The second Christological aspect is Jesus Christ as very man. In relation to Jesus Christ as very God, which is the humiliation of God, there is an exaltation of man. Jesus Christ as very man is the exalted of man. This can be stated in another way: Jesus Christ as very man means that the Servant becomes the Lord.¹ The exaltation of man through Jesus Christ's being very man corresponds to His kingly office.² In Jesus Christ as Servant made Lord man was converted and therefore reconciled to God.³ This reconciliation was made because in Jesus Christ "...man keeps and maintains the same faithfulness to God that God never ceased to maintain and keep to him."⁴ Through this faithfulness to God man is reconciled. Through his faithfulness to God Jesus Christ as very man, in a sense, created a new being of man. This new being of man is reconciled to God.⁵ Through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ as very man to God, man's judgment has been executed; this was the judgment that was due to man for breaking the covenant.

The third Christological aspect is between the "reconciling God above and reconciled man below."⁶ This

¹Klooster, p. 89.

²Ibid., p. 87.

³Barth, IV, Part I, 132.

⁴Ibid., IV, Part I, 89.

⁵Ibid., IV, Part I, 91.

⁶Ibid., IV, Part I, 122.

aspect simply involves the bringing of the first two aspects together. There is nothing new to be added except a new office.¹ This Christological aspect is Jesus Christ as very God and very man. This represents what older dogmatics called the prophetic office of Christ.² Jesus Christ as very God and very man comprehends Jesus Christ as very God and Jesus Christ as very man.

As the God who humbles Himself and therefore reconciles man with Himself, as the man exalted by God and therefore reconciled with Him, as the One who is very God and very man in this concrete sense, Jesus Christ Himself is One.³

Jesus Christ as very God and very man is the "middle point, the mediator between the reconciling action of God and the reconciled being of man." In Jesus Christ as very God and very man "we have to do wholly with God and wholly with man, and with both in their complete and utter unity."⁴ It is in this "utter unity" of God and man in Jesus that "reconciliation consists." The reconciliation of man "takes place" in the humiliation of God and the exaltation of man.⁵

b) Christological Achievements

The term "Christological Achievements" has reference to what Barth calls "three forms of the grace of God...".

¹Klooster, p. 91.

²Barth, IV, Part I, 137.

³Ibid., IV, Part I, 135.

⁴Ibid., IV, Part I, 126.

⁵Berkouwer, pp. 133-34.

These three forms are justification, sanctification and calling. Justification involves the doctrine of the "divine verdict" by which man is justified. Sanctification pertains to the exaltation of man by which God give His direction to man, which is considered as sanctifying man. The calling of man takes place along with the Divine judgment and direction which is considered to be the promise of God. The Christological achievements pertain to the content of what was known before in traditional works of theology as objective theology.¹

The justification, sanctification and calling of God through Jesus Christ are the Christological achievements in which reconciliation takes place.² The content of justification, sanctification and calling is the same: "that the sinful No of man has been matched and opposed and destroyed by the divine Yes spoken by Jesus Christ..."³ These Christological achievements indicate the relevance of what was done by God in and through Jesus Christ, but they "are expounding only the objective relevance...and not its subjective apprehension and acceptance...". Barth proceeds consistently by reminding us that it is Jesus Christ who "justifies, sanctifies and calls."⁴

¹Barth, IV, Part I, 145.

²Ibid., IV, Part I, 79.

³Ibid., IV, Part I, 145.

⁴Ibid., IV, Part I, 147.

These three Christological achievements will now be delineated at greater length individually.

(1) Justification

On the Godward side justification

definitely means the sentence executed and revealed in Jesus Christ and His death and resurrection, the No and Yes with which God vindicates Himself in relation to covenant-breaking man, with which He converts him to Himself and therefore reconciles him with Himself.¹

On the manward side justification is God's decision

in which man's being as the subject of that act is repudiated, his responsibility for that act, his guilt, is pardoned, cancelled and removed, and there is ascribed to him instead as being the subject of pure acts of thankfulness for this liberation.²

Both of the previous statements regarding the meaning of justification on the Godward and manward sides reflect a common duality. Each of them contains a negative and a positive side. Negatively, God "disowns and renounces" man's sinful disobedience. To put it dialectically, God rejects man's rejection.³ Because of the work that was done by God in Jesus Christ, man is not considered a "transgressor, sinner and covenant-breaker...." Positively, man is declared righteous which "without any reserve can be called a making righteous." This represents God's saying Yes to man in accepting him. Hence there is a twofold divine pardon in Jesus Christ which involves the "destruction of the unrighteous and creation of the righteous being."⁴

¹Ibid., IV, Part I, 96.

²Ibid., IV, Part I, 145.

³Ibid., IV, Part I, 93.

⁴Ibid., IV, Part I, 97.

Justification is God's doing. He has acted and spoken for His own cause. This means that it is not man's doing. It is all done by God through Jesus Christ.¹

(2) Sanctification

Sanctification is a "necessary consequence" of Justification.² It, sanctification, is the directing of man along God's designed paths so that man "can stand and proceed along the way God has appointed for him...". The "subjection of man under God's direction" is involved. Man has been placed into a freedom through Jesus Christ. Sanctification is a matter of directing man within that freedom. It is "God's direction to make use of his freedom."³ The word "freedom" is to be underscored, because sanctification is not to be seen as a subjection of man to a law. Rather it is to be seen as "a call to awakening to the freedom...for all in Jesus Christ."⁴

Sanctification is a work that God has done by setting man free through Jesus Christ. In this sense God has given His direction to man. This direction by God has an air of sovereignty about it. Reflection of this sovereignty is seen in Barth's statement: "God's direction is...an all-powerful decision."⁵

¹Ibid., IV, Part I, 96.

²Ibid., IV, Part I, 145.

³Ibid., IV, Part I, 100.

⁴Ibid., IV, Part I, 102.

⁵Ibid., IV, Part I, 99.

There is a relationship between sanctification and ethics. Sanctification is "nothing other than the basic presupposition of all Christian ethics."¹ Being a presupposition to ethics does not make sanctification equal to ethics. However, as its presupposition, sanctification is closely related to ethics. Sanctification is a direction that we receive from God for ethics but it is not "our self-sanctifying as the filling out of the justification..." which would equate it with ethics.²

(3) Calling

The calling of man is the third aspect of the reconciliation of man with God.³ God's calling of man is "a middle point," a "one thing which both differentiates and comprehends the reconciling God above and reconciled man below..."⁴ God's calling man is "the moment of the promise given to man in Jesus Christ, and therefore Christian hope..." This discussion is necessary in the doctrine of reconciliation because at the "very heart" of the New Testament this "moment of the promise" is found.⁵ This divine promise or "pledge" is Jesus Christ Himself.⁶ "But Jesus Christ is

¹Ibid., IV, Part I, 101.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., IV, Part I, 11.

⁴Ibid., IV, Part I, 122.

⁵Ibid., IV, Part I, 108.

⁶Ibid., IV, Part I, 115.

also the content of the divine pledge, the One in whom the Christian is summoned to hope."¹ Therefore, Jesus Christ is the promise and that which is promised.

What does this promise have to do with man? The promise of God points man generally "to the actualization and preservation of the fellowship between God and himself." "Eternal life" is that which is "shown and pledged to man by the divine promise."² The calling of man in Jesus Christ is a calling unto eternal life. A helpful summary statement is: "The promise of God" is "God's decision in which He has given to man...an eternal future in fellowship with Himself... in His service, and therefore a teleological direction of his life in times."³ This promise is an objective matter. Objectively, we have our hope in a "goal and future in Jesus Christ...."⁴ Thus, one sees a correlation between this third aspect of reconciliation and the third Christological aspect, Jesus Christ as very God and very man. This third aspect of man's reconciliation to God in Jesus Christ "consists...in the postiting and equipping of man as the bearer of the divine promise."⁵

(4) Election

Although Barth's doctrine of election is not included

¹Ibid., IV, Part I, 116.

²Ibid., IV, Part I, 111.

³Ibid., IV, Part I, 146.

⁴Ibid., IV, Part I, 119.

⁵Ibid., IV, Part I, 108.

within the doctrine of reconciliation, it will be briefly considered. Traditional theology has considered the doctrine of election as being part of objective soteriology. As it has been stated before, Barth himself considers the doctrine of election to be significantly related to the doctrine of reconciliation.

Barth "openly rejects Calvin's doctrine of election and substitutes a radically new doctrine...."¹ Election is of Jesus Christ, the community and the individual. Christology is the "basis and starting point for the doctrine."²

Jesus Christ is both the elected and the elector. Therefore, He is both the subject and the object of election. However, there is a double object of election--Jesus Christ and man.³ In the election of man, there is both the election of the individual and the election of the community. The election of the community is to be stressed more than that of the individual. Barth has criticised Calvin for his strong emphasis upon the election of the individual.⁴ The importance of the community, over against the individual, is also indicated by Barth's placing the discussion of the community before that of the individual. Despite the emphasis of the election of the community the "telos" of the

¹Klooster, p. 24.

²Barth, II, Part II, 145.

³Klooster, p. 54.

⁴Ibid., P. 57.

election of the community is the individual.¹ Election of the individual does not mean that there is an election of some and a rejection of other. There is both a Yes and No in election. The Yes is said in the acceptance of sinful man, and the No is said to God Himself, as He takes man's rejection upon Himself in Jesus Christ.

Predestination is synonymous to election.² Predestination is God's actively willing His election of Jesus Christ and the rejection of man's rejection. Barth has not considered predestination as the predetermining of the ultimate destinies of individuals. Already in his The Epistle to the Romans, he wrote that predestination is not a "quantitative limitation of God's action, but its qualitative definition."³ In fact, predestination doesn't have to do with the carrying out of a "fixed and static result" of the will. It is rather an act of the will itself. Predestination concerns "God's action in time."⁴ Hence, it is not a carrying out of eternal decrees.

Objectively, salvation has been provided for man in the "being of Jesus Christ." In Him, there was "the completed act of the reconciliation of man with God." Barth indicates that reconciliation has come through the incarnation.⁵

¹Ibid., p. 59.

²Ibid., p. 52.

³Karl Barth, The Epistle to the Romans. Trans. Edwin C. Hoskyns (6th ed.; London Oxford University Press, 1933), p.34.

⁴Klooster, pp. 49-50.

⁵Barth, IV, Part I, 126-28.

There is validity to the charge that the incarnation is not a "means to an end, but an end in itself" for Barth.¹

4. Scope of Objective Soteriology

The Scope of Barth's objective soteriology is many sided, in that, one must approach it from different perspectives to get a true picture. In this section, the scope of Barth's objective soteriology will be viewed from the perspectives of various categories of his objective soteriology.

In the reconciliation through Jesus Christ, a change took place for "the world and every man." This took place without the slightest help from man. The reconciliation of Jesus Christ was for every man. It turned all men to God.² Therefore, whatever we say of any man, Christian or not, "at every point we have to think and say it of his being as man reconciled in Jesus Christ."³ This reconciliation is, at least, objectively achieved for every man. Whether it is subjectively apprehended is another question.

All men are not only objectively reconciled to God through Jesus Christ, but they are all in the kingdom too. No response of man is required for entrance into the kingdom. One has "...no alternative but to adjust...to it...."⁴ This obviously implies that man is already in the kingdom.

The benefits of justification, sanctification and

¹Klooster, p. 95.

²Berkouwer, p. 139.

³Barth, IV, Part I, 91.

⁴Ibid., IV, Part I, 99.

calling in Jesus are universal in scope. "The Word of God is spoken to all. To that extent, objectively, all are justified, sanctified and called."¹ Justification is not only universal in its extent, but it is very strong in its effect, in application to the individual. It is overpowering to the extent that it is "...against everything that man either is of himself or does of himself...."² What is true for justification, in this regard, is true also for the sanctification and the calling of an individual.

The work of the atonement is universally efficacious. It has been done for all men.³ This is readily concluded when one remembers that the work of atonement is quite synonymous to the work of reconciliation. Thus, as reconciliation is for all men, atonement is too. The work of God in the atonement is universal, and it is sovereign. "Everything depends on Him.... It does not depend at all on what man had or has or will have to contribute."⁴

A discussion of the objective soteriology of Karl Barth would not be at all complete without a statement on the part of grace in this objective work. The element of grace, whether by word or simply by idea, is so prominent in the theology of Karl Barth that it has led to a major

¹Ibid., IV, Part I, 148.

²Ibid., IV, Part I, 98.

³Ibid., IV, Part I, 148.

⁴Ibid., IV, Part I, 83.

discussion on the subject--The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth by G. C. Berkouwer. Reconciliation in the thought of Barth is completely a work of God's grace, through Jesus Christ.¹ Man has nothing to contribute. It is all of and from God.

God has reconciled all men unto Himself, objectively. Whether man wants to be reconciled or not makes no difference; the fact is and remains that all men are reconciled. This universality is true of all the aspects of reconciliation, as well as, of reconciliation as a whole. Objectively, salvation has been provided for all.

C. The Subjective Soteriology of Karl Barth

This section will contain three subsections. Within the first subsection, the approach of Barth himself to subjective soteriology will be discussed. Secondly, the nature of Barth's subjective soteriology will be delineated. Thirdly, there will be a description of man's role in the subjective soteriology of Barth.

1. Approach to Subjective Soteriology

The last two sections of each part of the doctrine of reconciliation compose the subjective dimension of soteriology. In these two sections, the relevance of the work of Jesus Christ in reconciliation is seen.² Thus subjective soteriology is relegated to last place in the soteriology

¹Ibid., IV, Part I, 84.

²Ibid., IV, Part I, 149.

of Barth. These two sections contain discussions on the community and the individual as they are related to reconciliation. The discussion on the community contains what is usually called ecclesiology, by traditional theologians. The discussion on the community precedes that of the individual. This is consistent with Barth's placement of these two aspects in his doctrine of election, where a discussion of the community precedes that of the individual. From this order, discussion of the individual being last in the doctrine of reconciliation, one can infer that the individual is the least important in this doctrine for Barth.

In the introduction it was stated that this thesis pertains to soteriology as it is related to the individual. Hence, Barth's discussion of the individual will take preference to that of the community in this presentation. Barth's doctrine of the community will not be described, only incidental observations, if any, will be made of the community, when they pertain to the salvation of the individual.

Although Christology is included in the sections pertaining to objective soteriology, it is related to and inseparable from subjective soteriology. Barth asks cogently if Jesus Christ is ever presented except in relationship to the men of Israel, the disciples and the world in the New Testament. Through this rhetorical question, Barth links Christology to subjective soteriology. Jesus Christ is always related to the community and the individual,

therefore, he is related to salvation of the community and the individual.

The Holy Spirit is not given a separate categorization in discussion by Barth. He simply indicates that the work of Jesus Christ is the work of the Holy Spirit. This means that the work of Jesus Christ in subjective soteriology is through the Holy Spirit. It is Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit working upon man.

The three sections on the salvation of the individual include discussions of faith, love and hope. These three are given separate treatment because they are involved in the doctrine of the salvation of man. Each of these aspects of the doctrine of reconciliation will be discussed at length in the following section of this paper, the Nature of Subjective Soteriology.

2. Nature of Subjective Soteriology

a) Faith

Barth's understanding of faith has many facets. Primarily, it is a matter of "subjection and a sheer obedience" to God in Jesus Christ.¹ However, there is also a noetic element in faith which is rather strongly emphasized. Faith is a "subjective realization of reconciliation."² Realization implies here a noetic character. Barth warns about giving too much emphasis to the words "...trust, confidence, faithfulness, etc. on man's part to God...." By

¹Ibid., IV, Part I, 98.

²Berkouwer, p. 147.

emphasizing these one runs the risk of believing in the very thing that the Apostle Paul wants "to abrogate--man's own righteousness from the Law...." Faith can best be described as the recognition of one's lostness. In this type of faith, man "...gives himself up, and can take comfort in the righteousness of God only in this his self-surrender."¹ Again, "from man's point of view, faith in its decisive act is the collapse of every effort of his own capacity and will, and the recognition of the absolute necessity of that collapse."² Barth has been criticised for coming "painfully short of Luther's conception of faith as fiducia (trust)."³ These statements represent the negative side of faith. Faith also has a positive side, in that, man must subjectively acknowledge and accept God's justification of man.

God is the source of faith for man and not man himself. In order to understand faith "...everything depends on whether the supposed object, God, is understood as in fact the effecting Subject."⁴ God provides this faith subjectively through the Holy Spirit.

Faith is essentially the only form of the "...being

¹Karl Barth, The Epistle to the Philippians, trans. James W. Leitch (6th ed.; Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1962), p. 101.

²Ibid., p. 102.

³O. W. Heick, History of Protestant Theology, Vol. II of A History of a Christian Thought, ed. J. L. Neve (Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1946), 178.

⁴Barth, The Epistle to the Philippians, p. 102.

of the new man...."¹ Since it is through the being of the new man that we have peace with God, we can have peace with God only "by the Word of God, in Jesus Christ, by faith in Him...."² The term "conversion" is another way of saying the "being of the new man," which is to be at peace with God. Man's conversion to God is effectuated by faith. "Before God...we...are righteous and accepted only by faith...."³

As has already been implied, faith is not a "human contribution that creates or that complements the reconciliation."⁴ Faith is not a "new work which brings reconciliation into being and makes it real, but it is directed to Jesus Christ alone." Hence faith excludes the possibility of containing merit.⁵

Faith is related to the assurance that man can have; the assurance that God has justified him. It is "in the act of faith" that this assurance is brought to man.⁶

Love is the second form of subjective soteriology that will be discussed. In Barth's thought, faith is followed by love, practically.⁷ However, even though this love

¹Barth, IV, Part I, 96.

²Ibid., IV, Part I, 83.

³Ibid., IV, Part I, 96.

⁴Berkouwer, p. 147.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Barth, IV, Part I, 102.

may precede faith, there can be no love for God until one has faith in Him.¹

b) Love

Love is the second form of reconciliation, as it is viewed subjectively. Love is a response to God's direction through Jesus Christ, which corresponds to Christian faith as the response to "God's justifying sentence."² "The being of man in the form of Christian love consists in the fact that he accepts the divine direction."³

Generally, Christian love is

the active human recognition...of the love of God. It recognizes it by following it, imitating it, modeling (sic) itself upon it. It is the attitude in which man gives himself to reflect the divine attitude.⁴

There are two "dimensions" in Christian love. There is a coming together of God with "all men," and their "coming together with Him." And at the same time, there is the second dimension, this is a "coming together of all men one with another."⁵ Love for God and love for man are mutually needed.

Love to others cannot exhaust itself in love to God, nor can love to God exhaust itself in love to others. The one cannot be replaced and be made unnecessary by the other.⁶

¹Ibid., IV, Part I, 105.

²Ibid., IV, Part I, 102.

³Ibid., IV, Part I, 99.

⁴Ibid., IV, Part I, 103.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid., IV, Part I, 106.

A response of love to the divine direction for God and neighbor cannot be motivated by an ulterior gain.¹

Continuing with his emphasis upon divine grace, Barth asserts that accepting the divine direction is a work of the Holy Spirit.² Man is not able to create love himself.

If man responds to the divine direction, he is not justified by his response of love before God.³ Seeking to love with justification as an ulterior motive is an exercise in futility.

c) Hope

The third form of the reconciliation, viewed subjectively, is hope. Hope is a response to the promise of God given through Jesus Christ. Hope "embraces" the promise of God.⁴ The promise of God has to do with a "future event, with this still expected being of God for man, with yet another form of the fellowship between God and man."⁵ Hope is not only concerned with the "future event." There are two distinctions in hope. There is a "great hope", which has to do with eternal life, and there is a "small hope" which is the hope of the present.⁶ However, "the small hopes are only

¹Ibid., IV, Part I, 107.

²Ibid., IV, Part I, 99.

³Ibid., IV, Part I, 104.

⁴Ibid., IV, Part I, 109.

⁵Ibid., IV, Part I, 110.

⁶Ibid., IV, Part I, 120.

for the sake of the great hope from which they derive."¹
 This hope of the Christian in Jesus Christ and a future in
 Him is a "personal" hope.²

Considering that personal experience has been a dominant factor and emphasis in soteriology in a considerable section of Christendom, it is relevant to ask what Barth's thought is on experience as it relates to salvation. It is pertinent that when Barth was a student at Marburg he came under the influence of W. Herrmann. Herrmann defined religion as a "strictly individual experience."³ He said that the "psychological phenomena" was the "staying principle in theology."⁴ Barth later strongly reacted to this liberal instruction. It seems accurate to say that Barth's theology is "characterized throughout by the reactionary note," which is to say that there is a reaction against "religious experiences."⁵

3. Role of Man in Subjective Soteriology

This subsection will itself be broken into two further subdivisions. First, man's place in subjective soteriology will be discussed. Secondly, there will be a discussion on man's subjective soteriological responsibility.

¹Ibid., IV, Part I, 121.

²Ibid., IV, Part I, 119.

³Heick, II, 172.

⁴Ibid., II, 173.

⁵Klooster, p. 21.

a) Place of Man

Man does not have a primary place in the subjective soteriology of Barth. God and His work for man through Jesus Christ have the primary emphasis. It is the "being of man" brought about through Jesus Christ by God that gets the primary emphasis.¹ The fact that Barth does not give primary emphasis to the place of man in subjective soteriology has been considered a reaction of Barth against a theology that did give this emphasis to man. Already at the age of twenty-three Barth spoke of the "predicament" of having been trained "in the religious individualism and historical relativism as taught in Marburg and Heidelberg."² It was against this religious individualism that Barth reacted. Barth's reaction took the form of a flight from anthropology, so that throughout his writings Barth warns against an anthropological emphasis. His emphasis is not man but "Emmanuel", "God with us."

However, there is a place for man in the subjective soteriology of Barth. This is reflected in Barth's writing of the "subjective appropriation of salvation."³ This appropriation pertains to the election of man in Jesus Christ. Men ought to "subjectively accept their election and believe and live as elect in the service of God."⁴ Reconciliation

¹Barth, IV, Part I, 90.

²Heick, II, 172.

³Barth, IV, Part I, 149.

⁴Klooster, p. 43.

also has a place for the responsibility of man. Reconciliation does not take place outside of man. There is a participation by man in God's act of reconciliation."¹ As there is a place for the responsibility of man generally in reconciliation, there is a place for the responsibility of man in the different forms of reconciliation. There is a subjective "apprehension and acceptance" of the reconciliatory forms of justification, sanctification and calling.² Justification, "divine judgment", demands that "man must resolutely turn his back on his own being..." and set "his face equally resolutely to his being in Jesus Christ...."³ A decision and act are also required of man in relation to sanctification which is the "divine direction." This decision and act of man are confirmatory of the "divine direction" given in Jesus Christ.⁴ Neither is hope, as a form of reconciliation, merely an act of God. But again, man's "thoughts and words and works" must respond to it.

b) Responsibility of Man

The general responsibility of man in subjective soteriology is to appropriate the "grace of God ascribed to all men in Jesus Christ."⁵ This discussion is divided into three questions: (1) What are men's specific responsibilities?

¹Berkouwer, p. 147.

²Barth, IV, Part I, 147.

³Ibid., IV, Part I, 98.

⁴Ibid., IV, Part I, 100.

⁵Ibid., IV, Part I, 119.

(2) How are these responsibilities of man carried out? (3) Is it necessary for man to fulfill these responsibilities?

What are men's specific responsibilities in appropriating the "grace of God ascribed to all men in Jesus Christ"? Man must specifically recognize, acknowledge and accept the verdict of God which is man's justification. If man recognizes, acknowledges and accepts God's justification it will have a bearing on "thought and words and works" in daily life.¹ An act and a decision on the part of man are therefore required. This decisive acknowledgment of the work of God in Jesus Christ comes only in the way of "confession of guilt."² Not much is written by Barth regarding man's need of specific confession of guilt through prayer. Perhaps he assumes this.

Man has subjective soteriological responsibilities but how are these responsibilities of man carried out? This question pertains to the dichotomy of human effort and divine grace. Barth quite strongly takes the position that man's subjective soteriological responsibilities are carried out through divine grace. Man's subjective soteriological responsibilities of faith, love and hope do not "in any sense include...a co-operation of man with God...." All that man can do is respond to God. Therefore, in Barth's thought, there is no synergism.³

¹Ibid., IV, Part I, 97.

²Berkouwer, p. 144.

³Barth, IV, Part I, 113.

The last question to be asked about the responsibility of man in Barth's subjective soteriology is the most difficult to answer--is it necessary for man to fulfill his subjective soteriological responsibilities? Is there an absolute requirement that man has to do what God has set forth for him to do? Barth writes that "the question of the subjective apprehension...by the individual is absolutely indispensable."¹ There is an importance not only to the question of "subjective apprehension" but also to the oughtness of it. Man ought to respond to God's work in Jesus Christ.² "Barth...would not think of saying that God simply looks on all human beings and their various modes of conduct as equally good or evil and indulgently lets them all into eternal fellowship with him."³ Much discussion revolves around the question of whether or not Barth believes in universal salvation. Although Barth strongly implies a universalism,⁴ he refuses to affirm or deny the position. If Barth would accept a universalistic position, this would imply that man's fulfillment of his subjective soteriological responsibilities is not necessary.

¹Ibid., IV, Part I, 150.

²Klooster, p. 43.

³L. Harold DeWolf, Theology of the Living Church (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1953), pp. 282-83.

⁴Barth, IV, Part I, 149.

SUMMARY

In the thought of Karl Barth, sin is essentially the breaking of God's covenant by which man's fellowship with God was interrupted; this break in fellowship God desired to reconcile.

Reconciliation came through God's coming to man in Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is central to Barth's doctrine of reconciliation, which is the fulfillment of a broken covenant; therefore the doctrine of Jesus Christ is included in, or is, soteriology and soteriology is included in Christology. Jesus Christ brought about a work of God for man which has three forms corresponding to three Christological aspects, which are Jesus Christ as very God, very man and very God and very man. The three forms of reconciliation are justification, sanctification and calling. Justification is God's rejecting man's rejection, thus accepting man. Through sanctification, man is given a divine direction for living. The calling of man is God's giving to man a promise of life.

Through the grace of God, all men have been reconciled to God in Jesus Christ. Hence there has also been a universal atonement for man. As a result, all men are objectively justified, sanctified and called by God. All of this can be summarized in this way: objective salvation is universal in its scope.

In subjective soteriology, the individual is considered as following the community in God's order of priority. However, prior in importance to all doctrines within soteriology

is the doctrine of Jesus Christ, which is central to all soteriology.

The nature of subjective soteriology consists in the words and ideas of faith, love and hope. Faith is a subjection of the self, which involves the recognition of God's work and self-surrender, and it is the response of man to the justification of man by God through Jesus Christ. Love is man's response to the sanctification, divine direction, of God through Jesus Christ whereby man recognizes his sanctification and seeks emulation of the love of God, the Sanctifier. Hope is man's personal response to God's promise given through Jesus Christ in which man anticipates fellowship with God in the present world and in the world to come. Through none of the subjective salvation is there much possibility of any significant personal religious experience.

Individual man has a definite place of responsibility in subjective soteriology. He ought to have faith, which requires the confession of guilt after one recognizes God's justifying work in Jesus Christ. It is also man's responsibility to love both God and man, and he ought to have hope, which manifests itself practically, for fellowship with God. The subjective soteriological responsibilities of man are fulfilled only because of God's grace; there is not human co-operation with the divine work. God desires that man fulfill his subjective soteriological responsibilities of faith, love and hope but if it is an absolute requirement of man to fulfill these is not to be answered now.

CHAPTER III

SOTERIOLOGIES OF H. ORTON WILEY AND KARL BARTH COMPARED AND CONTRASTED

Introduction

This chapter will have the same basic method of treatment as Chapter I and II. A comparison and contrast will first be made of Wiley's and Barth's views of sin. This will be followed by a comparison and contrast of their views concerning subjective soteriology. The last section of the chapter will contain a comparison and contrast of the subjective soteriologies of Wiley and Barth.

The nature of this chapter will not be rigidly treated within the sections on objective and subjective soteriology as in Chapters I and II. There will be some interweaving of the two subjects within each section. The reason is that Wiley and Barth differ considerably in their use of soteriological terminology. Barth reconstructs many ideas at which Wiley is seemingly quite traditional. Barth is one of the contemporary theologians who has developed his theology with "creative diversity."¹ Because of the difficulty of making comparisons and contrasts between these two scholars, the most meaningful

¹Daniel Day Williams, What Present-Day Theologians Are Thinking (Evanston: Harper and Row Publishers, 1959), p. 49.

comparisons and contrasts within this chapter will often be broad in nature.

A. Problem of Sin Compared and Contrasted

1. Nature of Sin Compared and Contrasted

Although Wiley and Barth are somewhat agreed on the result of sin being a self-separation from God, they differ in their emphasis on the means which brings about that self-separation. Wiley places the emphasis upon man's trying to decentralize God; man desires to take God's place. Barth places his emphasis upon man's breaking the covenant. Man sins through breaking the covenant of grace. Wiley mentions the covenant as a possible legitimate emphasis; however, he doesn't do so predominantly as Barth does. There is also common agreement in that sin is active in nature. However, the idea of sin as a state is peculiar to Wiley.

2. Consequences of Sin Compared and Contrasted

There is little "common ground" between Wiley and Barth in the respective discussions pertaining to the consequences of sin. Therefore, it is difficult to make any comparisons or contrasts. Wiley has quite a neat schema between the nature of sin and its consequences. The intricacies of the consequences of sin are quite evident. But for Barth, there is no such neat schema. His ideas churn rather broadly. Hence, the intricacies of the consequences of sin are quite deeply enmeshed and concealed.

Wiley understands the consequences of sin to be guilt and penalty. Man actively decentralized God, bringing upon

himself guilt. Because of man's guilt, there must be punishment for this sin. The chief penalty for man is death which is primarily a temporal, spiritual death. Guilt and penalty are not seen as consequences of sin by Barth. He asserts broadly that because of man's sinning through breaking the covenant of grace he needs conversion to God. He needs to be reconciled to God. The aim of this conversion and reconciliation is to put love into the hearts of men. It does not have to do centrally with freeing man from the guilt and penalty of sin.¹

B. The Objective Soteriologies Compared and Contrasted

1. Approach of Objective Soteriology Compared and Contrasted

This subsection will begin by asking a question: What doctrines are included in the respective objective soteriologies of Wiley and Barth? This is answered by Wiley very simply--atonement, which is the work of God through Jesus Christ. The answer for Barth is not nearly as short and simple. Jesus Christ, His person and His work of atonement are central to subjective soteriology. This is the only basic element that is common to Wiley and Barth in objective soteriology. However, in the area of agreement, there is disagreement. Jesus Christ in the atonement of Wiley means only the work of Jesus Christ, but Jesus Christ in the atonement in the doctrine of objective salvation of Barth means both the person and the work of Jesus Christ.

¹Barth, II, Part I, 74.

Doctrines in objective soteriology which are peculiar to Barth are justification, sanctification, calling, and election. Wiley considers each of these doctrines under subjective soteriology.

Under what larger doctrines are the objective soteriologies of Wiley and Barth found? Wiley discusses objective soteriology within the context of Christology, "the Doctrine of the Son."¹ Again Barth's discussion of the context of objective soteriology is more complicated. It is discussed both within Christology and within separate discussions which may be called "Christological achievements", which are justification, sanctification and calling. Each of these three receives individual categorization.

Barth discusses Christology under the doctrine of reconciliation, and Wiley discusses the doctrine of reconciliation, which is an aspect of atonement, under the doctrine of the Son. Therefore, it would seem that Barth would emphasize reconciliation more than Jesus Christ, and that Wiley would emphasize Jesus Christ more than reconciliation or atonement. However, it is ironic that Barth has a greater emphasis upon Jesus Christ than Wiley does within the doctrine of atonement. Perhaps the irony is mitigated by the fact that Wiley's Christological emphasis would be greater too, if he considered both the person and the work of Jesus Christ under objective soteriology.

¹Wiley, II, 143-300.

Both Wiley and Barth consider the doctrine of the atonement within or as objective soteriology. But, they approach the atonement differently. Wiley understands the atonement as a continuation of the Old Testament concept of sacrifice; whereas, Barth considers the atonement as a fulfillment of the covenant.

2. Terminology of Objective Soteriology Compared and Contrasted

This subsection will first present basic terms that are common to both Wiley and Barth. Then those terms that are not basic to the objective soteriologies of these two men, but which are common to both of them will be mentioned. Following this will be those terms which are peculiar to Wiley's objective soteriology, basic or not, and those which are peculiar to Barth, also disregarding whether or not they are basic.

Basic objective soteriological terms that are common to Wiley and Barth are reconciliation and atonement. The latter is considered more basic to Wiley. Reconciliation is only an aspect of the atonement. Barth reverses their order of importance. To him, reconciliation is basic. Atonement is discussed within the doctrine of reconciliation, and not the other way around, as it is with Wiley. In relationship to objective soteriology, atonement for Wiley is synonymous with objective soteriology. Reconciliation, therefore, as an aspect of atonement, cannot be equated with objective soteriology. Barth considers reconciliation to be a more encompassing doctrine than does Wiley. Reconciliation

not only is equivalent to objective soteriology in scope but it also encompasses subjective soteriology along with objective soteriology.

Terms that are less basic in importance but are common to both Wiley and Barth are "incarnation", "redemption" and "satisfaction." These terms are common in their occurrence to these two scholars although they are not common in meaning, e.g. Wiley writes of redemption as God's buying back man unto Himself,¹ but Barth uses the term in reference to eschatology, man will have redemption unto eternal life.²

Two doctrines have been included in Barth's objective soteriology although Barth himself does not include them in his doctrine of reconciliation. These doctrines are election and predestination. Traditionally, these doctrines have been considered part of soteriology. Considering that they fit best, in idea, in objective soteriology, that is where they have been placed.

Two terms that are peculiar to Wiley in objective soteriology are "expiation" and "propitiation." Terms that are peculiar to Barth in objective soteriology are "conversion," "calling," "justification," "sanctification," and "regeneration." Each of these terms is peculiar to Barth only in objective soteriology because Wiley uses each of them as terms that reflect subjective soteriological concepts.

¹Ibid., II, 295.

²Barth, IV, Part II, 345.

3. Nature of Objective Soteriology Compared and Contrasted

Structurally, there is a wide difference between Wiley and Barth in objective soteriology. Wiley structures his objective soteriology according to the neat patterns of traditional theology. Whereas, Barth reconstructs the doctrine of objective salvation so that it is very different from that which has traditionally appeared. Objective soteriology is quite synonymous with atonement for Wiley. This is somewhat true for Barth too. But the arguments that each scholar constructs to get to the place, where he says that atonement is objective soteriology, are vastly different, at least structurally. Wiley discusses the whole matter of objective soteriology under the concept of the atonement. But Barth discusses part of the objective soteriology under the concept of Christology. Barth's Christology includes both the person and the work of Jesus Christ. Hence, his objective soteriology includes not only the work of Jesus Christ but also His person. This differs from Wiley in that his objective soteriology, atonement, includes only what is traditionally called the work of Jesus Christ.

Another basic structural difference between Wiley and Barth in objective soteriology is that Barth categorizes three basic soteriological concepts under objective soteriology, whereas Wiley considers them to be subjective soteriological concepts. These concepts are justification, sanctification, and calling. Barth considers each of these as a major objective soteriological doctrine. Wiley doesn't mention these

in his objective soteriological discussion, rather he discusses them within the doctrine of subjective soteriology.

The more minute comparisons and contrasts in this subsection will be treated in two subdivisions. The first will be that of Christology, which will contain the doctrine of atonement. The viewpoints of Wiley and Barth which have similarities will be presented. Following this will be a presentation of the differences of each writer. The second subdivision will contain the doctrines of justification, sanctification, calling, election and predestination. Barth is the only one of these two writers who includes these doctrines in his objective soteriology. However, even though Wiley discusses these doctrines within subjective soteriology he, at points, gives an objective soteriological character to them. If a doctrine does have an objective soteriological sense, such as this, it will be compared and contrasted to the objective soteriological doctrine as presented by Barth. Hence, there will be an interweaving of what Barth considers objective soteriological doctrines and what Wiley considers within subjective soteriology.

a) Christology (Atonement)

A similarity between Wiley and Barth is that each discusses the doctrine of the atonement within Christology. Wiley divides Christology into two sections--the person of Jesus Christ and the work of Jesus Christ.¹ Barth discusses Christology as a unity; he does not make a division of the

¹Wiley, II, 143-300.

person of Jesus Christ from the work of Jesus Christ. He interweaves the person of Jesus Christ into the work of Jesus Christ.¹ Christology is presented in the first section of each part of The Doctrine of Reconciliation. Although Barth interweaves the person and the work of Jesus Christ in his Christology and Wiley does not, there are seeming similarities between their respective Christologies.

One of these similarities is in what Wiley calls the "vital principle" of the atonement. This "vital principle" is that Jesus Christ was pre-existent, but it is not that He was just pre-existent but that He was pre-existent as the divine Logos. Because Jesus Christ was pre-existent as the divine Logos, He is the "ground of unity" between God and the man.² This unity between God and man is "fundamental...in the atonement."³ Barth also understands a necessity for a unifying factor between God and man. This unitive factor is seen in Barth's understanding Jesus Christ as very God and very man, which is an "utter unity" of God and man.⁴

The differences between Wiley and Barth which will be delineated next are not structurally basic. However, they are significantly different.

An objective soteriological difference between Wiley

¹Barth, IV, Part I, 123-24.

²Wiley, II, 277.

³Ibid.

⁴Barth, IV, Part I, 126.

and Barth is in understanding the need of reconciliation. Wiley calls this the need of reconciliation, the "ground or occasion" for the atonement.¹ The reason that the atonement was needed is because there is sin in the world that needs to be propitiated. The sins were offenses against God which needed to be atoned.² Objectively, Jesus Christ paid God for these offenses, thus He set man free. Barth also takes seriously the sin of man but in another sense. The sin of man was the result of man's breaking the covenant of God; man turned away from God going after his own paths. The need of reconciliation was to convert, or turn, man toward God again. God through his grace in Jesus Christ rejected man's turning away from Him and in a sense set man back unto the path, whereby he is converted to do God's will.³

The goal of reconciliation thus differs in the thinking of these two men too. This does not have reference to the final goal of reconciliation but to an intermediate goal. The final goal in the thought of these two scholars is quite similar. It is a fellowship between God and man, that is finally desired. The atonement was ordained by God to bring about this final end according to both Wiley and Barth. The intermediate end or goal for Wiley involves the idea that God could not have fellowship with men previous to the atoning work of Jesus Christ because of man's sin.⁴ Atonement had to be

¹Wiley, II, 273.

²Ibid., II, 229.

³Barth, II, Part I, 74.

⁴Wiley, II, 283.

made for the sin of man, in order that there could be fellowship between God and man. Barth understands the remedy for the restoration of the severed fellowship to be the turning of man toward God. Therefore, Wiley understands the intermediary goal to be the atonement of sin, whereas Barth understands the intermediary goal to be the converting or turning of man.

Another closely related distinction, between Wiley and Barth, concerns the question: Who needs to be reconciled? Wiley asserts that reconciliation is both for God and for man. God is reconciled to man, and man is reconciled to God.¹ Barth makes the assertion that only man needs to be reconciled to God. God needs no reconciliation.

These are some of the primary non-structural distinctions between Wiley and Barth concerning the doctrine of atonement. The structural distinctions have already been mentioned. Undoubtedly, the structural differences are more significant than the nonstructural. However, these non-structural differences are important.

Barth and Wiley each has distinctive emphases. Those of Wiley are less numerous since he regards only the atonement within the scope of objective soteriology. This does not allow for as many concepts to be presented, as it does for Barth, who includes both the person and work of Jesus Christ within the doctrine of objective soteriology. It would be far beyond the scope of this thesis to enumerate all the

¹Ibid, II, 291.

distinctives of each scholar; this study has the purpose of presenting those Christological areas of similarity and difference which are most significant.

b) Christological Achievements

Outside the strict Christological doctrines, there are several important distinctive doctrines of Barth within objective soteriology. They are justification, sanctification, calling, election and predestination. The last two are not included by Barth as basic doctrines, as are the first three. However, they have been included within this discussion of Barth's objective soteriology because of their objective soteriological character. Not one of these doctrines does Wiley consider as an objective soteriological doctrine. However, there are certain soteriological ideas that are found in Wiley which sometimes correspond to one of these soteriological doctrines of Barth. The doctrines of justification, sanctification, calling, election and predestination of Barth and Wiley will now be compared and contrasted.

The doctrine of justification contains a basic agreement and a basic disagreement between Wiley and Barth. These two scholars understand justification in a similar manner. It is both a negative and a positive work. Negatively, it is renouncing and pardoning man's guilt, and positively, it involves imputing a righteousness. But they disagree on when and on what basis man is justified. Barth propounds the view that God through Jesus Christ has brought about man's justification without any responsibility on the part of man. Wiley, on the other hand, makes almost no reference to the

justification of man apart from man's penitence. Barth considers justification for man, which came through Jesus Christ, as a past act while Wiley considers justification as a present act, contingent upon man's repentance. Therefore, there is agreement on the doctrine of justification concerning the nature of it, but there is disagreement concerning the apprehension of it. Therefore, it is understandable why Barth includes the doctrine within objective soteriology and Wiley considers it subjectively.

It has already been mentioned that Barth places the doctrine of sanctification into the doctrine of objective salvation, whereas Wiley places it into subjective soteriology. There is seemingly only one point, where Wiley has an idea of sanctification, implied in its relationship to the atonement, which corresponds to one of the points that Barth makes in his development of sanctification. Barth contends that sanctification is God's giving man a new direction within the freedom that man has through Jesus Christ. Considerable discussion is given to this idea of the freedom that man has and how it is involved in man's sanctification. Wiley, within the doctrine of atonement, also makes a point that Jesus Christ has set us free. This is a freeing of man from the law.¹ This is the only seeming agreement of Wiley and Barth in the doctrine of sanctification as it is related to the atonement, i.e. objective soteriology. Another discussion of sanctification will be

¹Ibid, II, 280.

given in the subsection on the nature of subjective soteriology where it will be investigated as to whether or not further relationships are, or are not, within the doctrine of sanctification, as it is understood by Barth and Wiley.

The doctrine of the calling of man is entirely peculiar to Barth, as he develops it. He justifies his doctrine of calling in this way:

But we must not overlook the fact that as we take note of the witness of the New Testament at this very heart and center of the matter there is a third moment which we have to treat independently and as true in and for itself. It is of this that we must now speak, the moment of the promise given to man in Jesus Christ, and therefore, Christian hope, and therefore the calling of man side by side with his justification and sanctification.¹

There is nothing in Wiley's objective soteriology, nor subjective soteriology, that corresponds to the doctrine that Barth has developed and considered as the calling of man. Wiley does, however, have a doctrine of vocation or calling, which is found within subjective soteriology. But it is entirely something that happens to a man subjectively, and today, whereas the calling of man according to Barth "took place in what was done for man and the world in the atonement made in Jesus Christ."² Wiley's doctrine of the calling of man will be discussed within the subsection of the nature of subjective soteriology. An effort will be made to see if there is some corresponding idea found in Barth.

¹Barth, IV, Part I, 108.

²Ibid., IV, Part I, 114.

A statement by Wiley on election is appropriate for beginning a comparative discussion of the views of Wiley, the Arminian, and Barth, the Calvinist, on election.

The elect in either the Arminian or Calvinistic view of grace are called or chosen ones, but the two systems differ widely as to the manner of this election. Those who hold to the former view regard it as dependent upon the personal acceptance of a universal call, and therefore conditional; the latter regard it as unconditional and dependent upon...the exercise of sovereign grace.¹

Wiley and Barth assert that election is a choosing of persons unto fellowship with God. However, for Wiley, being elected depends upon the condition of responding to the grace of God in Jesus Christ. Whereas, for Barth, being elected has nothing to do with an individual's response. The election of man is done by God's initiative and grace. Wiley understands election to involve the calling of an individual by the Holy Spirit, and the responding of that individual to the Holy Spirit's call. Therefore, it is a work upon man. Election, for Barth, is not a work of God upon an individual man, rather it is upon man only as Jesus Christ is very man. Election is God's rejecting man's rejection of God by taking that rejection upon Himself in Jesus Christ in order that man can be accepted.²

For Barth, predestination is synonymous with election, generally.³ Predestination, however, more specifically, is God's actively willing his election of Jesus Christ and

¹Wiley, II, 335.

²Klooster, p. 55.

³Ibid., p. 50.

refusing to accept man's rejection of Himself. Wiley's understanding of predestination is broader in that it refers to "God's gracious plan of saving men...."¹ There seems to be a similarity between Barth's view of election and Wiley's view of predestination. Isn't Barth's view of election also "God's gracious plan of saving men..." in a sense?

4. Scope of Objective Soteriology Compared and Contrasted

There is basic agreement between Wiley and Barth in the scope of objective soteriology concerning the extent of its outreach. Both contend that mankind, universally, has provision made for him through the atoning work of God in Jesus Christ. However, there is a difference in the intensity in which this is said. Wiley always has a seeming "if" attached or implied in his statements regarding this universality. In one breath, he writes that the atonement is universal, and with the next breath, he attaches a condition to the atonement. Typical of Wiley is this opening statement on the matter:

The atonement is universal. This does not mean that all mankind will be unconditionally saved, but that the sacrificial offering of Christ so far satisfied the claims of the divine law as to make salvation a possibility for all.²

For Barth, on the other hand, the universality of the atonement is expressed strongly without such qualifications.

¹Wiley, II, 337.

²Ibid., II, 295.

The ring of "all" men is sharp and continuous in Barth's writings. Although this difference of intensity in stating the universality of the atonement exists, there is basic agreement between the two men at this point. The atoning work of God in Jesus Christ was universal for all men in its outreach.

The question of efficacious universality is another matter. Here Wiley and Barth are not in agreement. Wiley contends that the atonement is "...universal or general in the provisional sense, but special or conditional in its application to the individual."¹ The atonement is not universal efficaciously. For Barth, there is a seeming efficacious universality if one takes the testimony of The Doctrine of Reconciliation by itself. The response of man that makes the atonement conditional for Wiley does not contribute toward the efficacy of the atonement for Barth. The justification of God through Jesus Christ which makes a man righteous "...will have incontrovertible truth and an unconditional force against everything that man either is of himself or does of himself, ...which cannot be limited by anything that may or may not correspond on the part of man."² What is true for the efficacious extent of justification is true of the atonement.

The question of the conditionality, or the unconditionality, of the atonement, for Barth, is ultimately the

¹Ibid.

²Barth, IV, Part I, 98.

question of whether or not there is universal salvation. Does or does not Barth believe that all men will finally be saved? This widely debated question is unsettled, primarily because Barth, himself, "refuses to affirm or deny the doctrine of universal salvation."¹

C. The Subjective Soteriologies Compared and Contrasted

The same method of treatment will be used in this subsection that has been used in the subjective soteriological sections of previous chapters. The approach and nature of subjective soteriologies of Wiley and Barth will be compared and contrasted in the first and second subsections, respectively. The third subsection will be a discussion on the role of man in the subjective soteriologies of Wiley and Barth. Within each subsection, first the similarities of the two scholars will be delineated, and secondly their differences will be discussed.

1. Approach to Subjective Soteriology Compared and Contrasted

The dissimilarities between the subjective soteriologies are not minor. Basically, there are no similarities in structure. Wiley discusses objective soteriology under the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Barth's subjective soteriological discussions are found in the doctrine of reconciliation. The Holy Spirit is not given a separate categorical discussion by Barth. To him, Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit are inseparable. Therefore, there is no need for making a separate

¹Klooster, p. 65.

doctrine of the Holy Spirit. However, the Holy Spirit is categorized in subjective soteriology of Barth together with the Christian community and the individual. Another difference between Wiley and Barth is in regard to the relationship between the community and the individual. Wiley has no specific discussions of the relationship between soteriology and the individual. This is because his whole emphasis seems to be in subjective soteriology upon the individual. Wiley has a separate doctrine for the community under The Doctrine of the Church.¹ But, this doctrine of the community is not made in specific relationship to soteriology. On the other hand, Barth does have a doctrine of the church presented within the doctrine of reconciliation.² Furthermore, Barth's doctrine of the church is given priority over the individual in soteriology. The individual is discussed only after the doctrine of the church is delineated. Hence, Wiley's emphasis on the individual in subjective soteriology is central, while the emphasis on the individual for Barth is secondary.

Another difference between the two scholars is in regard to the amount of content given to subjective soteriology over against objective soteriology. Wiley gives approximately twice as much content to subjective soteriology as he does to its objective counterpart. In contrast to

¹Wiley, III, 103-208.

²Barth, IV, Parts I, II, III, 4th section of each part.

this, Barth gives more content to his objective soteriology than he does to subjective soteriology.

Looking at these two viewpoints, still structurally but more minutely, one still finds virtually no similarity. Wiley discusses the idea of grace, righteousness, justification, sonship, sanctification and ethics as larger categories within his subjective soteriology, while Barth's larger categories are faith, love and hope.

2. Nature of Subjective Soteriology Compared and Contrasted

There are some similarities between the nature of subjective soteriology of the individual as it is understood by Barth and Wiley. However, these similarities exist primarily in the area of subjective soteriological ideas. Some of these ideas are the calling of man (Barth--awakening), repentance and faith.

Their primary difference lies in their distinctive development of these ideas. Wiley has a neat subjective soteriological schema developed. There are definite steps that the individual must take in being subjectively saved. These steps are neatly and simply arranged. On the other hand, the subjective soteriology of Barth has no such neat and simple pattern. Being subjectively saved, in Barth's thought, involves a more complex series of steps. Wiley conveys the idea that subjective soteriology is only a forward movement, but for Barth, the movement of subjective soteriology is dialectic--forward, backward, then forward again, etc.

There is a sharp difference within the major sections in which Wiley and Barth each discusses the doctrine of subjective salvation. Wiley's four sections pertain to the preliminary work of grace upon the individual before salvation, justification, adoption and sanctification. Barth's three major sections pertain to faith, love and hope.

There is an area of similarity in the beginning of the process of subjective soteriology. Barth calls this the beginning of being subjectively saved, awakening.¹ For Wiley, this beginning involves calling, awakening and conviction. Therefore, Barth uses a broad term, awakening, to convey these ideas, whereas Wiley expands the matter to include three terms. Both scholars agree that this work of bringing one to a knowledge of his state of death, and the work that God has done through Jesus Christ to deliver him from that state, is a work of God through the Holy Spirit. Although there are different ways of expressing it, both scholars assert that the awakening is from the "sleep of death."² An individual is awakened by the Holy Spirit out of his rebellion against God, which has brought guilt within himself and before God. Within this beginning of subjective salvation, one sees a good example of the neat soteriology of Wiley. He develops the idea in this way: (1) man is called by God through the Holy Spirit, (2) man is awakened to see his lostness, (3) man is convicted, so that he perceives his "guilt and

¹Barth, IV, Part II, 556.

²Ibid., IV, Part II, 555-57.

condemnation because of sin."¹ Barth has no such simple and neat development.

Repentance is a common factor in the subjective soteriologies of Wiley and Barth. It is similar in nature in the thought of both men in that repentance is an initial act and something that continues. However, Wiley asserts that it continues as a state of penitence, whereas Barth contends that the act of repentance itself must be repeated throughout life.

Conversion for both scholars is, essentially, the turning of man to God. There is, however, a difference in their thought regarding the nature of the time of conversion. For Wiley, conversion signifies an instant. For Barth, there is an instant involvement too, but conversion is not "exhausted in a once-for-all act,...."² Rather, conversion is a process involving the whole time of life.

Wiley and Barth are considerably different in their understanding of faith. For Wiley, it is primarily a matter of trust. On the other hand, it is primarily a matter of subjecting oneself in humble obedience to God. Barth warns against making faith too much of trust, lest it takes upon itself the character of a work; this would lend to the theological error of righteousness by the work of faith.

Distinctive subjective soteriological emphases of Wiley are the doctrines of justification, regeneration,

¹Wiley, II, 340-44.

²Barth, IV, Part II, 566.

adoption, assurance and sanctification. The doctrine of sanctification for Wiley is major in subjective soteriology. Perhaps it is here that the basis lies for some differences in the doctrine of subjective salvation in Wiley and Barth. Through sanctification, Wiley asserts that man can become completely free from the act of sinning. This gives his subjective soteriology its linear character. Barth contends that man will keep on sinning throughout his Christian life. One must always be willing to say: "I have overcome in Him, but not in myself, not even remotely."¹ An individual is never completely free from sinning. Yes, he is always justified, but he is always a sinner too.

Major distinctive subjective soteriological doctrines in Barth are love and hope. Important emphases throughout Barth's writings are knowledge and confession. Having knowledge of God's objective soteriological work in Jesus Christ is important. Barth places emphasis upon the idea of confession, but Wiley hardly uses the word.

One reason why Wiley gives separate consideration to certain doctrines is that he considers them to be distinct from each other. Barth does not discuss these same doctrines separately because he believes they are essentially the same doctrines in idea, although they may differ in terminology. For example, he implies that regeneration, conversion and belief may have the same meaning, in idea, in the New Testament.²

¹Ibid., IV, Part II, 771.

²Ibid., IV, Part II, 568.

Therefore, he himself would consider them as being of the same meaning.

3. The Role of Man in Subjective Soteriology Compared and Contrasted

This subsection has reference primarily to the individual. Therefore, when the term "man" is used, it has primary reference to the individual man.

a) Place of Man

Both Wiley and Barth give a significant place to man in their subjective soteriologies. Barth, however, has more emphasis upon God's work for man through Jesus Christ than Wiley does. There is a constant reminder to man, in Barth, that he needs to remember God's work for him in Jesus Christ. Wiley's attention given to man as an individual is more pronounced than that of Barth. Through his subjective soteriological writings Wiley has his sights set upon the individual man. However, Barth relegates the individual man to a categorical discussion instead of referring to him throughout. Furthermore, the categorical emphasis of the individual is secondary to the community. We can conclude: the place of individual man in the subjective soteriology of Wiley is more important than that of the individual man in Barth.

b) Responsibility of Man

Man is a very responsible creature in his procuring salvation. But because man has no righteousness in himself, he is dependent upon God for that salvation. So far, Wiley

and Barth agree. Because man is not righteous, is God going to supply all of his righteousness for him? Barth says yes. "Everything depends on Him who is above It does not depend at all on what man had or has or will have to contribute...."¹ Wiley disagrees. He writes that because man is unrighteous he can do nothing except by the aid of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, man can do something, but it is only by God's help through His Spirit.

This leads to the point of synergism as it is related to the doctrine of salvation. Wiley affirms a synergism between God and man in subjective soteriology. He writes that "The Scriptures represent the Spirit as working through and with man's concurrence."² Barth denies that man co-operates with God in working out his salvation. Barth asserts that man does not co-operate with God in the working out of his salvation, but he responds to God in it.

Man's specific responsibilities in subjective soteriology are to co-operate with the Holy Spirit in repentance and confession. It is the individual man's responsibility to have faith in God's work in Jesus Christ by trusting in that work as being efficacious for his own life. To devote oneself wholly to God and seek cleansing from unrighteousness is also man's responsibility. This devoting of the self and the seeking cleansing is sanctification. Barth

¹Ibid., IV, Part I, 83.

²Wiley, II, 355.

does not emphasize the latter as a responsibility of man. Barth also asserts that individual man has the responsibility to repent and confess his sins if he is to gain salvation subjectively. However, the primary responsibilities of man are to have faith, to love God and man, and to have hope for fellowship with God.

The responsibilities of the individual man leading up to and entering a saved relationship with God in Jesus Christ are similar in the understanding of Wiley and Barth. However, each scholar has distinctive emphases concerning these responsibilities.

SUMMARY

There is little similarity between Wiley and Barth in the doctrine of sin. Sin is taken seriously by both, and both consider the consequence of sin to be death. But Wiley strongly links this death to the guilt and penalty of sin. In order to be removed from this death, man needs to have his penalty of sin paid. Barth conceives of this death as man's slothfully going on his own way, disregarding God's work in Jesus Christ for man. Death isn't specifically penalty for sin. Therefore, man's need is not to have his penalty paid to God but to be reconciled to God by being turned, converted away from his own paths to those of God.

The objective soteriologies of Wiley and Barth are very different in approach, terminology and nature. At the point, however, where objective soteriology is the most significant in relationship to subjective soteriology--the scope of objective soteriology, Wiley and Barth are basically in agreement. They agree in this: the work done by God through Jesus Christ was done for all men. Man, universally, has salvation provided for him objectively.

Structurally, the approach of Wiley and Barth to subjective soteriology is very different in terminology and idea. However, there is considerable similarity in the ideas of subjective soteriology, apart from structure. Individual man's subjective soteriological responsibilities of repentance, confession, and faith are common to Wiley and Barth.

Man's striving for righteousness through devoting himself to God and emptying himself of sin is peculiar to Wiley.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Arminius, James. The Works of James Arminius. Vols. I and II. Trans. James Nichols. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1956.
- Arminius, James. The Works of James Arminius. Vol. III. Trans. W. R. Bagnall. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1956.
- Baab, Otto J. The Theology of the Old Testament. New York: Abingdon Press, 1949.
- Baille, Donald M. The Theology of the Sacraments. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1957.
- Bangs, Nathan. The Life of James Arminius. James Nichols. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1843.
- Barth, Karl. The Doctrine of God. Trans. G. M. Bromiley and others. Vol. II, part 2; Church Dogmatics; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1957.
- _____. The Doctrine of Reconciliation. Trans. by G. W. Bromiley. Vol. IV, part 1; Church Dogmatics; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956.
- _____. The Doctrine of Reconciliation. Trans. G. W. Bromiley, Vol. IV, part 2; Church Dogmatics; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.
- _____. The Doctrine of Reconciliation. Trans. G. W. Bromiley. Vol. IV, part 3a; Church Dogmatics; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1961.
- _____. The Doctrine of Reconciliation. Trans. G. W. Bromiley, Vol. IV, part 3b; Church Dogmatics; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1962.
- _____. Dogmatics in Outline. New York: Harper & Brothers Publisher, 1959.
- _____. The Humanity of God. Trans. Thomas Wieser and John Newton Thomas. 3rd printing, Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1963.
- _____. Table Talk. Rec. John D. Godsey. Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1962.

- _____. The Word of God and the Word of Man. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1957.
- Berkouwer, G. C. The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Erdmans Publishing Company, 1956.
- Clark, Gordon H. Karl Barth's Theological Method. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1963.
- DeWolf, L. Harold. The Case for Theology in Liberal Perspective. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959.
- _____. A Theology of the Living Church. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1953.
- Dillenberger, John and Welch, Claude. Protestant Christianity. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954.
- Easton, W. Burnet, Jr. Basic Christian Beliefs. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957.
- Fey, Harold E. (ed.) How My Mind Has Changed. Cleveland and New York: Meridian Books, 1961.
- Gamertsfelder, S. J. Systematic Theology. Harrisburg, Penna.: Evangelical Publishing House, 1921.
- Gerstner, John H. Steps to Salvation. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960.
- Grimes, Howard. The Rebirth of the Laity. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- Heick, O. W. History of Protestant Thought. Vol. II of A History of Christian Thought. Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1946.
- Henderlite, Rachel. Forgiveness and Hope. Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1961.
- Henry, Carl F. H. (ed.) Revelation and the Bible. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958.
- Hordern, William. The Case For a New Reformation Theology. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959.
- Hunt, George L. (ed.) Ten Makers of Modern Protestant Thought. New York: Association Press, 1958.
- Hunter, Archibald M. Interpreting the New Testament (1900-1950). Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1951.

- Klooster, Fred H. The Significance of Barth's Theology. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1961.
- Kraemer, Hendrik. A Theology of the Laity. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1958.
- Leavenworth, Lynn (ed.) Great Themes in Theology. Chicago: The Judson Press, 1958.
- Marty, Martin E. (ed.) The Place of Bonhoeffer. New York: Association Press, 1962.
- The New English Bible. (New Testament). United States of America: Oxford University Press and Cambridge University Press, 1961.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold. Human Nature. Vol. I of The Nature and Destiny of Man. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941.
- _____. Human Destiny. Vol. II of The Nature and Destiny of Man. London: Nisbet & Co., Ltd., 1943.
- Olmstead, Clifton E. History of Religion in the United States. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.
- Richardson, Alan. Christian Apologetics. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1947.
- Tenney, Merrill C. The Reality of the Resurrection. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963.
- Torrance, Thomas F. Karl Barth. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1962.
- Walker, Williston. A History of the Christian Church. Rev. Cyril C. Richardson, Wilhelm Pauck and Robert T. Handy. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1959.
- Whale, J. S. Christian Doctrine. Cambridge: University Press, 1961.
- _____. The Protestant Tradition. Cambridge: University Press, 1962.
- Wiley, H. Orton. Christian Theology. Vols. I, II, III. Kansas City, Mo.: Beacon Hill Press, 1952.
- _____. God Has the Answer. Kansas City, Missouri: Beacon Hill Press, 1946.

Wiley, H. Orton and Culbertson, Paul T. Introduction To Christian Theology. Kansas City, Mo.: Beacon Hill Press, n.d.

Williams, Colin. W. John Wesley's Theology Today. New York: Abingdon Press, 1960.

Williams, Daniel Day. What Present-Day Theologians Are Thinking. New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publisher, 1959.

Commentaries

Barrett, C. K. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1957.

Barth, Karl. The Epistle to the Philippians. Trans. James W. Leitch, 6th ed. Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1962.

_____. The Epistle to the Romans. Trans. 6th ed. Edwin C. Hickyns. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.

Wiley, H. Orton. The Epistle to the Hebrews. Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1959.

Encyclopedia, Handbook and Word Book

Buttrick, George A. (ed.) The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. IV, New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Halverson, M. and Cohen, A. A. (eds.) A Handbook of Christian Theology. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1958.

Loetscher, Lefferts A. (ed.) Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1955.

Richardson, Alan. (ed.) A Theological Word Book of the Bible. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1957.

Articles

"Dr. H. Orton Wiley," The Herald of Holiness, (October 4, 1961), 11-14.

"Feature Interview: The Debate Over Divine Election," Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Roger Nicole and H. Orton Wiley (interviewees), Christianity Today, Vol. IV, No. 1 (October 12, 1959).

Graham, Billy. "Where to Begin," Decision, (November, 1962), 1, 14 & 15.

Henry, Carl F. H. (ed.), "Basic Issues in Modern Theology: Revelation in History." Editorial, Christianity Today, (November 20, 1964), 17-20.

_____. (ed.), "Chaos in European Theology: The Deterioration of Barth's Defenses," Editorial, Christianity Today, (October 9, 1964), 15-19.

_____. (ed.), "Revelation in History," Editorial, Christianity Today, (October 9, 1964), 31-33.

_____. (ed.), "Which Way for Theology in the Future?" Editorial, Christianity Today, (November 6, 1964), 8-11.

Montgomery, John Warwick. "The Law's Third Use: Sanctification," Christianity Today, (April 26, 1963), 5-8.

Robb, Edmund W. "The Predicament of Methodism," Christianity Today, VIII, No. 2, (October 25, 1963).

Other Sources

Bangs, Carl. Arminius and the Reformation. Ori. pub. Church History; Vol. XXX, No. 2; June, 1961.

_____. Personal letter. November 3, 1964.

Carnell, Edward J. Chapel Sermon at Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois, in the spring of 1962.

Church of the Nazarene Information Service. "Biographical Sketch" for "Newspapers and General Use."

Church of the Nazarene Information Service. News release for "Religious Press and General Use." August 29, 1961.

Kantzer, Kenneth K. Lectures from a course in soteriology at Fuller Summer Seminary, Winona Lake, Indiana, June-July, 1964.

_____. Personal interview with Dr. K. K. Kantzer at Winona Lake, Indiana, in July, 1964.

Ludwig, S. T. "These Facts Gleaned From a Statement Made - to the General Church Secretary in 1952..." Historical Material from Nazarene Headquarters.

Nazarene News Service. "Biographical Questionnaire" filled out by H. Orton Wiley. February 28, 1952.

Pasadena College News Bureau. News release. November 14,
1957.

Wiley, H. Orton. "For the Historical Record" sent to the
General Church Secretary of the Church of the
Nazarene.