

KARL BARTH'S RECEPTION IN KOREA:  
FOCUSING ON ECCLESIOLOGY IN RELATION TO  
KOREAN CHRISTIAN THOUGHT

YOUNG-GWAN KIM  
FACULTY OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES, MCGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL  
DECEMBER 2001

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH  
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

COPYRIGHT BY

YOUNG-GWAN KIM

DECEMBER 2001

COPY NO. 1



National Library  
of Canada

Acquisitions and  
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Acquisitions et  
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

*Your file Votre référence*

*Our file Notre référence*

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-78706-0

Canada

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT -----	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS -----	vii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS -----	ix
GLOSSARY -----	x
<b>INTRODUCTION:</b>	
THE RECEPTION OF KARL BARTH'S THEOLOGY IN KOREA -----	1
Chapter	
I. AN ACCOUNT OF THE HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIANITY IN KOREA AND THE ROLE OF CONFUCIANISM IN ITS RAPID GROWTH -----	8
A. An Historical Account of Korean Confucianism -----	9
B. The Characteristics of Korean Confucianism -----	17
The traditional Patriarchal Family System -----	17
Ancestor Worship as a Means of Establishing Community Bonds and Fellowship -----	20
Culture as the Life and the Fellowship for the Gathering of the Confucian Community -----	21
Education: <i>Hyangkyo</i> (Community School) -----	22
<i>Kye</i> (the Korean Personal Community) as a Means for the Upbuilding of the Confucian Community -----	23
C. Confucian Scholars' Early Contact with Christianity -----	28
D. The Confucian-Christian Context in Korean Christianity -----	40
E. Early Protestant Missionaries' Contribution to the Growth of Korean Christianity and to the Reception of Barth's Christocentric Theology in Korea -----	46
II. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF KARL BARTH'S THEOLOGY AND HIS CHRISTOCENTRIC ECCLESIOLOGY -----	94
A. The Distinctive Characteristics of Barth's Theology -----	94
B. Barth's Christocentric Ecclesiology -----	107
The Gathering of the Christian Community -----	108

The Upbuilding of the Christian community -----	118
The Sending of the Christian community -----	133
C. Barth's Theology of Mission -----	160
III. THE INDIGENIZATION OF KARL BARTH'S CHRISTOCENTRIC ECCLESIOLOGY IN KOREAN CHRISTIAN THOUGHT: SUNG-BUM YUN'S THEOLOGY OF SUNG -----	193
A. An Overview of the Reception of Karl Barth's Theology in Korea -	194
B. Sung-Bum Yun's Theology of Sung -----	204
The Christological Centre of Sung Theology -----	204
Sung-Bum Yun's General Response to Barth's Ecclesiology -	217
A Further Appraisal of Yun's Ecclesiological Response to Barth -----	256
CONCLUSION -----	284
BIBLIOGRAPHY -----	287

## ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this thesis is to explore the reception of Karl Barth's theology in Korea by focusing specifically on his doctrine of the Church. This he describes as the gathering, upbuilding and sending of the Christian community. His work, *Church Dogmatics*, will be examined, and then an attempt will be made to identify how Barth's Christocentric ecclesiology was indigenized and is still received in Korea by examining Korean Christian thought. This will include an investigation of Sung-Bum Yun's theology of Sung.

The secondary purpose of this thesis is: (1) the description of a unique relationship between Christianity and Confucianism, because Korean Confucianism has played an important role in both the explosive growth of the Christian community and provided a basic foundation for the reception of Barth's theology in Korea; (2) the inquiry whether Barth's ecclesiology, especially his theology of mission (the sending of the Christian community), pays sufficient attention to different cultures and religions; and consequently (3) the justification that the indigenization of Barth's Christocentric theology was, and is, genuinely possible with Korean Confucianism, though Barth's theology is typically confined within the European context.

This thesis will be divided into three chapters. Chapter One is designed as a brief sketch of the historical development of early Korean Protestantism and its impact on cultural and religious changes in Korea. This will include a detailed introduction to Korean Confucianism and its community concept and structure.

In the second chapter, an analysis of Barth's ecclesiology is presented by providing a discussion of what constitutes the true church, the upbuilding of the Christian community, and the missionary task of the Christian community.

Chapter Three indicates why Barth's Christocentric ecclesiology can still make an impact on contemporary Korean ecclesiological theology and practice, by exploring a specific overview of the Korean reception of Barth's theology. On this basis, this chapter critically examines and analyzes Sung-Bum Yun's appropriation and misappropriation of Barth's theology.

## RÉSUMÉ

L'objet principal de cette thèse est de comprendre l'influence de la théologie de Karl Barth en Corée en se basant essentiellement sur sa doctrine de l'Eglise. Il la présente à travers le rassemblement, le développement de la communauté chrétienne et la dissémination de ses missionnaires. Son travail, «Church Dogmatics», sera analysé puis nous tenterons de comprendre comment la théorie ecclésiastique centrée sur le Christ de Barth a influencé et influence toujours la Corée. Nous étudierons pour cela la pensée coréenne chrétienne. Cela comprendra aussi une analyse sur la théologie de Sung-Bum Yun sur le Sung.

Le second objectif de cette thèse est de: (1) décrire la relation particulière entre le christianisme et le confucianisme. Le confucianisme coréen a joué un rôle important dans l'émergence de la communauté chrétienne et de la théologie de Barth en Corée dont il a établi les fondements; (2) Une étude pour savoir si la théorie ecclésiastique de Barth, et plus particulièrement ce qui attrait aux missions, considère avec suffisamment d'attention les autres cultures et religions; De fait (3), on se demandera si l'influence de la théologie de Barth centrée sur le Christ était et est véritablement possible au sein du confucianisme coréen, dans la mesure où cette théologie est issue, à l'origine, d'un contexte purement européen.

Cette thèse sera divisée en 3 chapitres. Le chapitre un présente une brève esquisse historique du développement précoce du protestantisme coréen et de son impact sur les évolutions culturelles et religieuses en Corée. Il inclura notamment une introduction détaillée du confucianisme coréen, de sa structure et de son concept de communauté.

Dans le second chapitre, nous présenterons une analyse de la théorie ecclésiastique de Barth. Une discussion sera menée sur ce qui constitue la vraie église, la constitution de la communauté chrétienne et ses devoirs de missionnaire.

Le Chapitre 3 explique pourquoi la théorie ecclésiastique centrée sur le Christ de Barth est encore à même d'influencer la théologie ecclésiastique contemporaine coréenne et sa pratique. Cette analyse sera rendue possible par une étude spécifique des influences de la théologie de Barth à travers la Corée. Sur cette base, ce chapitre analysera de façon critique l'appropriation Sung-Bum Yun de la théologie de Barth et le détournement qu'il en a faite.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to Professor William Klempa, the supervisor of this thesis, whose interest in the theology of Karl Barth has encouraged and guided me in the pursuit of this research. His friendship, patience and criticisms of the manuscript and his assistance in directing me to sources have been invaluable. Not only has Professor Klempa contributed in so many ways to the writing of this thesis, but he has challenged me spiritually. I will ever thank God for allowing me to do this research under his supervision.

While many have encouraged me in this thesis, I wish to acknowledge the Rev. Sang-Jun Yoo, senior pastor at Nonsan Evangelical Holiness Church, who has continually encouraged my doctoral studies and prayed for me; Dr. Eui-Kyu Choi, medical doctor at Nonsan Koryo Hospital, who supported me financially during my doctoral course work at McGill University; Dr. Taek-Koo Sohn, Professor of Systematic Theology at Sungkyul Christian University, Anyang, Korea, who allowed me to use his office to write this thesis; Dr. Kee-Ho Sung, the Principal of Sungkyul Christian University, who gave me constant encouragement and advice; Dr. Catherine Clark Kroeger, Professor of Classical Studies at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, South-Hamilton, Massachusetts, who not only led me to pursue doctoral studies, but has helped me to be accepted into Ph.D. programme at McGill University Faculty of Religious Studies; and Dr. Heup-Young Kim, Professor of Systematic Theology at Kangnam University, Yongin, Korea, who not only provided me with many valuable materials for this thesis, but also guided me towards very informative articles and books in the area of Karl Barth's impact on Korean Christian theologians.

Special thanks is expressed to Professor Gregory Baum, Professor of Theological Ethics at McGill University Faculty of Religious Studies, for his encouragement, friendship, and kind advice during my comprehensive examinations.

I also would like to express my special thanks to the library staff at Sungkyul Christian University, and the libraries of the Methodist Theological Seminary, and Yonsei University School of Theology. My appreciation is especially extended to the libraries of the Faculty of Religious Studies, McGill University, and to the Presbyterian College, Montreal, for providing me with facilities for writing and research during the academic year of 1998.

My deep appreciation particularly goes to Cassandra Lee Patterson, Professor of English Language and Communication at Chonan College of Foreign Studies, Chonan, Chungnam, Korea, who read and edited the final draft of the thesis. Also, I wish to recognize my parents, whose constant financial and spiritual support has done much to make this possible.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>CD</i>	Karl Barth, <i>Church Dogmatics</i>
<i>ST</i>	Sung-Bum Yun, <i>Sung Theology</i>
<i>YSBS</i>	Edited by the Editorial Committee of Methodist Theological Seminary, <i>Sung-Bum Yun Series</i>
Vol. I	<i>Hankuk Jongkyo Moonhwa Ya Hankukjok Kidokkyo</i> [Religion & Culture in Korea and Korean Christianity]
Vol. II	<i>Hankuk Yookyo Ya Hankukjok Shinhak</i> [Korean Confucianism and Korean Christian Theology]
Vol. III	<i>Hyo Ya Jongkyo</i> [Filial Piety and Religion]
Vol. IV	<i>Shinhakjok Inkan Hak Kwa Hyunhai Shinhak Ja Deul</i> [Theological Anthropology and Modern Christian Theologians]
Vol. V	<i>Sungseo Yeunkoo: Romaseo wa Galadiaseo</i> [Romans & Galatians]
Vol. VI	<i>Hankuk Sahae wa Hankuk Kyohae ye Kwajae</i> [Korean Society & the Task of Korean Chruch]
Vol. VII	<i>Sanghwal Shin ya-ang wa Sangmyung Sasang</i> [Practical Christian Faith & the Idea of Life]

## GLOSSARY

Ae-in.	Loving others.
Ch'eng.	Integrity.
Eui.	Justice.
Ei.	Righteousness.
In.	Benevolence.
Jung-yong.	The path of middle.
Jen.	Love or human-heartedness. Humanity.
Kigil.	Disposition. Nature or boldness.
Kong-dong-chae.	Community. The kingdom of God.
Kye.	Personal community or social cooperative system.
Minjung.	People.
Shin.	Faith or trust.
Sung.	Sincerity or fulfillment of the word.
Tao.	The way, the truth, and the word.
Yi.	Knowledge, principle, propriety, or reason.

## INTRODUCTION: THE RECEPTION OF KARL BARTH'S THEOLOGY IN KOREA

In the history of the Christian mission, beginning in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century in Korea, Protestant missionaries, mainly Presbyterians<sup>1</sup> and Methodists, placed a strong emphasis on both the Word of God and faith as the means of achieving personal salvation through Jesus Christ within the “community-based church.”<sup>2</sup> The overall mission policy, according to historical records, was evangelism on the basis of the “Nevius Methods”<sup>3</sup> which involved the worship of God, instruction, prayer, social service, and fellowship. Due to these positive elements in the Christian community, King Kojong (1864-1907), the last king of the Chosun Dynasty, encouraged the Korean people to believe and to accept the Christian missionaries along with their Christ-centred message.<sup>4</sup>

As the Christian community grew in Korea, it also faced the challenges and dangers of radical waves of pluralistic religious groups. These include the pervasive Shamanistic belief and practice, ecclesiastical schisms, and the rise of political theology and indigenous theological movements during the period of economic growth between the mid-1960s and the 1970s.<sup>5</sup>

During this period, Korean theologians, who studied philosophy and theology under Western theologians in the Reformed Protestant seminaries in Europe and North America, were eager to characterize themselves as evangelical and Bible-centered, with an emphasis on the worshipping community and the maintenance of high standards of individual conduct. They emphasized both a theocentric and Christocentric theology—so-called evangelical theology by employing Karl Barth’s Christocentric ecclesiology as a

practical, as well as a theoretical basis for Korean Churches and pastors.<sup>6</sup> This included an emphasis on twelve basic forms of the ministry of the community formulated by Karl Barth. First, under the category of the Word, they include: (1) the praise of God; (2) preaching; (3) instruction; (4) evangelization; (5) mission; (6) ministry of theology; and secondly, under the heading of Action: (7) prayer; (8) the cure of souls; (9) the production and existence of definite personal examples of Christian life and action; (10) diaconate; (11) prophetic action; (12) the establishment of fellowship.<sup>7</sup>

The reciprocal relationship between knowledge and practice, that is, the unity between theology and ethics in Barth's theological development, was helpful in promoting the rapid growth of the Church in Korea. The statement, "Knowing God is doing His will ethically and morally," became an extensively proclaimed motto by theologians and pastors in the Korean Christian community. Korean Christians accepted it without any resistance. This was because they had already been influenced by Confucianism with regard to their ethical principles of conduct as well as their religious views, as this thesis will seek to argue.

Confucianism is one of Korea's main religions which appears to have played a very important role in rendering the Korean people receptive to Christianity and later to Barth's theology. In fact, both Roman Catholicism and Protestantism in Korea were introduced and developed by the Korean Confucian scholars, who converted to Christianity.<sup>8</sup> When Christianity was introduced into Korea, it was primarily Confucian scholars who translated the English Bible (The King James Version) into Korean (*Hangul*). Moreover, the first theological works in Korean, such as *Sung-gyo Yo-ji* [Essentials of the Holy Teaching] by Pyok Yi (1754-1786) and *Chu-gyo Yo-ji* [Essentials of the Lord's Teaching] by Yak-Jong Chung (1760-1801), were written and completed by Confucian scholars.<sup>9</sup> With respect to the Confucian scholars' initial contact with Christianity, Spencer J. Palmer argues that the Holy Spirit primarily worked through Confucianism as a preparation for the evangelization of the people of Korea. This is because he sees that a Confucian's definition of God,

humanity, and community is remarkably similar to Western theologians' works concerning the concept of God, humanity, the Church, justification and sanctification.<sup>10</sup> Christianity has the concept of God, whereas Confucianism has the theory of Heaven. Although the Confucian definition of Heaven is different from the Christian concept of God, Confucians see Heaven as the "Dominator," "Creator," "Sustainer," "Revealer," and "Judge" in accordance with Christian definitions of God.<sup>11</sup>

One of Barth's students in Basel, Sung-Bum Yun (1916-1989), was instrumental in establishing Barth's ideas in Korea. In his work *Hankukjok Shinhak: Song ui Haesokhak* [The Korean Theology: The Hermeneutics of Sincerity] (1972), Sung-Bum Yun, the founder of "Sung" theology, has argued that a genuine Confucian-Christian dialogue and formulation of a Korean theology of Confucianism is possible by integrating the theology of Karl Barth and Neo-Confucianism.<sup>12</sup> This is because "Karl Barth has significantly influenced Korean Calvinist or Reformed Theology, namely Korean Presbyterianism, which was ultimately influenced by Confucianism."<sup>13</sup> Correspondingly, Heup-Young Kim, the most recent and outstanding neo-Calvinist interpreter of Karl Barth, has developed a unique relationship between Karl Barth's theology and Wang Yang-ming's confuciology of self-cultivation, in his work *Wang Yang-Ming and Karl Barth: A Confucian-Christian Dialogue* (1996), for the purpose of a genuine inter-religious dialogue within a Northeast Asian context.<sup>14</sup> This thesis will explore and evaluate the validity of these views.

The primary purpose of this thesis, therefore, is to explore the reception of Karl Barth's theology in Korea by focusing specifically on his doctrine of the Church, which he describes as the gathering, upbuilding and sending of the Christian community. By examining his work, *Church Dogmatics*, Volume IV, an attempt will be made to identify how Barth's Christocentric doctrine of the Christian community was indigenized and remains widely received in Korea due to the much stronger Confucian influence than in North East Asian countries such as China and Japan. An investigation of Sung theology, a

distinctively Korean Christian theology, will also be undertaken in this thesis. The impact of Barth's concept of the Christian community on the traditional community concept and practice in Korean Confucianism will also be examined, since it has played an important role and has been a significant factor in the explosive growth of the Christian community in Korea.

This thesis on the reception of Karl Barth's theology in Korea will be divided into three chapters. Chapter one is designed as a detailed introduction to Korean Confucianism and its community concept and structure, which has been an important factor for both the rapid growth of the Christian community and a basic foundation for the reception of Barth's theology in Korea. This will include a sketch of Korean Confucian scholars' initial contact with Christianity and the early Protestant missionaries' contribution to the reception of Barth's Christocentric theology in Korea.

In the second chapter, a detailed analysis of Barth's concept of ecclesiology will be presented by providing a discussion of what constitutes the true church, the upbuilding of the Christian community, and the missionary task of the Christian community. Here the aim will be to evaluate whether Barth's Christocentric ecclesiology, especially his theology of mission, pays sufficient attention to different cultures and religions.

In the third chapter, a discussion of when Barth's theology was received in Korea and how Korean Christian theologians responded to it, will begin this chapter. Then this chapter identifies how Barth's Christocentric ecclesiology was indigenized and is still influential in Korea, by investigating Korean Christian thought such as Sung-Bum Yun's theology of Sung. In this chapter, there is an appraisal of Barth's Christocentric doctrine of the Christian community and Yun's theology of Sung, by comparing their convergences and differences. The main purpose of this Chapter is to demonstrate the claim that, although Barth's theology is typically confined within the European context, an indigenization of Barth's Christocentric theology with Korea's socio-cultural-religious tradition of Confucianism, was, and is, possible.

The conclusion represents the result of my study of the reception of Karl Barth's theology in Korea, and also indicates that his Christocentric ecclesiology continues to have an impact on the contemporary Korean church's theology and practice.

---

## End Notes for Introduction

<sup>1</sup> It is important to note that the Presbyterian Church, now makes up two-thirds (7 or 8 million out of 11 million) of the Protestant total (For a summary of the statistics, see *Korea: its history & culture* published by Korean Overseas Information Service [Seoul, Korea, 1994], 14; *idem, A Handbook of Korea* [Seoul: Ministry of Culture & Information, 1979], 205 and Korea National Christian Council, *Prayer Calendar of Christian Missions in Korea* [Seoul, 1950-1983]), “has had the greatest numerical growth of all denominations in Korea” (Roy E. Shearer, *Wildfire: Church Growth in Korea* [Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1966], 9). For this reason, the Presbyterian Seminary of Korea, founded by Samuel A. Moffet in 1901, is the first and the largest Presbyterian Seminary in Korea (*Ibid.*, 59 & Samuel H. Moffett, “Korea” in *New 20th Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* [Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1991], 485). This Seminary introduced Karl Barth’s theology to Korea in the 1950s. For example, Professor Shin-Keun Lee, Yong-Han Kim and Tong-Sik Chi, who are well-known students of Karl Barth, are leaders of the “Barth Society” in Korea. There are also many theologians and pastors who claim to be followers of and interpreters of Karl Barth in Korea.

<sup>2</sup> The Korean Confucian Society was traditionally family and community-oriented. For this reason, Christianity in Korea was able to grow rapidly due to its family and community-rootedness. Thus, the phrase “community-based Korean Christianity or Confucianism” will be used frequently in this thesis. For a reference of community-centredness in Korean Christianity and Confucianism, see Jae-Ki Kwak, “Development of Cooperatives for Rural Church Support,” in *Korean Church Growth Explosion*, eds. Bong-Rin Ro & Nelson L. Marlin (Seoul: Word of Life Press, 1983), 290-308. A fuller discussion of the community-based Korean Confucian society will be given in Chapter One, Section B entitled “The Characteristics of Korean Confucianism.”

<sup>3</sup> The American Presbyterian minister John L. Nevius (1829-1893), who was an experienced missionary in Shan-tung Province in China, introduced this mission policy. His practice was to preach the Word of God and then to carry out actions in the form of healing or teaching for non-Christians, which is closely related to Barth’s theology. See further on this policy Chapter One, Section E entitled “Early Protestant Missionaries’ Contribution to the Growth of Korean Christianity and to the Reception of Barth’s Christocentric Theology in Korea.”

<sup>4</sup> See Daniel M. Davies, “The Impact of Christianity upon Korea, 1884-1910: Six Key American and Korean Figures,” *Journal of Church and State* 36 (1994), 806-807. See also Fred Harvey Harrington, *God, Mammon, and the Japanese: Dr. Horace N. Allen and Korean-American Relations, 1884-1905* (Madison, Wisc.: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1966), 51-53; Everett N. Hunt, Jr., *Protestant Pioneers in Korea* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1980), 3, 65; and Tae-young Lee, “Seoul as a missionary-sending city,” *Kukminilbo*, 27 May 1999, section 25.

<sup>5</sup> For the historical situation of the Protestant Church in Korea in this period, see Chai-Choon Kim, “The Presbyterian Church in Korea,” *Reformed and Protestant World* 28/1 (March 1964): 21-26 and Kang-Nam Oh, “Christianity and Religious Pluralism in Korea,” *Religious Studies and Theology* 6/3 (September 1986): 27-38.

---

<sup>6</sup>This thesis does not argue that all Christian churches and pastors in Korea accepted Barth's theology without any criticism. It explores interpreters of Karl Barth who have taken Barth's Christ-centred principle as their theological norm and basis. It should, however, be noted that the ideas of the Reformer John Calvin have had a great influence on Korean theologians, especially those belonging to the Presbyterian Church of Korea (Tonghap), which represents over 60 percent of the Christian population. Therefore, it was natural for Karl Barth's theology, with its rootedness in Calvin, to be well received in Korea. See Martha Huntley, *To Start a Work: the foundations of the Protestant mission in Korea, 1884-1919* (Seoul: Presbyterian Church of Korea, 1987), 407. For an analysis of Barth's interpretation of some aspects of Calvin's theology see William Klempa, "Barth as a Scholar and Interpreter of Calvin," *Calvin Studies* 7 (1994): 31-50.

<sup>7</sup>See Karl Barth, *CD.*, IV/3, 874-878. Also cf. Martha Huntley, *To Start a Work: the foundations of the Protestant mission in Korea, 1884-1919*, 372-385.

<sup>8</sup>See Martha Huntley, *Caring, Growing, Changing: A History of the Protestant Mission in Korea* (New York: Friendship Press, 1984), 14-15.

<sup>9</sup>See Hector Diaz, *A Korean Theology* (Immense, Switzerland: Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft, 1986) and Jean Sangbae Ri, *Confucius et Jesus Christ: La Première Théologie Chrétienne en Corée D'après L'œuvre de Yl Piek lettore Confuceen 1754-1786* (Paris: Editions Beauchesne, 1979).

<sup>10</sup>See Spencer J. Palmer, *Korea and Christianity: The Problem of Identification with Tradition* (Seoul: Hollym Corporation Publishers, 1967), 3-18, 82-84, and 88-96.

<sup>11</sup>See Pei-Jung Fu, "The Confucian Heaven and the Christian God," *Ching Feng* 31/2 &3 (August 1988): 177-188. For a detailed discussion of Confucian-Christian similarities on the concept of God, humanity, justification and sanctification, see Chapter One, Section C entitled "Confucian Scholars' Early Contact with Christianity." Also regarding the similarity of the community concept in both traditions, see Robert C. Neville, "The Puritan Ethic in Confucianism and Christianity," *Ching Feng* 34/2 (June 1991): 100-103.

<sup>12</sup>See Sung-Bum Yun, *Hankukjok Shinhak: Song ui Haesokhak* [The Korean Theology: The Hermeneutics of Sincerity] (Seoul: Sunmyung Munhwasa, 1972), 11-35.

<sup>13</sup>Heup-Young Kim, *Wang Yang-Ming and Karl Barth: A Confucian-Christian Dialogue* (Lanham, New York, London: University Press of America, Inc., 1996), 5 and see *ibid.*, 195-196.

<sup>14</sup>In this work, Kim seeks to identify the affinity between Korean Christian thought and Barth's theology and his impact on Korean Christianity, especially on the Presbyterian Church in Korea. However, he does not explore in any detail, why and how Barth's theology was assimilated and is still influential in Korea. It is thus necessary to investigate Korean Confucianism in terms of its deep-rooted religious affinity with Reformed Christianity, namely Neo-Calvinism.

## CHAPTER I

### AN ACCOUNT OF THE HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIANITY IN KOREA AND THE ROLE OF CONFUCIANISM IN ITS RAPID GROWTH

This chapter will give an historical account of Confucianism in Korea in order to understand the early Protestant missionaries' contribution to the growth of Korean Christianity, and as a background to the later introduction of Karl Barth's theology in Korea. Since Confucianism in Korea greatly influenced the Korean people's way of thinking and social behaviour, Martha Huntley has suggested that, from the beginning of the early Catholic and Protestant missionary activities, Confucianism played an important role in the growth of Christianity in Korea.<sup>1</sup> The initial contact with Western Christianity occurred through Korean Confucian scholars who found compatibility between Confucianism and Christianity; especially their common understanding of God (Heaven), mutual human responsibility for a better community and the importance of familial and social structures.<sup>2</sup> Correspondingly, this chapter will explore Confucian scholars' early contact with Christianity.

Confucian scholars who converted to Christianity translated the English and Chinese Bible into *Hangul* (Korean) and published some important Christian literature in Korean for the common people. They also translated the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed, the Ten Commandments, hymns, and other articles of faith from Chinese or English.<sup>3</sup> Thus some scholars argue that Korean Christianity is basically a "Confucian-Christianity."<sup>4</sup> This chapter will evaluate the validity of this view. Accordingly, it is argued that no one can fully understand Korean Christian thought without a pre-understanding of

Confucianism.<sup>5</sup> This argument is relatively important and becomes a presupposition for the writing of Chapter Three, which discusses analytically Sung-Bum Yun's theology of Sung and his appropriation, or misappropriation of Barth's theology in relation to Confucianism. This chapter will thus describe the characteristics of Korean Confucianism and then discuss how early Protestant missionaries utilized the positive aspects of the community-based Confucian legacy for their evangelistic work in Korea, facilitating the reception of Barth's Christocentric theology in Korea.

#### A. An Historical Account of Korean Confucianism

It is not known when Confucianism first came to Korea. Allen Clark simply notes that "early immigrants from China must surely have brought it with them."<sup>6</sup> According to Jahyun K. Haboush, it was the Three-Kingdom period (570 B. C.-668 A. D.)—Koguryo in the north, Paekche in the southwest, and Silla in the southeast—that provides accurate historical evidence of Confucianism in Korea. As he states,

The first Korean exposure to Confucianism is usually dated the second century B. C., when Han Chinese must have brought the Confucian classics with them to their colonial posts. Most likely, Koreans acquired knowledge of Confucian political administration by observing Chinese practice and applied this knowledge in transforming the peninsula from tribal federations to the centralized states that finalized into the three kingdoms of subsequent centuries.<sup>7</sup>

It was Koguryo that displayed Confucian influence in the early centuries. A National Confucian Academy in Koguryo was established in 372 A. D. A Code of administrative law was also announced in 373, by creating a new centralized bureaucratic structure. Paekche subsequently followed such a procedure, but Silla did not adopt Confucian features of government until the early seventh century. That is to say, the impact of Confucianism on the three kingdoms was limited until the early seventh century.

George Paik maintains that the Silla Kingdom conquered the other two kingdoms in 668 and entirely unified the language, the law, and the culture that "welded the Koreans into a homogeneous people and laid the foundation for modern Korea."<sup>8</sup> The unifying force of the Silla Kingdom marks a formative period for the ancient civilization of Korea as

influenced by Chinese intellectual thought, and in particular by Confucianism.<sup>9</sup> As Paik goes on to argue, "...at about this time there began an influx of Chinese ideas."<sup>10</sup> Since Silla established a unified kingdom throughout the land of Korea (668-935 A. D), Confucianism was partly adopted as "...a measure of centralization, a patriotic code of conduct for its ruling warrior class in peace and war, and transmission of the arts of government to this class."<sup>11</sup> The impact of Confucianism on Silla was particularly remarkable from the end of the seventh century. In 682, the Royal Confucian Academy was established for the more systematic education of aristocratic youths. Confucian social ethics were incorporated into the codes of conduct for the *hwarang*, a knightly organization consisting of aristocratic youth. As Haboush indicates, the codes of conduct—loyalty to the ruler, filial piety to one's father, and trust between friends—were deemed useful in upholding political and social order and in maintaining the cohesiveness of the group.<sup>12</sup>

We must note that the Silla government established a state examination to recruit officials in 788, which was only open to the aristocracy. Questions in the examination included Confucian classics and history. Since Korea is located at the centre of northeast Asia, lying between the Sea of Japan on the east and the Yellow Sea of China on the West,<sup>13</sup> many Sillian students went to China to study and ultimately to prepare for this official examination. The first Sillian student who studied abroad was Chi-Won Choi. He went to China in 875 and sojourned in Chang-An, the capital of the T'ang Dynasty. There he studied Confucian classics and had a chance to read Chinese Nestorian documents.<sup>14</sup>

According to Paik's statement, Chi-Won Choi "reached Chang-An about a century after the erection of the famous Nestorian Monument."<sup>15</sup> It is still believed that Choi was the first Korean Confucian scholar to bring early Christian literature to Korea. This argument is supported by E. A. Gordon in her work entitled *Some Recent: Discoveries in Korean Temple and Their Relationship to Early Eastern Christianity* (1914) and later by Timothy Richard in *Forty Five Years in China* (1916). Kenneth S. Latourette summarizes this controversy in *The Development of Japan* (1926). A. C. Moule's work entitled

*Christians in China before the Year 1500* (1930), discusses the Korean Confucian scholar's early contact with Eastern Christianity in China. However, there is no further evidence of the historical development of the Korean Confucianism in relation to early Eastern Christianity.

However, it is clear that Choi returned from China and brought the Chinese Classics with him in 885. As Allen D. Clark says, "he became the father of Korean literature. This gave a great impetus to the study of the Confucian classics and their influence on the life of Korea."<sup>16</sup> Later, the first national shrine was erected in Sajik in 991 to venerate Confucian sages. The Confucian College of the elite was established in 992.<sup>17</sup> During the Silla times, Confucianism acquired a scholarly component, and it partly influenced the political sphere.

The end of the Silla Kingdom (668-935) and the founding of the Koryo Dynasty (918-1392 A. D) was the beginning of the medieval history of Korea. Most historians accept that Chinese Confucianism was forbidden during the Koryo Dynasty, but Buddhism became the state religion for both the ruling classes and the common people.<sup>18</sup> However, it should be noted that Confucianism played a significant role in the political realm, while Buddhism did in the spiritual realm.<sup>19</sup> For instance, as Haboush argues, Wang Kon, the founder of the Koryo Dynasty, was a devout Buddhist, but he adopted Confucianism as a norm for the formation of political ideology and government structure.<sup>20</sup> Since he was not of royal birth, he turned to the Confucian concept of "the Mandate of Heaven" to claim legitimacy for his own new government. Haboush explains, "the Mandate of Heaven was the Confucian political theory posited on the belief that Heaven gave the right to rule to the most virtuous person even if he was otherwise ordinary."<sup>21</sup> This political theory of rulership was based on divine sovereignty that regarded Heaven as the ultimate authority. Confucians believe that Heaven only gives to the ruler. Wang Kun used it successfully to proclaim his legitimacy of the Koryo Dynasty. It means that the Confucian political ethos already exerted considerable influence from the beginning of the Koryo Dynasty.<sup>22</sup>

In the early years of Koryo, Wang Kun established the Confucian school, namely *hyangkyo*, and devoted himself to the study of Chinese Confucian classics. In his later life, he wrote *Shiphunyo* [Ten Political Ethics] on the basis of T'ang's model for the Confucianization of government. This book explores the importance of courteous politics between king and officials.<sup>23</sup> This is to say that the monarch's virtuous rule must be rooted in the anthropomorphism and the sanctity of sovereign power, along with the theory of the continuity and change of the royal family. Wang's political ethics was primarily based on the filial piety toward one's parents, which became the foundation of the ruling order. Wang justified royalty by emphasizing that the ruled must respect and obey the ruler as children do their parents. As Hee-Dok Lee describes, Wang's political idea was later institutionalized into the Three Fundamental Rules—the father is the heaven of the son; the monarch, the heaven of the subject; and the husband, the heaven of the wife.<sup>24</sup> This idea eventually came to be the basis of patriarchal political ethics.

Wang's son, King Sung-Jong, continued to follow the Confucian political ideas. He adopted the civil service examination for the formation of a rigidly hierarchical bureaucracy consisting of civil and military officials.<sup>25</sup> In particular, he developed social ethics on the basis of his father's political ethics. He established the *Kukjahak* (the National Academy) and systematically installed several curricula to educate the civil elite, the *yangban*. *The Book of Filial Piety* was the most important textbook.<sup>26</sup> Sung-Jong attempted to introduce the Confucian idea of filial piety to the common people. He thus established some regional Confucian schools to fulfill the same purpose.

Owing to his zeal for the educational establishment, prominent scholar-officials were encouraged to establish their own private Confucian schools. They mainly trained bureaucrats, but the children of the civil elite were also allowed to attend their schools. The close relationship between master and disciples even attracted the common people. This meant that Confucian education extended to the common people for the purpose of cultivating their virtue and intellect. It was therefore in the middle to late eleventh century

that the number of private schools increased to twelve and functioned as centres of educational activity.<sup>27</sup> At this point, Hee-Dok Lee notes, Confucianism took special hold among minor aristocrats during the Silla and the early Koryo periods, but it began to influence the common people from the middle period of Koryo.<sup>28</sup> In other words, the Confucian influence was not confined within the capital city, or the small and cohesive group that had enjoyed dominance.

It was from 1258 to 1356 that Neo-Confucianism took root in Korea. In 1314, Koryo adopted the system of the civil service examination from the Yüan Dynasty and imported Chu Hsi's works entitled *The Five Classics* and *The Four Books*. These books introduced Neo-Confucianism to the Korean people. As Haboush states, "King Chungson invited renowned Chinese Neo-Confucian scholars such as Yao Sui, Yen Fu, and Chao Meng-fu. This gave Korean scholars firsthand exposure to current scholarship."<sup>29</sup> By the mid-1360s, the Royal College was restored with a Neo-Confucian curriculum, and a large number of students flocked there.<sup>30</sup>

However, it ought to be mentioned that Buddhism<sup>31</sup> became the greatest political force in the late Koryo period and extended its authority until the end of the fourteenth century. Since Confucius (551-479 B. C.) was a great moral teacher in China, his primary interest was a matter of ethics among the family and social members. He deemed that the family would be the fundamental unit of society and state. For him, spiritual matters were not significant. George Paik says of him, "Confucius himself gave little light on the problems of God, soul or immortality."<sup>32</sup> For this reason, Chinese Confucianism was not regarded as a religion, but as a philosophy of political virtue and social system. On the contrary, Buddhism, from the beginning of the Koryo Dynasty, became the state religion for both the ruling classes and the common people.<sup>33</sup> It exclusively played on its political power during the late Koryo period. Hei-Chu Kim states that a Buddhist monk could reach a rank of instructor of the nation in the hierarchy and become a spiritual mentor to the king.<sup>34</sup> Buddhist monks were deeply involved in political power. This led to the corruption

of Buddhism and eventually to the fall of the Koryo Dynasty in 1391 A. D. George Paik explains:

The Buddhist priesthood became corrupt through prosperity and many priests gradually cast aside their religious character and entered politics. Priests thronged to the courts and council halls of the monarch, administered the great offices of the realm, marshalled armies in time of war, and eventually placed the offspring of a priest on the throne. The blackest pages of the history of Buddhism were in the waning years of the Koryo Dynasty. The tenets of the cult, among them chastity, abstinence, and self-abnegation, were flagrantly violated. The monasteries became great sores and tainted all society with a moral rottenness. As Buddhism had exchanged its religious field for a political one, so the reformation, which nearly annihilated it in Korea, was primarily political.<sup>35</sup>

Since the late Koryo Dynasty was virtually ruled by Buddhist intriguers steeped in corruption and immorality, Neo-Confucian scholars wanted “a total transformation of Korea into a Confucian social order in conformity with their vision of a moral universe.”<sup>36</sup> This meant that a new polity was necessary. Tae-Jin Yi says,

A newly risen nobility wielded increasing power and planned new government reforms, incorporating Neo-Confucianism into its political doctrine. This Confucian movement gained momentum, especially in the middle part of the fourteenth century, when anti-Yüan political sentiment became more and more vigorous, culminating in the founding of a new Chosun Dynasty.<sup>37</sup>

Neo-Confucian scholars allied with a powerful general Yi Sung-Gye, who subsequently established the Chosun Dynasty in 1392. The new dynasty inaugurated a great reform programme. The first king T’aejo, Yi Sung-Gye (1392-1398), prohibited Koryo’s corrupted Buddhist state religion, and instead took Confucianism as the cardinal principle for his new government.<sup>38</sup> There was no severe persecution of Buddhism, but Buddhists were not allowed to reside in the new capital, Seoul. The elimination of the authority and influence of Buddhism and Buddhist temples was one of the primary tasks for the new dynasty.<sup>39</sup> Therefore, Buddhist monasteries or temples were transformed into Confucian schools, namely, *hyangkyo*.<sup>40</sup>

Yi Sung-Gye devoted himself to the revival of Confucianism, which was supported by friendly relations with China. He sent some diplomats to China and they brought back the five Chinese Confucian Classics such as *Sijeon* [The Book of Odes], *Shooking* [The Scripture of Documents], *Juyeok* [The Book of Change], *Chunchu* [The Chronicles of Lu]

and *Yeki* [The Book of Rites]. *Yeki* in particular contains four ritual texts such as the *Chou-li* [The Rites of Chou], the *Li-chi* [Book of Rites], the *I-li* [Rituals and Ceremonials], and Chu Hsi's *Chia-li* [Family Ritual].<sup>41</sup> These texts provided Korean reformers with a practical guide for shaping their social and moral norms. They acknowledged Chinese Confucianism as an ideal model for the formation of their socio-political order. Haboush notes:

The Koreans' acceptance of Ming China's status as a direct heir to Confucian civilization was uniquely Chinese or that the Chinese manifestation of it was intrinsically superior. Korean Confucians, like Chinese Confucians, regarded Confucianism as universal truth applicable to all civilized societies. That Korea was a relatively late convert did not signify that the quality of its Confucian civilization should be inferior to Chinese civilization. In fact, the Ming, compromised and even corrupted by the forces of the history, was a pale imitation of the ideal society that the Korean reformers, full of zealous optimism, were determined to create.<sup>42</sup>

As Martina Deuchler states, Yi Sung-Gye and Confucian scholars' primary task was thus to create "a Confucian normative society."<sup>43</sup> This is to say, "the founding of the Chosun Dynasty can be described as a Confucian revolution."<sup>44</sup> As a result of Yi's great reform programme, based on the teachings and theories of Confucianism, King Sei-Jong (1418-1450), who was the grandson of Yi Sung-Gye, "...placed the people under a great debt of gratitude by inventing and encouraging the use of the Korean alphabet (*Hangul*), as a substitute for, and auxiliary to, Chinese characters."<sup>45</sup>

Confucianism grew significantly during the Chosun Dynasty (1392-1910).<sup>46</sup> It has had a formative influence on the thinking and conduct of the Korean people. However, George Paik has described some negative aspects of the Confucian impact upon Korea and gives the following reasons:

There was much that was splendid and admirable in Confucianism at its best. As practiced in Korea, however, it had many deplorable results: it nourished pride, it taught no higher ideal than that of a superior man, and was agnostic and atheistic in its tendency; it encouraged selfishness, exalted filial piety to the position of the highest virtue and made this hide a multitude of sins; and it imbued every follower with a hunger for office which resulted in simony and sinecure. Religiously, the system taught nothing that goes beyond what is known and seen. Consequently it avoided philosophical speculation; it enfeebled or destroyed the faculty of faith, for its doctrine required no exercise of belief.<sup>47</sup>

Yet, as Paik reminds us, “it was Confucianism that formed the character of the people and shaped the course of the ancient civilization of Korea.”<sup>48</sup> Confucianism affected Korean peoples’ family life as well as their way of thinking and behaving. One of the most important aspects of Korean Confucianism is “a respect for learning, cultivation and reverence in all relations,”<sup>49</sup> which is fundamentally rooted in mutual and reciprocal relationships for the benefit of community. In this respect, Hei-Chu Kim explains three positive elements in Korean Confucianism:

First, order, regularity, and a harmonious integration of its parts characterize the universe. Second, it is possible for people to discern this order, which underlies things and events. Third, one must be able to devote oneself to the systematic study of man, institutions, history, and the classics. This is the high calling of the “gentleman,” the occupation that will enable people to live in harmony with each other and the universe.<sup>50</sup>

In Korean Confucianism, there are five virtues: benevolent love, righteousness, proper conduct, wisdom, and faithfulness. Proper worship of heaven, nature and one’s ancestors were important to maintain the harmony of the cosmic order. Confucians believe that when people follow these virtues, the world will be in harmony; there will be peace, and order. A central principle of Korean Confucianism, as Quee-Young Kim points out, is the high value of the individual life and its social relations.<sup>51</sup>

Interestingly, Tae-Jin Lee, in an article entitled “The Influence of Neo-Confucianism on 14<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> Century Korean Population Growth,” argues that the wet-field farming method in Chosun cultivated a community-based society.<sup>52</sup> In agriculture, it was common for the Korean farmer to plough or dig the land first and then sow his seed. The land first of all should be prepared in order for the seed to be planted deeply, encouraging rapid growth. In the process of sowing rice, especially in Korea, rice seedlings are planted in seedbeds first, and only after they have grown a little, will they be transplanted to larger rice paddies. This unique process of the wet-field farming method has persevered in Korea through the centuries. A large labour force, or community solidarity, was necessary for the extensive development of wet-field cultivation. Lee goes on to argue that:

The influence of the Neo-Confucian precept “food is the heaven of the people” was emphasized to such a degree that it became the guiding principle for an ideal government; thus, to have a benevolent administration, it should be agrarian-based. If this strain of Neo-Confucianism is duly considered then the simultaneous developments of Neo-Confucianism and wet-field cultivation cannot be viewed as mere coincidence.<sup>53</sup>

When the Chosun Dynasty carried out Confucian orthodoxy in its socio-political structure, it certainly affected the norms and values of social and familial systems. Scholars of Korean Confucianism generally agree that a family system becomes a basis for maintaining social harmony and stability. That is to say that Korean Confucianism is based on a strong sense of human solidarity within one’s own community. It is, therefore, necessary to describe the concept of community and its structure in Korean Confucianism. This includes a patriarchal family system, ancestor worship, fellowship, education, and a sense of personal community.

## B. The Characteristics of Korean Confucianism

### The Traditional Patriarchal Family System

Edward B. Adams asserts that the Korean Confucian society is based on the family unit which requires mutual and reciprocal relationships.<sup>54</sup> The family, kinship and larger consanguineous groups, with which families under the same ancestor are associated, are the mainstays of Korean society. In the Confucian system, the familial relationship is basic, essential, and ultimately a model for social, as well as ethical, behaviour. The key concept is “respect,” that is, respect for elders and being kind to those who are younger. This concept is based on the strong sense of human solidarity in the Confucian family as well as in Confucian social organizations, which implies a belief in a universal brotherhood.

Family order was maintained strictly by Confucian norms that required unconditional obedience to the family-head, distinction between both sexes, and respect for the aged.<sup>55</sup>

There are “Three Fundamentals”:

- (1) The king is the mainstay of the state;
- (2) The father is the mainstay of the son;

(3) The husband is the mainstay of the wife;

and the “Five Moral Rules or Relationships,” which are regarded as the basis of personal relationships, as well as being ethical responsibilities for the formation of human society:

- (1) Loyalty, between king or ruler as a head and ministers as a body;
- (2) Intimacy, between father and son;
- (3) Distinction in position, between husband and wife;
- (4) Respect, between elder and younger brother;
- (5) Trust, between friends.

Three of these rules are related to family relationships, and the other two are considered as familial as well as societal models; this is because the ruler-ministers’ relationship resembles the father-son relationship, and friendship resembles brotherliness.

The system of Five Relationships represents a hierarchical system demanding a certain respect at each level. Although the relationship between friends seems to be horizontal, recognition of seniority is required. The Korean social system is based on strong family loyalty, which is crystallized in its extreme form by Confucian feudalism and paternalism, called “the society of ladder,” which denotes four classes (rungs): literary men or officials, farmers, artisans and traders.<sup>56</sup> James S. Gale says that within this hierarchical social system, the family is represented as patriarchal, vertical, hierarchical and interpersonal, so that parents are imperious in relation to their children, but children must be submissive to their parents.<sup>57</sup>

There is no concept of equality in Korean Confucianism. It is one of the most negative aspects that Confucianism in Korea is a very hierarchical and unequal system, especially with regard to the relationship between male and female as well as between the socially high classes and low classes, which caused the minjung or women to be oppressed, suppressed and repressed. The reason for such a hierarchy, according to Tae-Rim Yun, is due to the traditionally oriented patriarchal family form.<sup>58</sup>

The positive aspects of the Confucian influence upon Korean people, as James B. Palais has argued, lies in its “...great respect for learning and scholastic attainment, keen

sensitivity of hospitality and politeness to others, native intelligence and quickness of mind, integrity, scientific thinking, and social consciousness.”<sup>59</sup>

Another factor that needs to be mentioned is the endurance of hardship. It provided the Korean people with the inspiration and strength to enable them to put up with their severe suffering, caused by invasion, wars and disputes with surrounding countries. Interestingly, Korea has been a highway of civilization and culture in times of peace, but a battleground in times of war. This was due to her unique geographical location as the heart of the Far East. As Isabella B. Bishop states, “the geographical position of Korea, with a frontier conterminous (sic) with those of China and Russia, and divided from Japan by only a narrow sea, has done much to determine her political relationships.”<sup>60</sup> Historically, Korea was invaded by surrounding countries such as China and Japan more than 287 times throughout her own entire history. For this reason, as Martha Huntley has argued, it was natural for the Korean people to be motivated by their suffering, to cooperate with one another in times of crisis.<sup>61</sup> In other words, the family and community-oriented character of Korean society was due to its geographical uniqueness. This aspect can be attributed to a significant characteristic of Korean Confucianism that centres on the life of the community in respect of the family-based social organization. Since the family was the basic unit in Korean society, James B. Palais describes “the family-based Korean Confucian society” as “patrilineality and the patriarchal family” as well as “blood and kinship.”<sup>62</sup>

The term “correlation” is also important in the five relationships, because these relationships evoke reciprocal duties and responsibilities. This means that the superior partners have more rights, and the inferior more duties. At this point, it is necessary to mention another dimension of Confucian humanism, that is, “its openness to the divine and to the transcendent.”<sup>63</sup> The doctrine of the oneness of Heaven, Earth and the Human Being implies the correlation between spirit and body. As Julia Ching states: “Heaven, Earth and the Human Being are the origin of all things; Heaven gives them birth, Earth gives them nourishment, and the Human Being gives them perfection.”<sup>64</sup> These three are not only co-

related, but also united to each other like the members of the human body. Most Confucians presuppose that the Confucian community is a world community as well as a universally basic human community.<sup>65</sup> In such a context, Confucians do not accept dualism. They try to love all in society and the world, especially their own family, friends, and relatives. Their sense of community is basically rooted in responsibility toward others.<sup>66</sup>

**Ancestor worship as a means of establishing community bonds  
and fellowship**

In Korean Confucian thought, the importance of family life was in accordance with a system of ethics and a philosophy of religion. For example, the rituals of ancestor worship have continued for centuries in the Korean Confucian family, and it is still considered as a religious belief that after death, one's soul will be consoled by one's descendants.<sup>67</sup> Its ritual has been called "a community of living and the dead."<sup>68</sup> Confucians traditionally assumed that death is not a final destination, but rather that a new life begins after death. It implies that, even though there is no teaching regarding the immortality of soul or life after death in Confucianism, both the sincere practice of filial piety and the performance of the ancestor worship ceremony, were regarded as belief in a system of reward and blessing. Such a belief, as Kil-Song Choe has stated, has been transmitted to the Korean people throughout their long-inherited history.<sup>69</sup> More accurately, there is a dual system of ancestor worship. It is composed on the one hand by a system of household beliefs and rituals influenced by Confucianism, and on the other by the shamanistic ritual called "*kut*."<sup>70</sup>

Therefore, filial piety, as Norman Jacobs maintains, is a significant virtue of all Confucians.<sup>71</sup> It has also been an integrating and stabilizing influence in the patriarchal family, where the descendants are from the same ancestors.<sup>72</sup> Both marriage and birth are related to the ancestral cult and the duty of filial piety. This means that the former increases the number of descendants and the latter is considered as a means for continuing the family lineage and the ancestral cult. For this reason, Korean people, as Man-Gap Kim has

argued, were “eager to have sons who are supposed to be successors of the family, take care of their elderly parents, and have responsibility for ancestor worship.”<sup>73</sup> Myung-Hyuk Kim indicates the unique aspects of filial piety and the ancestor worship ceremony in the Confucian tradition:

The faithful practice of filial piety and faithful performance of the ancestor worship ceremony would please Heaven and receive heavenly blessings. Then it was again commonly believed that the deceased souls themselves, not Heaven, could be able to bless their descendants...ancestor worship is a social product of a large family system. To express filial piety and perform sacrifices is following the Heaven-designated ethics. Ancestor worship is an expression of filial affection.<sup>74</sup>

Furthermore, Robert Cummings Neville mentions the four traits concerning the positive aspects of filial piety as follows:

First, filial piety is the virtue of being competent at honoring those who brought you into existence...the second trait of filial piety is that its institutions contribute to the social services that care for the elderly...the third trait is part of a complex reciprocal relation in which one learns how to love, that is, how to be *ren*, humane...the fourth trait is the taking on of the virtues of the ancestors. A filial person is one who learns the goodness and strength of character that his or her parents can teach.<sup>75</sup>

Therefore, the most important filial act, as Sung-Bum Yun asserts, is for a person to be “full of humanity, propriety, wisdom, and righteousness,”<sup>76</sup> as he or she grows old in peace and fulfillment.

**Culture as the life and the fellowship for the gathering of  
the Confucian community**

Interestingly, Confucian society is organized by a community of personal relationships and not just by religious belief. Culture, in the Korean Confucian society, is the life and philosophy of community. It esteems the person, and human relationships, above the law or the state. Korean Confucian culture is both religious and secular in terms of understanding the faith of the oneness between Heaven and the Human Being, signifying a great optimism about human nature and its perfectibility, a universal way of life, and a universal order on earth. As Myung-Hyuk Kim describes, Heaven is not only regarded as “the ultimate source of human life,” but also as the protection and the satisfaction of human desire.<sup>77</sup> On the other side, Earth is considered as the dwelling place

in life and death, a storehouse of resources as well as a living garden, eventually realizing the gifts from Heaven. The Human Being is regarded as a participant in life, being of both Heaven and Earth by relating with other human beings through common participation in the community.<sup>78</sup> It is required of human beings to love people, and to rest in the highest good.

To express this more concretely, as Quee-Young Kim says, both individual life and its social relations in Confucian culture are highly respected in terms of “an individualism based on ethical universalism.”<sup>79</sup> There is no distinction between personalism and universalism, or between private and public in Korean Confucianism, for the most fundamental values of Korean culture are rooted in a sense of self-restraint and morality. This constitutes a personal commitment to an ethical doctrine of personal relationships. In this respect, the Confucian tradition of personalism does not emphasize group discipline and the habits of coordination in an organized setting, but rather takes “the need for virtue and morality as an individual quality for the harmony, stability and solidarity of the whole community.”<sup>80</sup> It is thus believed that the strength of individual relationships among people of varying social status provides “acquaintance, emotional intensity, intimacy and reciprocal services for others.”<sup>81</sup>

#### Education: *Hyangkyo* (Community School)

Indeed, such Confucian thought stressing individual stability within social solidarity, inevitably developed into a cultural ethos in establishing the educational and socializing institution for the purpose of gathering its community members, as well as teaching ethics to the people. For example, *hyangkyo* is an educational and cultural organization set up by Confucian intellectuals or the *yangban*,<sup>82</sup> who were the ruling class by the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Their highest virtue, as Haboush claims, is not only learning self-esteem and contributing to the community, but also seeking truth over materialistic wealth.<sup>83</sup> They gathered at the *hyangkyo* daily in order to constitute a ruling circle for the common people by upholding Confucianism as a supreme ideology of life. They also

conducted the semi-religious Confucian spring and fall festivals, provided lectures on the classics, and published a periodical of their own.<sup>84</sup> Accordingly, Confucian intellectuals idealized a moralistic orthodoxy including the virtue of mutual submission and obedience, loyalty to the ruler, filial piety to parents, sincerity to friends, and responsibility for social service.<sup>85</sup>

***Kye* (the Korean Personal Community) as a means for the upbuilding of the Confucian community**

In Korean society and history, the community is essential and important in sharing suffering, joy and encouragement. There are various forms of community that still exist in Korea. One of the most characteristic forms is “*kye*,”<sup>86</sup> which is a sort of social cooperative system for raising funds or labor on the occasion of funerals and *pumasi* (agricultural cooperation among the community members). It is a social activity in which all community members cooperate. It also maintains community solidarity. Often these organic socio-economic activities were extended to adjacent villages on a wider community level.

As Isabella Bird Bishop states, *kye* is the most basic and personal of relationships, which is viewed as the basis of virtue and the source of people’s solidarity in a Confucian society.<sup>87</sup> It extends exclusively to the public good and promulgates harmony between person and community, even though it is commonly rooted in personal virtue. On the other hand, the self can be conceived to be real and complete only as participating in the community. Robert C. Neville calls it “the principle of the ontological community”; the being of people depends on their being involved in a community.<sup>88</sup> The concept of *kye* in Korean Confucian society refers to genuine integrity and value. In other words, it implies an association of people who share in both profits and losses. Each individual, in this sense, is a public person who is identified with his or her own community; a selfless commitment to work for the well-being of others is a basic ideal of Confucianism.

Significantly, the qualifications of being a leader in “*kye*” are first that a person should be comparatively wealthy and firmly respected by the laity in a town or an organization<sup>89</sup>; secondly, a person should be a charismatic leader.<sup>90</sup> His or her function is

to lead the people into an integrated political unity and thus to maintain strong solidarity among those under his or her authority<sup>91</sup>; thirdly, his or her educational level should be high enough to instruct people and to enforce order when managing a project for the whole community.<sup>92</sup>

As we have observed, the characteristics of Korean Confucianism are community-based. Most scholars recognize that not only does the system of Confucian practice still persist in Korea today, but it also exists in combination with modern Korean Christianity.<sup>93</sup> As we shall see, its behavioral pattern and familial structure have exerted an influence on the Korean Christian community, since the beginning of Korea's evangelization by missionaries from the Western world. Conversely, some scholars see that the role of Shamanism was a major reason for the dramatic growth of Christianity in Korea. For instance, Young-Chan Ro states that:

Shamanism, as the oldest form of religious belief in Korea, has always been the most influential religious tradition. Due to its flexibility and receptivity, Shamanism has been successfully incorporated into other major religious traditions, such as those of Buddhism, Taoism, Confucianism and Christianity that have been introduced to Korea.<sup>94</sup>

Yamashita Akiko insists that "the remarkable growth of Korean Christianity essentially is due to a number of factors: its assimilation of Shamanistic elements, the conversion of the supporters of shamans, ethnic pride, and competition with Buddhism."<sup>95</sup>

It is a difficult task to describe the historical origin of Shamanism in Korea. The best material for the study of Shamanism are Emile Bourdaret's work *Réligion et Superstition en Corée* (1904), Henry Dore's work *Researches into Chinese Superstitions* (1914-1926), and Tong-Sik Yu's *Minsok Chongyo wa Hankuk Munhwa* [Folk Religion and Korean Culture] (1978). They have commonly observed that the origin of Shamanism in Korea is related to her ancient legend of the mythological King Tangun who descended from Heaven with God-given sovereignty to form the first Korean Kingdom of Chosun in 2332 B. C. It is still believed that the top of Mt. Manisan is the place where King Tangun worshipped his Heavenly Father, God, on the great stone "Altar of Heaven."<sup>96</sup>

One of the important aspects of Korean Shamanism is its deep belief in the souls of the dead. The non-dualistic nature of Korean Shamanism, as Young-Chan Ro has argued, “has led to a uniquely Korean form of worship, involving the non-duality of the sacred and the secular, of religious ritual and secular play, of men and gods, and of spiritual and material life.”<sup>97</sup> Pong-Bae Park furthermore notes:

The Korean culture is a mixture of three cultural elements, Shamanism, Confucianism and Buddhism. Among them, Shamanism was the original cultural soil into which the other two foreign cultures came to Korea around the third and fourth centuries...these three cultural elements were synthesized, or how one of them came to dominate the other two, determined the characteristics of the respective period in Korean history. However, it should be remembered that Shamanism is the key element for the understanding of religious mentality of the Korean people.<sup>98</sup>

A number of scholars claim that Shamanism contributed to the growth of Korean Christianity. Yohan Lee’s work *The Analysis of the Christian Prayer Mountain Phenomenon in Korea* (1985) explores the relationship between Korean Church growth and prayer mountains. For Korean shamans and their followers, the mountain was regarded as a holy place for prayer and worshipping gods. Lee argues that such beliefs influenced Korean Christians, who have deemed a high mountain as the best place for prayer. Se-Hee Han, in his work *Healing in the Korean Worldview: Its Influence upon the Korean Christian Churches* (1991), also explores the view that Korean Christians’ belief and practice of healing are influenced by Shamanism. Moses Lee’s work, entitled *Transforming the Korean Church: The Conceptual Transformation of Shamanistic Bok to the Biblical Concept of Blessing* (1994), interestingly argues that Korean ministers preach God’s blessing, but they tend to integrate its biblical teaching with the Shamanistic concept of *Bok* (blessing). He is critical that such an attempt will lead to syncretism and eventually distort biblical truth. Hee-Keun Jin’s work *Preaching in the Korean Presbyterian Church with Insights from a Shamanistic Worldview* (1996) is also interesting. Jin argues that God has prepared Korean Christians to be open to the Gospel of God through their ancient religious belief of Shamanism. He regards Shamanism as “God’s general grace” for Korean people. Recently, Younsik Noh’s work *Indigenous Christian Response to the*

*Challenge of Contemporary Korean Shamanism within the Protestant Churches of Korea*

(1998) explores the concept that Shamanistic beliefs and practices have not only been flourishing in Korean society, but also have become syncretized with Christianity. He argues that contemporary Shamanism continues to influence Korean Christians.

In general, the above scholars believe that Shamanism in Korea played an integral role in her traditional socio-cultural development and contributed practically to the growth of Christianity. On the other hand, Dong-Shik Ryu does not share this point of view. Ryu points out the following negative characteristics of Korean Shamanism that are, he believes, incompatible with Christianity:

- (1) a tendency toward dependence on spirits based on fatalism; (2) conservative attitudes without progressivism; (3) a shortsighted attitude ignoring the future; and (4) a tendency to enjoy life.<sup>99</sup>

He maintains that Korean Shamanism is just a primitive religion relying upon simple magic or techniques. For him, it neither teaches any ethical value nor has any sense of community. George Paik's view is more critical:

Shamanism is little concerned with moral character. This worship of spirits dwarfs and debases the moral nature, and the dread espionage of creation fills the hearts of the people with fear...and have made the Korean superstitious.<sup>100</sup>

In this respect, Horace Underwood, the American missionary to Korea, recognized Shamanism as the superstition of a mystical nature that would be a most obstinate enemy and would present strong barriers to the progress of the gospel.<sup>101</sup> Homer Hulbert in his work *The Passing of Korea* (1906) describes Shamanism as "superstition" or "spirit worship."<sup>102</sup> James Gale, in his work entitled *Korea in Transition* (1909), also states that "missionaries were to fight against prevalent superstitions like spirit cults, divination, magic, and fetishism in the way Joshua overcame the kings of the Amorites."<sup>103</sup> Most early Protestant missionaries regarded Shamanism as a hindrance for the propagation of the Gospel of God. Instead they utilized the positive elements of the community-based Confucian society for their own mission work in Korea. This aspect will be discussed in the following section.

Therefore, it can be argued that the role of Confucianism in the growth of Korean Christianity was much greater than Shamanism. Martha Huntley affirms that Confucian ethics and thought patterns had a stabilizing influence on the formation of the evangelistic Korean Christian community and its theology.<sup>104</sup> Sung-Bum Yun's work *Sung Theology: A Yellow Theology* (1972) particularly explores the principal role of Neo-Confucianism in the growth of Korean Christianity. Doo-Yong Chung, in his work *Kidokkyo wa Yukyo* [Christianity and Confucianism] (1994), also asserts that Confucianism-influenced Korean society was open to the reception of Western Christianity. This is because there are many similarities between Christian and Confucian ethics.<sup>105</sup> Most recently, Heup-Young Kim's work *Wang Yang-ming and Karl Barth: A Confucian-Christian Dialogue* (1996) deals explicitly with the convergence and divergence of Christianity and Confucianism, by comparing Wang's confuciology and Barth's theology. Kim says that someone studying the history of Korean Christianity needs to have a pre-understanding that there were various religious movements, such as Buddhism, Confucianism, Taoism, and Shamanism, which inspired, informed and confined the syncretic structure of the social and religious tradition of the Korean people throughout their long-inherited history. These religions contributed directly and indirectly to individual stability and social solidarity, as well as to morality. However, a strong Confucian ethical legacy for both personal and group harmony, as Heup-Young Kim has argued, became the leading system of thought in the culture, society, economy and politics of the Korean people. In this way, Kim also claims that Confucianism ultimately influenced Korean Reformed theology.<sup>106</sup>

According to Ki-Baik Lee, it was Confucianism that exclusively influenced the Korean peoples' ethical behaviour as well as their religious views.<sup>107</sup> For instance, the Confucian practice of ancestor worship is an example that implies the religious aspect of Confucianism and its influence upon the Korean people.

Interestingly, H. B. Hulbert maintains that the average Korean takes his religious ceremonies from ancestor worship, seeks the efficacy of Buddhistic prayers, devoutly bows his head at the shrine of mountain demons, and recites Confucian classics.<sup>108</sup> Allen Clark states that “all three religions—Buddhism, Confucianism, and the spirit-worship—are mixed up together and the same person finds himself involved in all three, according to the circumstances of the moment.”<sup>109</sup> David Chung defines such a tendency as “religious syncretism” that shows a religious hunger among Korean people.<sup>110</sup> This religious syncretism of the Korean people, as George Paik says, is “an indication of a total indifference and undue tolerance toward religion.”<sup>111</sup> Paik further notes that “as in the ancient Roman world, there was a tendency toward syncretism.”<sup>112</sup> For him, both the ethical codes of Confucianism and the spiritual world of Shamanism played significant roles in the religious development of Korea, but it was Korean Confucianists who discovered a personal God.<sup>113</sup> Accordingly, Myung-Hyuk Kim insists that “Christianity in Korea was not propagated by foreign missionaries; it was introduced by Korean scholars through their contact with Christian literature obtained in Peking.”<sup>114</sup> We will discuss much more of this view in the following section C entitled “Confucian Scholars’ Early Contact with Christianity.” Since they found compatibility between Confucianism and Christianity, it was natural for them to accept the Christian message and contribute to the growth of Christianity.<sup>115</sup> It was in the early part of the seventeenth century, when Korean Confucian scholars made the initial contact with Western Christianity.<sup>116</sup>

### C. Confucian Scholars’ Early Contact with Christianity

According to I’Abbé Huc, Matteo Ricci, a Jesuit missionary to China, settled down in Peking in 1601 and then began to propagate Christianity.<sup>117</sup> Ricci introduced Western science, especially mathematics and astronomy, to the Chinese and published Christian literature. His book *True Doctrine of the Lord of Heaven* was first published in China in 1601. His primary purpose for writing this book was to introduce Christian doctrines on the basis of Confucian terms and thought. He thus avoided all negative attitudes toward

Chinese Confucianism and its culture. This is because Ricci's mission policy, as Chol-Such Woo has stated, "was that of accommodation through learning Chinese religion and culture."<sup>118</sup>

It was then customary for the king of Korea to send an annual envoy to Peking to present compliments and gifts to the emperor of China. Some members of this delegation came into contact with Ricci and his successors.<sup>119</sup> Su-Gwang Yi (1563-1628), one of the diplomatic envoys of the Chosun Dynasty to the Chinese government, as well as a Confucian scholar who studied ancient and modern Chinese literature and history, brought Matteo Ricci's Chinese version *True Doctrine of the Lord of Heaven* to Korea.<sup>120</sup> George Paik states that it was in 1631 that To-Won Chong, a member of the annual envoy, took back with him many books on science, a pair of pistols, and a telescope, together with some other products from the West, including Ricci's book *True Doctrine of the Lord of Heaven*.<sup>121</sup> In 1644 Prince Sohyun returned from China and brought Catholic tracts written by Jesuit missionaries in China.<sup>122</sup> These are *Pien-hsueh Yi-tu* [Disputation with Idolaters] (1609) and *Chi-jen ship'ien* [Ten Paradoxes] (1608). The books were thus imported into Korea, but received very little attention.

Ik Yi (1682-1763), one of the greatest Confucian scholars of Sirhak (Science and Mathematics)<sup>123</sup> in Korea, and his follower Jung-Bok Ahn, began to read Matteo Ricci's *True Doctrine of the Lord of Heaven*.<sup>124</sup> Ik Yi spoke earnestly of the "Love of God." He believed in a personal God as a source of life and held the idea of an overruling Providence. Jung-Bok Ahn also discovered a personal God through nature.<sup>125</sup> They then became the first Korean Christians. Ik Yi thought that Catholicism solely worships *chon-ju*, the Lord of Heaven, whose reverential belief in God is like the Confucian worship of *sangje* (the Ruler Above or the Supreme God).<sup>126</sup> In commenting upon Didace de Pantoja's (1571-1618) work entitled *Les sept victoires* (1614), which deals with the Christian view of the self-control of covetousness, arrogance, greediness, lust, idleness, jealousy, and anger, he pointed out that "basically there was no difference between the Catholic and the

Confucian teachings on the matter of practical morality, and that the coherence of the Catholic teaching was in a way even superior to Confucian teaching.”<sup>127</sup> Ik Yi saw Christianity as a system of wisdom and ethics that is compatible with the teachings of Confucianism.<sup>128</sup> His Christian book entitled *Sunghak Jepyoo* [Summary of the Holy Teaching] explores the similarities between Confucian *Hyo* (filial piety) and Christian filial piety. Jung-Bok Ahn also wrote Christian text such as *Chunhak Mundak* [Confucian Answers to the Teachings of Catholicism].

In 1777, a group of young Sirhak Confucian scholars<sup>129</sup> were called together by Chol-Shin Kwon (1736-1801) to examine the scientific and mathematical treatises written by the Jesuits. As Allen Clark has stated,

They read these and discussed them. Pyuk Lee became convinced that here was the answer to all the philosophical problems that had been troubling him. He decided to keep holy one day in seven. Since he had no calendar, he kept the 7<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup>, 21<sup>st</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> of each lunar month, praying on these days, morning and night. He seems to have continued this for several years until, in 1783, he met Yak Sun Chung and his brother, Yak Yong Chung...he discussed these things with them and found them interested. When they got to Seoul, he found that...Sung Heun Lee had been appointed to go to Peking with the annual embassy. He talked with him and convinced him that this doctrine was a wonderful thing and urged him to get in touch with the Catholic priests in Peking and bring back more information about it.<sup>130</sup>

The Confucian scholar Sung-Heun Lee (1756-1801) went to Peking with the annual convoy in 1783. While he was there, he visited the Jesuit priests at the Nan T'ien-chu Tang and received instruction in Catholic teachings. Baptized in 1784, he became the first official member of the Catholic Church among Koreans. Upon returning to Korea in the Spring of 1784, he baptized his friend Tok-Cho Yi. They preached the gospel to their friends and relatives, many of whom were converted. They began to consider a more formal organization for the church, based upon what they knew of the Roman Catholic Church in China. In 1784, they eventually established the first Korean Catholic Church.<sup>131</sup> Regarding this first-known Korean Church, William E. Biernatzki notes that:

The Confucian background of the Church's founders is another factor which should be considered...Korean Confucianism was open to new ways of thinking deemed “subversive” by the official school of Korea neo-Confucianism, including the doctrines they found in the Catholic books brought from Peking. But they were

fundamentally Confucians, in education and even in the earliest experiences of their childhood...They were searchers for truth...and they felt they had found the way to the truth in the Catholic books.<sup>132</sup>

Such Christian doctrines, as the resurrection of believers and an eternal life after a physical death, have attracted Confucian scholars due to their own religious beliefs, which were ritually practiced in their ancestor worship.<sup>133</sup> They believed that, although ancestors had passed away, their spirits would take care of their descendants. For them, ancestor worship is a communion that unites the dead and the living in prayer. In particular, they used an ancestral tablet that contained two meanings. As Ki-Bok Choe explains, first, there is the image of the invisible soul through which offspring may pay respect and express affection to the invisible soul of their dead ancestor. Second, this also serves as the resting-place for the soul.<sup>134</sup> For the early Korean Catholics, ancestor worship was similar to the Christian memorial service for one's deceased parents.<sup>135</sup> They found that Christianity uses the cross or portrait of Jesus Christ as a means by which believers concentrate their minds and worship God, while an ancestral tablet is the image of the soul in the Confucian practice of ancestor worship. Interestingly, Jesuit missionaries permitted the use of ancestral tablets by interpreting them as the image of the soul. This was because they not only made contact with Confucian scholars who opposed superstition, but also appreciated the true Confucian meanings of ancestral rites and tablets.<sup>136</sup>

The traditional patriarchal family system and ancestor worship helped to shape the Korean Christian Church as the “familial community-based church.”<sup>137</sup> To be specific, if the patriarchal head of one's family accepted the Christian faith, the other members in the same family line and its relatives would obey and accept it as the normative religious practice without any resistance or disobedience. Thus, a converted father became instrumental in the conversion of his entire family and neighbours.<sup>138</sup> Certainly, Christianity could expand according to the spirit of traditional customs cultivated within Confucian ancestral worship, as well as the duty of filial piety. This fosters faith, rigid uniformity, fellowship among the family, and the good of the whole community. We must

note that the first Catholic Church established by Sung-Heun Lee in 1784 was distinctively a family-based congregation. Most members were from the family, relatives and friends.

Sung-Heun Lee was Yak-Yong Chung's brother-in-law. Pyuk Lee was Sung-Heun Lee's brother-in-law. Yak-Yong and Yak-Chun were Yak-Jong Chung's brothers.<sup>139</sup> As Korean Confucian society was based on the unit of family, it was easy for early Christian leaders to propagate Catholicism among their own family members.

Furthermore, this family-based church could be expanded through the institutional function of Korean Confucianism, namely, *hyangkyo*, which was considered as an exemplary model for the Church by the early Korean Christians at that time. For them, it was not only the place for learning and instruction, but was also understood as the body of a whole community.<sup>140</sup> Early Korean Christians emphasized group solidarity as well as education, distinctively for the teaching of the Bible and theological doctrines for women and children, at the Church or *hyangkyo*.

Confucian scholars have contributed immensely towards the writings of Christian literature as well as to the translation of the Chinese Bible into the Korean language. Confucian values and thought patterns played a vitally important role for the early Korean Catholics in interpreting some Christian doctrines according to their language and way of thinking. As William E. Biernatzki notes, "the religious conversion of the first Sirhak scholars meant their acceptance of the faith, but it could not mean a complete change in the basic values and ways of thinking that were the result of decades of cultural conditioning from their earliest childhood."<sup>141</sup> They used Christian concepts that were common to them to translate the Bible and other Christian literature. Inevitably their concepts were given a new meaning. In 1784, Pyuk Lee, an ardent evangelist and a brother-in-law of Sung-Heun Lee, wrote the Korean Christian book, *Sung-gyo Yo-ji* [Essentials of the Holy Teaching].<sup>142</sup> Here he demonstrated that Christianity possessed the true doctrine with which to serve the supreme God, the creator of all things, the source of human

endowment, of man's heart and character, and of his knowledge. According to Chai-Sik Chung, Lee was convinced that

Without the Christian doctrine, human beings would be ignorant of the different duties of the king and the people, the fundamental rules of life, the creation of heaven and earth, the laws of the heavens, the course and the regular revolutions of the stars, the distinction between right and wrong, the origin and the end of the world, the union of the spirit and body, the incarnation of the son of God for the remission of sins, and the reward of the good in heaven and the punishment of the wicked in hell.<sup>143</sup>

Yak-Chong Chung completed *Chu-gyo Yo-ji* [Essentials of the Lord's Teaching] and his brother Yak-Yong Chung (1762-1836) also wrote *Jung-yong kang-eui* [Lecture on Jung-Yong]. In particular, Chung's *Jung-yong kang-eui* explores Ik Yi's teaching of Catholicism, and attempts to integrate some ethical aspects from both Confucianism and Christianity. He deals extensively with the Christian God as the Lord of heaven and hell, celibacy, immortality, baptism and the effect of these ideas on the traditional family and social structure, including one's relations with parents and the sovereign.<sup>144</sup> Chung attempts to identify Christian doctrines according to Confucian thought patterns and values.<sup>145</sup> In accordance with the Confucian concept of Heaven as a high authority and a source of life and goodness, he saw God as a Creator. He particularly defined God as the *Tao* of the truth, the way and the life for everyone. As Chung has said, "to know God (*Tao*) is a human being's ultimate task, and justifies his or her own existence...neglecting God is ignoring himself or herself."<sup>146</sup> On the other hand, he saw God as a lawgiver and a judge who metes out rewards and punishments in exact proportion to the merits of each soul.<sup>147</sup> God is also portrayed as the wealthy monarch or an absolute king who dispenses grace at his will. Since Chung was politically persecuted, his attitude towards the world was very negative. For him, the world was a source of suffering, trial and temptation, so there was no virtue or justice. Unlike the traditional Confucian view of humanity as good, Chung saw that a human being is sinful, arrogant and greedy.<sup>148</sup> Therefore, Chung's texts are preoccupied with thoughts of impending divine judgment, with expressions of longing for heaven and with warnings of hell.<sup>149</sup> He stressed the eschatological hope that would be

fulfilled within his time. Accordingly, he points out the necessity for communion with other Christian members in order to build a more virtuous Christian community. For him, the Church is the place where the body of Christ must cultivate virtues such as obedience, humility, and filial piety.<sup>150</sup> He understands Christ as the Head of his body and the male as the head of the female; thus, his concept of church is hierarchical.

Confucian scholars believed that the Scriptures are instructive and absolute regarding the teaching of family, the sexes and respect for the aged.<sup>151</sup> Accordingly, they explain God as the Lord of Heaven; Christ as the Head of his body; the Christian community as the body of Christ; male as the head of female, and elder as head of the younger. In Confucianism, hierarchy and authority are emphasized in the three and five cardinal relations. “The Three Fundamentals” are verticals that indicate the more primordial relation between superior and inferior. “The Five Morals” also seem to pertain to hierarchy, but imply a horizontal relationship. At this point, Confucian ethics and codes are based on interpersonal relationships for both family and society. It is as if the Ten Commandments were kept in the Ark of the Covenant as a reminder that religion and ethics go together. The ethics of the Ten Commandments are personal ethics—because it is the personal God who speaks them, and it is the voice of God Himself in His law, addressed to each one who claims to be in covenant with him. Jesus Christ summarized the law when He said, “Love the Lord your God with all your heart, your soul, your mind, your strength. Love your neighbor as yourself” (Luke 10: 27).

Thus, Confucian scholars found that the order of the Ten Commandments is significant in that the first four commandments involve our relationship with God and the last six our relationship with others.<sup>152</sup> Yak-Yong Chung’s work entitled *Meng-ja Yo-eui* [Summary of Mencius’ Teachings] explicates the Ten Commandments, especially from the fourth to the tenth. He synthesized six commandments into the three following ethical elements: the duty of filial piety, the immorality of adultery and the false act of deception of one’s neighbour.<sup>153</sup> According to Biblical religion, how a person relates to God must affect

how he or she relates to his or her neighbor. If not, there is something wrong with the way he or she relates to God. Love for a person is rooted in love for God, and love for God is expressed in love for a person. Korean Confucian scholars who converted to Christianity realized that the ten words compel Christians to be both God-centered and people-centered. For them, both Confucianism and Christianity are similar in their ethics and practical life.<sup>154</sup>

For instance, Yak-Yong Chung's *Yikiron* [Two Theories] emphasizes one of the Confucian virtues, *Kyungchunaein*, that is, "respect the Heaven and love your neighbour." Chung found that this concept is similar to Christian teaching, "love the Lord your God" and "love your neighbour as yourself."<sup>155</sup> Ik Yi saw that there is an affinity between Christianity and Confucianism on the issue of filial piety; for the fifth of the great commandments of the *Torah*: states: "Honour your father and mother, so that your days may be long in the land that the Lord your God is giving you" (Exodus 20:12).<sup>156</sup> For him, honouring earthly parents is thus an important duty that both religious traditions emphasized coincidentally. Han-Sun Chong's work *San'gi Sansu* [Worshipping Heaven] shows that the Ten Commandments and the Confucian Five Morals and Three Fundamentals, are compatible, showing that the indigenization of Christian ethics within a Korean Confucian context is possible.<sup>157</sup>

Furthermore, *Songkyo Konggwa* [The Prayerbook] explores Catholic doctrines that reflect some Confucian aspects of Christianity. This book served as the spiritual guidebook of nearly every Catholic from the early eighteenth to the late nineteenth century. It is not known when this book was completed, but it was entirely edited by the Reverend Hyong-Jung Yun in 1958. The new *Katolik Kidoso* [Catholic Prayerbook] was published in 1968. This book describes the concept of God and of God's relationship to human beings and the world. God is seen as a king who has absolute power. The violations of God's law are seen as threats to his power. Korean Catholics had ample experience of earthly kings and *yangban* who inflicted severe punishments because they saw their power

threatened.<sup>158</sup> This idea of God reflects Korean Catholics' socio-political circumstances; most early Catholics were Sirhak scholars who were politically persecuted by the Noron faction, the ruling party of the Chosun Dynasty during the eighteenth century. The idea of the state of the human being is thus described as morally degenerate, vain, rebellious, and proud.

Although the initial founder and first converts to Catholicism in Korea were Confucian intellectuals and *yangban*, Catholicism began to attract the common people. It was towards the end of the eighteenth century when many Koreans became Christians. Most Confucian scholars who converted to Christianity encouraged the people of Korea by teaching the Christian message of hope and introduced some advanced Western technology. Norman Jacobs notes that "Catholicism spread geographically and from the elite to the masses who, deprived of close contact with Buddhism, found the Christian ideals of social equality and the promise of otherworldly relief from the sufferings of this world appealing."<sup>159</sup> The lower classes particularly found that the Christian teaching of equality as children of God appealing; there is neither slave nor free, male nor female, for all are one in Christ.<sup>160</sup> This concept led to the writing of many books. One of the most important of Sirhak scholars' writings was Yak-Yong Chung's *Mongmin Shimsu* [The Book for the People]. His main thought was the rights of the people. He acknowledged the *minjung* (common people) as having the right to take official positions in the government and the right to vote. He advocated democracy on the basis of the biblical concept of equality. His ideas led to the reformation of Korean society through an emphasis on human equality.<sup>161</sup> However, the government regarded his ideas as a dangerous threat, so Chung was sentenced to death. The persecution of 1801 therefore indicates that "many Catholics came from low social origins and that their numbers included many orphans, widows, and others whose lives had been difficult even before their conversion."<sup>162</sup>

The cause of this persecution was primarily political. The group of Confucian scholars who converted to Catholicism belonged mostly to the faction called Sipa of the

Southerners Party (*namin*). They neither held office in the government nor exerted political influence throughout the country. Since they pursued socio-political reform, it was natural for them to consider Catholicism as a new hope. In 1801, the opposing party Pyokpa of the Old Doctrines (*noron*), pleaded with the Queen Regent Chongsun to issue an edict stating that anyone who held to the Catholic teaching should be sentenced to death. Kang-Nam Oh has argued that this was an excuse to wipe out political enemies.<sup>163</sup> There were three hundred Catholic martyrs, including such early Christian leaders as Sung-Heun Lee, Yak-Jong Chung, Sa-Yong Hwang, and some foreign missionaries from China and France.<sup>164</sup> Their death, and Christian writings, as William E. Biernatzki has asserted, therefore provided a fertile soil for the contribution of the massive growth of Korean Christianity in the early twentieth century.<sup>165</sup>

The direct influence of Catholicism upon Sirhak scholars and upon the common people of Korea, led subsequently to the creation of an indigenous religion, so-called “Chondogyo” (the Heavenly Way), or “Tonghak” (Eastern Learning). Cheu Choi (1824-1864) was the founder of this religious movement. He was a Confucian scholar and was greatly impressed by Catholic doctrines.<sup>166</sup> Cheu Choi sought political reform because of the corrupted government of the nineteenth century Chosun Dynasty. He believed that Catholicism could be the source of his religious and political reform programme. He thus wrote *Tongkyungtaechun* [Tonghak Bible] on the basis of the Catholic concept of equality, the Confucian doctrine of *Samkangohryun* (Three Fundamentals and Five Ethics), and the practice and thought of Buddhism, Shamanism, and Taoism. In this work, he introduced the Christian concept of monotheism and proclaimed himself as *Chunju* (the Heavenly Father). Although Choi’s Tonghak movement was an expression of syncretism, he eagerly adopted Catholic doctrines, liturgy and sacraments. During his four-year ministry (1860-1864), he gained four thousand followers, mostly from among the poor, oppressed farmers of southern Korea.<sup>167</sup> In 1864, Choi was “arrested on the charge of preaching and practicing Catholicism, which had been outlawed again.”<sup>168</sup> Choi’s cousin, Hae-Wol Choi,

took over leadership, and continued to propagate the Heavenly Way movement.

Interestingly, Benjamin B. Weems calls it “the Catholic-influenced Confucian reform movement.”<sup>169</sup>

According to Daniel Davies, there were twenty thousand Korean Catholics by 1864.<sup>170</sup> The numbers of Catholic converts were among those of the politically disenfranchised southerner faction and other non-privileged people, such as the poor and oppressed low classes. The government of the Chosun Dynasty feared the spread of Catholicism and regarded it as a political threat. The government thus called it an “unorthodox and evil religion.”<sup>171</sup> In 1866, the Prince Taewongun inaugurated the massive persecution of Catholics in which an estimated eight to ten thousand faithful perished, including French priests.<sup>172</sup> Catholicism in Korea, nonetheless, grew steadily. As Allen Clark has stated, there were some forty thousand Catholics in Korea by 1898.<sup>173</sup>

Christianity in Korea had its formal beginning in the eighteenth century when some enthusiastic Confucian intellectuals were impressed with Jesuit science. They subsequently became disciples, because they found that the Catholic social gospel was compatible with the Confucian rules of etiquette.<sup>174</sup> They introduced the new doctrines of Catholicism to the common people in accordance with Confucian concept and terminology. They thus translated the Lord’s Prayer, the Apostles’ Creed, the Ten Commandments, hymns, and other articles of faith from Chinese according to their own Confucian concept and terminology. Early Catholics, who were mostly Confucian scholars, therefore helped to open up Korea, making the beginnings of Protestant work easier.<sup>175</sup> This meant that Confucianism played a role in the establishment of Roman Catholicism in Korea. Later it had a role in the acceptance of Protestantism.<sup>176</sup> Thus, Kang-Nam Oh states that Confucianism has had a profound impact on the Korean people, including Christians.<sup>177</sup>

Before the formal introduction of Protestantism into Korea, a portion of the English Bible’s New Testament was also translated and published into *Hangul*, the language of the common people in Korea. This was during 1881-1887 and done mainly by Ung-Chan Yi,

Sang-Yoon Suh, Sang-U Suh, Su-Jong Yi, who were born into Confucian families.<sup>178</sup> The Gospels of Luke and John were published in 1882, the Gospels of Mark and Matthew in 1884, First Corinthians, the Epistle to the Galatians, and Ephesians in 1885.<sup>179</sup> The Gospel of Luke was translated by John Ross, a Scotch Presbyterian missionary residing in Manchuria, and his fellow missionary, John MacIntyre, with the assistance of their Korean teacher Ung-Chan Yi. In 1874, Yi went to Manchuria for commercial purposes and came into contact with John Ross. He agreed to be Ross' Korean language teacher. Yi became a convert, and was baptized by MacIntyre in 1876. He not only became the first Korean Protestant Christian, but also joined in the work of Bible translation and printing.<sup>180</sup>

In 1878, the Suh brothers, Sang-Yoon, Sang-U and Kyong-Jo, also went to Manchuria for commercial purposes. When they came into contact with Ross and MacIntyre, Sang-Yoon was very sick and discouraged. He was taken to the mission hospital in New Chwang and soon recovered through Ross' prayer. The Suh brothers were converted. Ross waited until 1879 to baptize Sang-Yoon.<sup>181</sup> He went to Mukden with Ross to assist in Bible translation and printing, while his younger brother Kyong-Jo returned to Korea. In 1883, Sang-Yoon Suh returned to his hometown Uiju, Hwanghae Province, as an evangelist with portions of the Ross New Testament and gathered together the first group of worshipping Protestants. He became instrumental in the conversion of his family and neighbors.<sup>182</sup> Since Kyong-Jo had a previous Christian experience in Manchuria, H. G. Underwood in Seoul, baptized him in 1887. He eventually became one of the first seven Presbyterian ministers ordained in Korea in 1907.<sup>183</sup>

We must note that, in 1880, the National Bible Society of Scotland and the British and Foreign Bible Society provided an allowance to Ross and MacIntyre for expenses and for payment of Korean assistants. Thus, in 1882, three thousand copies of the Gospels of John and Luke were printed and circulated to Korean people. The society published the four Gospels in 1884 and the entire Ross New Testament in 1887.<sup>184</sup> According to George Paik, the society distributed more than five thousand copies of the Ross New Testament to

the Korean people when it was completed.<sup>185</sup> Ross visited Korea in 1884 and he reported to the society that “besides those already baptized there are 600 men applicants for baptism in the Korean valleys.”<sup>186</sup> Ross also reported Evangelist Sang-Yoon Suh’s contribution as follows:

As the result of his two years’ labors there, he has now over 70 men applicants for baptism...He has opened what he calls a “Preaching Hall” in a city to the west of the capital, where he has 18 believers, and another convert in a city to the south of the capital has “over twenty” who are applying for baptism.<sup>187</sup>

The achievements of the pioneering Bible work among Koreans during the late nineteenth century can partially be explained on the basis of the fact that the early Korean Protestant Christians, who were usually upper-class of Confucian families, socially, and moderately wealthy, found a mirror of their own true God in Christianity.<sup>188</sup> As Sung-Hae Kim notes, the Confucian definition of God is similar to the God of Christianity.<sup>189</sup> Confucian values and moral systems had also some of the same relations to the Christian message. They used the early Korean Catholic Christians’ literature as well as the Chinese Scriptures as their primary references for the translation of the English Bible. It was thus natural for them to formulate a Confucian-Christian syncretism in the course of the Bible’s translation into their own language of religion and spirituality. For this reason, the reading of the Scriptures, as Allen Clark has said, was easy for Korean people and eventually there were many converts who wanted to be baptized.<sup>190</sup>

#### D. The Confucian-Christian Context in Korean Christianity

Korean Confucian scholars, who converted to the Christian faith, contributed to the development of both Roman Catholicism and Protestantism in Korea. Simply put, Korean Christian theology cannot be understood without a basic knowledge of Korean Confucianism. In this regard, Julia Ching points out:

Whether they like it or not, Korean Christians, like other East Asian Christians, cannot but assert themselves as Christians of Confucian background and values...This implies...that Korean Christians, as long as they are Koreans as well as Christians, cannot avoid the religio-cultural legacy of Confucianism, which has been the sole cumulative tradition during the past five centuries in Korea.<sup>191</sup>

Ching also explains that the reason for the difference between Korea and Japan in accepting Christianity is as follows: “the stronger Confucian influence in Korea has been favorable to the development of Christianity, whereas the stronger Buddhist influence in Japan is more of a deterrent.”<sup>192</sup>

It is significant that Confucianism’s definition of God, humanity, and the universe is similar to the Christian understanding of God, humanity, and the doctrines of justification and of sanctification. Paul A. Rule, in his article entitled “Jesuit and Confucian: Chinese Religion in the Journals of Matteo Ricci SJ,” shows that Ricci, an early Jesuit missionary to China, uses Confucian terminology and cites Confucian texts to bolster his arguments about God’s existence and attributes in his *Catechism*. For Ricci, as Rule writes,

Confucianism is a philosophy, not a rival theology to Christianity but a purely rational system...it is analogous to a common theological view about the relation of the Old Testament to the New...Ricci thus attempts to relate Confucian and Aristotelian concepts—the medieval synthesis of Aristotelian philosophy and Christian revelation in the theological system of St. Thomas Aquinas.<sup>193</sup>

Chai-Sik Chung affirms that:

The Jesuits deemed Christianity essentially compatible with Confucianism, while Taoism and Buddhism were considered idolatrous. The Jesuit acceptance of the Confucian canon in its textual form as “ancient wisdom” and their use of the Confucian language for presenting the Western religion, made it possible to establish a point of contact between the two heterogeneous religions. Anything that deviated from the Confucian pattern aroused questions and reservations. For example, the name of the Christian God, the doctrine of heaven and hell, the apparent neglect of life on earth, and the confusion of the traditionally ascribed roles of man and woman and of the high and low, created concern among the Confucian traditionalists.<sup>194</sup>

Pei-Jung Fu says, “the Confucians inherited the belief in a transcendent Heaven from the ancient Chinese. One of the significant achievements of early Confucianism was to offer a reasonable explanation of the connection between Heaven (transcendence) and man (immanence).”<sup>195</sup> Such Chinese Confucian texts as the *Book of History* and the *Book of Odes*, as Fu states, define “Heaven” as “Dominator, Creator, Sustainer, Revealer, and Judge” in accordance with Christian concept of God. Accordingly, Heaven as Creator has given birth to humanity and becomes the source of life. Cynthia R. Chapman’s article

entitled “On Heaven-Humanity Harmony and Divine-Human Reconciliation” represents a Confucian-Christian inter-religious dialogue regarding the relationship between God and humanity.<sup>196</sup> Correspondingly, Timothy Tian-Min Lin examines the concept of humanity in Confucianism and Christianity. He mentions the following agreement between the two religious traditions:

First, both Confucianism and Christianity agree that the status of man is above other creatures...second, both agree that man at the same time belongs to nature...third, both agree that man is potentially good...fourth, both agree that the task of man is to be truly human...In Confucianism the decree of Heaven is that man should develop his essential nature which is the endowment of Heaven. Moral evil is due to man’s failure to actualize his essential nature.<sup>197</sup>

Furthermore, Lin, in his work “The Confucian Concept of *Jen* and The Christian Concept of Love,” explores the similar aspect of sanctification in Confucianism and Christianity. As Christian sanctification means a life long process, Lin believes that the Confucian concept of *Jen* expresses the virtue of endurance, which is the foundation of Confucian view of sanctification.<sup>198</sup> In his article “Biblical and Confucian Thought: A Consideration of Some Common Teachings,” Graham S. Ogden analyzes some similar concepts in both Confucian and Christian thought. For example, the fifth commandment of honouring one’s parents in the Old Testament is similar to the Confucian teaching of filial piety, which becomes one of the five *li* (Rite or Ritual). Jesus’ Golden Rule of doing to others as you would have them do to you (Mt. 7:12; Lk. 6:31) is also similar to one of the Confucian virtues, that is, benevolence (*in*) or loving others (*ae-in*).<sup>199</sup> Ogden notes more similarities in both religious traditions, such as justice (*eui*), interpersonal relationships with others (*li*), love (*jen*), the wisdom of poverty,<sup>200</sup> righteousness (*ei*), loyalty and faithfulness between friends, and mutual cooperation within one’s community.

On another level, Heup-Young Kim, a Presbyterian disciple of Barth’s theology, argues that one of the Confucian teachings—the intellectual pursuit or the Taoist search for Truth—is also similar to the Christian message concerning the idea of Jesus Christ as the Way, the Truth and the Life for all who can accept His Word in faith. Kim thus tried to formulate a Confucian Christology on the basis of both the Confucian term “*Tao*” and Karl

Barth's Christocentric theology, for he believes that a strong resemblance exists between Confucianism and Christianity.<sup>201</sup>

Sung-Hae Kim's article entitled "Silent Heaven Giving Birth to the Multitude of People" describes Korean Confucian scholars' interpretation of the Christian doctrine of God. Confucian scholars, as she has stated, expressed the Christian view of God on the basis of the Confucian tradition. She maintains that the Korean Christian faith is confined within the Confucian tradition that dominantly influenced the lives of Korean people throughout Korea's entire history, especially throughout the five centuries of the Chosun Dynasty until the end of the 19th century.<sup>202</sup> In this respect, Julia Ching's point of view is helpful that:

Confucianism as a dynamic discovery of the worth of the human person, of the possibility of moral greatness and even sagehood, of one's fundamental relationship to others in a society based on ethical values, of an interpretation of reality and a metaphysics of the self that remain open to the transcendental—all this, of course, the basis for a true sense of human dignity, freedom, and equality, is still relevant to Korean Christians.<sup>203</sup>

Huston Smith, in his work entitled *The World's Religions* (1991), holds that "in the case of Korean Christians, Confucianism is not exactly the faith of 'others'. For them it is 'theirs', or, at least, part of 'theirs'."<sup>204</sup> For Smith, it is the Confucian tradition that makes Korean Christians' religious life much deeper and more abundant. As Michael Kalton rightly observes, "Korean society undoubtedly possesses the deepest and most vital Confucian tradition."<sup>205</sup> Donald N. Clark notes that "one cannot escape the impression that Christianity is now a Korean people's religion and no longer a foreign import...If any society can be considered a particularly favorable laboratory for the Confucian-Christian dialogue, it must be Korea."<sup>206</sup> Moreover, as Ha-Tai Kim has stated, the unique situation of Korea demands that Korean theologians engage themselves in the comparative study of Christianity and Confucianism; if they do so with openness they will make important contributions to world Christianity.<sup>207</sup>

Therefore, it should be noted that, according to Yee-Heum Yoon's recent survey, "more than ninety percent of self-identified church-going Korean Protestant Christians are

virtually practical members of the Confucian ‘soft’ community who still hold to Confucian moral norms and practice traditional Confucian social customs.”<sup>208</sup> In other words, Korean Christians tend to identify themselves as Christians, but paradoxically their practices in customs and ethics are based on Confucianism. As Kyong-Jae Kim asserts, Korean Christians are trying to abide by high ethical standards according to their Confucian tradition.<sup>209</sup>

Early church buildings in Korea were built not in a Western style but with traditional brick and straw. Old-fashioned Confucian schools were used as the place for the gathering of early Korean Christian communities. Christians also employed Confucian musical instruments, which were formerly used for ancestor worship, for their own worship service. Interestingly, when Korean Christians gathered for the worship service, men were separated from women by a curtain between the two seated groups. This, as Kyong-Jae Kim has stated, was influenced by the Confucian teaching that male and female should not sit together after the age of seven.<sup>210</sup> Most Korean theological scholars do not deny that Confucianism fundamentally influenced Korean Christianity.<sup>211</sup>

Nevertheless, there are some scholars in the Korean Christian faith who reject the Confucian-Christian encounter. For instance, Chul-Ha Han asserts that Christian means someone who follows Christ’s life and teachings; a Confucian, on the other hand, follows Confucius’ teachings. It is thus, as Han has argued, impossible for one to be a Confucian and a Christian at the same time. He denies one’s dual religious identity.<sup>212</sup> Bong-Rang Park strongly rejects a theological attempt at indigenization. Park argues that there is always a danger of syncretism in the course of theological indigenization or contextualization. He sees that the role of Confucianism is rather negative for the Christian community in Korea, though it greatly influenced the Korean people including Christians. For him, hierarchy, legalism and mannerism in Confucianism are the main reasons for the division of the Korean Churches. Park goes on to argue that Confucianism as a backward-looking ideology, sterile textual studies, a social order interested only in the past and not in the

future, is neither relevant nor influential in the growth of Korean Christianity. He boldly claims therefore that any theological attempt at syncretism with Korean Confucianism should be rejected.<sup>213</sup> Kwang-Sik Kim's point of view is similar to Park. His work entitled *Contextualization and Interpretation* (1987) criticizes any theological attempt at the indigenous contextualization of the Christian faith, especially, a Confucian-Christian syncretism.<sup>214</sup>

Conversely, Chai-Sik Chung does not reject the Confucian-Christian context in the Korean Christian faith, but urges Christian theologians to avoid the danger of theological indigenization. For Chung, an attempt at the theological indigenization of the Christian faith should be carried out within one's inherited culture and religion; but one of the pitfalls in such an attempt is a distortion of biblical truth. He thus asks, "what relevance is there in reasserting Confucian symbols and meaning, thereby to find their parallels in the Christian message."<sup>215</sup>

Although some scholars reject a Confucian-Christian context in the Korean Christian faith, it can be argued that the influence of Confucianism on the lives of the Korean Christians is still dominant. Un-Sunn Lee's work *Korean Feminist Theology in a Postmodern Age: A Dialogue with Confucianism, Feminism and Pedagogy* (1997), holds that the Korean Christian faith is based on the Confucian-Christian context.<sup>216</sup> Heup-Young Kim's insistence on the need for a Confucian-Christian dialogue is particularly imperative in Korea because of the following three reasons: "(1) Korea is the only country in East Asia where Christianity is no longer a small minority religion, but takes a leading role in society; (2) in the history of East Asia, Korea was most strongly influenced by Confucianism, and still is; (3) Korean Christianity is basically a Confucian Christianity."<sup>217</sup> Due to this Confucian-Christian context in Korean Christianity, Kim in his work entitled *Wang Yang-Ming and Karl Barth* (1996) argues that the Confucian-Christian dialogue as a genuine theological task is possible. For him, the common issue of Wang's Confuciology of self-cultivation and Barth's theology of sanctification is "a point of contact in which a

genuine Confucian-Christian dialogue can be made.”<sup>218</sup> To be specific, Sung-Bum Yun, the Methodist interpreter of Barth’s theology, in his work *Hankukjok Shinhak: Song ui Haesokhak* [The Korean Theology: The Hermeneutics of Sincerity] (1972), argues that a genuine Confucian-Christian dialogue and formulation of a Korean theology of Confucianism is possible by integrating the theology of Karl Barth and Neo-Confucianism. This is because Karl Barth, as he has argued, “has significantly influenced Korean Reformed theology, which was ultimately influenced by Confucianism.”<sup>219</sup> Martha Huntley supports Yun’s argument. In her work entitled *Caring, Growing, and Changing: A History of the Protestant Mission in Korea* (1984), she correspondingly claims that the socio-cultural legacy of Confucianism influenced Korean Reformed theology.<sup>220</sup> There is no doubt that a Confucian-Christian encounter in the Korean Christian faith exists. Accordingly, it can also be argued that the indigenization of Karl Barth’s theology with Korean Confucianism is possible.

The primary task of this thesis is to explore the reception of Karl Barth’s theology in the Korean context, influenced as it was by Confucianism. Therefore, the influence of community-based Korean Confucianism on early Protestant missionaries’ evangelistic works in the following section will be discussed in the context of its contribution to the rapid growth of Christianity and later to the reception of Karl Barth’s Christocentric ecclesiology in Korea.

#### E. Early Protestant Missionaries’ Contribution to the Growth of Korean Christianity and to the reception of Barth’s Christocentric theology in Korea

Before the formal introduction of Protestantism into Korea, there were some important historical events, which helped Korea emerge from centuries of seclusion. In 1876, the Korean government signed the Byungja Treaty of Peace and Amity with Japan. It was an example of an unequal treaty with a foreign country, but represented a break in the Korean government’s policy of seclusion. The treaty initially opened the ports of Korea to foreign influence, and so a period of enlightenment began.<sup>221</sup>

In 1882, the establishment of a formal diplomatic relationship between Korea and the United States of America was made; this is called “The Shufelt Treaty.”<sup>222</sup> Korean treaties with England (1882), Germany (1882), Italy (1884), France (1886), and other European nations including Austria, Belgium, and Denmark followed soon thereafter.<sup>223</sup> Such treaties opened the country to trade, friendship and foreign residence. These eventually gave religious freedom to Korean Catholics and made it possible for the earliest Protestant missionaries to enter Korea.

In general, the history of the Protestant Church in Korea is divided into five periods: the first period of acceptance (1884-1896); the formative period of the Church (1896-1919); the depoliticization period (1919-1932); the period of Babylonian Captivity (1932-1960); and the period of awakening (1960 to the present).<sup>224</sup>

Most scholars agree that the formal introduction of Protestantism into Korea was made in 1884, when Dr. Horace N. Allen, a medical missionary of the American Presbyterian Mission Board arrived.<sup>225</sup> He had transferred from the Presbyterian mission in China and landed at Inchon on September 20, 1884. He was promptly appointed physician to the American legation. Subsequently, he was appointed to be the physician of the British Legation and other diplomatic establishments. His appointment secured his safety. In his status as a missionary, he would not have been allowed to enter Korea. The Korean government forbade the propagation of Western Christianity, especially Roman Catholicism. The common people had not forgotten the massacre of the Catholics and the anti-foreign decrees. In spite of unfavorable circumstances, Horace Allen, the pioneer missionary, started at once to lay foundations for future missionary work in Korea.<sup>226</sup>

There were some Christian politicians who had adhered to a liberal policy. They were Yong-Ik Min, Ok-Kyun Kim, Yong-Hyo Pak, Kwang-Pom Seo, Yong-Sik Hong, and Chae-Pil Seo. These men desired to overturn the corrupt, impotent, and intriguing government and set up a better one, for they had seen the new conditions in Japan. On the

night of December 4, 1884, they planned to murder the conservative leaders. However, their revolutionary plot failed.

According to Allen's diary, December 4, 1884 was the most eventful night in the history of Protestantism in Korea. Yong-Ik Min, the nephew of Queen Min, was lying at the point of death with arteries severed and seven sword cuts to his head and body.<sup>227</sup> Allen was called to treat his injury and succeeded in bringing the prince back to health. It took three months of constant care, attended with much anxiety and peril. The reward was favorable. Dr. Allen gained the confidence of the royal family and had opportunities to evangelize many upper-class intellectuals.<sup>228</sup> A grateful King Kojong appointed Allen as his personal physician and allowed him to open the first Western style hospital in Seoul on April 10, 1885.<sup>229</sup> The Korean government "in co-operation with a benevolent society in America" sponsored this hospital.<sup>230</sup> It was the first official approval by the Korean government of missionary work in Korea. The opening of the first Western style hospital in co-operation with the American missionary Dr. Allen had some interesting features.

They are, as George Paik states,

In promoting...the declared American policy of fostering the complete independence of Korea. In granting the request the Korean government made ready recognition of the disinterested friendship of the United States. The missionary policy of Dr. Allen was to win the favor of the government and the confidence of the people; only gradually and cautiously did he reveal his identity and ultimate purpose. He was, at the beginning, known as the physician of the America Legation...the king soon knew that Allen was a missionary...To Dr. Allen the honor is due of inaugurating resident Protestant mission work in Korea.<sup>231</sup>

Five days before the new hospital opened in Seoul, the first ordained Protestant missionaries from the U.S.A., landed at Inchon. It was April 5, 1885, that the Reverend Horace Grant Underwood, a Presbyterian, and the Reverend Henry G. Appenzeller, a Methodist, arrived together in Korea. Horace Underwood, a graduate of New Brunswick Theological Seminary, began his missionary career as the teacher of chemistry and physics in the government medical school.<sup>232</sup> He engaged in educational work until he was permitted to freely preach the Gospel of God. In 1886, Underwood opened a boarding

school for boys which was originally an orphanage. George W. Gilmore gives the following account of the institution:

The needs of some boys with whom Mr. Underwood had come into contact suggested to him the establishing of an orphanage, and he mentioned this to some Koreans of high rank, through whom knowledge of the project came to the king, and the latter gave it his sanction. The Board of Missions at home approved of the suggestion, and the orphanage became a fact.<sup>233</sup>

The institution was entirely supported by the Presbyterian Mission Board of the U.S.A.

Although this was at the start an orphanage, the founder entertained hopes for a “Christian College and a “Theological Seminary.”<sup>234</sup> Thus, later it became Chosun Christian College and today Yonsei University, which boasts a Faculty of Divinity.<sup>235</sup>

Henry Appenzeller,<sup>236</sup> a graduate of Drew Theological Seminary, sought to evangelize Korea through educational and social work. As an experienced schoolteacher, Appenzeller was allowed to open Paichai Academy for youth education in 1886. King Kojong bestowed the name Paichai (Hall for Fostering Talented Men or Hall for Rearing Useful Men) and encouraged Koreans to attend. Appenzeller provided a basic liberal arts curriculum for Korean boys and men. This included science, mathematics, geography, Western literature, political science, cultural anthropology, astronomy, and biology.<sup>237</sup> In the summer of 1887, he baptized two Korean students at Paichai Academy. A few months later he baptized a Korean woman. By the fall of 1888, the Methodist mission was prepared to ordain two Koreans as the first local preachers in Korea.

In 1894, Paichai not only became the centre for the progressive movement, but also produced many distinguished patriots: Chi-Ho Yun and Syngman Rhee, who were brought up in Confucian families. The two became the most prominent representatives of the Korean Christian patriots.<sup>238</sup> They worked closely with Appenzeller for the education of Korean children and women, as well as for the care of suffering and oppressed people.<sup>239</sup> During the Japanese occupation of Korea (1910-1945), they were prompted by the social and political situation and took an active leadership role in national and independent

movements.<sup>240</sup> In 1896, they established the “Independence Association” and published the “Independence Newspaper.”

In particular, it was during the March First Independence Movement of 1919 that Korean Christians began to take an anti-Japanese stance. At that time the number of Protestant believers stood at 300,000. Protestant Christians played a leading role in the realization of a national consciousness for independence from Japanese colonialism. According to Kyong-Jae Kim, “the March First Movement was a harmonious and unified movement, incorporating the Christian’s sense of nonviolence and love (and liberty, equality, and independence) with the Confucian tradition of gentlemanship (harmony and ethics).”<sup>241</sup> The early Korean Protestant Church produced many Christian leaders whose thoughts and acts were based upon indigenous and traditional Confucian concepts, such as that of gentlemanly conduct.

We must note that, when Catholicism entered Korea, social criticism was confined more to the intelligentsia. The government persecuted Christians, so the Catholic Church emphasized survival, which consequently deprived the Church of any significant involvement in society and caused it to turn into an inward-looking sect.<sup>242</sup> Protestantism, however, arrived at a time when the structure and values of traditional society were being widely criticized, and at a time when the central government’s ability to function was greatly impaired. For this reason, Protestant missionaries encouraged the Korean people to participate socially and politically. This was reinforced by the presence of many Korean Christians among the nationalists and patriots who saw that the Christian faith and missionaries’ allies supported their struggle for human dignity, justice and independence.<sup>243</sup>

Therefore, compared to the introduction of Catholicism, which “was accepted by the nobility belonging to the so-called Nam-in (i. e., Sirhak scholars) faction,”<sup>244</sup> the propagation of Protestantism was primarily oriented to the lower strata of the social classes. The early Protestant missionaries in Korea propagated the Gospel of God for the common

people, or lower classes. For them, liberation of the common people from all kinds of oppression such as personal sin, a hierarchical social structure, economic exploitation, political oppression, and gender discrimination, was an important issue.<sup>245</sup> As Chai-Yong Choo says, “Christianity was a religion of hope and power for the oppressed and suffering people, who were the focus of attention and the subject of Korean Christianity from the beginning of foreign missionary work.”<sup>246</sup> The Scriptures and missionary writings were not in the Chinese characters of the higher classes, but in *Hangul*, the Korean alphabet, which can be easily read and understood and of which Koreans are proud.<sup>247</sup>

Protestantism, indeed, spearheaded Korea’s enlightenment movements by influencing education and the family and class structures of the Korean people. Protestant missionary groups established mission schools for advanced education, “mostly for women and common people that produced prominent social leadership in many fields in modern Korea.”<sup>248</sup> This earned the Protestant Church the esteem of the Korean people. The influence of Protestantism on women’s education and the recognition of their equality with men in Jesus Christ had a remarkable impact on Korean society.<sup>249</sup> Protestantism brought about a change of traditional sexual morality by promoting equality between husband and wife, male and female, the learned and the ignorant, young and old, the ruler and the ruled, from the beginning of its missionary activities, by representing all of them as having been created in the image of God.<sup>250</sup>

Women's contributions to Korean society, as well as to the Christian community, will increase as the society continues to develop. It is true that the past and present role of Korean Christian women has expanded remarkably, because increasingly more women are contributing to the growth of the Christian community in Korea through their participation in church activities.<sup>251</sup> For instance, mission activity was and is still a primary concern of Korean Protestant women. Owing to the Protestant missionaries' emphasis on education for women, there were 2450 women evangelists, counsellors and teachers during the first period of the Korean Protestant Church in Korea. According to Youn-Ok Lee, Korean

Christian women were not only co-workers and partners in the mission of Christ, but also contributed to world evangelization.<sup>252</sup>

It must be mentioned that Henry G. Appenzeller helped Mary F. Scranton of the Women's Foreign Missionary Society establish Ewha Girls' School, which today has become Ewha Woman's University. This school was founded in 1886 and its educational purpose was "to develop Korean women in such ways as to make them model housewives under the conditions in which they must pass their lives and to make them missionaries of the Cross among their relatives and associates."<sup>253</sup> George Paik quotes the same purpose from Mary Scranton: "We take pleasure in making Koreans better Koreans only. We want Korea to be proud of Korean things, and more, that it is a perfect Korea through Christ and his teachings."<sup>254</sup>

Scranton also opened the Methodist Mission Hospital on June 15 of 1886. This was a hospital devoted exclusively to the treatment of women and children. She asked the Women's Foreign Missionary Society to send a woman doctor. In October 1887, Miss Meta Howard, M. D., arrived in Korea. Miss Rosetta Sherwood, M D., came to Korea in the following year and in 1890, the Methodists added Mr. William McGill, M. D., to their medical work.<sup>255</sup> Methodist medical work was started among the poorest class and carried on for the neediest, but its primary task was to do evangelistic work.<sup>256</sup> Mary Scranton states that "Some know we do our work for Christ's sake, and rejoice in it with us. Some suppose we do it for some reason connected with our religious belief. And the remainder wonder why we do them these kindly acts."<sup>257</sup> In fact, the disinterested effects of medical work opened the way for preachers, and won the confidence of the Korean people.

It was not easy for the Protestant missionaries to organize a formal worshipping Christian community in the face of the Korean government's prohibitive laws against the Western Christian religion. For this reason, evangelistic activities were quietly carried on through hospitals, schools and private conversations. However, the truth is that the government has winked at the prosecution of the missionaries' labour.<sup>258</sup> According to

Everett N. Hunt, Jr., King Kojong was appreciated by early Protestant missionaries' works of medicine and education, so he encouraged the Korean people to accept the Christian missionaries along with their Christ-centred message.<sup>259</sup> Horace Underwood tells us the story of the early beginning of the evangelistic work as follows:

As soon as we had secured a little knowledge of the language, we regularly went out into the lanes and byways, and, sitting down under some tree, near a frequent highway, or beside some medical spring, to which the people were in the habit of flocking, we would take out a book and start reading, and when several gathered round us to ask questions we would attempt to explain to them the book, its truth, and what it meant; but, of course, in all this, it was necessary to find some common ground on which we both stood, and lead them gradually, from what was, to them, the known, to the unknown. Later, this street work developed further, and gatherings were held on large streets, or in villages, and in certain sections, street chapels were opened.<sup>260</sup>

Presbyterian and Methodist missionaries gathered together for worship beginning in June, 1885. The first Korean Protestant convert Sang-Yoon Suh, who was baptized by the Reverend John Ross, a Scottish missionary in Manchuria, visited Underwood and asked him to baptize his converts in Sorai. In the fall of 1886, Underwood went to Sorai and baptized seven Koreans. This tiny Christian community, the first in the peninsula, gave a distinctive pattern to the rapid growth of the Protestant church that followed. The official report of the Presbyterian Mission Board for 1888 speaks of the rise of the church in Korea as a "mysteriously sudden growth."<sup>261</sup> Horace Underwood explains the growth in the following statements:

Throughout the whole of the northern province it seemed evident that the wide seed-sowing that had been carried on from China, and the books that had been circulated, had had their effect, and opportunities for effective work seemed more numerous in that direction than elsewhere. While, therefore, natives were employed to distribute and sell books in other parts of the land, the efforts of the missionaries were merely directed thither, and their trips were almost entirely toward the north. A most promising work was opening up at Uiju, and at one time there were gathered at this city from the surrounding villages and countries men to the number of over one hundred who asked to be received into full membership.<sup>262</sup>

The missionary work, Samuel Moffett states, was "started by the Korean Christians themselves. It was self-supporting from the beginning...it called the missions to a policy of rural itineration that became foundational in the rise of the Korean church."<sup>263</sup>

After the establishment of hospitals and schools, the church was logically the next activity to be begun. John Ross visited Korea in September 1887 and met Underwood to organize the city's first Presbyterian church, now the Saimoonan Church in Seoul. A few weeks later, Appenzeller held the first Methodist public service for Koreans in the Bethel Chapel, which is today known as the Great Chungdong Methodist Church.

The Reverend Samuel A. Moffett, a Presbyterian missionary from U.S.A., moved into Pyongyang in 1893. There he baptized seven men and laid the foundation of the largest Presbyterian mission station in Korea.<sup>264</sup> Moffett established the first theological institute, the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, in Pyongyang in 1901. By 1907, the enrollment had grown to seventy-five. In 1919 the full quota of five classes was taught for the first time, and the enrollment reached 138. The first objective of a theological seminary was to produce native Korean Christian leaders.

While major missions were entering Korea, some lesser societies and independent missionaries were also beginning to appear. As early as 1885, Anglicans of the Church Missionary Society in China sent two independent Chinese evangelists to work in Pusan, but there were no converts. In 1890, the Church of England appointed the Reverend C. J. Corfe as the first missionary bishop of Korea. After a few years of Korean studies, he was able to hold the first Korean service from the Book of Common Prayer on Christmas Eve, 1896.

In October 1889, the Presbyterian Church of Victoria, Australia, opened a mission in Korea. The Toronto University Young Men's Christian Association Mission sent James S. Gale as its representative to Korea. Gale landed in Korea on December 15, 1888 and opened his missionary work in Pusan in 1889. He was appointed a missionary of the American Presbyterian Board in 1891. By settling down in Seoul in 1898, Gale served as a member of the Committee of Bible Translators and published his own translation of the Bible.<sup>265</sup> He wrote several books in English on Korean history, literature, and the life of the people. He also compiled a Korean-English Dictionary, which is not only a

monumental work marked by painstaking and careful scholarship, but also covers the entire ground of the Korean side of the language.<sup>266</sup> Malcolm C. Fenwick was the first Independent Baptist missionary from Canada.<sup>267</sup> He came to Korea toward the end of 1889. His major contribution was the organization of the “Corean Itinerant Mission” that aimed to create an independent Baptist Church by converted native Koreans themselves.

The first Canadian Presbyterian missionary was William J. Mackenzie (1861-1895) who was educated at Dalhousie College and at the Presbyterian College, Halifax, from which he received his theological degree in 1891. As soon as Mackenzie reached Korea in the middle of December 1894, he decided to live with Korean Christians at the village of Sorai. There he adopted the Korean life style and learned the language. He won the confidence of the people and was very highly respected. Like most American missionaries, he showed his strong interest in education by founding the elementary school. By 1908, there were four elementary schools and three middle schools, which were approved by the Canadian Presbyterian Mission Board.<sup>268</sup> From the beginning, Mackenzie encouraged the people of the town to organize an educational committee and urged them to support the budget for education. Native support and assistance were important for the maintenance of the schools. Mackenzie adopted the principle of self-support as a mission policy in Korea. He, as George Paik says, “was apparently the first to inaugurate a self-supporting program in church building, and the first church built by Koreans was erected in this village under his direction.”<sup>269</sup> Unfortunately, he died of a fever in June 1895. According to Elizabeth A. McCully’s monograph entitled *A Corn of Wheat* (1904), Mackenzie’s pastoral ministry at Sorai was entirely “for the sake of Korea.”<sup>270</sup> In fact, he became instrumental in bringing the Canadian Presbyterian mission to Korea. Robert G. Grierson was one of the pioneer missionaries of the Canadian Presbyterian Church who was commissioned and arrived at Seoul in September 1898. Therefore, the formal Canadian Presbyterian mission began in Korea in 1898.<sup>271</sup>

We must note that the ecumenical nature of Protestant beginnings in Korea was evident. As Samuel Moffett states, “the four different Presbyterian bodies (United Presbyterian, Presbyterian in the U.S.A., Australian Presbyterian, and The Presbyterian Church in Canada) agreed to join in forming one Presbyterian Church in Korea.”<sup>272</sup> For this purpose, Presbyterian missionaries organized the Presbyterian Council in 1889. Likewise, the two Methodists (Northern and Southern) agreed to unite in educational and literary work. The result of this pioneer ecumenical spirit was the foundation of Union Christian College (Soongsil University) in Pyongyang, which aimed to train leaders for the church and its ministry. Underwood states that:

The founders and sponsors of the college have frequently described its aim as similar to those of certain of the small denominational college of the middle west (U. S.). One article definitely mentions a certain college as the ideal on which the institution was modeled. Its sphere was to be that of a preparatory school for the theological seminary and the natural hope was that all or almost all the students would be candidates for the ministry.<sup>273</sup>

In 1910, the two Methodist missions united in opening Union Theological Seminary in Seoul, with five departments: Old Testament, New Testament, Systematic Theology, Church History, and Homiletics and Practical Theology.<sup>274</sup> There were 121 graduates by 1924. The registered enrollment for 1924-25 was 165. The missionaries’ aim for this theological education was to produce native Korean Methodist pastors and create native Methodist churches in Korea. Today it has become the Methodist Theological Seminary in Seoul.

A wider union brought Anglican, Methodist, and Presbyterian physicians into Severance Union Medical College and Hospital in Seoul, which was opened in 1912. The aim of the college was ultimately for mission work. Underwood states that:

Only by the thorough training of native workers, whether doctors, nurses, preachers or teachers, can the missionary enterprise hope to bring its task to an end and turn the further maintenance of the work over to the men and women thus trained, and in the effort to achieve this aim medical education in Korea has progressed further along the road than have other branches seeking the same end.<sup>275</sup>

The circulation of Christian books and pamphlets was one of the most effective missionary methods. The early Protestant missionaries realized the need for the systematic publication and dissemination of literature. In order to obtain financial aid for the publication of tracts, they made contact with the Toronto Tract Society, the American Tract Society, and the Religious Tract Society of London.<sup>276</sup> In 1889, the missionaries organized the Korean Religious Tract Society, now the Christian Literature Society. The origin of the society, as George Paik says, "has been attributed to three missionaries: to Dr. Heron, the 'idea', to Dr. Underwood, the securing of financial aid from the tract societies in England and America, and to Mr. Ohlinger, the 'organization'."<sup>277</sup> Its object was the publication and circulation of a wide range of interdenominational literature throughout the kingdom of Korea. The society completed the Korean translation of the whole New Testament and published a Union Hymn Book.

The high point of the tide to union was a Summer Bible Conference during the year 1905-1906. Its primary emphasis was "on the deep truths of the Bible that brings Christians close to Christ and to each other, the Word of God."<sup>278</sup> During this conference, Methodists and Presbyterians agreed to focus their missionary work on evangelism and theological education. Eventually six major mission bodies in Korea, such as Northern and Southern Presbyterian, Northern and Southern Methodist, Australian and Canadian Presbyterian, organized a General Council of Evangelical Missions in Korea that aimed at co-operation in Christian work and the establishment of one Evangelical Church in Korea.<sup>279</sup> With regard to the spirit of such an ecumenical movement, Dr. W. D. Reynolds, the Southern Presbyterian pioneer, has said, "the time is ripe for the establishment of one Korean National Church, to be called the Church of Christ in Korea."<sup>280</sup>

From 1903 to 1907, there was a spiritual revival in Korea, which began with a week of prayer and Bible study for missionaries in Wonsan. R. A. Hardie, a Methodist physician from Canada, was a principal leader who spread the great revival. Its climax reached Pyongyang in 1907. According to Moffett, the revival movement greatly

contributed to the growth of Protestantism. Within these five years, the membership of the churches in Korea was increased fourfold.<sup>281</sup>

This movement subsequently brought into it “The Million Movement” which was launched in 1909. It was a wide evangelistic movement led by the General Council of Evangelical Missions in Korea. Both Bible study and prayer were emphasized with a watchword of “Two Hundred Thousand Souls for Christ.”<sup>282</sup> It was a nation-wide campaign for the evangelization of Korea. James S. Gale notes that “the great movement calls for special effort in Korea...now is the moment, and it is here: the wide open door, the humbled people, the waiting heart...the missionaries are convinced that NOW is the hour of crisis for Korea.”<sup>283</sup>

The Million Movement was the first national undertaking of the Korean people in religious propagation. As George Paik says, “Young and old, men and women, students, laity, and all Christian workers made strenuous efforts to make the watchword a reality.”<sup>284</sup> In order to show the magnitude of the movement, the Korean Christians adopted the self-principle. Since there were not many evangelists, they pledged their time to preaching and the distribution of Christian literature, especially portions of the Gospels. According to *The Korea Mission Field*,

Poor and hard-working Koreans were inspired to give at least 100,000 days of work in all, for 76,000 days of earnest personal work were done last winter, and this fall several hundreds of native workers gave a whole month to special service, going from house to house as well as dealing with men personally in great meetings. Many millions of tracts and 700,000 gospels of Mark were purchased by native Christians and given to unbelievers with prayer and earnest persuasion; nearly every home in Korea has been visited and daily prayer has been offered for this by thousands of Koreans.<sup>285</sup>

As Allen Clark states, “the policy of the Mission has been to establish Korean churches that would be self-supporting, self-governing, and self-propagating. To this end, great emphasis has been laid, from the beginning, on house-to-house evangelism.”<sup>286</sup> Clark goes on to say “the result of the Million Movement was a spirit of brotherhood with singleness of purpose within the Church and among the denominations.”<sup>287</sup> Korean Christians labored toward their common goal, “Two Hundred Thousand Souls for Christ.” Although the

million were not gathered at the end of this campaign, a great many conversions were made. According to W. M. Baird of Pyongyang Mission Board, a great multitude had been persuaded to enter the churches and expressed a desire to believe.<sup>288</sup>

The Million Movement increased the evangelistic zeal of Korean Christians and eventually established a community-based Church in Korea.<sup>289</sup> It has been asserted that the traditional patriarchal family system was partially responsible in making the Million Movement successful.

As Roy Shearer argued in his work *Wildfire: Church Growth in Korea* (1966), “the Million Movement flowed along the web of family relationships.”<sup>290</sup> According to Martha Huntley’s story from her book *Caring, Growing, and Changing: A History of the Protestant Mission in Korea*,

When a person was delivered from evil spirits by Christian exorcism, his whole family was likely to embrace the new religion, impressed by its power and effectiveness. Thus, the Christian faith most often spread through family channels, for the family was the basic and strongest unit of Korean Confucian society. In other words, when a multi-individual decision occurs so that a whole social unit changes with only slight dislocation, it is called a “people movement.”<sup>291</sup>

From this perspective, a distinctive feature of Korean Christianity from the beginning of early Protestant missionary work can be also called “the familial community-based church,” which contributed to the rapid growth of Christianity.

On the other hand, the Million Movement was made possible due to the self-principle, especially the effective organization for self-government. The first establishment of the Korean Presbyterian Church in 1907 was independent and self-governing. In 1908, Southern and Northern Methodists ordained two Korean Protestants and authorized them to baptize and perform marriages for their native Koreans. Self-government was for witness, and this became a significant part of the forward flow of the Korean Church. For instance, the testimony of the Korean converts was far more effective as an evangelistic agency than the preaching of the missionaries. Moffett quotes M. C. Fenwick’s experience,

Testifying in tears to the love of God in Christ...people simply laughed at me and said that was all well enough for me, a Westerner, but they were Koreans...One

day...I saw how his testimony gripped the people as mine had never done...these Korean sinners listened that day to Mr. Kim because he, too was a Korean.<sup>292</sup>

The strength of the Korean Church was in its self-propagating evangelism. Every Christian became an evangelist. It was also self-governing and self-supporting; especially self-reliant in financial matters. By 1908, out of 188 Presbyterian churches in Korea, 186 were entirely self-supporting. Korean Christians themselves contributed more to the upbuilding of their church than they were receiving in missionary gifts from abroad.

It was natural for Korean Christians to be independent financially. This is because they had a personal community (*kye*) which was a sort of social cooperative system for raising funds as well as helping one another. *Kye* maintained community solidarity. It was traditionally sustained in a Korean Confucian society. In the broader context of Christianity, it is appropriate to express the Confucian conception of “*kye*” in light of the Christian doctrine of the Covenant, which is manifested in God’s relation to the people of Israel. As the divine commandments represented both a vertical relationship between God and the people of Israel and a horizontal relationship among people, the *kye*-oriented Korean Confucian community helped early Protestant church leaders formulate their own leadership according to the bonds of love, trust, and familiarity with the fellow church members under his or her care.<sup>293</sup> For this reason, the Korean Christian community has been characterized as the community of covenant, mutual support and stimulation for the benefits of others.<sup>294</sup>

To take an another example, the most effective method for evangelism was personal contacts. Every Korean home has a “Sarang”<sup>295</sup> where men gather together to enjoy social contacts with their neighbors. The men lived in the “Sarang,” while the women resided in the “Anbang,” or inner-apartment. The pioneer missionaries visited these “Sarang” and cordially met a father of one’s family. They propagated the Gospel of God and helped him convert to the Christian faith. As already indicated, if the father of the family converted to Christianity, all of his family members were obliged to follow their father’s new religious belief.

Accordingly, the missionaries established a family-based congregation. This is because they recognized the unique nature of the community-based Korean Confucian society, which is bound together by a system of patriarchal authority. As James S. Gale has stated, “Chief among the many fathers, is the father of family. Then there is the father of the state, the king, and as the father of the family has power absolute within the limits of his own home, so in state affairs the king is absolute.”<sup>296</sup> The Presbyterian and the Methodist missionaries adopted the patriarchal ideas of the Koreans. They authorized the father of the family as a leader, with self-government of the individual congregation. The missionaries just taught Christian doctrines and preached the Gospel to the family without any interference. As James S. Gale states,

From the earliest years of the mission, the Koreans have been taught that the final and complete evangelization of their people rests with them, and that the purpose of the foreign missionary is to inaugurate the work and then cooperate with Korean Christians in extending it. The Korean Christians have accepted this position and the Korean type is that of a man who places all his possessions in the hands of the Lord for his work. A happy illustration of this occurred in our work in the north district. Dr. W. Arthur Noble led to Christ a sturdy specimen of the northern Korean. He was the first convert in his village, and his house was the first meeting-place. After awhile the village church grew too large for its quarters and put up a chapel of its own...The Korean is a preacher of the gospel by a kind of spiritual instinct...he provides for his church schools without a cent from the homelands...opportunity is given at meetings for Christians to pledge several weeks during a single year. Then campaigns are mapped out, and in some cases whole regions have been systematically evangelized.<sup>297</sup>

Through the self-government principle, “hand-to-hand and house-to-house evangelism was carried on, even while public preaching was not allowed.”<sup>298</sup>

The principles of self such as self-propagation, self-government, and self-support were originally devised by the Reverend John Nevius, an experienced and scholarly missionary of the Presbyterian Mission in Shan-tung Province in northeastern China. That is why these principles were often called “the Nevius Methods.” Early Protestant missionaries particularly considered them as an ideal plan for the self-government of a native Korean church. They effectively utilized its positive elements in their evangelistic work in Korea.

It was the year 1890 when John Nevius spent two weeks in Seoul, Korea, with seven young Presbyterian missionaries.<sup>299</sup> Members of the group reported a brief explanation of the missionary policies manifested in the Nevius Method. The central principles of this method may be summarized as follows:

- (1) Personal evangelism and wide itineration by the missionaries.
- (2) The Bible is central in every part of the work.
- (3) Self-propagation. Every believer is a teacher of someone and a learner from someone else better fitted. Every individual and group seeks to extend the work.
- (4) Self-government. Every group is under its chosen unpaid leaders; circuits under their own paid helpers, who will later yield to pastors.
- (5) Self-support, with all chapels provided by the believers; each group, as soon as founded, beginning to pay toward the circuit helper's salary.
- (6) Systematic Bible study for every believer under his group leader and circuit helper.
- (7) Strict discipline enforced by Biblical penalties.
- (8) Cooperation and union with other bodies, or at least territorial division.
- (9) Non-interference in lawsuits or any such matters.
- (10) General helpfulness, where possible, in the economic life of the people.<sup>300</sup>

Although early Protestant missionaries used medicine and education as opening wedges, they understood their primary task as being to preach the Word of God and to plant a Christian church. In 1891, just a year after the Reverend John Nevius' visit to Korea, the Board of the Korea Mission led by the early Presbyterian missionaries, Underwood, Moffett, Avison and Baird, etc., thus established "The Presbyterian Northern Mission Rules and By-laws" that were directly influenced by Nevius' unique methods.<sup>301</sup> The leading members of the Board enthusiastically adopted the above mentioned ten statements in 1893 as the most appropriate principles of missionary policy and practice for the continued growth and strength of the Christian Church in Korea. According to George Paik, they ultimately adopted "the Nevius Methods" for the "indigenization" of the Korean church.<sup>302</sup>

Horace G. Underwood in his book entitled *The Call of Korea* (1906) says that:

Very early in the history of the work, almost at its beginning, God, in His Providence, led us to adopt methods that have been said by some to have been unique, but in reality are simply those that have been adopted by numbers of missionaries in different parts of the world. The only unique feature has been the almost unanimity with which these have been followed by the whole missionary body in this land.<sup>303</sup>

It is interesting to note that Underwood studied Nevius' mission policy before he arrived in Korea. As Mrs. L. H. Underwood states,

Several of our experiences at Weju were very bitter and disappointing to us, for the insincerity of men whom we trusted was made clear, and yet at the same time they were instructive for they taught us to be very slow and cautious in investing men with responsibility, and to be very guarded both in receiving converts and in using money, and helped to strengthen us in those ideas of rigid self-support which Mr. Underwood had already, from the study of Dr. Nevius' book, begun to consider deeply and to some extent to follow.<sup>304</sup>

She summarizes the policy of the mission, which Mr. Underwood already practiced at Weju as follows:

- (1) To let each man "abide in the calling wherein he was found," teaching that each was to be an individual worker for Christ, and to live Christ in his own neighborhood, supporting himself by his trade.
- (2) To develop Church methods and machinery (government and property) only so far as the native Church was able to take care of and manage the same.
- (3) As far as the Church itself was able to provide the man and means, to set aside those who seemed the best qualified, to do evangelistic work among their neighbor.
- (4) To let the natives provide their own church buildings, which to be native in architecture, and of such style as the local church could afford to put up.<sup>305</sup>

Later on, the Nevius Methods were modified into four central points: the self-principle; biblical emphasis; education; and medical work, which were "aimed at the creation of native churches" in the context of a particular socio-religious-cultural circumstance of Korea.<sup>306</sup> The principle of self, first of all, includes self-government, self-support, and self-evangelism. It holds that Korean Christians should manage their own churches without the interference of foreign missionaries. This is not to say that the church and its members are completely independent from the Mission Council, but rather its works and any other related matters of the church are to be conducted under native Korean leadership. Even the preaching of the Gospel was to be undertaken by Korean Christians, for it was observed that "when the Korean Christians preached the Gospel of God, the people were captured by the message more effectively and respectfully."<sup>307</sup> As a result of these self-principles, the Korean people were stimulated toward an independent consciousness, and thus prepared to accept responsibility for the evangelization of their own people. In this way, as George Paik states, the development of the Protestant Church

in Korea from the outset depended primarily upon the efforts of indigenous Korean Christians.<sup>308</sup>

Secondly, while Nevius' principles emphasized the gathering and upbuilding of the Christian community through Bible study, regular prayer meetings, Christian education, and social work, the authority of Jesus Christ, the Living Word of God, remained the foundation of all missionary works in Korea.<sup>309</sup> In fact, this foundation helped Korean Christians and Churches cultivate a very conservative Christian life as well as a strong belief in the Bible as the Word of God. Samuel H. Moffett affirms that the Gospel of God revealed in Jesus Christ was central in Korean Christian communities.<sup>310</sup> It fundamentally challenged them to devote more effort to educational work<sup>311</sup>; which significantly contributed to the church's rapid growth and to systematic Christian education, not only by maintaining elementary schools in the countryside, but also by translating and publishing the Bible and Christian Books in *Hangul* for the working classes.

The missionary policy from the first was to make every Korean Christian a witnessing Christian, learning to take the Gospel of God to others without salary or change of occupation. Early Protestant missionaries realized that Korean people were zealous to learn. According to H. H. Underwood's work entitled *Modern Education in Korea* (1926), "Confucian scholars' clubs and shrines were to be found in almost every town or district in the country and their members were the scholastic arbiters of the region as those of the central society were for the country."<sup>312</sup> From the beginning of the twentieth century, many old district temples and Confucian centres have been remodeled for the modern schoolhouses or church buildings.

By utilizing the Korean people's educational zeal, missionaries encouraged every believer not only to learn from those older in the faith, but also to teach those younger in the faith. The responsibility of teaching others made it necessary for the Christians themselves to meet for Bible study and instruction. As Frederick Woodberry observes, it was the principle of self-propagation that not only became an important step for the vital

growth of Christianity in Korea, but also made the continuous widespread Bible study possible on a practical scale.<sup>313</sup> Woodberry states four types of Bible training developed to fit the people for the work of the church:

- (1) Local Bible study classes. These are held in the local churches at various times throughout the year and ordinarily continue for only a week or even less.
- (2) General Bible study classes. These are centrally located in certain districts. They are usually conducted in the winter when there is the most leisure time, are open for all that are willing to come, and last from a week to ten days.
- (3) Leaders' Bible classes. These are held for from two or three weeks up to six weeks, during the summer months, and are for church officers only.
- (4) Theological Seminary. This is the crowning step and logical outgrowth of the others, and is vitally necessary if the church is to become self-contained, with its own native ministry, and with its own government.<sup>314</sup>

Woodberry further notes that the Theological Seminaries are the final step of formal training in the Bible. The Presbyterian Theological Seminary was the first seminary opened by the Presbyterian Mission at Pyongyang in 1901 with an enrollment of two. It grew quickly in its early years. Later it became the largest theological seminary in Korea.

The strength of the systematic Bible class system was evident in the Sunday Schools, where enrollment was higher than the total number of enrolled adherents of all the churches.<sup>315</sup> There were classes for all ages. Such a large number in Sunday School required many teachers, all of whom were compelled to study the Bible more carefully.<sup>316</sup>

Medical work was strongly emphasized. It was an effective way of preaching the Gospel to the sick and the poor.<sup>317</sup> In this way, Nevius' Methods were practically concerned with social work as an essential part of the missionary task. Furthermore, Western missionaries encouraged Korean Christians to foster vitality in the Christian faith as well as solidarity within the community-based church.<sup>318</sup> They insisted on a rigid and high moral code, strict Sabbath observance, and respect and obedience to the Word of God as revealed in His Son Jesus Christ. The determining principle of Nevius' Methods was the Bible, which provided the direction for mission policy and practice in Korea.<sup>319</sup>

As Samuel H. Moffett has observed, the Korean Church generally stresses "church-wide Christian education in Bible classes for the entire church membership, and sturdy self-reliance for the young church—self-government, self-propagation and self-

support.”<sup>320</sup> The Nevius Methods ultimately prepared the Korean Christian Church to be a gathering, upbuilding, and sending Christian community learning God’s Word, praying, worshiping, and serving others. Frederick Woodberry affirms that “Korea has the largest Bible conferences, the largest and most regular prayer meetings, the most actively evangelistic church in the world today.”<sup>321</sup> He goes on to explain the secret of this phenomenon by quoting Charles A. Clark’s observation, “(1) not by might, nor power, but by my Spirit; (2) the peculiar system of methods adopted, and applied conscientiously.”<sup>322</sup> Significantly, the Korean Church “sent its first missionary in 1907 and is now sending many missionaries” for world evangelization.<sup>323</sup> Marlin Nelson notes that “there are 47 mission organizations sending 323 missionaries to 37 different countries. The majority of these, 249 missionaries, are sent by 8 mission societies, and 31 mission societies are supporting and promoting activities in various ways.”<sup>324</sup>

In sum, a number of characteristics of early evangelistic missionaries’ philosophy and action contributed not only to the rapid growth of Korean Christianity, but also later to the reception of Barth’s theology in Korea. First, the Bible was the only source of God’s revelation and the most unique and most important factor in the development of the Korean church. That is to say that the Gospel of God was the source of the cultural and religious change of the Korean people from the beginning of the Protestant mission in Korea. Early Protestant missionaries were influenced by the Nevius Methods which are characterized as Bible-centredness, the self-principle and are action-oriented.<sup>325</sup> Their initial focus was upon evangelism in which the Word of God revealed in Jesus Christ through the saving work of the Holy Spirit, was recognized as the fullness of truth and grace.

As we shall see, such a point is closely linked to Karl Barth’s theology, which is radically Christocentric. Therefore, the contemporary Korean Protestant Church proved to be open later to the impact of Barth’s theology of Jesus Christ as “the living Word of God, Scripture as the written Word of God, and the proclaimed Word of God.”<sup>326</sup> It is coincidental that both Barth and Nevius’ theological rootedness is in Calvinism. The early

Presbyterian missionaries enthusiastically adopted Nevius' mission plan and eventually contributed to the rapid growth of the Presbyterian Church in Korea. It has thus been natural for the Korean Protestant Church, mainly the Presbyterian Church, to adopt Barth's theology as its guiding principle in the growth of its church and theological education since the 1950s. It is further to be noted that the Korean Methodist Church also adopted Barth's theology very eagerly.

Secondly, we can say that the Protestant missionary movement in Korea derived historically from American pietism. This was not only "a blend of evangelism and conservatism," but also concentrated on the salvation of the individual effected by the substitutionary atonement of Jesus Christ. Throughout the first period of the acceptance of Christianity, Korean people accepted the Christ-centred message.<sup>327</sup> As William W. Sweet definitely notes, American Protestantism was "practically active in taking the biblical teachings into action."<sup>328</sup> At this point, it has been asserted that the early Protestant Church in Korea was a theory and action-oriented religious community which has contributed to the enlightenment of the Korean people's way of life, their thinking and their society.<sup>329</sup> From the beginning of the Protestant mission in Korea, freedom of faith was advocated, so that every individual could exercise his or her free-will to seek the truth of the Word of God.<sup>330</sup>

Early Protestant missionaries forbade drinking and smoking. As Korean Confucians emphasized individual ethical discipline and a sense of justice, Protestant missionaries also taught people to be ethical.<sup>331</sup> The strong ethical code of Protestantism eventually appealed to intellectuals trained in Confucian morality.<sup>332</sup> In this respect, Martha Huntley argues that:

The Korean Protestant Church's legacy from Calvinist and Wesleyan missionaries, added to Confucian ethics and thought patterns, has had a stabilizing influence. The missionaries in shaping a unifying conservative theology and conformity of opinion regarding standards of Christian conduct helped to provide a strong framework for the structure of the Korean Church.<sup>333</sup>

As Samuel H. Moffett notes, “Christianity did not deny much that people had loved in the old beliefs. Like Confucianism, it taught righteousness and revered learning.”<sup>334</sup>

David Kwang-Sun Suh further argues that “Korean Christians are more Calvinist, more Puritan than the Calvinists. Much of this is due in actuality to Confucian ethics which exemplified rigidity, authoritarianism and a basically pure life.”<sup>335</sup> James S. Gale’s remark is convincing that:

The gentleness of the Korean people, their appreciation of high morals, notwithstanding the lack of the same in their own history, their exalting of principles of right, is a preparation for the gospel call. Outwardly, by habit, custom, and ceremonial form, they are equipped to understand the Bible.<sup>336</sup>

Gale furthermore states that:

Underneath this Confucian social structure with its Five Rules and Three Fundamentals great charges of dynamite are exploding. They have come about through the opening of the gates, the incoming of the missionary...this country’s ideals...are upon us, and a great smashing up of all the social system is taking place. Has the gospel anything to offer at such a time as this? When the old paternal system has given way and domestic life and government are at sea, it comes in tones of matchless simplicity and says: “Our Father, who art in heaven, thy kingdom come. In the Father’s house are many mansions, prepared for those that love him.” How about *in-eui-ye-chi-shin*? The character *in*, is made up of men and two, two men, showing that love always keeps in mind the other one; but chief of all altruistic teachers is the Word of God, and it comes with its message to take the place of the lost virtue, *in*. *Eui*, righteousness, is made up of sacrificial lamb, and first personal pronoun, I. I, underneath the sacrificial lamb, means righteousness. My oneness with Jesus not only takes the place of the character, but fills out its thought, and makes the studies of the past a prophetic voice pointing to the great revelation. Where is freedom to be found, freedom from past bondage, from present bondage, from the bondage of self, from custom, from fear, from superstition? The heart of the nation these days goes out in longings for freedom. “Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.” Korea’s ancient civilization appears to be a planned opening of the way for receiving the gospel at the present day.<sup>337</sup>

The dramatic successes of the cultural and social modernization of Korea were due to the powerfully operative role of Protestantism, which went hand in hand with the Korean people’s deep-rooted religious tradition of Confucianism.<sup>338</sup> The dominant influence of Confucianism on the lives of the Korean people throughout Korea’s entire history, especially throughout the five centuries of the Chosun Dynasty until the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, contributed to the reception of Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. It provided not only a strong setting for the structure of the community-based Korean

Church, but also numerical strength in the Korean Presbyterian Church in a comparatively short time.

Interestingly, Ill-Soo Kim, in his article entitled “Organizational Patterns of Korean-American Methodist Churches: denomination and personal community,” points out that Korean Presbyterian Churches outnumbered Korean Methodist Churches by more than five times (as of 1982, 5 million versus some 800,000), whereas, in the U.S., Methodists outnumbered Presbyterians by almost three times.<sup>339</sup> He says the reasons for this explosive growth of Korean Presbyterianism beyond all denominations in Korea, are as follows:

- (1) The “religious affinity” between Presbyterianism and Confucianism;
- (2) The traditional propensity toward “personal community” (e.g., *kye*) and social codes (e.g., five cardinal relationships);
- (3) The Nevius plan as an effective strategy that enabled Korean Presbyterians to incorporate their new faith into their traditional organizational pattern of self-governance.<sup>340</sup>

Most scholars agree that the largest denomination in Korea is the Presbyterian Church. The Methodist church in Korea could only grow as fast as the money for buildings and pastors’ salaries could be provided by foreign missionaries, while the adjacent Presbyterian Church, free of foreign control and funds but with plenty of volunteer ministers from dedicated Koreans, grew rapidly. That is to say, the fantastic growth of the Presbyterian Church in Korea took place through not only adapting the Nevius principles of “self-support, self-propagation, and self-governance” as its rules and by-laws of the Mission, but also utilizing the community-based Korean Confucianism.<sup>341</sup>

Spencer Palmer in his monograph *Korea and Christianity: The Problem of Identification with Tradition* (1967) points out that the Presbyterian and Methodist missionaries regarded Korea as the best mission field in the world. This was because they saw that Korea’s community-based Confucian society emphasized the gathering of the people as the primary concern for the upbuilding of its own community. As James S. Gale notes, “there is no individual in Korean society, it is one body corporate. If one member sins all suffer with him.”<sup>342</sup> Due to the community-based Korean society, as Palmer

claims, early Presbyterian and Methodist missionaries found it easy to propagate the Christian Gospel in Korea.<sup>343</sup>

In section B entitled “the Characteristics of Korean Confucianism,” we have already observed that the Korean Confucian community was zealous for gathering and upbuilding for the benefit of a whole community. This, as Hyosung Lee claims, has been united to a remarkable degree in the Korean Protestant Church’s “speech” and “action” ministries, such as “the dawn or early morning prayer meeting, Friday overnight prayer services, prayer mountain retreats, and cell group meetings for home Bible study.”<sup>344</sup> Such forms of ministries helped the Korean Churches to increase the number of their congregation, and to focus on the foreign mission through practicing their faith in Jesus Christ. As we shall see in the following chapter, the above mentioned Korean Protestant Church’s ministry forms are closely related to Karl Barth’s doctrine of ministry. These are namely, his 12 forms of the church’s missionary service, such as, six “speech” ministries—praise, preaching, instruction, evangelization, foreign missions, theology—and six “action” ministries—prayer, cure of souls, nurture of saints, the diaconate, prophetic action, and establishing fellowship.<sup>345</sup>

Martha Huntley consequently affirms that the Korean Protestant Church’s central concern for church growth was the zeal for worship, preaching, Sunday school for children and youth, foreign missions, prayer meetings, social service, nurture of pastoral and lay leadership, and fellowship.<sup>346</sup> As Huntley goes on to assert, “the Christian communities of Korea are best known for their zeal for evangelism and mission.”<sup>347</sup> In this respect, it can be argued that Korean Christianity is characterized as the gathering, the upbuilding, and the sending of the community in accordance with Barth’s definitive descriptions of the church as the gathering, the upbuilding and the sending of the Christian community.<sup>348</sup>

---

### End Notes for Chapter One

<sup>1</sup>Martha Huntley, *To Start a Work: the foundations of the Protestant mission in Korea, 1884-1919*, 407-408

<sup>2</sup>For the influence of Confucianism upon the growth of Christianity in Korea and their compatibility, see Jahyun Kim Haboush, "The Confucianization of Korean Society," in *The East Asian Region: Confucian Heritage & Its Modern Adaptation*, ed. Gilbert Rozman (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1991), 84-110; Martha Huntley, *Caring, Growing, Changing: A History of the Protestant Mission in Korea*, 4-12; and Michael Robinson, "Perceptions of Confucianism in Twentieth-Century Korea, in *The East Asia Region*, 204-225.

<sup>3</sup>See George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea 1832-1910* (Seoul: Yonsei University Press, 1970), 141-146.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Martha Huntley, *Caring, Growing, Changing*, 14-15 and Heup-Young Kim, *Wang Yang-Ming and Karl Barth*, 3-4. We will discuss much more of other positions in the following section D entitled "The Confucian-Christian Context in Korean Christianity."

<sup>5</sup>Sung-Bum Yun, "Christian Confucianism as an Attempt at a Korean Indigenous Theology," *Northeast Asia Journal of Theology* 24-25 (1980), 102.

<sup>6</sup>Allen Clark, *History of the Korean Church* (Seoul: Christian Literature Society of Korea, 1971), 25.

<sup>7</sup>Jahyun K. Haboush, "The Confucianization of Korean Society," 86.

<sup>8</sup>George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, 15.

<sup>9</sup>James H. Grayson, *Korea: A Religious History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 30-64; Allen Clark, *History of the Korean Church*, 127-129.

<sup>10</sup>George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, 15.

<sup>11</sup>Jahyun K. Haboush, "The Confucianization of Korean Society," 87.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.

<sup>13</sup>Korean Overseas Information Service, *A Handbook of Korea* (Seoul: Ministry of Culture & Information, 1979), 13.

<sup>14</sup>"Chi-Won Choi," *The Korea Magazine* I/1 (Jan, 1917), 13. The following books are the extant Chinese Nestorian documents: *Jesus Messiah Sutra*; *Discourse of the Lord of Universe's Alms Giving*; *The Inscription of the Nestorian Monument*; *The Nestorian Motwa Hymn of the Holy Trinity*; *The Sutra on Mysterious Rest and Joy*; *The Sutra on the Origin of Origin*; *The Tsung Ching*; and *the Nestorian Hymn of the Transfiguration*. The Patriarch Nestorius of Constantinople (428-451), as an extreme exponent of the Antiochene Christology, denied any real organic union between the man Jesus and the indwelling divine Logos (H. D. MacDonald, "Nestorius," *New Dictionary of Theology*, ed. J. I. Packer [Leicester, England: InterVarsity Press, 1988], 457). He was condemned for

---

heresy at the Council of Ephesus held in 431 A. D. His defence of his orthodoxy was accepted by several Eastern bishops who continued to acknowledge his primacy after the Council of Ephesus and united to form a separate Nestorian Church. The Nestorian Christians, characterized by a vigorous missionary zeal, carried the gospel to India, Arabia and China. The incipient period of the Nestorian mission in China was from 635 to 640 A. D. (Chang Sik Lee, "A Study of A Chinese Nestorian Sutra, 'Jesus Messiah', " *Northeast Asia Journal of Theology* 13 [Sept., 1974], 47). In China, the Nestorian missionaries attempted to incorporate their doctrines with many non-Christian elements such as Chinese Buddhism and Confucianism. The inscription on the Nestorian Monument erected in Chang An in 781 describes their accomplishment in China. See A. Mingana, *The Early Spread of Christianity in Asia and the Far East: A New Document* (Manchester: The University Press, 1952), 38-39. For the kinds and quantity of Chinese Nestorian documents, see C. Burkitt, *Early Christianity Outside the Roman Empire* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1899), 15-16 and P. Y. Saeki, *The Nestorian Documents and Relics in China* (Tokyo: Maruzen Co., 1951), 83-84. For a fuller discussion of Nestorianism, see J. F. Bethune-Baker, *An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine* (London: Methuen, 1903), 274-275; *idem*, *Nestorius and His Teaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1908), 82-100; A. B. Bruce, *The Humiliation of Christ in Its Physical, Ethical, and Official Aspects*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1892), 50-51; and J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (New York: Harper and Row, 1960), 311-312. For the most recent research on the teaching of Nestorius, see Friedrich Loofs, *Nestorius and His Place in the History of Christian Doctrine* (New York: Lenox Hill, 1975), 41, 60-61.

<sup>15</sup>George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, 24.

<sup>16</sup>Allen Clark, *History of the Korean Church*, 26.

<sup>17</sup>Sang-Hi Moon, "A Historical Survey of Korean Religion," *Korea Journal* 14/5 (1974), 19.

<sup>18</sup>George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, 24. For a historical development of Buddhism in Koryo, see Robert E. Buswell, Jr., "Buddhism in Korea," in *The Religious Tradition of Asia*, ed. Joseph M. Kitagawa (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1987), 347-353; James H. Grayson, *Early Buddhism and Christianity in Korea: A Study in the Implantation of Religion* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985), 16-69.

<sup>19</sup>Hee-Dok Lee, *Koryo Yukyo Jungchi Sasang ui Yunkoo* [Confucian Political Idea During the Koryo Dynasty] (Seoul: Ilhokak, 1983), 1. For the influence of Confucianism upon Koryo, see Hi-Woon Kang, "Development of the Korean Ruling Class from Late Silla to Early Koryo" (Ph. D. Thesis, The University of Washington, 1964), 100-250.

<sup>20</sup>Haboush, "Confucianization of Korean Society," 88.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid. For a fuller discussion of "the Mandate of Heaven," see Michael C. Kalton, *The Four-Seven Debate: An Annotated Translation of the Most Famous Controversy in Korean Neo-Confucian Thought* (Albany: State University of New York, 1994), 1-9, 21-27, 42, 51-58, 102.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid.

<sup>23</sup>Hee-Dok Lee, *Koryo Yukyo Jungchi Sasang ui Yunkoo*, 71.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., 328.

---

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., 1.

<sup>26</sup>Pyo Kyo, "The Idea of Filial Piety in the Koryo Dynasty," *The Journal of History* 55 (Sept., 1972), 38.

<sup>27</sup>Haboush, "Confucianization of Korean Society," 89.

<sup>28</sup>Hee-Dok Lee, *Koryo Yukyo Jungchi Sasang ui Yunkoo*, 2.

<sup>29</sup>Haboush, "Confucianization of Korean Society," 90.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid. Cf. Songmu Yi, "The Influence of Neo-Confucianism on Education and the Civil Service Examination System in Fourteenth and Fifteenth Century Korea," *The Rise of Neo-Confucianism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), eds. De Bary and Haboush, 138.

<sup>31</sup>Buddhism was introduced into Koguryo in 327 A. D., into Paekche about 348 A. D., and into Silla about 539 A. D., from China and influenced the Korean worldview during the Three Kingdom period (570-668 A. D.). Since the present work is confined to the reception of Karl Barth's theology in Korea in relation to Confucianism, which has been regarded as the most influential religious factor for the rapid growth of the Korean Christianity, Buddhism will not be discussed in detail, though it is regarded as a source of traditional religious thought throughout the entire history of Korea. For a historical survey on the introduction of Buddhism in Korea and its characteristics, see Lewis R. Lancaster & C. S. Yu, eds. *Introduction of Buddhism to Korea: New Cultural Patterns* (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1989); *idem*, *Assimilation of Buddhism in Korea: Religious Maturity and Innovation in the Silla Dynasty* (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1991).

<sup>32</sup>George Paik, *The History of Protestant Mission in Korea*, 25.

<sup>33</sup>See Robert E. Buswell, Jr., "Buddhism in Korea," in *The Religious Tradition of Asia*, ed. Joseph M. Kitagawa (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1987), 347-353.

<sup>34</sup>Hei-Chu Kim, "Confucianism and Social Integration in Yi Dynasty Korea," *Religions in Korea: Beliefs and Cultural Values*, eds. E. H. Phillips and Eui Young Yu (Los Angeles: Center for Korean-American and Korean Studies, California State University, 1982), 88.

<sup>35</sup>George Paik, *The History of Protestant Mission in Korea*, 21-22. For a fuller discussion of Buddhist monks' involvement in political power in the Koryo Dynasty, see H. B. Hulbert, *The History of Korea* (Seoul: The Methodist Publishing House, 1905), vol. I, 165-280.

<sup>36</sup>Haboush, "Confucianization of Korean Society," 90.

<sup>37</sup>Tae-Jin Yi, "The Influence of Neo-Confucianism on 14<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> Century Korean Population Growth," *Korea Journal* 37/2 (Summer 1997): 5-23, 16.

<sup>38</sup>James Scarth Gale, *History of the Korean People* (Seoul: Royal Asiatic Society, 1983), 230; Ki-Baik Lee, *A New History of Korea*, tran. Edward W. Wagner with Edward J. Shultz (Seoul: Ilchokak Publishers, 1984), 166, 199-200.

---

<sup>39</sup>Hei-Chu Kim, "Confucianism and Social Integration in Yi Dynasty Korea," 89.

<sup>40</sup>George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, 17. For a further reference on Chosun Dynasty's anti-Buddhist polemics and its breaking relationship with Koryo Dynasty (935-1392), see Yongu Han, *Chong Tojon sasang ui yon gu* [A Study of the Thought of Chong Tojon] (Seoul: Hankuk Munhwa Yonguso, 1973); *idem*, *Chosun cho'gi ui sahoe sasang* [Social Thought of the Early Chosun Period] (Seoul: Hankuk ilbosa, 1983); Woo-Keun Han, "Yomal soncho ui Pulgyo chongch'aek" [Policies toward Buddhism in the Late Koryo and the Early Chosun periods], *Seoul taehakkyo nonmunjip inmun sahoe kwahakpyon* 6 (1957): 5-16; Chonyong Mun, "Yomal sinhung sadabudul ui sinyuhak kwa ku tukching" [The Reception of new Confucianism by the rising *sadaebu* (scholar officials) of Late Koryo and its special features], *Hankuk Munhwa* 3 (November 1982): 113-20; and Sangbaek Yi, *Chosun Munhwasa Yongu* [Studies in the Cultural History of Korea] (Seoul: Uryu Munhwasa, 1947).

<sup>41</sup>See Chai-Sik Chung, "Chong Tojon: Architect of Yi Dynasty Government and Ideology," *The Rise of Neo-Confucianism*, 67-71.

<sup>42</sup>Haboush, "Confucianization of Korean Society," 91.

<sup>43</sup>Martina Deuchler, "Neo-Confucianism: The Impulse for Social Action in Early Yi Korea," *The Journal of Korean Studies* 2, 75.

<sup>44</sup>Haboush, "Confucianization of Korean Society," 90. Also see Yongu Han, *Chosun Chongi Sahoe Kyongje Yongu* [Politics and Economy in the Chosun Dynasty] (Seoul: Uryu munhwasa, 1983), 11-50.

<sup>45</sup>George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, 17. Cf. Daniel M. Davies, "The Impact of Christianity upon Korea, 1884-1910: Six Key American and Korean Figures," *Journal of Church and State* 36 (1994), 797.

<sup>46</sup>For more extensive literature on the revival of Confucianism during the Chosun Dynasty (1392-1910), see Wm. Theodore de Bary and Jahyun Kim, eds. *The Rise of Neo-Confucianism in Korea*; Chong-Hong Pak, "Historical Review of Korean Confucianism," *Korea Journal* 3 (May 1964): 5-11; Wei-Ming Tu, *Humanity and Self-Cultivation: Essays in Confucian Thought* (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1979); Pyong-do Yi, *Hankuk Yukuyksa* [History of Korean Confucianism] (Seoul: Asea munhwasa, 1987).

<sup>47</sup>George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, 24-25.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., 25.

<sup>49</sup>Edward B. Adams, *Korea Guide: A Glimpse of Korea's Cultural Legacy* (Seoul: International Publishing House, 1988), 240.

<sup>50</sup>Hei-Chu Kim, "Confucianism and Social Integration in Yi Dynasty Korea," 92.

<sup>51</sup>Quee-Young Kim, "Korea's Confucian Heritage and Social Change," *Journal of Developing Societies* IV (July-October 1988), 260.

<sup>52</sup>Tae-Jin Lee, "The Influence of Neo-Confucianism on 14<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> Century Korean Population Growth," 5-6.

---

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., 6.

<sup>54</sup>Edward B. Adams, *Korea Guide: A Glimpse of Korea's Cultural Legacy*, 240.

<sup>55</sup>For Confucian view of family and respect for the aged, see Frederick J. Luhmann, "Respect for Older Persons: A Confucian Perspective," *Journal of Religion and Aging* 3/4 (Spring/Summer 1987): 83-90.

<sup>56</sup>Isabella Bird Bishop, *Korea and Her Neighbors* (Seoul: Yonsei University Press, 1970), 22.

<sup>57</sup>James S. Gale, *Korea in Transition*, 101-102.

<sup>58</sup>See Tae-Rim Yun, *Uisik Kujosangulo bon Hangkukin* [The Mental Structure of Korean People] (Seoul: Hyunamsa, 1970), 125-268.

<sup>59</sup>James B. Palais, "Confucianism and the Aristocratic/Bureaucratic Balance in Korea," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 44 (1984), 458, 464. There is much literature on the influence of Confucianism upon Korean society and people, that cannot be cited here. See the bibliography in *Yi Urho Paksa Chongnyon Kinyom, Sirhak Nonchong* [Essays on practical learning in honor of the retirement of Dr. Yi Urho] (Kwangju: Chonnam Taehakkyo, Honam Munhwa Yonguso, 1965), 565-575.

<sup>60</sup>Isabella Bird Bishop, *Korea and Her Neighbors*, 452-453.

<sup>61</sup>Martha Huntley, *Caring, Growing, Changing*, 3-4.

<sup>62</sup>James B. Palais, "Confucianism and the Aristocratic/Bureaucratic Balance in Korea," 467. For more references on family-based Korean Confucian society, see Martina Deuchler, *Confucian Transformation of Korea* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993); Jahyun Kim Haboush, "The Confucianization of Korean Society," 98-101; *idem*, "Filial Emotions and Filial Values: Changing Patterns in the Discourse of Filiality in Late Choson Korea," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 55 (1995): 129-177; James B. Palais, "Politics and Policy in Traditional Korea," *Harvard East Asian Monographs* 82 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975).

<sup>63</sup>Hans Küng and Julia Ching, *Christianity and Chinese Religions* (New York: Doubleday, 1989), 90.

<sup>64</sup>Julia Ching, *Confucianism and Christianity* (New York, Tokyo & San Francisco: Kodansha International, 1977), 99.

<sup>65</sup>Timothy Tian-Min Lin, "The Confucian Concept of *Jen* and the Christian Concept of Love," *Ching Feng* 15 (1972), 163.

<sup>66</sup>Robert E. Allinson, "The Ethics of Confucianism and Christianity: The Delicate Balance," *Ching Feng* 33/3 (September 1990), 162.

<sup>67</sup>Hee-Dok Lee, *Koryo Yukyo Jungchi Sasang ui Yunkoo*, 180.

<sup>68</sup>Myung-Hyuk Kim, "Ancestor Worship in the Korean Church," *Evangelical Review of Theology* 8 (Oct, 1984), 236.

---

<sup>69</sup>See Kil-Song Choe, "Community Ritual and Social Structure in Village Korea," *Asian Folklore Studies* 41/1 (1982): 39-48.

<sup>70</sup>Haboush, "Confucianization of Korean Society," 103.

<sup>71</sup>Norman Jacobs, *The Korean Road to Modernization and Development* (Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1985), 229.

<sup>72</sup>Kil-Song Choe, "Community Ritual and Social Structure in Village Korea," 40.

<sup>73</sup>Man-Gap Kim, *Sociology and Social Change in Korea* (Seoul: Seoul National University Press, 1982), 174.

<sup>74</sup>Myung-Hyuk Kim, "Ancestor Worship in the Korean Church," 237-245. Also see Young-Chan Ro, "Ancestor Worship From the Perspective of Korean Tradition," 12.

<sup>75</sup>Robert Cummings Neville, "Confucian-Christian Incompatibilities," *Ching Feng* 37/4 (November 1994), 196-202.

<sup>76</sup>Sung-Bum Yun, "Human-heartedness, Jen the Quality of Full Humanity," in *Hyo Ywa Jongkyo* [Filial Piety and Religion] (Seoul: Methodist Theological Seminary Press, 1998), 187.

<sup>77</sup>Myung-Hyuk Kim, "Ancestor Worship: From the Perspective of Korean Church History," in *Ancestor Worship and Christianity in Korea*, ed. Jung-Young Lee (Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1983), 22.

<sup>78</sup>Michael C. Kalton, *The Four-Seven Debate*, 128-129.

<sup>79</sup>Quee-Young Kim, "Korea's Confucian Heritage and Social Change," 260. Obviously, the most important and fundamental unit of universal order for Korean Confucians is a human being in a social nexus. That is to say that a person, in the Korean Confucian view, is identified within a group, for the people of Korea share racial homogeneity, a common language, and other habits and customs throughout their own entire history.

<sup>80</sup>William E. Biernatzki, Luke Jin-Chang Im, and Anselm K. Min, *Korean Catholicism in the 70s* (New York: Orbis Books, 1975), 19.

<sup>81</sup>Quee-Young Kim, "Korea's Confucian Heritage and Social Change," 261.

<sup>82</sup>They were "landed gentry who were considered the upper class. The yangban's position was hereditary, and manual labour was beneath his dignity" (Roy E. Shearer, *Wildfire: Church Growth in Korea* [Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1966], 240).

<sup>83</sup>Jahyun Kim Haboush, "The Confucianization of Korean Society," 93, 97.

<sup>84</sup>Horace Underwood, *Modern Education in Korea* (New York: International Press, 1926), 273.

<sup>85</sup>In-Soo Soon, *Yul-Gok Sasang Ui Kyuyuk Leeyum* [Yul-Gok's Philosophy of Education] (Seoul: Moonuem Sa, 1996), 186. Also see Han-Duek Choi, *Hankuk Yooky*

---

*Sasang Yonku* [A Study of Korean Confucianism] (Seoul: Chulhak Kwa Hyunsill Sa, 1992), esp., entitled “Confucianism and Education,” 213-228.

<sup>86</sup> “*Kye*” was “a mutual savings association, a system of private cooperatives with joint funds. The “*kye*” was a self-governing organization intended for mutual assistance and improvement in living cooperatively among people of the same community, clansmen, or those who are engaged in the same business” (Korean Overseas Information Service, *Saemaul Undong* [New Community Movement] [Seoul, Korea, 1973], 19). For a fuller explanation of “*kye*,” see *Saemaul Undong*, *idem*, 17-22.

<sup>87</sup> Isabella Bird Bishop, *Korea and Her Neighbors*, 440-441.

<sup>88</sup> Robert C. Neville, “The Puritan Ethics in Confucianism and Christianity,” *Ching Feng* 34/2 (June 1991), 101.

<sup>89</sup> Man-Gap Lee, *Sociology and Social Change in Korea* (Seoul: Seoul National University Press, 1982), 155.

<sup>90</sup> See *Saemaul Undong*, 5-6 and 29-32.

<sup>91</sup> Kil-Song Choe, “Community Ritual and Social Structure in Village Korea,” 48.

<sup>92</sup> In-Joung Whang, *Management of Rural Change in Korea: The Saemaul Undong* (Seoul: Seoul National University Press, 1981), 72-73.

<sup>93</sup> For a survey of the historical development of the Korean Confucianism in relation to Christianity, see Chi-yon Chang, *Chosun Yu Kyo Yon Won* [Confucianism in Chosun Period] (Seoul, 1921) and Pyong-Do Yi, *Han Kuk Yu Hak Sa Choko* [History of the Korean Confucianism] (Seoul National University Press, the Department of History, 1959).

<sup>94</sup> Young-Chan Ro, “Ancestor Worship from the Perspective of Korean Tradition,” in *Ancestor Worship and Christianity in Korea*, 11.

<sup>95</sup> Yamashita Akiko, “Korean Shamanism and Christianity: A Shaman’s Story,” *Japanese Religions* 21/2 (July 1996): 299-322, 302.

<sup>96</sup> Tong-Sik Yu, *Minsok Chongyo wa Hankuk Munhwa* [Folk Religion and Korean Culture] (Seoul: Hyundae Sasang Sa, 1978), 151-152.

<sup>97</sup> Young-Chan Ro, “Ancestor Worship from the Perspective of Korean Tradition,” 12.

<sup>98</sup> Pong-Bae Park, “Christianity in the Land of Shamanism, Buddhism and Confucianism,” *South East Asia Journal of Theology* 14 (1972-1973): 33-39, 33. For a summary of Shamanism in Korea from prehistory and its influence on the Korean people, see Kah-Kyung Cho, “Philosophy and Religion,” in *Studies on Korea: A Scholar’s Guide*, ed. Han-Kyo Kim (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1983), 120-121; Allen Clark, *History of the Korean Church*, 173-220; C. Covell, *Folk Art and Magic: Shamanism in Korea* (Seoul: Hollym Corporation, 1986), 12-40; Ki-Baik Lee, *A New History of Korea*, 7-8.

---

<sup>99</sup>Dong-Shik Ryu, *Hankuk Jongkyo wa Kidokkyo* [Korean Religions and Christianity in Korea] (Seoul: The Christian Literature Society of Korea, 1965), 33-39, 193-194.

<sup>100</sup>George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, 20-26.

<sup>101</sup>Horace Underwood, *The Call of Korea: Political-Social-Religious* (New York: Revell, 1908), 98-99.

<sup>102</sup>Homer Hulbert, *The Passing of Korea* (New York: Doubleday, 1906), 404.

<sup>103</sup>James Gale, *Korea in Transition*, 67-68.

<sup>104</sup>Martha Huntley, *To Start a Work*, 407-408.

<sup>105</sup>See Doo-Yong Chung, *Kidokkyo wa Yukyo* [Christianity and Confucianism] (Seoul: Sungkwang Munwha Sa, 1994), 172-200.

<sup>106</sup>See Heup-Young Kim, *Wang Yang-Ming and Karl Barth: A Confucian-Christian Dialogue*, 1-5.

<sup>107</sup>See Ki-Baik Lee, *A New History of Korea*, 239-240. Jung-Young Lee's editorial work *Ancestor Worship and Christianity in Korea* explicitly demonstrates this issue.

<sup>108</sup>H. B. Hulbert, *The Passing of Korea*, 403-404.

<sup>109</sup>Allen Clark, *History of the Korean Church*, 27.

<sup>110</sup>See David Chung, "Religious Syncretism in Korean Society" (Ph. D. Thesis, Yale University, 1959) and *idem.*, "The Han-San-We-I, Principle in Far Eastern Society," *Transactions of the Korea Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 38 (1961): 93-118.

<sup>111</sup>George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, 27.

<sup>112</sup>*Ibid.*, 19.

<sup>113</sup>*Ibid.*, 25.

<sup>114</sup>Myung-Hyuk Kim, "Ancestor Worship in the Korean Church," 237.

<sup>115</sup>For a thorough discussion of Confucianism as the traditional religious factor for the rapid growth of the Korean Christianity, see Edward B. Adams, *Through the Gates of Seoul: Trails and Tales of Yi Dynasty*, 2 vols. (Seoul: Taewon Publishing Co., 1974), 33-37; Daniel M. Davies, "The Impact of Christianity upon Korea, 1884-1910: Six Key American and Korean Figures," 798-799; Mark Setton, *Chong Yagyong: Korea's Challenge to Orthodox Neo-Confucianism* (Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Press, forthcoming), 41-42.

<sup>116</sup>Joseph Chang-Mun Kim, *Catholic Korea: Yesterday and Today, 1784-1884* (Seoul: St. Joseph Publishing Co., 1984), 8-10.

---

<sup>117</sup>I'Abbe Huc, *Christianity in China, Tartary and Thibet* (London: Longmans and Robert, 1894), 150.

<sup>118</sup>Chol-Such Woo, "Modern Korean Society and Roman Catholic Christianity," *Soong Chun Journal* 5 (1974), 422.

<sup>119</sup>See M. N. Trollope, "An Old Map and Its Story," *The Korea Magazine* 2/9 (September 1918), 386-396.

<sup>120</sup>Kang-Nam Oh, "Sagehood and Metanoia: The Confucian-Christian Encounter in Korea," *Journal of the Academy of Religion* 61/2 (1993), 303.

<sup>121</sup>George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, 31.

<sup>122</sup>Allen Clark, *Religions of Old Korea* (Seoul: The Christian Literature Society, 1961), 225. The primary source for the historical studies of early Roman Catholicism in Korea is Charles Dallet's *Histoire de l'Église de Corée* (Paris: Victor Palmé, 1874). His work is the only complete and extensive record of the beginning and development of the Roman Catholic Church in Korea from the late seventeenth century to the year 1866. Hong-Yul Yu's work *Hankuk Ch'onjukyhoe-sa* [The History of Korean Catholic Church] (Seoul: K'at'ollik Ch'ulpansa, 1964) is also helpful.

<sup>123</sup>Sirhak is a Neo-Confucian reform movement, so-called "the practical learning movement," that happened among Korean Neo-Confucian scholars from 1620 to 1820. The Sirhak scholars turned their attention to every branch of learning. They are the first Koreans who were interested in Catholicism, the so-called *sohak* (Western learning), through Christian literatures written by Jesuit missionaries in China. They sought a way in Catholicism to correct the growing political and social corruption of the stagnating Chosun Dynasty. For this reason, they were persecuted by government in 1801. See Michael C. Kalton, "An Introduction to Sirhak," *Korea Journal* 15 (May 1975): 29-46.

<sup>124</sup>See Key P. Yang & Gregory Henderson, "An Outline History of Korean Confucianism," *Journal of Asian Studies* 18 (February 1959), 269-270.

<sup>125</sup>Cf. James S. Gale, "A History of the Korean People," *The Korea Mission Field* 22/9 (Sept, 1926), 163, 191, and 222-224.

<sup>126</sup>The Research Centre for the Study of Korean Confucianism, ed., *Chosun Yuhak ei Hakpales* [The Schools of Korean Confucianism] (Seoul: Yemoonseowon, 1996), 498.

<sup>127</sup>Ik Yi, "Ch'ilguk," *Songho Saesol* [Minute Explanations on Various Topics by Songho Ik Yi] (Seoul: Kyonghi ch'ulp'an-sa, 1967), 368.

<sup>128</sup>Chai-Sik Chung, "Christianity as a Heterodoxy: An Aspect of General Cultural Orientation in Traditional Korea," in *Korea's Response to the West*, ed. Yung-Hwan Jo (Kalamazoo, Michigan: The Korea Research and Publications, Inc, 1971), 61.

<sup>129</sup>They were Yak-Yong Chung, Yak-Chun Chung, Yak-Jong Chung, Il-Shin Kwon, and Pyk Yi. See Doo-Yong Chung, *Christianity and Confucianism* (Seoul: Sungkwang Munhwa Sa, 1994), 177.

<sup>130</sup>Allen Clark, *History of the Korean Church*, 29-30.

---

<sup>131</sup>Kang-Nam Oh, “Sagehood and Metanoia: The Confucian-Christian Encounter in Korea,” 304.

<sup>132</sup>William E. Biernatzki, Luke Jin-Chang Im and Anselm K. Min, *Korean Catholicism in the 70s*, 4.

<sup>133</sup>Doo-Yong Chung, *Christianity and Confucianism*, 31. Also see Myung-Shin Kang, “The Dignity of Korean Pastors, in *Korean Church Growth Explosion*, 305 and Harold S. Hong, “Social, Political, and Psychological Aspects of Church Growth, *ibid.*, 179. For the early Protestant missionaries’ attitude toward ancestor worship among Korean people, see Young-Tai Pyun, “Ancestor Worship: From the Perspective of Early Protestant Christians,” in *Ancestor Worship and Christianity in Korea*, 45-60.

<sup>134</sup>Ki-Bok Choe, “Ancestor Worship: From the Perspective of Confucianism and Catholicism,” in *Ancestor Worship and Christianity in Korea*, 41.

<sup>135</sup>Do-Yong Chung, *Christianity and Confucianism*, 31.

<sup>136</sup>Ki-Bok Choe, “Ancestor Worship: From the Perspective of Confucianism and Catholicism,” 41-42.

<sup>137</sup>See Do-Yong Chung, *Christianity and Confucianism*, 176-178.

<sup>138</sup>Roy E. Shearer, “The Evangelistic Missionary’s Role in Church Growth in Korea,” *International Review of Mission* 54 (1965), 463.

<sup>139</sup>Do-Yong Chung, *Christianity and Confucianism*, 176-178.

<sup>140</sup>See Man-Gap Lee, *Sociology and Social Change in Korea*, 154-156.

<sup>141</sup>William E. Biernatzki, Luke Jin-Chang Im and Anselm K. Min, *Korean Catholicism in the 70s*, 12.

<sup>142</sup>Pyuk Lee was influenced by Ik Yi (1681-1763), who not only saw the Christian God as the same as the Confucian *Shang-ti* (Heaven), but also found similar ethical practices between Christianity and Confucianism. Hu-Dam Shin (?-1785) and Chong-Bok An (1712-1791) who were Ik Yi’s disciples completed *Seo-hak-byun* [Discussions on Western Learning] in 1724. This book explores the existence of God and the origin of humanity. Lee used this as his primary reference to write his book *Sung-gyo Yo-ji*. See Sung-Hae Kim, “Silent Heaven Giving Birth to the Multitude of People,” *Ching Feng* 31/4 (Dec, 1988): 195-224.

<sup>143</sup>Chai-Sik Chung, “Christianity as a Heterodoxy: An Aspect of General Cultural Orientation in Traditional Korea,” 63. Also cf. Charles Dallet, *Histoire de l’Eglise de Corée* (Paris: Librairie Victor Palme, 1874), vol. I, 16-17.

<sup>144</sup>See Jang-Tai Keum, *Tongso Kyosop kwa Kuntae Hankuk Sasang-ui Chui-ekwanhan Yon-gu* [A Study on the Tendency of Korean Thoughts through the Modern Interaction between East and West] (Seoul: Sunggyun-Gwan University, 1978), 77-111 and Hyung-Cho Han, *Chu hei aese Chung Yak-Yong kaji* [From Chu hei to Yak-Yong Chung] (Seoul: Saekae sa, 1996), 147-151.

---

<sup>145</sup>Pyuk Lee, Yak-Yong Chung's brother-in-law, greatly influenced Chung's Confucian and Christian thought. Lee's *Sung-gyo Yo-ji* explores some similarities between Confucian and Christian definitions of God, humanity, and the universe. Chung's *Jung-yong kang-eui* reinterprets Lee's view of these issues and extensively explains his own viewpoint. Interestingly, Chung rejects the theory of evolution and materialism, but claims that the Heaven is God and Creator who becomes a source of life. He also accepts the Christian view of dichotomism that was commonly held from the earliest period of Christian thought. This is to say, Chung sees that humanity is composed of two elements, a material aspect, the body, and an immaterial component, the soul or spirit. He seeks to reinterpret Confucian thought on the basis of a Christian worldview. See Hyung-Cho Han, *Chu hei aese Chung Yak-yong kaji*, 221-227.

<sup>146</sup>*Meng-ja Yo-eui*, vol. 2, 39.

<sup>147</sup>Hyung-Cho Han, *Chu hei aese Chung Yak-yong kaji*, 228.

<sup>148</sup>Ibid., 219. Korean Sirhak Confucian scholars rejected China's Sung-Ri-Hak (classical Confucianism) that followed Confucius' teaching, but accepted Ju-Ja-Hak, that was advocated by Mencius. Confucius teaches the truth of the physical world, while Mencius emphasizes the spiritual dimension of the world. Thus Confucius sees Heaven as harmonious with humanity, while Mencius believes in Heaven as a Creator or Provider. Confucius sees humanity as good, while Mencius claims the nature of humanity as sinful. Scholars of Ju-Ja-Hak thus hold that similar interaction between Christianity and Ju-Ja Confucianism exists. See Sung-Hae Kim, "Silent Heaven Giving Birth to the Multitude of People," *Ching Feng* 31/4 (Dec, 1988): 195-224 and Sung-Bum Yun, "Tae-Gye wa Yul-Gok uei Chun Ehae Sasang" [Tae-Gye and Yul-Gok's Understanding of the Heaven] in *Korean Confucianism and Christianity* (Seoul: Methodist Theological Seminary Press, 1998), 461-473.

<sup>149</sup>Ibid., 227-228.

<sup>150</sup>Ibid., 229.

<sup>151</sup>For Confucian-Christian compatibility, especially regarding family and respect for the aged, see Robert E. Allinson, "The Ethics of Confucianism and Christianity: The Delicate Balance," *Ching Feng* 33/3 (September 1990): 158-175; Frederick J. Luhmann, "Respect for Older Persons: A Confucian Perspective," *Journal of Religion and Aging* 3/4 (Spring/Summer 1987): 83-90; Robert C. Neville, "The Puritan Ethic in Confucianism and Christianity," *Ching Feng* 34/2 (June 1991): 100-103; Graham S. Ogden, "Biblical and Confucian Thought: A Consideration of Some Common Teachings," *Taiwan Journal of Theology* 4 (March 1982): 215-227.

<sup>152</sup>Doo-Yong Chung, *Christianity and Confucianism*, 78. See Hyung-Cho Han, *Chu hei aese Chung Yak-yong kaji*, 230-236.

<sup>153</sup>See *Meng-ja Yo-eui*, vol. 2, 21.

<sup>154</sup>Sung-Bum Yun, *Hyundae Sahae wa Hyodo* [Filial Piety in Contemporary Society] (Seoul: Eulgi Munhwasa, 1975), 78. See Robert E. Allinson, "The Ethics of Confucianism and Christianity: The Delicate Balance," 158-175.

<sup>155</sup>Hyung-Cho Han, *Chu hei aese Chung Yak-yong kaji*, 159-160.

---

<sup>156</sup>Sung-Kuk Shin, “Kyungro Jungshin Yangyang,” [Confucian Aspect of Respect for Elders] *Hankuk Munhwah* (1976), 83.

<sup>157</sup>Kyung-Jae Kim, “History and Prospects of the Protestant Church in Korea,” in *Korea and Christianity*, ed. Chai-Shin Yu (Seoul, Berkeley, Toronto: Korean Scholar Press, 1996), 185.

<sup>158</sup>William E. Biernatzki, Luke Jin-Chang Im and Anselm K. Min, *Korean Catholicism in the 70s*, 9.

<sup>159</sup>Norman Jacobs, *The Korean Road to Modernization and Development*, 234.

<sup>160</sup>Daniel M. Davies, “The Impact of Christianity upon Korea, 1884-1910: Six Key American and Korean Figures,” 800.

<sup>161</sup>Sang-Taek Lee, *Religion and Social Formation in Korea* (Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1996), 47.

<sup>162</sup>William E. Biernatzki, *Korean Catholicism in the 70s*, 22.

<sup>163</sup>Kang-Nam Oh, “Sagehood and Metanoia: The Confucian-Christian Encounter in Korea,” 304.

<sup>164</sup>Ibid.

<sup>165</sup>William E. Biernatzki, Luke Jin-Chang Im, and Anselm K. Min, *Korean Catholicism in the 70s*, 3, 23.

<sup>166</sup>George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, 171.

<sup>167</sup>Daniel M. Davies, “The Impact of Christianity upon Korea, 1884-1910: Six Key American and Korean Figures,” 801.

<sup>168</sup>Ibid. Also see Susan S. Shin, “The Tonghak Movement: From Enlightenment to Revolution,” *Form 5* (Winter-Spring 1978-1979): 1-78, 61-62.

<sup>169</sup>See Benjamin B. Weems, *Reform, Rebellion, and the Heavenly Way* (Tucson, AZ.: The University of Arizona Press, 1966), 15-18.

<sup>170</sup>Daniel M. Davies, “The Impact of Christianity upon Korea, 1884-1910: Six Key American and Korean Figures,” 802.

<sup>171</sup>Kang-Nam Oh, “Sagehood and Metanoia: The Confucian-Christian Encounter in Korea,” 304.

<sup>172</sup>Joseph Chang-Mun Kim, *Catholic Korea: Yesterday and Today, 1784-1884*, 233-194.

<sup>173</sup>Allen Clark, *History of the Korean Church*, 38-39.

<sup>174</sup>Norman Jacobs, *The Korean Road to Modernization and Development*, 233.

<sup>175</sup>Allen Clark, *History of the Korean Church*, 40.

---

<sup>176</sup>For a further discussion of the historical development of Roman Catholicism in Korea, especially in relation to Confucian scholars' initial contribution to the growth of Korean Christianity, see Min-Hong Choi, *A Modern History of Korean Philosophy* (Seoul: Seong-moon Sa, 1983), 218-236; Ki-Baik Lee, *A New History of Korea*, 275-276, 297-298; Yun-Tae Oh, *The History of Korean Christianity* (Seoul: Haesun Munhwasa, 1978).

<sup>177</sup>Kang-Nam Oh, "Sagehood and Metanoia: The Confucian-Christian Encounter in Korea," 309.

<sup>178</sup>Doo-Yong Chung, *Christianity and Confucianism*, 183. Also see Martha Huntley, *Caring, Growing, Changing*, 14-15.

<sup>179</sup>William E. Griffis and Henry G. Appenzeller, *A Modern Pioneer in Korea* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1912), 45-46.

<sup>180</sup>See Yang-Sun Kim, "Ross Version and the Korean Protestantism" in *The Paeksan Hakpo* (Seoul, 1967), 401-461.

<sup>181</sup>George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, 52.

<sup>182</sup>Ibid.

<sup>183</sup>Ibid.

<sup>184</sup>Allen Clark, *History of the Korean Church*, 47. Also see Chan-Hie Kim, "Christianity and Modernization of Korea," *Religions in Korea: Beliefs and Cultural Values*, 118-119.

<sup>185</sup>George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, 58.

<sup>186</sup>*Annual Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society for 1885*, 215-216.

<sup>187</sup>Ibid.

<sup>188</sup>See Allen Clark, *History of the Korean Church*, 45-48.

<sup>189</sup>See Sung-Hae Kim, "Silent Heaven Giving Birth to the Multitude of People," 195-224.

<sup>190</sup>Allen Clark, *History of the Korean Church*, 47.

<sup>191</sup>Hans Küng and Julia Ching, *Christianity and Chinese Religions*, 85.

<sup>192</sup>Ibid., 199.

<sup>193</sup>Paul A. Rule, "Jesuit and Confucian?: Chinese Religion in the Journals of Matteo Ricci SJ," *The Journal of Religious History* 5/2 (Dec, 1968): 105-124, 122-123.

<sup>194</sup>Chai-Sik Chung, "Christianity as a Heterodoxy: An Aspect of General Cultural Orientation in Traditional Korea," 62.

---

<sup>195</sup>Pei-Jung Fu, "The Confucian Heaven and the Christian God," *Ching Feng* 31/2 & 3 (August 1988): 177-124, 177.

<sup>196</sup>For further Confucian-Christian similarities on the doctrine of God, humanity and the universe, see Cynthia R. Chapman, "On Heaven-Humanity Harmony and Divine-Human Reconciliation: A Confucian-Christian Dialogue," *Ching Feng* 34/2 (June 1991): 121-124; Shu-Hsien Liu, "On Confucius' Attitude Toward Gods, Sacrifice, and Heaven," *Ching Feng* 34/1 (Jan, 1991): 16-27.

<sup>197</sup>Timothy Tian-Min Lin, "The Concept of Man in Confucianism and Christianity," *Northeast Asia Journal of Theology* 14 (March 1975), 23-24.

<sup>198</sup>See Timothy Tian-Min Lin, "The Confucian Concept of Jen and The Christian Concept of Love," *Ching Feng* 15 (1972): 162-171.

<sup>199</sup>Graham S. Ogden, "Biblical and Confucian Thought: A Consideration of Some Common Teachings," 224. Also for the Confucian version of the Golden Rule, see *Analects* vol. 12.2, 15 & 24.

<sup>200</sup>Cf. Eccl. 4: 13-16; 9: 13-16; Job; Prov. 15: 16. Also see Ji Shr, *Analects* vol. 12, 214 and Graham S. Ogden, "Numerical Sayings in Israelite Wisdom and in Confucius," *Taiwan Journal of Theology* 3 (1980): 145-176.

<sup>201</sup>See Heup-Young Kim, "Jen and Agape: Towards a Confucian Christology," *Asia Journal of Theology* 8/2 (1994): 335-364 and Xinzhang Yao, "Jesus and Confucius: A Comparison," *Scottish Journal of Religious Studies* 16, 37-50.

<sup>202</sup>See Sung-Hae Kim, "Silent Heaven Giving Birth to the Multitude of People," 195-224.

<sup>203</sup>Hans Küng and Julia Ching, *Christianity and Chinese Religions*, 90.

<sup>204</sup>Huston Smith, *The World's Religions* (San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1991), 390.

<sup>205</sup>Michael Kalton, "Neo-Confucian Studies Phase II: Future," *Korean Studies and Its Tasks and Prospectives: Proceedings of the 5<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Korean Studies* (Seoul: The Academy of Korean Studies, 1988), vol. 2, 270.

<sup>206</sup>Donald N. Clark, *Christianity in Modern Korea* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1986), 36.

<sup>207</sup>Ha-Tai Kim, *Tongso Chorhak ui Mannam* [The Meeting of Eastern and Western Philosophies] (Seoul: Chonro Sojok, 1985), 214.

<sup>208</sup>Heup-Young Kim, *Wang Yang-Ming and Karl Barth: A Confucian-Christian Dialogue*, 4. For details on this point, see Yee-Heum Yoon, "The Contemporary Religious Situation in Korea," a paper presented in the Conference on Religion and Contemporary Society in Korea, Center of East Asian Studies, University of California at Berkeley, November 11-12, 1988.

<sup>209</sup>Kyong-Jae Kim, "History and Prospects of the Protestant Church," in *Korea and Christianity*, 185.

<sup>210</sup>Ibid., 187.

<sup>211</sup>Kang-Nam Oh, “Sagehood and Metanoia: The Confucian-Christian Encounter in Korea,” 309.

<sup>212</sup>See Sung-Bum Yun Series, vol. I, *Korean Culture, Religion and Christianity* (Seoul: Methodist Theological Seminary Press, 1998), 543-591.

<sup>213</sup>See Bong-Rang Park, “A Response to Sung-Bum Yun’s Theological Attempt of Contextualization,” in *Korean Religion, Culture and Christianity* (Seoul: Methodist Theological Seminary Press, 1988), 370-392 and Sung-Bum Yun, “A Theological Approach to the Understanding of the Indigenization of Christianity,” in *ibid.*, 447-461.

<sup>214</sup>Also see Kwang-Sik Kim, *Mission and Indigenization* (Seoul: Daehan Kidokkyo Seohae, 1975) and Kyung-Yun Chun, “Can the Western Christianity be Contextualized?” *Kidokkyo Sasang* vol. III.

<sup>215</sup>Chai-Sik Chung, “Confucian-Protestant Encounter in Korea: Two Cases of Westernization and De-Westernization,” *Ching Feng* 34/1 (Jan, 1991), 74-75.

<sup>216</sup>See Un-Sunn Lee, *Korean Feminist Theology in a Postmodern Age: A Dialogue with Confucianism, Feminism and Pedagogy* (Waegwan, Korea: Benedict Press, 1997), 17-82.

<sup>217</sup>Heup-Young Kim, *Wang Yang-Ming and Karl Barth*, 3-4.

<sup>218</sup>Ibid., 136.

<sup>219</sup>Sung-Bum Yun, *Hankukjok Shinhak: Song ui Haesokhak* [The Korean Theology: The Hermeneutics of Sincerity] (Seoul: Sunmyung Munhwasa, 1972), 14.

<sup>220</sup>Martha Huntley, *Caring, Growing, Changing*, 225-318.

<sup>221</sup>Chai-Yong Choo, “A Brief Sketch of Korean Christian History from the Minjung Perspective,” in *Minjung Theology: People as the Subjects of History*, ed. Yong-Bock Kim (Singapore: The Commission on Theological Concerns, The Christian Conference of Asia, 1981), 70.

<sup>222</sup>For the Shufelt Treaty, see Frederick C. Drake, *The Empire of the Seas: A Biography of Rear Admiral Robert Wilson Shufeldt, USN* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1984). For the diplomatic relationship between Korea and USA, see Donald M. Bishop, “Policy and Personality in Early Korean-American Relations: The Case of George Clayton Poulk,” in *The United States and Korea: American-Korean Relations, 1866-1976*, ed. Andrew C. Nahm (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Western Michigan University, 1979), 27-63; Yur-Bok Lee, *West Goes East: Paul Georg von Moellendorff and Great Power Imperialism in Late Yi Korea* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1988), 22-32; Young-Ick Lew, “American Advisers in Korea, 1885-1894: Anatomy of Failure,” in *The United States and Korea: American-Korean Relations, 1866-1976*, 64-90; Robert R. Swartout, Jr., *Mandarins, Gunboats, and Power Politics: Owen Nickerson Denny and the International Rivalries in Korea* (Honolulu: The University of Hawaii Press, 1980), 56-80.

<sup>223</sup>Ki-Baik Lee, *A New History of Korea*, 274-275.

---

<sup>224</sup>Chai-Yong Choo, "A Brief Sketch of a Korean Christian History from the Minjung Perspective," 69-76. On the other hand, Roy E. Shearer divides Korean Protestant Church History, especially the growth of the Presbyterian Church in Korea, into seven periods: (1) establishment of the Presbyterian Church, 1832-1895; (2) growth of the Church, 1895-1905; (3) Confession and Revival, 1905-1910; (4) annexation and emigration, 1910-1919; (5) imprisonment and poverty, 1919-1928; (6) Shintoism and oppression, 1928-1938; (7) missionary departure and World War II, 1938-1942. See Roy E. Shearer, *Wildfire: Church Growth in Korea*, 38-79. Particularly, George Paik divides early Protestantism in Korea into four periods: (1) the establishment of missions (1885-1890); (2) occupation of the field (1891-1897); (3) the rise of the Church (1897-1906); and (4) the revival and the growth of the Church (1907-1910). See George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, 91-417.

<sup>225</sup>Daniel M. Davies, "The Impact of Christianity upon Korea, 1884-1910: Six Key American and Korean Figures," 809. Also see Fred Harvey Harrington, *God, Mammon, and the Japanese: Dr. Horace N. Allen and Korean-American Relations, 1884-1905*, 3-33.

<sup>226</sup>George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, 97.

<sup>227</sup>Horace Allen, *Things Korean* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1908), 70.

<sup>228</sup>Yong-Jae Kim, "A Re-evaluation of the Mission Policies of Nevius," in *Korea and Christianity*, 80.

<sup>229</sup>Spencer J. Palmer, *Korea and Christianity: The Problem of Identification with Tradition* (Seoul: Hollym Corporation Publishers, 1967), 57-58.

<sup>230</sup>Samuel H. Moffett, *The Christians of Korea* (New York: Friendship Press, 1962), 37.

<sup>231</sup>George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, 106-107.

<sup>232</sup>For a summary of Horace G. Underwood's life in Korea and his thought, see Horace G. Underwood, *The Call of Korea: Political, Social, Religious*, 3rd ed. (New York: Revell, 1908); Lilius H. Underwood, *Fifteen Years Among the Top-Knots* (New York: American Tract Society, 1904); *idem*, *Underwood of Korea: Being an Intimate Record of the Life and Work of the Rev. H.G. Underwood, D.D., LL.D., for Thirty-One Years a Missionary of the Presbyterian Board in Korea* (New York: Revell, 1918); *idem*, *With Tommy Tompkins in Korea* (New York: Revell, 1905); Kenneth M. Wells, *New God, New Nation: Protestants and Self-Reconstruction: Nationalism in Korea, 1896-1937* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1990).

<sup>233</sup>George W. Gilmore, *Korea From its Capital* (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian Board of Publications, 1882), 295.

<sup>234</sup>L. H. Underwood, *Underwood of Korea*, 45.

<sup>235</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>236</sup>For H. G. Appenzeller's life and thought, see Daniel M. Davies, *The Life and Thought of Henry Gerhard Appenzeller (1858-1902): Missionary to Korea* (Lewiston,

---

N.Y.: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1988) and William E. Griffis, *A Modern Pioneer in Korea: The Life Story of H. G. Appenzeller* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1912).

<sup>237</sup>See Daniel M. Davies, "Henry G. Appenzeller's Contribution to Science Education in Korea," *Journal of Education* 37 (1990): 4-48.

<sup>238</sup>For Chi-Ho Yun's and Syngman Rhee's autobiographical record, see Chi-Ho Yun, *Yun chi-ho Igi* [Yun Chi-ho's diary], 8 vols. (Seoul: National History Compilation Committee, 1973-86) and Robert T. Oliver, *Syngman Rhee: The Man Behind the Myth* (New York: Dodd Mead and Company, 1960).

<sup>239</sup>Chai-Yong Choo, "A Brief Sketch of Korean Christian History from the Minjung Perspective," 70.

<sup>240</sup>Daniel M. Davies, "The Impact of Christianity upon Korea, 1884-1910: Six Key American and Korean Figures," 819. Also see F. A. McKenzie, *Korea's Fight for Freedom* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1920).

<sup>241</sup>Kyong-Jae Kim, "History and Prospects of the Protestant Church in Korea," 188.

<sup>242</sup>Kang-Nam Oh, "Sagehood and Metanoia: The Confucian-Christian Encounter in Korea," 305-306.

<sup>243</sup>Yong-Bock Kim, "Korean Christianity as a Messianic Movement of the People," in *Minjung Theology: People as the Subjects of History*, 80.

<sup>244</sup>Sung-Mo Huang, "Protestant Churches and Their Impact on Cultural Change," *Aspects of Social Changes in Korea*, eds. C. I. Eugene Kim & Changboh Chee (Kalamazoo, Michigan: The Korea Research & Publications, Inc., 1968), 151.

<sup>245</sup>Martina Deuchler, *Confucian Gentlemen and Barbarian Envoys: The Opening of Korea, 1875-1885* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1977), 51-230 and Everett N. Hunt, Jr., *Protestant Pioneers in Korea* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1980), 69-70. Also see K. Hwang, *The Korean Reform Movement of the 1880s: A Study of Transition in Intra-Asian Relations* (Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1978).

<sup>246</sup>Chai-Yong Choo, "A Brief Sketch of Korean Christian History from the Minjung Perspective," 70 and Robert Speer, *Missions and Politics in Asia* (New York: Revell & Co., 1898), 287.

<sup>247</sup>For a summary of the Protestant missionaries' contribution to the translation of the English Bible into *Hangul*, as well as commentary on the education of women and children, see Daniel M. Davies, *The Life and Thought of Henry Gerhard Appenzeller (1858-1902): Missionary to Korea* (Lewiston, N.Y.: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1988), 217-220; *idem*, "Henry G. Appenzeller: Pioneer Missionary and Reformer in Korea," *Methodist History* 30 (July 1992): 195-205; Charles D. Stokes, "History of Methodist Missions in Korea, 1885-1930" (Ph. D. Thesis, Yale University, 1947), 120-124; George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea, 1832-1910*, 232-233.

<sup>248</sup>Jung-Young Lee, "The American Missionary Movement in Korea, 1882-1945: Its Contributions and American Diplomacy," *Missionology: An International Review* 11/4 (October 1983), 392-393.

---

<sup>249</sup>In traditional Korean society, women had to follow the Confucian virtues of subordination and endurance in which traditional Confucianist thinking demands women's reticence, obedience and devotion to their husbands and sons. Sexual morality under such a system is exclusively characterized by its dual nature. In other words, sexual attitudes are particularly measured by two conflicting standards, that is, a dual moral discipline, which permits husbands to do what is prohibited to wives. That is to say that a woman's role in Korea was limited to household affairs such as cooking, cleaning, rearing the children and to taking care of the family by staying at home. But husbands worked outside to support the family. In terms of social status, women were thus considered inferior to men. Social customs did not permit women to engage in non-family affairs. For a discussion on the issue of women's roles and identity in Korea, see Isabella Bird Bishop, *Korea and Her Neighbors*, 338-343; Martina Deuchler, "The Tradition: Women During the Yi Dynasty," in *Virtues in Conflict: Tradition and the Korean Woman Today*, ed. Sandra Mattielli (Seoul: Royal Asiatic Society, Korean Branch, 1983), 1-47; Yung-Chung Kim, *Women of Korea: a history from ancient times to 1945* (Seoul: Women's University Press, 1976); Young-Hai Park, ed. *Women of the Yi Dynasty* (Seoul: Sookmyung Women's University, 1986).

<sup>250</sup>See Carter J. Eckert, Ki-Baik Lee, Young-Ick Lew, Michael Robinson, and Edward W. Wagner, *Korea, Old and New: A History* (Seoul: Ilchokak Publishers, 1990), 183-184.

<sup>251</sup>See Martha Huntley, *Caring, Growing, Changing*, 167-195.

<sup>252</sup>Youn-Ok Lee, "The Role of Women in Korean Church Growth," in *Korean Church Growth Explosion*, 231-244. See Chae-ok Chun, "Korean Protestant Women in Mission," in *ibid.*, 77-87.

<sup>253</sup>George W. Gilmore, *Korea from Its Capital* (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1882), 300.

<sup>254</sup>George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, 128. Also see *The Gospel in All lands for 1888*, published by The Organ of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, 373.

<sup>255</sup>*Annual Report of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church for 1886*, 275.

<sup>256</sup>*Ibid.*, 268, 277.

<sup>257</sup>*Ibid.*, 341.

<sup>258</sup>George W. Gilmore, *Korea From Its Capital*, 302.

<sup>259</sup>Everett N. Hunt, Jr., *Protestant Pioneers in Korea*, 3, 65.

<sup>260</sup>H. G. Underwood, *The Call of Korea*, 106-107.

<sup>261</sup>*Annual Report of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., for 1888*, 170.

<sup>262</sup>H. G. Underwood, *The Call of Korea*, 137-138.

---

<sup>263</sup>Samuel H. Moffett, *The Christians of Korea*, 39-40.

<sup>264</sup>Ibid., 42.

<sup>265</sup>J. F. Genso, "A New Translation of the Bible," *The Korea Mission Field* 22/4 (April 1926), 81.

<sup>266</sup>George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, 144.

<sup>267</sup>For Malcolm C. Fenwick's life and work in Korea, see M. C. Fenwick, *The Church of Christ in Corea* (New York: Geroge G. Doran Company, 1911).

<sup>268</sup>Horace H. Underwood, *Modern Education in Korea*, 81-82.

<sup>269</sup>George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, 205.

<sup>270</sup>See Elizabeth A. McCully, *A Corn of Wheat: The Life of Rev. W. J. McKenzie of Korea* (Toronto: The Westminster Press, 1904), 250-254.

<sup>271</sup>For a further historical information about Canadian missionary activity in Korea, see Geoffrey Johnston and A. Hamish Ion, *Canadian Missionaries and Korea: Two Case Studies in Public Opinion* (Donner Canadian Foundation & The Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada, 1988); Young-Sik Yoo, *Earlier Canadian Missionaries in Korea* (Mississauga, On.: The Society for Korean and Related Studies, 1987).

<sup>272</sup>Samuel H. Moffett, *The Christians of Korea*, 45.

<sup>273</sup>H. H. Underwood, *Modern Education in Korea*, 127.

<sup>274</sup>Allen D. Clark, *History of the Korean Church*, 152.

<sup>275</sup>H. H. Underwood, *Modern Education in Korea*, 125.

<sup>276</sup>G. Bonwick, "The Birth of the Korean Religious Tract Society," *The Korea Mission Field* 10/1 (January 1914), 12.

<sup>277</sup>George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, 147.

<sup>278</sup>Samuel H. Moffett, *The Christians of Korea*, 47.

<sup>279</sup>Ibid., 48.

<sup>280</sup>Ibid., 47.

<sup>281</sup>Ibid., 53.

<sup>282</sup>George T. B. Davis, *Korea for Christ* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1910), 6-7.

<sup>283</sup>*The Missionary* 43/5 (May 1910), 213.

<sup>284</sup>George Paik, *The History of the Protestant Missions in Korea*, 386.

---

<sup>285</sup>“The Million Movement and Its Result,” *Korea Mission Field* 7/1 (January 1911), 5.

<sup>286</sup>Allen D. Clark, *History of the Korean Church*, 255.

<sup>287</sup>Ibid., 156.

<sup>288</sup>W. M. Baird, “An Address to the Presbyterian Mission on the Million Movement,” *Korea Mission Field* 7/11 (November 1911), 210.

<sup>289</sup>Myung-Shin Kang, “The Dignity of Korean Pastors, in *Korean Church Growth Explosion*, 305. Also see Harold S. Hong, “Social, Political, and Psychological Aspects of Church Growth,” in *ibid.*, 179 and Sang-Mo Huang, “Protestant Churches and Their Impact on Cultural Change,” in *ibid.*, 151.

<sup>290</sup>Roy E. Shearer, *Wildfire: Church Growth in Korea*, 147, 150.

<sup>291</sup>Martha Huntley, *Caring, Growing, Changing*, 125.

<sup>292</sup>Samuel H. Moffett, *The Christians of Korea*, 57.

<sup>293</sup>Werner Bieder, “How I Experienced South Korea Theologically,” *Northeast Asia Journal of Theology* 10 (March 1973), 12.

<sup>294</sup>Cf. Ronald Rore & Zoe Mars, *Community Development: Comparative Case Studies in India, the Republic of Korea, Mexico and Tanzania* (Paris & London: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1981), 125-130.

<sup>295</sup>“Sarang” is the living room for men, where they gather to talk over current social issues, to hear one of the number read from a story book, and to study Chinese Confucian literatures. On the other hand, “Anbang” is the living room for women. See George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, 60.

<sup>296</sup>James S. Gale, *Korea in Transition* (New York: Young People’s Missionary Movement of the United States and Canada, 1909), 113-114.

<sup>297</sup>Ibid., 198-200.

<sup>298</sup>George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, 161.

<sup>299</sup>R. Harry, *History of the Korean Mission* (Seoul: Chosun Mission Presbyterian Church in USA, 1934), 87-88.

<sup>300</sup>Allen D. Clark, *History of the Korean Church*, 87. For a detailed summary of the Nevius Methods, see C. A. Clark, *The Korean Church and the Nevius Method* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1930); Frederick M. Woodberry, “The Nevius Methods” (B. Th. Thesis, The Presbyterian College, Montreal, 1953). Also for John Nevius’ life, see Helen S. C. Nevius, *The Life of John Livingston Nevius* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1895).

<sup>301</sup>Roy E. Shearer, “The Evangelistic Missionary’s Role in Church Growth in Korea,” 466.

---

<sup>302</sup>George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea 1832-1910*, 161.

<sup>303</sup>Horace Underwood, *The Call of Korea*, 5.

<sup>304</sup>L. H. Underwood, *Underwood: Fifteen Years Among the Top-Knots* (Boston: American Tract Society, 1904), 84.

<sup>305</sup>Ibid., 109-110.

<sup>306</sup>Frederick M. Woodberry, "The Nevius Methods," 12.

<sup>307</sup>Tae-Hwan Kim, "An Empirical Study of the Factors Contributing to Rapid Church Growth in Korea" (D. Min. Thesis, The Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1984), 102.

<sup>308</sup>George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, 42-43.

<sup>309</sup>Frederick M. Woodberry, "The Nevius Methods," 24.

<sup>310</sup>Samuel H. Moffett, *The Christians of Korea*, 130-131.

<sup>311</sup>In-Jong You, "The Impact of the American Protestant Missions on Korean Education from 1805 to 1932" (Ph. D. disse., The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1967), 254-256.

<sup>312</sup>H. H. Underwood, *Modern Education in Korea*, 11.

<sup>313</sup>Frederick M. Woodberry, "The Nevius Methods," 70.

<sup>314</sup>Ibid., 49-50.

<sup>315</sup>Ibid., 55.

<sup>316</sup>Correspondingly, there was a heavy demand for the translation of the English Bible into *Hangul* and its publication. As already mentioned, the Korean Bible Society was established in Seoul in co-operation with Bible Societies of Britain and America. Early Protestant missionaries also organized the Korean Religious Tract Society to supply Scriptures and Christian books to Korean Christians. The *Hangul* Bible was easy for every Christian in Korea to learn to read because of the simple phonetic script. As T. Stanley Soltau states, "the ordinary people are not naturally great readers, and in many homes the Bible and the Sunday School lesson book are practically the only book to be found, but the well-thumbed condition of the pages bears eloquent testimony to the place which the Word of God has found in the hearts and lives of even those who comparatively recently have become believers." See T. Stanley Soltau, *Korea: The Hermit Nation* (London: World Dominion Press, 1932), 41.

<sup>317</sup>Jung-Young Lee, "The American Missionary Movement in Korea, 1882-1945: Its Contributions and American Diplomacy," 392.

<sup>318</sup>Ibid., 393-395.

<sup>319</sup>Yong-Bock Kim, "Korean Christianity as a Messianic Movement of the People," 82.

---

<sup>320</sup>Samuel Hugh Moffett, “The Church in Korea,” *The Japan Christian Quarterly* 39/3 (Sum, 73), 126.

<sup>321</sup>Frederick Woodberry, “The Nevius Methods,” 24.

<sup>322</sup>Ibid., 25.

<sup>323</sup>Marlin L. Nelson, “Korean Church Mission Growth,” in *Korean Church Growth Explosion*, 90.

<sup>324</sup>Ibid.

<sup>325</sup>See G. Thompson Brown, “Why Has Christianity Grown Faster in Korea Than in China?” *Missiology: An International Review* XXII/1 (January 1994), 78-82.

<sup>326</sup>See Karl Barth, *CD.*, I/1, 88-120.

<sup>327</sup>Chai-Yong Choo, “A Brief Sketch of Korean Christian History from the Minjung Perspective,” 72. For a fuller discussion of the influence of American Christianity in Korea, see Jung-Young Lee, “The American Missionary Movement in Korea, 1882-1945: Its Contributions and American Diplomacy,” 400; George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea, 1876-1901*, 77-80; Eric J Sharpe, *Not to Destroy But To Fulfill* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell Boktryckeri AB, 1965); Dong-Shil Yoo, *Hankuk JongKyo Wa Kidokkyo* [The Christian Faith Encounters the Religions of Korea] (Seoul: CLSK, 1965). Also for the characteristics of American Protestantism, the reader is referred to Winthrop S. Hudson, *American Protestantism* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1972).

<sup>328</sup>William W. Sweet, *The American Churches* (New York & Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1947), 110.

<sup>329</sup>See Chai-Sik Chung, “Global Theology for the Common Good: Lessons from Two Centuries of Korean Christianity,” *International Review of Mission* 85 (Oct, 1985): 523-538.

<sup>330</sup>Sung-Mo Huang, “Protestant Churches and Their Impact on Cultural Change,” 149.

<sup>331</sup>Jung-Young Lee, “The American Missionary Movement in Korea, 1882-1945: Its Contributions and American Diplomacy,” 400.

<sup>332</sup>Martha Huntley, *Caring, Growing, Changing*, 292.

<sup>333</sup>Martha Huntley, *To Start a Work*, 407-408.

<sup>334</sup>Samuel H. Moffett, *The Christians of Korea*, 52.

<sup>335</sup>See his article entitled “American Missionaries and One Hundred Years of Korean Protestantism,” address for the Royal Asiatic Society of Seoul in October 27, 1982.

<sup>336</sup>James S. Gale, *Korea in Transition*, 154.

---

<sup>337</sup>Ibid., 119-120.

<sup>338</sup>See Samuel H. Moffett, “Protestantism: Its Influence on Modernization in Korea,” in *Modern Transformation of Korea* (Seoul: Sejong Publishing Co., 1970), 194-201.

<sup>339</sup>See Russell Richey and Kenneth Rowe, eds. *Rethinking Methodist History* (Nashville: Kingswood Books, 1985), 228-237.

<sup>340</sup>Heup-Young Kim, *Wang Yang-Ming and Karl Barth*, 194. Also cf. Russell Richey and Kenneth Rowe, eds. *Rethinking Methodist History*, 228-237.

<sup>341</sup>See Edward Adams, ‘The Adams Evangelistic Fund’, *Korea Mission Field* (Seoul: Evangelical Missions in Korea, 1930); Jung-Young Lee, “The American Missionary Movement in Korea, 1882-1945: Its Contributions and American Diplomacy,” 393-395 and Roy E. Shearer, “The Evangelistic Missionary’s Role in Church Growth in Korea,” 465-467.

<sup>342</sup>James S. Gale, *Korea in Transition*, 111.

<sup>343</sup>See Spencer Palmer, *Korea and Christianity: The Problem of Identification with Tradition*, 19-33.

<sup>344</sup>Hyosung Lee, “Church Growth Through Mission to the Community: A Model of Outreach for a Korean Church” (D. Min. Thesis, Erskine Theological Seminary, 1998), 1.

<sup>345</sup>See Karl Barth, *CD.*, IV/3, 874-878.

<sup>346</sup>Martha Huntley, *To Start a Work*, 372-385.

<sup>347</sup>Martha Huntley, *Caring, Growing, Changing*, 125.

<sup>348</sup>Not surprisingly, Korea today has become the most famous missionary-sending nation in the world. For detailed statistics and information regarding missionary sending and supporting agencies in Korea, see David J. Cho, “The Growth of Korean Missions and Its Contribution to World Evangelization,” in *Korean Church Growth Explosion*, 120-125 and Marlin L. Nelson, “Korean Church Mission Growth,” in *ibid.*, 88-102.

## CHAPTER II

### THE CHARACTERISTICS OF KARL BARTH'S THEOLOGY AND HIS CHRISTOCENTRIC ECCLESIOLOGY

In the previous chapter, we noted that early Protestant missionaries' primary task was Christ-centred evangelism. They utilized the unique nature of the community-based Korean Confucian legacy. Both educational and social projects were provided as means of outreach.<sup>1</sup> This contribution to the growth of the Korean Christian community provided a fertile environment for the reception of Barth's Christocentric theology, especially his doctrine of the church as a Christian community.<sup>2</sup>

In this chapter, we will explore Barth's Christocentric ecclesiology, which he describes as the gathering, the upbuilding, and the sending of the Christian community. Then we will ask whether or not Barth pays sufficient attention to other cultures and religions.<sup>3</sup> This will enable us to examine the impact of his Christocentric theology upon Sung-Bum Yun's theology of Sung in the following chapter, which critically examines and analyzes his appropriation and misappropriation of Barth's theology.

Before Barth's doctrine of the church is described, it would be helpful to discuss who Barth was, and the main characteristics of his theology, in order to measure adequately his Christocentric ecclesiology.

#### A. The Distinctive Characteristics of Barth's Theology<sup>4</sup>

Karl Barth was born on May 10, 1886 in Basel, Switzerland. His father was Fritz Barth, a pastor and later a theological professor. Karl Barth's theological education began in Berne under his father, and continued in Berlin, Tübingen, and Marburg. Among his

teachers were Adolf von Harnack in Berlin, Adolf Schlatter in Tübingen and Wilhelm Hermann in Marburg, who all greatly influenced his theological views.

Early in life, Barth was impressed by the radical Christian socialist movement that focused on the identification of the kingdom of God with social action. It was led by Christoph Johann Blumhardt (1842-1919), Leonard Ragaz and Hermann Kutter (1863-1931).<sup>5</sup> Barth was also strongly influenced by liberal theology. Later he moved away from the liberal tradition of the Christian faith as expressed by Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834) and his disciples, by polemically rejecting natural theology in a debate with Emil Brunner, as well as the theology of German nationalism in a debate with Friedrich Gogarten.<sup>6</sup> Barth affirmed the primacy of God with a new commitment to the Scriptures as the Word of God to humanity. In fact, as Eberhard Busch stated, he was one of the most significant and influential theologians of the twentieth century who played a leading role in the “dialectical theology movement.”<sup>7</sup>

For ten years, Barth was pastor of an industrial village in Switzerland.<sup>8</sup> There he helped to organize a union and was given the nickname, “the red pastor.”<sup>9</sup> In 1915, he joined the Social Democratic Party. There was a profound conflict with Nazism and with the German Christians, which eventually led Barth to formulate the Barmen Declaration. His service in the Swiss army, his preaching to prisoners in the Basel jail, his trip to Hungary, and a famous letter to an East German Pastor represent political activities central and integral to Barth’s theological work. Barth expressed his concern for socio-political reality in many of his writings such as *Against the Stream: Shorter Post-War Writings 1946-52* (1954), *Community, State, and Church: Three Essays* (1960), *The German Church Conflict* (1965), and *The Church and the Political Problem of Our Day* (1939). His essay “Christian Community and Civil Community” in *Community, State, and Church* is a good example. Here Barth discusses the basic structure of his theology of the socio-political realm and outlines twelve possible analogies. They are: (1) the importance of serving people rather than abstract principles; (2) a constitutional state which gives equal

protection to all under its law; (3) support for social justice; (4) helping the poor and oppressed; (5) a balancing of the interests of the individual and the community; (6) equality of freedom and responsibility for all adult citizens; (7) the separation of powers; (8) opposition to secret policies and diplomacy; (9) support of free speech; (10) rules seen as the servants of the people and not their lords; (11) an awareness of worldwide as well as parochial interests; and (12) the support of the use of violence only as a last resort.<sup>10</sup>

Joseph Bettis notes in his article “Political Theology and Social Ethics: The Socialist Humanism of Karl Barth,” that “Barth’s mature theology, as it is expressed in the *Church Dogmatics*, leads directly, inevitably and necessarily to radical political ethics...this necessary interrelation of theology and politics is essential for any theology which would be true to its responsibility to speak honestly and truly about the living God.”<sup>11</sup> Bettis analyzes the political bearing of Barth’s theological ethics in terms of four criteria of social action that calls into question: “‘What ought we to do?’; ‘What’ means that ethical action is open; ‘Ought’ means that it is self-validating; ‘We’ means that it is communal; and ‘to do’ means that it is concrete.”<sup>12</sup> Bettis asserts that Barth’s definition of ethical behaviour is not abstract speculation, but based on the real socio-political world.<sup>13</sup> In this sense, the gospel is, for Barth, directly relevant to every political act, so that Christians should not avoid any political responsibility.

According to William Hordern, Barth’s doctrine of sanctification and of the church have political implications. The church is the people of God, and is called to preach a Risen Christ as God’s promise and hope for the world. The task given to the people of God, is to speak to specific times and situations. Hordern also observes that Barth’s doctrines of God, creation, Christ and eschatology likewise imply political responsibility.<sup>14</sup>

George Hunsinger’s book entitled *Karl Barth and Radical Politics* (1976) summarizes six theologians’ critical analyses of Barth’s theology and his politics. In the introductory section, Hunsinger claims that Barth as a radical socialist always maintained a critical stance toward politics, and believed socialism is a predicate of the gospel.<sup>15</sup> He

argues that Barth's essay "Jesus Christ and the Movement for Social Justice" is a good example of the early socialist perspective that so decisively influenced the development of his theology. It is true that Barth sees both Jesus Christ and the movement for social justice as one and the same; "Jesus is the movement for social justice, and the movement for social justice is Jesus in the present."<sup>16</sup> Friedrich-Wilhelm Marquardt has stated the point more strongly as summarized by George Hunsinger:

Barth was a radical socialist with strong anarchist tendencies; that his theology not only arose from but aims toward socialist action; that revolution was the basic concept for Barth's understanding of both God and society; that Barth's mature Christology provided the final grounding for leftist convictions arrived at earlier; that in Barth's view a church which bears witness to God's kingdom must herself become a revolutionary agent in society.<sup>17</sup>

Marquardt's essay entitled "Socialism in the Theology of Karl Barth" attempts to show the unity of Barth's theology and his politics, that is, the dialectic between theory and praxis. This unity, as Marquardt has argued, illustrates the practical nature of Barth's Christocentric theology and his ethics. He believes that the political function of the Christian community for Barth is ultimately necessary.<sup>18</sup> Helmut Gollwitzer, one of Barth's students, in his article "Kingdom of God and Socialism in the Theology of Karl Barth," explicates Barth's radical political views. By affirming Marquardt's point of view regarding Barth's socio-political concern, Gollwitzer states that:

"Socialist" is thus, it must be said, a predicate of the gospel. God wants socialism. The true socialism is the kingdom of God—both as the goal of God's history with man, and as the present movement on earth here and now. Where the kingdom of God is at stake, there socialism is always at stake as well. Where socialism is at stake, moreover, there God's kingdom is always already at stake.<sup>19</sup>

At a Safenwil lecture, Barth insisted, according to Gollwitzer, "God is concerned about the kingdom of God; the kingdom of God is the true socialism; therefore, the socialist movement is a 'reflection' of God's kingdom."<sup>20</sup> God's kingdom becomes the foundation of his political ethics. The task of the church is, for Barth, fundamentally to be on the side of the victims of the social disorder of class society and to espouse their cause.<sup>21</sup> Barth, in his 1951 discussion of the work situation in a class society and the class struggle, speaks as follows:

The Christian community can and must also espouse various forms of social progress or even of socialism—always the form most helpful in its specific time and place and in its specific situation. Yet her decisive word cannot consist in the proclamation of social progress or socialism. It can only consist in the proclamation of God's revolution against all “ungodliness and wickedness of men” (Rom. 1:18). That means, however, that it consists in the proclamation of his kingdom as it has already come and comes.<sup>22</sup>

As Gollwitzer says, the content of proclamation, for Barth, is political within and beneath the “decisive word,” the proclamation of God’s kingdom.<sup>23</sup> This action can be referred to Barth’s elaborated basic premise, that is, the “unity of dogmatics and ethics.”<sup>24</sup> Barth’s view of the true socialism of God’s kingdom extends to his use of the doctrine of reconciliation and eschatology. Both the Church and individual Christians are called upon to engage in socio-political activity passionately and therefore to conform to the kingdom of God. However, politics is, for Barth, not an ultimate concern. This is because the one, decisive fact of human history, God’s reconciliation of humanity and the world to himself, has already occurred; the one, decisive fact of reality has already been accomplished in Christ. The world is reconciled to God only because of what Christ did. That is to say that Christ is the Lord of the world as well as of His community. Gerald A. Butler notes that Barth “relativises all political action... This relativising of politics precludes Christians from practicing political fanaticism or from seeking salvation in politics. It does not, however, mean that politics is not taken seriously.”<sup>25</sup>

Barth is well known as the principal author of the Barmen Declaration (1934), which had as its main theme the theological opposition by the German Confessing Church to Adolf Hitler and Nazism.<sup>26</sup> As Rolf Ahlers notes, Barth urged the church “not to function politically but theologically, not to engage in mere institutional but in genuine ecclesiastical ways.”<sup>27</sup> The significance of the Barmen statements was to interpret properly the nature of the church and to show how, by this confessional standard, German Christians had failed theologically.<sup>28</sup> In this sense, Ahlers explains why Barth called the document a “declaration” and not a “confession.” He quotes Barth: “only the church itself is in a position to formulate a confession. A single professor can at best formulate a

‘declaration’, which can then become a confession through congregational and churchly action.”<sup>29</sup> This is not to say that Barth ignores the theological implication of the confession. As Ahlers notes, Barth’s basic idea of the Barmen Declaration is typically based on Reformed understanding of creeds and confessions.<sup>30</sup> Yet the real reason why Barmen was called a declaration rather than a confession was in deference to the Lutherans who were inclined to view a confession along the lines of the Augsburg Confession.

The real source of Reformed confessionalism is the authority of Holy Scripture that affirms a genuinely biblical understanding of God, humanity and the world. Like the Reformers, Lutherans and Calvinists, Barth, in the Barmen Declaration, maintains that God’s Word—expressed in Holy Scripture and interpreted by the Holy Spirit—is unchangeable, but the human condition is definite, limited and temporal. The primary focus of the Barmen Declaration was thus faithfulness to the Word of God as proclaimed and made manifest in Jesus Christ.

On the basis of the Reformed tradition of creeds and confessions, Barth’s main concern was the right interpretation of the Christian community. The confessing church cannot be formulated apart from a concrete *coetus* and *societas*. The church must strive to see that society assures everyone’s freedom and protects any individuals from discrimination based on race, economic status or religious convictions. This is to say that the confessing Christian community must be present in a definite and concrete society. For this reason, Barth stresses the contemporaneity of the Christian community in the world. As Arthur C. Cochrane argued, “Barmen has provided a correct and exemplary starting-point for the Church’s witness with regard to racial, social, political and economic questions.”<sup>31</sup> Cochrane goes on to say, the Declaration was “first of all an ecclesiological claim and a summons to the church to speak as a Church.”<sup>32</sup> Accordingly, Robert M. Brown affirms that Barth’s concern in the Barmen Declaration was to claim the church’s core; that is, the church’s own nature and task are to be true to itself and its message.<sup>33</sup>

We can discern two emphases in the Barmen Declaration: first, Barth's theology is strongly determined by the person of Jesus Christ, who is the sole key to understanding God, the universe and humanity;<sup>34</sup> secondly, the primary task of the Christian community is that it is "called to give an active response to the 'Yes' of God and, in so doing, to be God's witness among people."<sup>35</sup> These two emphases are also presented in Barth's ecclesiology; especially his theology of mission. The Christian community is sent into the world to bring the good news of salvation in Jesus Christ to all nations. Barth was a true missionary-minded theologian who sought a balance between theory and praxis.<sup>36</sup>

George Hunsinger's work, entitled *How to Read Karl Barth: The Shape of His Theology* (1991), is very helpful in understanding Barth's theological characteristics. Here Hunsinger represents six motifs in Barth's theology: actualism, particularism, objectivism, personalism, realism and rationalism. First of all, actualism governs Barth's complex conception of being and time. In the language of occurrence, Barth speaks of happening, event, history, decisions and act in the *Church Dogmatics*. Both events and relationships are emphasized. In particular, the relationship between God and humanity as actualistic is "one of the most vexed topics in Barth interpretation."<sup>37</sup> Our relationship to God is active and historical; our active relationship to God is a history of love and freedom. For Barth, this is ultimately an event, which is continually established by the ongoing activity of God's redeeming grace. As Hunsinger states, Barth's theological principle of actualism is therefore "a theology which stresses the sovereignty of grace, the incapacity of the creature, and the miraculous history whereby grace grants what the creature lacks for the sake of love and freedom."<sup>38</sup>

Secondly, Barth's particularism is based on the deeper patterns of biblical witness, especially in its narrative accounts of the event of grace as centred on Jesus Christ. The heart of his theological reflection begins with the particular and moves to the general.<sup>39</sup> The weakness might not be systematic or on non-theological grounds, but the strength can be the scriptural usage for the specific descriptions of various anomalies such as the doctrine

of the Trinity, of the incarnation or of reconciliation. Barth does not explain such anomalies in detail, but simply expresses these divine complexities with the assertions of faith about God. This is his loyalty to the particularities of the biblical witness, that is, his respect for the presence of mystery.

Thirdly, objectivism for Barth has two important aspects: the knowledge of God and salvation in Christ. Both are events, which are not only mediated by the creaturely sphere, but also grounded in the sovereignty of God. Barth understands the knowledge of God as irreducible and objective. God's self-revelation in history was the same as God's identity in eternity. For Barth, God's eternal being in and for itself, as Hunsinger notes, "could be inferred from God's being as enacted for and among us in history."<sup>40</sup> God's love and freedom in relation to us are grounded in God's love and freedom in and for themselves. God's trinitarian self-disclosure in history is understood as God's trinitarian identity in eternity. Barth's logical basis for these assertions is that the knowledge of God as confessed by faith lies not in human subjectivity but in God. For Barth, God is revealed in God's unity and entirety.<sup>41</sup> This is an act of self-revelation of the living God. God can be known by God alone. Therefore, proofs of God, for Barth, are neither necessary nor possible.

The heart of Barth's objectivism is in Jesus Christ who becomes God's definitive, final, and binding act of self-revelation. In Jesus Christ, God's unity and entirety are present. God's identity in and with Jesus Christ is the mysterious identity of the Triune God. Barth's objectivism in Jesus Christ is related to soteriological reality. This means that God's essential identity as disclosed in Jesus Christ is ontologically present in Jesus Christ, as well as the human race ontologically being present in Him in the sense that in and only in Him is its own true reality to be found.<sup>42</sup> Barth believes that God enters into human history in Jesus Christ. Thus humanity at the same time is brought to God in that history objectively. This is Barth's understanding of anthropological correlation; our true humanity is to be found not in ourselves but objectively in Jesus Christ. In this sense, Hunsinger

pinpoints Barth's claim of objectivism: "God's real presence to humanity in Jesus Christ (revelational objectivism) is paralleled by humanity's real presence in Jesus Christ to God (soteriological objectivism)."<sup>43</sup> Barth's idea of humanity's real presence in Jesus Christ is objective and "conceived as the soteriological counterpart to humanity's unstable existence in sin as an objective, eschatological 'unreality'."<sup>44</sup> Indeed, his revelational and soteriological objectivism is fundamentally based on the centrality of Jesus Christ, who becomes the absolute objectivity and actuality of God's self-revelation.

Fourthly, the core of the personalistic motif in Barth's theology is an I-Thou relationship in the eternal life of the Triune God. The sinful creature is granted an eternal life of love and freedom in and with Jesus Christ. The goal of the divine self-manifestation is to establish a relationship of love and freedom with the creature and make it capable of fellowship with God and also its fellow creatures. Barth continues to hold to the personalism of humanity's encounter with God. This encounter with God is given by God's redeeming grace, and is objectively mediated by Jesus Christ. This is not intrinsic to human nature, but extrinsic. In other words, a personal encounter with God is only given by God's free decision of grace, in which "God graciously determined to be our God, and to make us be God's people, in Jesus Christ."<sup>45</sup> In Barth's concept of personalism, the true identity of Jesus Christ is understood as the one Mediator of God to us and of us to God. He becomes "both the acting subject and the event of something far transcending all human possibility and reality, namely, the personalism of our salvation."<sup>46</sup> Hunsinger explains Barth's understanding of the I-Thou relationship:

In Jesus Christ (objectivism), God establishes an active, historical relationship with us (actualism), a relationship of love and freedom, and thus a relationship of deepest intimacy (personalism). It is the event of an I-Thou relationship. "God comes before us," writes Barth, "as the one who addresses us and who is to be addressed in return"—as an "I" who addresses us as "thou" and to whom we may freely say "Thou" in response (II/1, 58). The Word by which God comes to us, by which God addresses and encounters us, is Jesus Christ.<sup>47</sup>

For Barth, both objectivism and personalism are correlated. The former as the external basis of personalism makes personalism possible, while the latter as the internal basis of

objectivism establishes and entails objectivism. In this correlation, Jesus Christ is the centre who becomes the necessary and sufficient condition of our encounter with the Triune God.

Fifthly, realism is the motif which belongs to Barth's concept of theological language. Barth refers theological language to its subject matter by way of analogy.<sup>48</sup> He believes that analogy, as a category for the mode of reference, has several advantages. It not only acknowledges the inability of human language to explain God's essential otherness, but also respects the miracle of God's self-revelation. Moreover, it allows for the occurrence of genuine and proper reference. On the other hand, both "literalism" and "expressivism," as Hunsinger describes Barth's theological characteristics, tend to underestimate the sovereign activity of God as well as the mystery of God's otherness. Both are limited to interpret traditional dogmas such as the creation of the world *ex nihilo*, the incarnation of the eternal Word of God, and the resurrection of Jesus from the dead.<sup>49</sup> For these reasons, Barth sees that both literalism and expressivism underestimate the primacy of God who becomes the acting and addressing subject. This is to say that they failed to realize God's self-revelation as a form of personal address from God to the whole person as it was mediated through the witness of the church. Barth rejects the idea of literalism and expressivism.<sup>50</sup> This is because he sees the former as a univocal reference or propositional address and the latter as an equivocal reference or emotive revelation. Barth's realism is thus analogical rather than univocal or equivocal—self-involving rather than merely cognitive or emotive, and kerygmatic.

Hunsinger's final analysis of Barth's theological characteristics is rationalism, which pertains to the construction and assessment of doctrine. Hunsinger emphasizes Barth's concept of the *intellectus fidei* by representing two organizing rubrics: "no knowledge without faith" and "no faith without knowledge."<sup>51</sup> "No knowledge without faith" means the critical limits that Barth refers to as the *intellectus fidei*; the peculiar kind of knowledge gained within the web of Christian belief. This knowledge is for Barth, no neutrality, no speculation, no apologetics, and no system. To be specific, the knowledge of

faith in Barth's theological rationalism is self-involving, self-grounded, self-commendng, and self-interpreting. On the other hand, "no faith without knowledge" for Barth means that the content of faith must be explicated in terms of the conceptual implications of the ordinary language of faith. This phrase is rooted in "Anselmian coherentism," that is, "Faith seeking understanding." At this point, Hunsinger quotes Barth's statement, "faith seeking to understand the implications of the cognitive content intrinsic to faith."<sup>52</sup>

Therefore, the *intellectus fidei*, for Barth, is

...a matter of faith coming to display its own peculiar and intrinsic rationality...a set of internal cognitive relations...and a form of coherentism in the sense that no theological assertions and beliefs can be justified independently of other theological assertions and beliefs—all of which are rooted directly or indirectly in faith.<sup>53</sup>

Hunsinger further indicates that Barth's rationalistic character of the *intellectus fidei* can be explained by several "rationalist" procedures such as deriving, grounding, ordering, testing, and assimilating.<sup>54</sup> Rationalism and realism are the foundational motifs of Barth's theology. Both are applied to his conception of truth. Truth, as coherence in the *intellectus fidei*, presupposes truth as correspondence in the discourse of faith.<sup>55</sup> Coherence gives the criterion of truth, and correspondence the nature of truth. Coherence is the internal relations of deriving, grounding, explicating, and testing, while correspondence is the external relations of analogical predication.

Hunsinger in his concluding chapter entitled "Christ the Center," indicates that Jesus Christ, for Barth, is the centre of the motifs.<sup>56</sup> They are all descriptive of Him. As they point to Him, they are meant to be instructive and thought-provoking. Thereby they enlarge the understanding and devotion of faith. Barth regarded Jesus Christ as the Logos of God and therefore the rationality of God.<sup>57</sup> This means that, believing in Jesus Christ, we Christians seek understanding and therefore use our powers of reason in theological hearing and obedience.<sup>58</sup> Barth says: "To look to Him is to see Him at the very center, to see Him and the history which, accomplished in Him, heals everything and all things, as the mystery, reality, origin and goal of the whole world, all human beings, all life."<sup>59</sup> As the centre of the foundational motifs, Jesus Christ becomes the event of the absolute

miracle of grace and the absolute mystery of its content. As the objective Mediator of revelation and salvation, He becomes the truth of God and the reality of humanity. As the living Word of God, He is encountered in fellowship, attested in witness and appropriated by prayer. Jesus Christ as the reality of all history, for Barth, is the centre of all things. According to Hunsinger, realism, rationalism, actualism, particularism, objectivism, and personalism shape Barth's theology. These motifs "are directed toward Christ the center."<sup>60</sup>

In concluding remarks, it should be noted that Barth was a neo-Calvinist and emphasized both the primacy of God and the centrality of Christ. Professor William Klempa in his essay entitled, "Barth as a Scholar and Interpreter of Calvin," critically analyzes Barth's agreement and disagreement with Calvin in terms of three aspects: (1) theological method; (2) the Scripture-principle; and (3) doctrine of election. Klempa has argued that, for both Barth and Calvin, Christocentrism "was intimately connected with the truth of 'glory to God alone' and 'Scripture alone'."<sup>61</sup> For Barth, Jesus Christ is not only the centre and the heart of all truth regarding God and humanity, but also the starting point of his theology in terms of three interrelated forms. These include "Jesus Christ the living Word of God," "Scripture as the written Word of God" and "the Proclaimed Word of God."<sup>62</sup> In accordance with Calvin's teaching, Barth affirms the Scripture-principle and the inward testimony of the Holy Spirit. As Klempa maintains, election is a mirror of both Barth's agreement and disagreement with the theology of Calvin. In the Preface to *Church Dogmatics* II/2, Barth writes: "I would have preferred to follow Calvin's doctrine of predestination much more closely, instead of departing from it so radically."<sup>63</sup>

It is difficult to explore Barth's discussion of election in this limited section. However, it is helpful to look at Klempa's analyses of four points of agreement and three points of disagreement between Barth and Calvin. The four points of agreement are: (1) the doctrine of predestination; (2) the mystery, sovereign freedom and righteousness of the electing God; (3) double predestination in terms of two aspects of God's intention and act;

and (4) Scripture alone as the source of the truth of election. The three points of disagreement are: (1) the different approaches to Scripture. Barth criticized Calvin for coming to Scripture with a certain decision on the basis of experience and independently of Scripture; (2) the relationship of predestination and Christology. Unlike Calvin, Barth's Christological grounding of election is derived from Athanasius, who spoke of the Triune God as the subject of the divine decision, the Son of God no less than the Father and the Holy Spirit; and (3) the Christological reference. According to Barth, the electing God of Calvin is a *Deus nudus absconditus*. Klempa quotes Barth's judgment: "All the dubious features of Calvin's doctrine result from the basic failing that in the last analysis he separates God and Jesus Christ thinking that what was in the beginning with God must be sought elsewhere than in Jesus Christ."<sup>64</sup>

Although Barth's disagreements with Calvin are evident in some aspects, Calvin had a significant role in Barth's theology. Barth in his work *Church Dogmatics*, frequently quoted with approval Calvin's theological views on the covenant, gospel and law, providence, Christology, faith, justification and sanctification. According to Douglas Horton, Barth is a reincarnation of Calvin.<sup>65</sup> In accordance with Calvin, Barth's theological basis is the Sinaitic sovereignty of God. Arthur C. McGiffert, whom Professor Klempa quotes, said "it was mainly in the Barthian movement that Calvinism was coming back and in a lively way."<sup>66</sup> Cornelius van Til in his work entitled, *The New Modernism*, has denied that Barth was a Calvinist. However, Klempa refutes van Til's argument by citing Hans Urs von Balthasar's balanced view of the relation of Barth to Calvin.<sup>67</sup> He also mentions G. C. Berkouwer, who repudiated van Til's caricature and acknowledged Barth's great debt to Calvin. Klempa believes that Barth owed a considerable debt to Calvin. He says: "there is scarcely a major work of Barth which does not cite Calvin. It is no accident then that Barth placed the portrait of Calvin on the wall of his study side by side and at exactly the same level with the portrait of his favourite composer, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart."<sup>68</sup>

Indeed, Barth's encounter with the theology of Calvin is helpful for us to understand his theological characteristics.

### B. Barth's Christocentric Ecclesiology

This chapter does not deal with the whole of Barth's ecclesiological enterprise, but it focuses on the gathering, upbuilding and sending of the community. This is because his Christocentric concept of the Christian community is crucial to its Korean indigenization. We will discuss the validity of this view in the following chapter.

Before investigating the gathering, upbuilding and sending character of the church in Barth's ecclesiology, it is essential to note why Barth particularly prefers to define the church (*Kirche*) as a "community" (*Gemeinde*) throughout his work. In Barth's view, the term "community" refers to the "congregation" or the "company," or "Christendom" which exists by the concrete gathering of believers—the Christian fellowship—in the name of Jesus Christ through His Holy Spirit. In other words, the Christian community is the most fundamental biblical concept for the Church, where the communal aspect of subjective reconciliation through Jesus Christ takes place.<sup>69</sup> Thus, Barth's concept of the Christian community is always based on the fact that Jesus Christ is that ultimate root or originator of all beings. For Barth, Jesus Christ is the Saviour of the world.

It is only in the Church, or in the Christian community, where God grants His grace and His salvation to His people. Salvation is God's gracious gift and free act. The Church then functions to bring about reconciliation of God with His people through their communal gatherings in the name of Jesus Christ the Lord by the power of the Holy Spirit. Daniel B. Spross notes that Barth is convinced that the community's basic dignity and activity actually happen in the event of the common participation in "Christ's priestly, prophetic and kingly functions that produce the one salvation, faith, hope, love and consequently sanctification."<sup>70</sup> There is, for Barth, no salvation outside the life of the individual *in* and *with* a community, where the Spirit of God summons believers to share

their communal lives and acts as the unique source and power of the subjective realization of reconciliation.

In this context, the Church, for Barth, is an assembly called forth by God, that is, a community of believers in the common bond of faith and love uniting all its members.<sup>71</sup> In *Community, State, and Church* (1960), Barth claims that “Christians are called to offer supplications, prayers, intercessions and thanksgivings for all men...the Church has to offer itself to God for all men.”<sup>72</sup> He goes on to say that “the concept ‘community’ is intended to draw attention to the fact that we are concerned in the ‘Church’ and the ‘State’ not merely and not primarily with institutions and offices, but with human beings gathered together in corporate bodies in the service of common tasks.”<sup>73</sup>

On the other hand, Barth selects the biblical image of the “Body of Christ” as his definition of the church, where it is used early in *Church Dogmatics*.<sup>74</sup> But in Volume IV, he identifies the body of Christ with the “Christian community,” the invisible reality with the visible human,<sup>75</sup> by constructing his formal account of ecclesiology. Nicholas M. Healy points out that Barth’s methodological approach to establish a single definition of the church is, in one key aspect at least, formally similar to that of many of his contemporaries such as Dietrich Bonhoeffer, who uses “body of Christ” in his *The Communion of Saints* (1963), Karl Rahner, who defines the church as “*Ursakrament*” in his work entitled *The Church and the Sacraments* (1963), and Paul Tillich, who defines the church as the “Spiritual Community” in his *Systematic Theology* (1963), especially vol. 3.<sup>76</sup>

#### The gathering of the Christian community

According to Barth, the church is “the earthly-historical form of the existence of Jesus Christ Himself,”<sup>77</sup> which involves human action, human construction, or Christian activity through the work of God and His Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is the quickening power of the living Lord Jesus Christ. This is because the Holy Spirit sanctifies human beings and their works, and consequently upbuilds them to be the true members of the Christian community.<sup>78</sup> It is only in Christ that the true Church, organized by the true

Christian community, can move to the revelation of the sanctification of all humanity as well as human life. Its sanctification, which has already taken place in Christ, is provisional in the light of representing its incompleteness in the movement of the true Church. The divine work is true, genuine and effective, but human work is fragmentary, incomplete, insecure and always questionable. As David M. Gill maintains, the task of the true Christian community of Jesus Christ is, for Barth, to accomplish “this provisional representation of the sanctification of all humanity and human life” by witnessing to both the first revelation—the resurrection of Jesus Christ—of the reconciliation of the world with God and the second coming of Jesus Christ in the last time.<sup>79</sup>

The term “time” is, for Barth, understood within the concept of the eschatological fulfillment of this provisional representation. Barth considers that this time is between the first *parousia* of Jesus Christ and the second, which highlights the immediate visible presence and action of the living Lord Himself as the judge of the quick and the dead in His final coming in His revelation. Until His second coming, the community exists as His body, and He is invisibly the living Head of His community through the movement of His Holy Spirit. Between these times, the life of the Christian community is essentially to pray for the work of the Holy Spirit and to have faith and repentance and to preach the Gospel throughout the world. That is, it is the time of grace for the Christian community as His body, to perform its service effectively.<sup>80</sup> Jesus Christ is, in fact, the first and the final time. More precisely, He is “the first and the final revelation of the work of God.”<sup>81</sup> Barth asserts that Jesus Christ, as Saviour, is not only a living redemptive model, but also the saving operator in His resurrection, totally and perfectly. Jesus Christ cannot be understood as “yesterday” or “forever,” because He Himself is “today,” which is the intervening time, and ultimately our time, in the form of the true church. In other words, Jesus Christ has come already, will come again, and is alive today.

Barth therefore describes “the true Church” as an earthly-historical event (*Geschehens*) in Christ’s own particular history.<sup>82</sup> The reason is that Jesus Christ does not

work actively without His people, but does act for and with His people in order for them to be filled with His activity in the time given to them and the world. He Himself is the Lord who is active with His people in the continuous history of human thought, effort, and works. Thus, His community can achieve its provisional representation of sanctification as God leads His people on the way, and in a movement so that they can acquire the goal and the direction towards it.

For Barth, the Church is visible, *ecclesia visibilis*, in terms of its historical and earthly existence through “the awakening power of the Word made flesh, of the Son of God, who Himself entered the lowness of an historical existence in this world, who as very God became and is very man.”<sup>83</sup> According to Verne H. Fletcher, Barth insists that a definite human fellowship forms a visible Christian community as a doer of the Word of God (Jas. 1:22) in the relationship of its individual members.<sup>84</sup> It is a concrete human form, which seriously takes part in the historical life of community, its upbuilding, its mission, and ultimately the true humanity of Jesus Christ in order to be visible to the world. It means that true visibility, the earthly and historical existence of Christ, can be seen in the Church by confessing its faith “in the invisible aspect, which is the secret of the visible.”<sup>85</sup>

The Church as an earthly and historical form of Christ is, for Barth, especially visible within its own event of the communion of saints, which is very particular and peculiar from any other historical human activity. Faith is established on the firm basis that God is the reconciler and revealer, and Jesus Christ Himself is the humble atonement for sinful human beings, and the Holy Spirit accomplishes the task of mission for the world. It is also another aspect of faith that the real Christian community should be the living community of the living Lord Jesus Christ in the quickening power of His Spirit. In reality, the visible form of the Christian community, such as the gathering, maintaining, communicating, and completing of itself as an earthly-historical factor in the power of the act of God, is the primary step in realizing and knowing the invisible form of the

community as a spiritual reality of God's own work.<sup>86</sup> That is to say, the visible affirms the invisible, and therefore the invisible cannot be perceived, but only believed in Jesus Christ, who is "a heavenly-historical form of existence."<sup>87</sup> It is thus clear that Barth affirms both the visible and invisible nature of the Christian community.<sup>88</sup> He accordingly argues that the church can be activated by the following events: (1) being obedient to the law of the Gospel, that is, the law of the Spirit of life (Rom. 8:2); (2) acknowledging the Lord Jesus Christ as the Lord of the covenant in His faithfulness; (3) taking the form of a sequence and nexus of definite human activities, that is, active Christian fellowship.<sup>89</sup>

It is fundamental for Barth that Jesus Christ is the centre of the Christian community who not only co-exists as the Head of the community, but also became the servant of all human beings. This is based on *Credo ecclesiam*, which is visible only to one having faith.<sup>90</sup> The Christian community as the body of Christ, is therefore the earthly-historical form of existence of Jesus Christ Himself. At the same time He lives as the Crucified and Risen Lord in a heavenly-historical form of existence. As David M. Gill states, Barth affirms that the function of Christ's community is to subject itself to divine judgment by living with Him as His body, His fellowship, and His people, "through the awakening, enlightening, sustaining power of His Holy Spirit."<sup>91</sup> The community also exists by receiving the manifestation of the Spirit in the unity and diversity of His gifts (1 Cor. 12:7; Rom. 12:6). On the basis of this it can confess Jesus as Christ, which is its fundamental faith as well as the secret of the Christian community throughout Church history. One of the most important facets of Barth's ecclesiology is that the community cannot create itself by fully practicing spiritual gifts, or by the preaching of the Gospel with the power of the Holy Spirit, but only in and with Jesus Christ, can His body be recognized as His community and His community as His body.

As David M. Gill goes on to describe, on the basis of Scripture, Barth emphasizes that the being of the community cannot be divided, but must be a unity in the plurality of its own believers under the name of Jesus Christ who is simultaneously God Himself, and the

Holy Spirit.<sup>92</sup> God reconciled Himself with the sinful world in Jesus Christ, who was crucified and risen and eventually became the Head of His community by sending His Spirit with His diverse gifts in a unity of Himself. In this respect, there is only One divine being.

Barth asserts that the body (community) of Christ can be much more visible in faith as it is analyzed by the four elements which are determined to be norms for the *ecclesia* in the Nicene Creed (381): *una, sancta, catholica, apostolica*.<sup>93</sup> On the basis of this *credo*, Barth firmly believed the ecumenical task (*credo unam ecclesiam*) as being foremost an intra-community quest for integrity in the following: (1) both the visible and the invisible Church is the earthly-historical form of existence of the One living Lord Jesus Christ. The former is an earthly-historical fellowship, but the latter is a supra-naturally spiritual fellowship. It means that both co-exist dependently and mutually; (2) the *ecclesia militans* and the *ecclesia triumphans* are also one Church because of their continual relationship with the history of the present; (3) the people of Israel in its whole history *ante et post Christum* and the Christian Church as it came into being on the day of Pentecost are two forms and aspects of the one inseparable community in which Jesus Christ has His earthly-historical form of existence, by which He is attested to the whole world and by which the whole world is summoned to faith in Him. For what the Christian Church is, Israel was and is before it—His possession (John 1:11), His body; (4) the community can be divided geographically and be different culturally, but it exists in its own unity. Although the community has different factors such as its language, history, culture and tradition, it lives basically as the one body of Christ.<sup>94</sup>

The unity of the community, for Barth, is based on the correlation and co-ordination and mutual recognition of the individual communities in the one Lord Jesus Christ for the purpose of its edification, ministry, mission and confession (Eph. 4:11). The Holy Spirit helps the community gather together in the name of Jesus Christ who is the

basis and guarantee of its true unity. It is therefore a fundamental matter according to Barth that there is not a plurality of unities, but a single unity in the plurality of His body.

In Barth's ecclesiology, unity in diversity is fundamentally required in the forms of the communal external expressions of the grace of Christ, such as Bible study, prayer, worship, service, caring for others' souls and community meetings.<sup>95</sup> These functions definitely make the Church possible and make it the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church by way of building up the body of Christ,<sup>96</sup> and also for the world to see the unity, truth, justice and peace in the Church. The Church needs fellowship in the reality of salvation and in the totality of its acts, life and worship. In other words, the fellowship is the means and expression, the sign and instrument of universal salvation which is established by Christ's priestly, prophetic and kingly ministry for the upbuilding of His Body.<sup>97</sup>

Barth also affirms that the community as the body of Christ is holy (*Credo sanctam ecclesiam*) because Christ, as the living Head of His community, is holy. The individual members of His body live in Him and with Him as holy. It is because they have a very special relationship with Him in the form of the awakening of the faith of individuals. The term "holy" is relatively referred to as the concept for what is the good, just, right, and an appropriate standard of acting and being. Its definition is equivalent to the term "Godhead" as a standard for what is spiritual, moral, and ethical. Holiness was one of the most important parts of Old Testament life which had influenced every sphere, such as the Israelites' society and the individual. The holiness of the community, for Barth, does not mean its separation from the world, but its holy activity within the world in the hands of its Lord. In this sense, its holiness reflects both the holiness of the Lord and the free gift of His Holy Spirit. The members are therefore required to be holy in the Spirit of Christ as well as in His Word (Rom. 8:9).<sup>98</sup>

Barth generally prefers the term "catholic" to "ecumenical" in his ecclesiological work, for "catholic" is seen as a more inclusive term that explicates the true identity of the

Christian community as “the body of Christ” more comprehensively. In other words, for Barth, the ecumenical church cuts across the boundaries of space; the catholic church cuts across the boundaries of both space and time.<sup>99</sup> Hence, the community, as Christ’s body, is the same in spite of its particular differences such as its races, languages, cultures and classes (*Credo catholicam ecclesiam*).<sup>100</sup> Its task is initially to witness to Jesus Christ as the Saviour for every age and people in the world “within the comprehensive unity (catholicity) of the common faith, knowledge and confession.”<sup>101</sup> Then the Christian community is to maintain its identity in a pure and living form as the Christian community, for the sake of both its head and its individual members.

We must note that Barth laments racial discrimination: “How much longer will it be possible in the United States and South Africa to ratify the social distinctions between whites and blacks by a corresponding division in the Church, instead of calling it in question in the social sphere by the contrary practice of the Church?”<sup>102</sup> John W. Gruchy asserts that “Barth categorically rejected any attempt to divide the church along racial or nationalist lines...for Barth, the ‘earthly historical form’ of the church, its *Gestalt*, was, as the third thesis of the Barmen Declaration indicated, part of its confession of Jesus Christ.”<sup>103</sup> It is true that Barth was very negative regarding the British and German imperialism that attempted to justify their misuses of theological concepts and biblical texts for their own purposes, such as white racism and Nazi anti-Semitism. For this reason, he rejects any synthesis between the Church and culture, or so-called cultural Protestantism. His firm conviction is that the Church as the Christian community should be the Church itself *in and with* Jesus Christ in order for it to be unique and diverse only in Him. Therefore, the community is, for Barth, “*catholica*” because Jesus Christ as the Head, lives and speaks and acts in His community; it is a faith in which we can see unity, holiness and catholicity as the true community of Jesus Christ.

Furthermore, Barth defines the church as “*apostolica*,” which means listening and accepting the apostles’ discipline, instruction, and direction under their normative authority.

Barth's concept of *apostolica* is rooted in the spiritual criterion which "enables us to answer the question whether and to what extent in this or that case we have or have not to do with the one holy catholic Church."<sup>104</sup> The criterion that the Church is apostolic, can be known only in faith. Believing the Church involves believing the mystery of its institution and preservation. Barth in his work *Theology and Church* (1962) cites the Roman Catechism:

Since therefore this article, no less than the others, is beyond the capacity and power of our reason, we must rightly confess that we do not know the origin, the gifts and the honour of the Church by human reason, but we see them with the eyes of faith...And men were not the founders of this Church; the founder was the ever-living God himself. Nor is the power which the Church received human; it was assigned by divine gift. Therefore since it cannot be compared to any natural powers, it also is by faith only that we know that in the Church are the keys of heaven, and that to the Church was given the power to remit sins, to excommunicate, and to consecrate the body of Christ.<sup>105</sup>

Barth indicates that Roman Catechism, "By faith only we know (*fide solum intellegimus*)," affirms the divine reality of the Church.<sup>106</sup> The Church as apostolic is thus spiritual. Barth explains: "we Protestants understand by faith men's receiving of and laying hold on the grace of God, which is itself the effect of grace, and in which the grace, since it is grace is in both its aspects the inexpressible mercy of God. Both in what is received and in the act of receiving and laying hold, faith is and remains God's grace."<sup>107</sup> It is by the grace of God that at every moment and in every relation human beings are supported by God and only by God. Although one can perceive, know and experience his or her own faith, communion with God is impossible. This is because God is God and the human being is a creature and truly a sinful creature. Without God's grace, human beings cannot be saved. By grace, one is so kept by God alone. That is what faith affirms.

The apostolicity of the Church consists as a criterion of its catholicity, holiness and unity. It is the body of Christ, that is, "the earthly-historical form of the existence of Jesus Christ." Christ as the Head of His body exists in earthly-historical form in His community in the world. Then He gives Himself to be known in this earthly-historical form to it and to the world through it. The earthly-historical medium of His self-manifestation, Barth wrote, is in "those in whose midst He has lived on earth, in history, as the Word of God made

flesh, those who have seen and heard and handled Him in the servant-form of His flesh, but also in His glory.”<sup>108</sup> According to Barth, these are the apostles who are chosen, called, ordained, and sent out by Jesus Christ for this purpose. They are His direct witnesses and share His peculiar earthly-historical position. In this position, they become the cornerstone of His Church. That is to say that they are summoned to maintain and confirm their apostolic witness. Barth affirms the headship of Jesus Christ, by reminding us of the fact that their source of authority, power and mission belongs to Him. It is not they who build His community, but Jesus Christ who builds it as He makes use of them. They are only His servant; “Only in this way is there any correspondence to His own being in which He has manifested Himself to them, and therefore to the content of their preaching.”<sup>109</sup>

Christ speaks through the apostles. This means that someone who hears them hears Him; someone who does not hear them does not hear Him. At this point, Barth emphasizes the responsibility of the apostolic community for the world by quoting Matthew 16:19, “The keys of the kingdom of heaven are actually in their hands.”<sup>110</sup> When they preach the Word of God, they are identical as the servants of Christ. Their earthly and historical existence is always present when “their witness is sounded out and received and accepted and reproduced.”<sup>111</sup> Indeed, Barth holds that the apostolic church does not exist for its own sake; it must proclaim the Word of God and perform the service of its Lord in and to the world.<sup>112</sup> The apostolic church “builds up itself for the sake of its mission and in relation to it.”<sup>113</sup> Accordingly, the primary task of the apostolic church for Barth is to be, from first to last, a missionary church.

The attitude of subjection and obedience is essential for the apostolic community. Barth says: “It is a matter of the *ministerium Verbi*, of the *Verbum incarnatum*, Jesus Christ Himself.”<sup>114</sup> It is a matter of the *ministerium Verbi incarnati* which means the relationship of the Church to its Lord Jesus Christ. The community has not to subject itself, nor its own obedience, to their witness, but to Jesus Christ. The Christian community finds itself in the

school of the apostles. In this school, it learns the meaning of obedience and practices obedience. In other words, it knows the meaning of service and exercises its *ministerium*. Then it cannot be corrupted by human control over the Holy Spirit. To know and practice obedience is to be the servant of Jesus Christ who instructs, guides, corrects and qualifies them in this school. The Church is the *ecclesia apostolica* when it accepts Jesus Christ as the Lord of His body, and teaches Him as being the Lord over all things. In relation to this fact, the community can be known as the true and one holy Church on the basis of its teaching and, as a result, can be distinguished from the false Church. As Barth has argued, the apostolic community not only has a spiritual knowledge of Jesus Christ as the Crucified and Risen from the dead and as the living Lord even today, but also hears the apostolic witness of both the Old and New Testament as the source and norm of its existence by accepting Jesus Christ as a free subject, or the *veritas catholica*. For Barth, Jesus Christ makes the Church the catholic Church, His Church; the true, Christian Church and the one holy Church.<sup>115</sup>

Barth emphasizes “the authority of the Bible as the source and norm of the existence and doctrine and order of the Church—the ‘Scripture-principle’.”<sup>116</sup> The Church has to conform to the authority of both the Old and New Testaments as the canon and follow its direction. The Christian community must encounter the concrete biblical witness. In this witness, the truth of the Word of God is present, explained and explicated. The apostolic and catholic Church exists on the basis of Scripture and in conformity with it. For Barth, the Bible is not merely the book of law of the Church’s faith and order, but a witness that demands attention, respect and obedience—the obedience of the heart, the free and only genuine obedience.<sup>117</sup> The central theme of the Bible for Barth is the living Jesus Christ. For this reason, Scripture works in the service of its Lord. Barth says:

Again, the Church is apostolic and therefore the true Church where its regard for the direction of Scripture always gives to its preaching, doctrine, instruction and theology a strict concentration on the recognition of Jesus Christ alone, of Jesus Christ as God revealed and speaking and acting, of His death and resurrection, of the salvation which appeared in Him as the only salvation of men and the world, of the kingdom which has drawn near in Him, of the hope of His coming, of faith in

Him—all under this sign, all with reference to this reality, all thinking from and thinking back to this point.<sup>118</sup>

### The Upbuilding<sup>119</sup> of the Christian Community

The mutual relationship between Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit is, for Barth, important, for both play an essential role in upbuilding the true Christian community. Barth understands the Holy Spirit as the quickening power, which helps the body of Christ, “the earthly-historical form of His own existence,” come into being and exist to be the true Church in the service of its Lord. Hence, the true Christian community is, as Daniel B. Spross says, only possible within the upbuilding of the Christian community and Christian love, which is applied to the divine work of sanctification as a special form of the reconciliation of the world by the resurrected and the living Lord Jesus Christ.<sup>120</sup> The power of the Holy Spirit is the principle of sanctification and the means to promote the upbuilding of the Christian community through Christian love.

In Barth’s theology, the action of the Holy Spirit is the work of the free grace of God in Jesus Christ, because it brings the individual Christian and the Christian community and Jesus Christ the Head of His body, into harmony and therefore binds them into a true unity, which is already accomplished in God’s act of reconciliation with the world through His Son Jesus Christ. The gracious act of the Holy Spirit is thus crucial and actual that “the Head does not live without His body nor the body without its Head, but that the Head, Jesus Christ, lives with and in His community, and the body, His community, with and in Him.”<sup>121</sup> Such statements are firmly based on Barth’s Christologico-ecclesiological, or pneumatologico-ecclesiological concept that is regarded as the one reality of the basis and secret of the existence of the Christian community in the world-occurrence.<sup>122</sup>

Barth sees that sanctification constitutes participation in the work of Christ, by walking under the direction of the Holy Spirit.<sup>123</sup> The power of the Holy Spirit not only creates, commissions, controls, and empowers the people of God to be and become Christians, but also to gather, buildup, and go out as a Christian community. In the power of the Spirit, Christ was resurrected. The power of the Holy Spirit reveals not only the

crucified Jesus, but also the resurrected Christ.<sup>124</sup> Thus for Barth the Holy Spirit represents the Spirit of God in the person of His Son “whom the Father has sent forth into our hearts (Gal. 4:6).”<sup>125</sup> The Holy Spirit is light, liberation, knowledge, peace, and life.<sup>126</sup> This act, or event of the Holy Spirit, originates from God’s revealed will in His Son Jesus Christ. Since Christ is the source of light, liberation, knowledge, peace and life, the Holy Spirit works to deliver and establish our being in a new determination, through our election in Him, His humiliation as the Son of God for our justification, and His exaltation as the Son of Man for our sanctification.<sup>127</sup> It is a new determination of the Holy Spirit that authenticates and sanctifies the Christian community as the people of God.

For Barth, the Holy Spirit gives the Christian community a concrete direction (*die Weisung*).<sup>128</sup> As Heup-Young Kim states, Barth understands *Weisung* as “a sapiential (*Weisheit*) and definite (a way without crossroads) Way (*Weise*) of life,” in which the Christian community can walk under the direction of the Holy Spirit.<sup>129</sup> Indeed, the *Weisung* of the Holy Spirit guides Christian communities to seek their own freedom in the person of Jesus Christ. This also instructs Christian communities, both morally and spiritually. Here the *Weisung* of the Spirit commands Christian communities to march in true freedom in Christ, and calls them to gather together for the glorification of the Triune God.

For Barth, mutual love is essential for the upbuilding of the community. Jesus Christ is the foundation of co-humanity, for Christ Himself is the ontological determination of His community and of all people; indeed Jesus Christ’s community does not exist primarily for itself, since it is only a provisional community and a representative community which points beyond itself to the fellowship of all people.<sup>130</sup> Particularly, for Barth, the death and resurrection of Christ was, is and will be, the centre and the climax of human history. In essence Barth is saying that when the people of God share in dying and rising up with Christ, they themselves become the recipients of God’s love through the quickening power of the Holy Spirit. Not only so, but this love is poured into their own

hearts. Their hearts represent their thinking, emotions, and wills, and their whole inner life where the hidden motives of life and conduct take shape.

How does one accomplish or allow this self-transformation to take place? For Barth, this is where obedience comes in. “An act of obedience” in Barth’s sense means to subordinate one’s whole self—remade in love—to the controlling power of that love. In this respect, Barth maintains that one who is obedient will love, and love cannot fail to be holy, for love is the fulfilling of all the commandments of God and seeks the highest well-being of others. This is why Barth can say that obedience leads to righteousness, which in turn leads to holiness (Rom. 6:16, 19).<sup>131</sup> Therefore, Christian love is, for Barth, the radical giving up of one’s self and a radical being given over to the service of others.<sup>132</sup> It is love expressed in one’s love for one’s neighbour as well as for the body of Christ.

Furthermore, Barth argues that *agape*-love fulfills the two great commandments of Jesus Christ: “Love the Lord your God...and love your neighbour as yourself” (Matt. 22:37-39). Clearly, *agape*-love for Barth fulfills the law (Rom. 13:10), and it always assumes the form of service to others; *agape* correspondingly becomes the fundamental paradigm of co-humanity, that is, being-in-togetherness.<sup>133</sup> It is interesting to note that Barth’s point of view concerning *agape*-love demonstrates both the horizontal and vertical dimension of human nature.<sup>134</sup> The vertical love is for God, while the horizontal love is for others. Barth sees that both dimensions of love involve a real human act in continual subjection to the command of God as well as the real human act in the proper relationship with others. He also claims that the Christian *agape*-love is the essential and enduring element in the life-act of the Christian community, in the way God’s unconditional love in the history of reconciliation and salvation with His own people is personified. For Barth, then, *agape* is not just an aspect of the Christian’s new life, but its whole life of the community of people.<sup>135</sup> He claims that Christians do not only show love or act in love, they practice the reciprocal act of love with all their human imperfections. Within the limits and with all the frailties of human action, Christians do mutual love in reality and truth by

doing that, they fulfill the commandments (the law).<sup>136</sup> The whole of 1 Corinthians 13 is, for Barth, an answer to the question of the Christian way.<sup>137</sup> Barth believes that the Christian community can grow continuously as the perfect body of Christ through establishing a correct relationship with others, purely for the sake of others.<sup>138</sup> Such a particular relationship is, for Barth, not possible without practicing a self-giving *agape*-love.

Barth sees a connection between increasing in love and being sanctified, as if the Christian community is in effect being sanctified by filling Christians with God's *agape*-love. In fact, being sanctified means for Barth, burning out all the dross of selfishness and impurity. Verne H. Fletcher, in his work "Barth's Concept of Co-Humanity and the Search for Human Community," states that:

In this co-humanity of Jesus Christ we have to do...with "something ontological." "His orientation to others and reciprocal relationship with them are not accidental, external or subsequent but primary, internal and necessary"...We will touch on the teaching of reconciliation only in reference to its second form, which Barth says is sanctification or love. Here there are two dimensions: (1) "the love of God in Jesus Christ brings together Himself with all men and all men with Himself"; but it also (2) brings together all men with one another.<sup>139</sup>

Barth holds that the love, which brother and sister in Christ are to share, is rooted in God's love, bestowed in Christ and received by faith in Him.<sup>140</sup> It is God who not only chooses the Christian community from the beginning to be saved through the sanctifying work of the Spirit and through the redeeming work of Christ, but also makes their love increase and overflow for the blessing of one another and for others.<sup>141</sup> Barth states that:

It is in love that faith and hope are active, and that there takes place that which is specifically Christian in the life-act of the Christian...love is the eternal activity of the Christian. This is the reason why love abides. This is the reason why to say this is to say the final and supreme thing about it. This is the reason why we had to say previously that it is love alone that counts and love alone that conquers. This is the reason why it is *the way*...<sup>142</sup>

Hence, *agape*-love, for Barth, becomes the foundation for the upbuilding, growth, and ordering of the Christian community. It also makes possible the Christian fellowship in the household of faith (Gal. 6:10), and challenges the Christian community to execute its

missionary task for all peoples in the world. That is, the universal extension of Christian love is even for non-Christian neighbours.<sup>143</sup>

At any rate, Barth basically emphasizes the bond of faith, love and hope, which unites humanity to God as well as believer to believer. Therefore, the community, for Barth, activates its existence by practicing faith, love and hope in Jesus Christ. This should be done by community members and namely, individual Christians, for the upbuilding of the true Christian community. In *Community, State, and Church* (1960), Barth states that a single Christian community is as such an ecumenical (catholic) fellowship; that is, Christian communities are called apart and gathered together as Christians in all other places, regions, and lands, by reason of their knowledge of, and belief in, Jesus Christ.<sup>144</sup>

As Barth has emphasized, the importance of faith, love and hope within the body of Christ, obviously faith is not merely an “either-or” leap, but it entails the process of sanctification (continuous repentance, conversion, and regeneration), corresponding to the divine election.<sup>145</sup> Barth’s theology, as Heup-Young Kim has argued in his work *Wang Yang-Ming and Karl Barth* (1996), is neither metaphysics nor philosophy of religion.<sup>146</sup> It means that Barth rejected the anthropological dualism between the inner and the outer, but affirmed the inseparability of being and acting.<sup>147</sup> Contrary to Luther’s basic paradigm of humanity as the hearer of the Gospel, Barth’s theological thought of anthropology is based on the fact that “to exist as a human being means to act.”<sup>148</sup> By defining a human being as “a Doer of the Word,” Barth understands that a human being is constantly realizing one’s existence in acts of free determination and decision; therefore, one’s essence is the very self-determination without which he or she would not be a human being.<sup>149</sup>

In Barth’s case, to be a sincere human being is to realize one’s own “being-in-togetherness” in the unity of body and soul. The humanity paradigm is for Barth both vertical (a real human being in relation to God), and horizontal (humanity in relation to others).<sup>150</sup> Therefore, Barth’s theological interpretation of *imago Dei* is “the whole person

in the unity of soul and body.”<sup>151</sup> However, it must be mentioned that, in Barth, the image was distorted by human sin, so it needs to be redeemed and directed by God’s Spirit.

As Kim has stated, Barth emphasized an interconnected unity of creaturely life (soul) and of creaturely being (body); thus they hold a common mode of “thinking in relationships and communities.”<sup>152</sup> However, it is important to recognize that Barth’s source in this regard is always the centrality of Christ for the paradigm of humanity. Barth’s theological anthropology is in essence rooted in the *humanitas Christi*, since a genuine knowledge of the human being can only be found in a particular knowledge of the person of Jesus Christ.

In Barth’s thought, there are three doctrines which explain the concept of *humanitas Christi*. First, the doctrine of election is the fundamental witness to the graciousness of God through His Son Jesus Christ, since “God’s eternal election of grace is concretely the election of Jesus Christ.”<sup>153</sup> The key to Barth’s doctrine of election is established in Jesus Christ as the electing God and the elected man. Election is seen exclusively in Jesus Christ. For Barth, *humanitas Christi* “was and is and will be the primary content of God’s eternal election of grace...”<sup>154</sup>

Secondly, in Barth, the event of God’s incarnation in His Son Jesus Christ is the historical fulfillment of the *humanitas Christi* in which the ontic and noetic foundation of Christology would actually be recognized as “the *ratio essendi* and *ratio cognoscendi*, the ground of being and ground of knowledge.”<sup>155</sup> Barth’s position on the identity of Jesus Christ as both fully divine and human affirms that (1) Jesus, the Word of God, became human; (2) the existence of the Son of God is also of a human being; (3) in the One Jesus Christ divine and human essence were and are united; and (4) Jesus Christ as the Son of God is thus truly divine as well as human.<sup>156</sup>

Thirdly, Barth emphasizes that humanity in Christ is concretely manifested in His resurrection as well as His ascension. This was the historical event of the self-declaration of Jesus Christ Himself after His death.<sup>157</sup> The resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ

are “two distinct but inseparable moments in one and the same event,”<sup>158</sup> namely, the resurrection is “the point of departure, the commencement of this history of revelation,”<sup>159</sup> the ascension is on the other hand “the terminating point of this history of revelation.”<sup>160</sup> Jesus Christ has opened an ontological space for all humanity in heaven. This is good news for everyone, for He Himself becomes the *terminus a quo* (the beginning) as well as the *terminus ad quem* (the end).<sup>161</sup> Therefore, Christ Himself is, for Barth, not only the universal manifestation of God’s gracious election, but also the historical fulfillment of His salvific love for all human races.

In affirming Jesus Christ as the criterion for determining the paradigm of the whole person in the unity of soul and body, Barth was convinced that Jesus Christ as the Word of God is fully divine and human. Christ’s humanity signifies “being-in-encounter, life-in-fellowship, or history-in-partnership.”<sup>162</sup> Thus Christ is, in Barth’s theological anthropology, the centre and determination for the formal and material dimensions of the real human being.

Although Barth’s theological anthropology is radically rooted in Jesus Christ, his anthropology stands in the unity of hearing and doing. That is, Barth affirms the unity between ontological knowledge and ethical practice, or simply between theory and praxis. In fact, Barth firmly believed that without the unity of hearing and practicing the Gospel, Christians cannot be saved or identified as authentic people of God. In Barth’s theology, the doctrine of the law as the command of God is also regarded as an ethical paradigm in relation to dogmatics that deal with the ethical question as its most characteristic problem.<sup>163</sup> In other words, the grace of God in His Son Jesus Christ is free, and humankind needs to respond to it by fulfilling the law — as it is completely fulfilled in Christ — in the form of both hearing and acting.

With regard to the growth of the Christian community, questions such as the following may be posed: What is the appropriate definition of the true Church in the theology of Barth? How does the true Church function in a practical way? And how does

the true Church relate to the event of the upbuilding of the true Christian community? In answer to these questions, Barth holds that the true Church can be identified by the upbuilding of the true Christian community; that is, “the communion of saints” (*communio sanctorum*).<sup>164</sup> Barth defines the term “communion” as an action “in which, on the basis of an existing union (*unio*), many men are engaged in a common movement towards the same union.”<sup>165</sup>

Communion takes place in the sphere of the incomplete, between completion (union) and incompleteness (disunion) through the power and operation of the Holy Spirit. This term is understood as the unity and common act in diversity among many different bodies of Christ, which takes place in the upbuilding of the true Christian community. With regard to its occurrence and act, Barth calls the individual members saints, who come from the union presupposed in the event of their mutual communion. They are ultimately gathered by the power and work of the Holy Spirit and are finally appointed to do corresponding work. For Barth, saints are individual Christians who have been living and acting in the communion of the one Holy Spirit. Barth in his work *The Faith of the Church* claims that “the Church is not formed by a human gathering of people who would have the same opinions, but by a divine convocation that constitutes a corps of individuals until then scattered at the mercy of their opinions.”<sup>166</sup> Here Barth emphasizes again the *communion sanctorum* in which the hearing and receiving of the Word of God happens within the community, not in isolated individuals. Thus he attacks a particular brand of Protestant individualism.

Barth asserts that believers should accept that God’s eternal election has determined them to be true individual Christians in their own solitariness as well as in their common life. In this respect, the Church is called the communion of saints which is sanctified by the Holy Spirit in order for it to participate in genuine Christian fellowship in the knowledge and confession of its faith in the Triune God. That fellowship takes place through prayer, prophecy and the proclamation of God’s good news in the form of the Christian service of

worship; that is, a liturgical fellowship. In this sense, there are no real Christians (the saints), outside the fellowship of true Christian worship. God is praised, the Son Jesus Christ is proclaimed as the Saviour and His Spirit is manifested as the quickening power of the upbuilding of the true Christian community in this service of worship. For Barth, the communion of saints as the fundamental element for the upbuilding of the true Christian community is, “the event in the being and activity of ordinary sinful men.”<sup>167</sup>

Barth highlights the importance of participating in the one communal life with the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit (Rom. 12:5). Christians as individuals should live under the impact of Jesus Christ and His Spirit by confessing the primary and fundamental articles of the Christian creed, namely, “Belief in God, the Father Almighty, Jesus Christ, His only Son our Lord and the Holy Spirit.” Individual Christian life should be practiced in the fellowship or community of God’s own one-in-threeness, that is, the three divine persons or the Trinity. In other words, the salvation of individual Christians created by the grace of the Triune God (the Trinity) can be fundamentally actualized in the upbuilding of the Christian community (the body of Christ or Church) which involves total dedication to the Church’s commission and service to the world and concern for and solidarity with the Church, together with participation in its task of ministry and witness and in its whole life, thought and action. The Church alone is the place where salvation takes place *in* and *by* Christ alone. Jesus Christ as both the subjective and objective reconciliation, constituted His Church by acting through His own lordship and freedom *in* and *to* and *from* the Church through His Spirit.

Barth says that the upbuilding of the community “takes an analogous form to that of organic growth.”<sup>168</sup> It is as if, “the community as the communion of saints grows like a seed to a plant, or a sapling to a tree, or a human embryo to a child and then to a man...”<sup>169</sup> This is “the presupposition of the divine as well as the human action by which it is built.”<sup>170</sup> Mutual cooperation is essential and required for the growth of the saints. Growth is an ongoing process that means that Christians continually have to come and live and then

act within their sincere fellowship. In this regard, Barth mentions the Book of Acts as an example of the joyful worship of the community in the early Church and that the numbers of people were not only greatly increased, but also saved by gathering and hearing the Word of God enthusiastically.<sup>171</sup> This fellowship demands that the saints, or Christians be very active in hearing and understanding the Gospel for the proclamation of the Kingdom of God. It is then eventually required of them to become a witness<sup>172</sup> of the Gospel for the mission to the world. As Nicholas M. Healy states, the ultimate goal for this mission is, for Barth, to activate the *eschaton*, which is the operative power of growth and righteousness and is necessary here and now in accordance with its law.<sup>173</sup>

It is interesting to note that Barth does not strive for “vertical renewal merely to produce greater horizontal extension and a wider audience.”<sup>174</sup> He believes that the most dominant and effective power for true growth should be intensive, vertical and spiritual. This is because this power provides the community with the ability to share mutual admonition, encouragement, warning, comfort, assistance, and support in the place of its sincere fellowship. He thus claims that “nothing is more astonishing than the true, intensive, spiritual growth of the communion of saints on earth.”<sup>175</sup> To repeat, this growth, for Barth, is defined as an ongoing process on the basis of spiritual growth, or inward growth, which is much more important than the outward growth. It does not mean that he ignores outward growth. He, first of all, however, regards spiritual or inward growth as a basic step in expanding the growth of Christian community extensively, and later numerically. This growth then keeps the balance in both the horizontal and vertical, and from the lower to the higher, or from the higher to the lower.

According to Barth: “Growth is the expression, fulfilment and mark of life.”<sup>176</sup> The community as the communion of saints is therefore to live and grow in the immanent power of life which Jesus lived in through the quickening power of the Holy Spirit. In other words, the true Christian community in the world can be built up in the form of its true fellowship of faith and love and hope. The Holy Spirit, as the self-attestation of Jesus

Christ, not only identifies the Christian community to be the true communion of saints (*communio sanctorum*), but also causes it to grow intensively and extensively. To be specific, both the life and love of the true Christian community, for Barth, are inevitable for its upbuilding. The individual members in the community are responsible for the edification of the body of Christ in the unity of faith, knowledge and ultimately love (Eph. 4:16). It is thus that the community advances in mutual dependence, cooperation and especially reciprocal love within the body of Christ. With their reciprocal ministry, the edified community eventually can look and wait

for the completed edifice, which, in face of the development and construction in which it is here and now, the Christian community will, as its own *eschaton*, be something completely new; not the result of its own existence; not the final word of its history; but something which comes to it from God; its genuine *eschaton*, and therefore that of the whole cosmos.<sup>177</sup>

The work of upholding the community, for Barth, is the task of both God and Christians. God gives His omnipotent grace to Christians and then they correspond to His grace in their gratitude. The point is that the communion of saints is weak and in danger and thus needs defense, protection and preservation.<sup>178</sup> Although we presuppose that Christians are holy and sanctified by the Word of God, they are still human and sinful. Their activities are in the sphere of very diverse human societies, which claim very different origins, and a very different goal from the one of Jesus Christ and the Kingdom of God. They in fact threaten themselves both outwardly by human societies, and inwardly by failing to obey God. How can they overcome this danger so as to uphold themselves in this human world? According to Barth, it might be possible for them to be upheld in their growth by implementing a form of continuous renewal in their own human position. Their most crucial tasks are both to hear and accept the truth of God's Word and His dominion over all other dominions, and to proclaim Jesus Christ as a new and different humanity as compared with other human societies in this pagan world. This task makes them able to form a living and growing community.

Beyond the above task, the saints should inevitably expect persecution. Barth presupposes that the community has to pay the cost in order to grow continuously and build itself up for the purpose of the fulfillment of God's command, which is initially to preach His Word to the sinful people in the world so as to invite them to be saved in the name of His Son Jesus Christ through His Spirit. The community has to endure its trial and persecution in order to be a member of the living Christian community. Even the cost will be much greater than expected, such as isolation from the rest of the world, or being an object of ridicule and scorn and hatred; death or even destruction itself must be faced. Yet there has been a very firm witness in the history of Christianity that the more brutal or refined the persecution, the stronger and more powerfully the community grows. This is why Barth insists so strongly that "the community is strengthened under pressure."<sup>179</sup>

Barth goes on to speak of two forms of danger behind persecution, by asserting that "the community in its human activity is a part of the world."<sup>180</sup> One of two forms of danger is alienation (secularisation) which,

takes place when it allows itself to be radically determined and established and engaged and committed and imprisoned in this respect: in its knowledge by the adoption of a particular philosophy or outlook as the norm of its understanding of the Word of God; in its ethics by the commandment of a specific tradition or historical *kairos*; in its attitude to existing world-relationships by a distinctive ideology or by the most respectable or novel or simply the strongest of current political and economic forces; in its proclamation by allowing itself to be determined by what seems to be the most urgent and sacred need in its own particular environment.<sup>181</sup>

As John Bolt explains Barth's view, this is simply a matter of the environment of corrupted human societies or antagonistic human intentions towards the Law of the Gospel, the free grace of God and the will of Jesus Christ as the Lord and Head of His people.<sup>182</sup> This is also "a question of the translation of the Christian into the secular at the command of love; or conversely of a translation of the secular into the Christian, of a kind of baptism of non-Christian ideas and customs and enterprises by new Christian interpretations and the giving of a new Christian content, or of a minting of Christian gold on behalf of poor non-Christians."<sup>183</sup> The world was, as a matter of fact, secular and is secular and of course will

be secular where it consists of mere non-Christians. Barth considers the undeniable truth to be that the Christian community is in this world so that it can be salt (Mt. 5:13) according to the command of God. Accordingly, the Christian community in this world is not to lose its specific importance and meaning and task for the development and maintenance of itself in the world, and should not be corrupted by the inclination and desire for alienation.

The other form of danger is self-glorification (sacralisation) which means firstly, the transmutation of the lordship of Jesus Christ into the vanity of a Christianity which vaunts itself in His name but in reality is enamoured only of itself and its traditions, confessions and institutions; secondly, the suppression of the Gospel by a pseudo-sacred law erected and proclaimed on the supposed basis of the Gospel; thirdly, the setting up of an idol which is dead like all other images of human fabrication; which cannot hear or speak or illuminate or help or heal; in which the man who has discovered and created it cannot in the last resort admire or worship anyone or anything but himself.<sup>184</sup> Sacralisation is totally ignorant concerning the lordship and glory of Jesus Christ. Self-centeredness attempts to reveal itself in the world without recognizing its own origin and goal as a communion of saints in the body of Jesus Christ—the Head. Self-glorification, in reality, can be defined as the end of the community. It is also meant to be intentional neglect concerning the real truth that “Christ is the community as well as the Kingdom of God, but the community is not Christ as well as the Kingdom of God.”<sup>185</sup> In simpler terms, the community is His body as well as the earthly-historical form of His existence.

For Barth, a definite form is essential for the accomplishment of both the upbuilding of the community and the event of the communion of saints. Barth says: “Building is not something which is left to chance or caprice. It is not a wild or anarchical happening. It is controlled by a definite form and aims at the application, representation and vindication of this form. Building follows a law and is accomplished in its exercise and fulfilment.”<sup>186</sup> In this way, the upbuilding of the Christian community is accomplished in order. Barth understands this order as lawful and right. In the sphere of human history, the

upbuilding of the community is the attestation of the reconciliation of the world with God accomplished in Jesus Christ. This, as Barth asserts, is “the great campaign against chaos and therefore against disorder.”<sup>187</sup> God’s divine work is not in disorder or chaos, but in definite relationship and connection, and to that extent in order, which is lawful and right. This is to say that the order of the community is a right way of handling it, not merely as a protest against chaos, but as a confirmation of this form and distinctness.<sup>188</sup>

According to Verne H. Fletcher, the order which Barth talks about here is in particular the various interrelated responsibilities, functions and obligations in the face of the true relationship of the individual Christian community to other different communities; of the preservation and exercise of their unity, of the achievement of reciprocity in action, and in mutual understanding, and of the most outstanding and comprehensive regulation.<sup>189</sup> With these above characteristics of the order, canon law can be a basic starting-point to determine what is the right and lawful order of the community in the context of the Christologic-ecclesiological concept of the Christian community. We have to be reminded that, for Barth, it is a matter of canon law rather than dogma. This is because the former is regarded as a more primary element in answering all the detailed questions of order on the basis of the community concept that Jesus Christ, as the Head of His body, is the fundamental acting subject. Conversely, the acting human communion of saints as the earthly-historical form of His own existence is secondary, while the latter must declare its reality in order to solve all the problems of the included order. The statement “Jesus Christ as the Head of His body is the primary acting Subject,”<sup>190</sup> for Barth, becomes entirely the central truth of Christian faith, and of the theological approach towards the complete understanding of the order of the Christian community.

For Barth, two *desiderata* will be fulfilled in the explanation of canon law as follows: (1) the reason to inquire concerning order, a definite form, law and right in the life of the Christian community, and to make a distinction between an orderly and a disorderly community—sanctified and unsanctified; (2) the answer to what is the specific order and

form, the particular law and right, concerning the Christian community, which cannot be equated with any other human society.<sup>191</sup> In addition, Barth mentions two propositions: (1) the Christologico-ecclesiological concept of the community is such that by its very nature it speaks of law and order. The Christian community is the human fellowship in which Jesus Christ as the Head is the primary Subject, and the acting communion of saints as His body is the secondary—to say “community” is at once to say “law and order”; (2) from a Christologico-ecclesiological view of the community law and order are distinguished as Christian and ecclesiastical law and order from every other form, and are visible and effective in this distinctive form.<sup>192</sup> For Barth, the community is not the law itself, but Jesus Christ is its living law. The task of the community is continually to recognize Christ as the regulative law of its relationship to Him and to be perfectly obedient to Him by both listening on the question of law and order and opposing ecclesiastical lawlessness and disorder.

For Barth, the supreme law of the community is the “spiritual law” that is established in the spiritual fellowship of the Holy Spirit of the living Lord Jesus Christ. His life and ministry in the community is understood as the first and original form of “brotherly Christocracy,”<sup>193</sup> which helps us to know Him “there and then, yet also here and now, as the Lord Himself living and acting in His community.”<sup>194</sup> The Christologico-ecclesiological view of the community is thus, for Barth, the basic principle of “true canon law” which will always be normative and operative for every true Church law.<sup>195</sup>

Barth believes that the lordship of Jesus Christ can correct the formation and administration of human law with His Word and Spirit. For him, Christ Himself is the acting Subject of the Gospel for sinful human beings in the world in the form of “the Christian worship service” and pastoral ministry. Barth defines Christian worship as “the action of God, of Jesus, and of the community itself for the community, and therefore the upbuilding of the community.”<sup>196</sup> In this sense, Christian worship is, for Barth, a general integration where all are hearers and doers of the Word of God (Jas. 1:22) on the grounds

of a basic equality of receptivity and spontaneity. Therefore, all are challenged by the Holy Spirit to anticipate Christ's future manifestation and their own *eschaton*. Jesus Christ as the Head in Christian worship not only empowers His community to edify itself in the union of brotherhood and freedom and love, but also summons it to magnify His glory in His future form; that is, in the hope of His second coming at the end of the last time.

Eventually, Church law, Barth believes, will be found and known in the occurrence of Christian worship, e.g., in the occurrence of confession, baptism, the Lord's Supper and prayer. That is, Christ Himself is the Lord of His community's confession, baptism, the Lord's Supper and prayer. He Himself is definitely its law and is attested to in the Scripture. Therefore, Church law must have its true and proper theme in worship by accompanying the true concept that Christ as the Lord has the authority and competence to order this worship service properly and protect it against corruption.<sup>197</sup> Christ is, for Barth, the centre and ultimate source in the Christian worship service, because His life, death, and resurrection are proclaimed in it.

#### **The Sending of the Christian Community**

In this final aspect of ecclesiology, Barth asserts that the Holy Spirit is the enlightening power of the living Lord Jesus Christ in the following way:

The work of the Holy Spirit in the gathering and upbuilding of the community...draws and impels and presses beyond its being as such, beyond all the reception and experience of its members, beyond all that is promised to them personally. And only as it follows this drawing and impelling is it the real community of Jesus Christ.<sup>198</sup>

In this illuminating power of His Spirit, Christ calls the community as His body, that is His own earthly-historical form of existence. He authorizes His body to perform the ministry of His prophetic Word in order for it to represent the calling of all humanity as well as all creatures temporarily in Him.

For Barth, the ultimate vocation of the Christian community is to execute its missionary task; the ultimate vocation of human beings is to be Christians. According to Marcello De C. Azevedo, Barth defines this vocation as a calling into "the living

community of the living Lord Jesus Christ.”<sup>199</sup> It is only possible to be called into the living community within the context of faith and the sense of community. This brings Christians together through brotherly love and then makes them share a common aim with their own faithful union and fellowship in the name of the living Lord Jesus Christ.

By the Word, Jesus Christ alone, Barth argues, has created, preserves and overrules the cosmos. In this way Christ creates, maintains, orders, and sends His community so that it can actualize the Word as His self-declaration of the kingdom of God in its mutual responsibility. It is thus how the truth and power of His Word is revealed to the Church in the witness of Holy Scripture. The power of the Word of God, as Barth maintains in his work *The Faith of the Church: A Commentary on the Apostles' Creed according to Calvin's Catechism*, not only helps to unite His community with Himself and with one another, but also to acknowledge the one God who acts and declares Himself in His only begotten Son, Jesus Christ.<sup>200</sup>

Barth emphasizes that the community of Jesus Christ exists first and supremely for God, the Creator and Lord of the world, and secondly for the world in order to attest to His redemptive purpose and will for all human creatures. He notes that:

The community of Jesus Christ is for the world...it is the human creature, which is ordained by nature to exist for the other human creatures distinct from it...In this way it also exists for God, for the Creator and Lord of the world, for the fulfillment of His purposes and will for and to all human creatures.<sup>201</sup>

God Himself has become human and expresses His own true divinity and humanity in Jesus Christ. God therefore does not exist for Himself, but for the world in order to reconcile it to Himself. In this sense, Barth holds that the community cannot be separated from the world as well as from God. As God exists for the world, and for the community, it has to find its own orientation, meaning and purpose of existence in Him, and by Him. As Daniel B. Spross affirms Barth's view, the fulfillment of salvation, reconciliation, the covenant, the justification of humanity before God, and our sanctification for Him is possible in our own life.<sup>202</sup> God has originally sent His community through His Son Jesus Christ to live in the world and then to accomplish His mission to the world.

Barth also argues that the people of God exist in the midst of world-occurrence. He employs the Latin phrase *Hominum confusione et Dei providentia regitur*. For Barth, the phrase “*Dei providentia regitur*” is the most appropriate expression for the first, higher, and decisive aspect of the theological understanding of the world-occurrence which surrounds the community of Jesus Christ. In other words, the recollection of God’s rule is the first, decisive and comprehensive thing in relation to world history. This is because God not only rules over all things, and in all things from above, but also portrays Himself clearly as the good Creator and the Lord of His good creation. Antithetically, *hominum confusio* is understood below from the standpoint of the Christian community or its prophetic witness. The distinctive reality of the *confusio hominum* is thus the inner truth of the world-occurrence itself, which has constantly directed all possible world events. Barth says:

It is men exiled from God and their brethren who create confusion and therefore a world history which seems to be so strongly bedevilled...*Confusio* undoubtedly denotes something very questionable and indeed wholly evil. It opens up a vista of folly and wickedness, of deception and injustice, of blood and tears...It simply says...that men make and shape and achieve confusion.<sup>203</sup>

World history in Barth’s schema is therefore entangled by humanity in terms of the following two elements, which are important factors from the theological standpoint: (1) There is the good creation of God, which includes not only, man himself as a good creature, but also the surrounding cosmos as the *theatrum gloriae Dei*; (2) There is the real existence and operation of evil as the negation of the good creation of the Creator, which was neither elected nor willed by Him.<sup>204</sup>

The above two elements are totally antithetical and cannot be united. In this respect, Barth’s point is that human beings were at the centre, as well as the keypoint, of the creaturely world, and consequently would, and could reject the futile negation of the good creation of His Creator, but decided to live at peace with Him and their brothers. Unfortunately, because of *hominum confusione*, there is only equivocation, indecision and confusion under the limiting rule of the providence of God. As a result, human beings are sinners against God, their neighbours, and themselves. In the *confusio hominum*, the good

creation of God is ironically subordinated to nothingness instead of being absolutely above its negation. Between the two inter-relating elements, the world-occurrence can be characterized by the supposition that:

...nothingness, the negation of the good creation of God, becomes the master, controller and ruler of this creation, and the good creation of God is set in the service and under the control of its own negation, of nothingness, to be subjected, guided, used and despoiled by it. This is the great confusion, intermingling and jumbling of the two elements which characterises world-occurrence.<sup>205</sup>

However, it is, for Barth, an amazing truth that the good creation of God has historically been a continuous ongoing existence and concertedly a glory to God in spite of the *confusio hominum*. According to Barth:

In every age and place throughout world history, there has always been also the laughter of children, the scent of flowers and the song of birds and similar things which cannot be affected by any confusion with nothingness. Nor have there been lacking poets and musicians and other noble spirits who have been able to look past or through the creation confused with nothingness and thus to perceive, and to make perceptible to others, its form as untouched by this confusion.<sup>206</sup>

Whatever else may be the consequences of the *confusio hominum*, the superiority of God and the power of the good creation of Him cannot be destroyed by any confusion of humanity. It would be foolish to close our eyes to the glory of creation which is manifest even in the confusion of world history. Barth quotes Psalms 104:24, “O Lord, how manifold are thy works! In wisdom hast thou made them all: the earth is full of thy riches.”<sup>207</sup> Then he says: “there is the inexhaustible plenitude of the supply of the cosmos surrounding man, the forms and forces and materials of which seem to be in mysterious agreement with man’s capacities and to wait only to be seen and known in their particularity to become fruitful and of assistance to him in his life.”<sup>208</sup> In the midst of the negative history of the human confusion of God’s creation, the interplay of cosmos and humanity, of humanity and cosmos, could and should be orderly. For Barth, humanity should not find in the cosmos an alien antithesis, but understand, comprehend and apprehend it as its own cosmos. This is to say that humanity should not misuse the good creation of God, but use it as the gift of God’s grace and therefore be in peace with its fellows and itself.

Therefore, Barth summarizes two characteristics of the true community for the world as follows: first, the true community of Jesus Christ can be defined by knowing the true and real world by means of fellowship. In order to accomplish God's commission, it has to have the knowledge of all worldly human life in the context of knowing its limitation by what God is, and has done for the people of God without any exception.<sup>209</sup> Secondly, it can be defined by practicing its own solidarity with the world. Solidarity means:

full commitment to it, unreserved participation in its situation, in the promise given it by creation, in its responsibility for the arrogance, sloth and falsehood which reign within it, in its suffering under the resultant distress, but primarily and supremely in the free grace of God demonstrated and addressed to it in Jesus Christ, and therefore in its hope.<sup>210</sup>

A more concrete implication is that the community has actively to recognize that Jesus Christ is not only the Saviour of the world, but also exists willingly in a worldly fashion, as well as with a very compassionate conscience towards all humanity. For this reason, the community, for Barth, represents being with others by sharing all their own hopes and burdens in existence. Therefore, the community will be defined more firmly by performing its own obligations such as fellowship and solidarity with the world.

Clearly, Barth believes that God exists for the world in His divine nature, Jesus Christ in His divine-human, and the Christian community in its own purely human form.<sup>211</sup> This means that the Church fundamentally exists for the world. Within this firm theological determination, the Christian community will acknowledge that it can accomplish its own obligation in its human and creaturely spontaneity with the free power of God and the Holy Spirit on the basis of its confession of Jesus Christ. It is, in this respect, inevitable for Barth that Jesus Christ is "the primary and proper Subject acting in and with the community"<sup>212</sup> throughout the community's history. He Himself is also the kingdom of God, which is "the establishment of the exclusive, all-penetrating, all-determinative lordship of God and His Word and Spirit in the whole sphere of His creation."<sup>213</sup>

In relation to these above twofold characteristics of the community in world-occurrence, Barth mentions that the Christian community should perform its missionary

task in the world as follows: firstly, the community has to declare that human efforts are worthless and eventually will be destroyed on the one side. It has to accept that its own being is forced to exist in relation to its environment such as “an irrevocable tension or dialectic of faith in God’s unconditional overlordship as commanded and authorized by the Word which underlies it and its knowledge of human confusion which is unavoidable in the light of the same Word,”<sup>214</sup> on the other. Secondly, it has to recognize and proclaim both the providence of God and the confusion of humanity in relation to the consideration and understanding of world-occurrence history by demonstrating a positive relationship of basis and dependence between the two. Thirdly, it has to realize, grasp and proclaim the reality and truth of the grace of God addressed to the world in Jesus Christ, who is the ultimate source of freedom and sovereign power and self-disclosing truth. It is Barth’s paradoxical statement that the community has simply to serve and attest to the free omnipotent Word of the grace of God in its human words to all peoples, in order to gain its own freedom, which is given by God to those who are seriously fulfilling their responsibility for the attestation of His Word and are not in the pursuit of their own whims. The fundamental source of their freedom, for Barth, is in Jesus Christ who is the omnipotent Word of God’s grace. This Word makes different peoples at different times and places call, bind and unite together both invisibly with God and visibly with one another, so as to become a witness and proclaim Jesus Christ as an ultimate source of “freedom” for His people.<sup>215</sup> Fourthly, it also has to attest that without Jesus Christ there is “no harmony between above and below, no relation between the positive will of God and the confusion of man; no possibility of understanding the one as the basis of the other, or the other as grounded in it.”<sup>216</sup> But in Him there is the fulfilled covenant between God and man, the one kingdom of God in reality, and the new reality of world history.<sup>217</sup>

Barth sees that Jesus Christ has the dignity, power and validity of the first and last thing in world-occurrence. Christ has already executed the decisive act of the fatherly and royal providence of God by the removal of human confusion, and He will come to light as

the reality of all world history.<sup>218</sup> Barth notes that “in the life and death and resurrection of Jesus Christ everything has been accomplished and made new.”<sup>219</sup> Obviously, Jesus Christ’s own unique identity, the new divine-human, completes the reconciliation of the world with God, being the fulfillment of God’s covenant with humanity, the justification and sanctification of all human beings for Him.<sup>220</sup> The real truth is that the community must attest to Jesus Christ as the new reality of history to the world. Barth asserts that the new reality of world history is only knowable in Him with our confessing faith.<sup>221</sup>

With resolute faith in and obedience to Jesus Christ, Barth urges the Christian community to participate very actively in its ministry. The purpose of its ministry is to be a witness to Christ for the rest of humanity. Faith and hope for Barth, as John Webster notes, must be in Jesus Christ.<sup>222</sup> The community must affirm Him as the new reality of world history as well as the final, universal and definitive revelation to the rest of humanity. Therefore, it is looking for the coming of Him in His glory. It is precisely at this point that the Christian community, namely the Church, “exists in the divinely given knowledge of the new reality of world-occurrence concealed in Jesus Christ, and in the resultant and distinctive resoluteness of its confidence, decisions and hope.”<sup>223</sup> World-occurrence itself, for Barth, is therefore the sphere where it must exist with this resoluteness in Jesus Christ. To be sure, the community cannot exist without world-occurrence and *vice versa*. The community must live by the Word of Jesus Christ and in fellowship with God.

The community’s other task in world-occurrence for Barth is to correspond to the existence of Jesus Christ as the eternal Son of God and the incarnate Son of God, the Word of the invisible God in His own visible flesh. At this point, His being is truly identified from the invisible to the visible; from the particular to the universal. It is uniquely His community, which exists on the basis of the particular grace freely given by God, and the call and summons of Jesus Christ, so that it can bear the promise of “invisibility.”<sup>224</sup> It is also the witness of His active self-declaration and powerful prophetic task, with a definite

resoluteness in Him against world-occurrence. To be specific, the responsibility of the Christian community, for Barth, is therefore to speak the Word of hope in all its weakness in order to live and continue itself within the world-occurrence. It is in this sense that it lives by its own secret that is “its ontic and noetic basis, its noetic as its ontic and its ontic as its noetic,”<sup>225</sup> which is identical with the will and work and Word of God as effectively addressed to the world and specifically to the community. By virtue of this, the Christian community is “what it is in the world, visible and yet invisible, in the world and yet not of it, dependent and yet free, weak and yet strong.”<sup>226</sup>

The content of the community’s task, for Barth, is Jesus Christ. That is to say, one of the important tasks of the community is to perform His universal call to the world, which is commissioned by Him. Jesus Christ is ultimately the origin, centre, goal, and total content of its given task. His community thus must confess Him as the self-proclaimed Word of God as well as a distinctive reality and truth. His humanity, His divine work, His revealed name, and His prophetic Word, should be attested as the identical “Yes” of the true and effective life to the world, initially and predominantly. The community’s task is to proclaim Jesus Christ as “the reconciliation of the world to God...the effective justification and sanctification of sinful man, and indeed his honourable vocation to the service of God.”<sup>227</sup> It also has to proclaim Him as the kingdom of God, and the free love, the free grace and the free mercy of God in the purity of His will and with the superiority of His power.<sup>228</sup>

According to Craig Carter, Barth understands humanity as the definite and valuable object of the goodness of God.<sup>229</sup> The reason is that God is, for the human being, in Jesus Christ.<sup>230</sup> According to Barth’s understanding, God “acts together with man and in conjunction with him, as God has done in Jesus Christ, can be the content of its task only in company with him.”<sup>231</sup> Without humanity, it is pointless to proclaim the Gospel, because there is no object to proclaim. Humanity for Barth, as Verne H. Fletcher notes, can be defined as the true object of God’s goodness which has to hear His good news. On the

other hand, Jesus Christ is the Subject who has to be proclaimed to humanity unconditionally. Fletcher goes on to note, humanity “is not only the object of divine action, but also the subject of a personal act.”<sup>232</sup> It is a mutual and interdependent relationship between humanity and Jesus Christ. Nevertheless, the Subject, Jesus Christ, is not dependent upon humanity. This is because, for Barth, Jesus is not only the centre and origin of the content of the task commissioned to His community, but also is humanity and God.

The total content of the task of the community is the Gospel. Barth briefly states its content as “message, *kerygma*, proclamation.”<sup>233</sup> That is to say that the content of the task is a matter of revelation, knowledge, doctrine and *gnosis*. From this standpoint of the Gospel, humanity is fully identified as humanity itself both inwardly and outwardly, both naturally and historically, both socially and individually.

For Barth, it is the community’s primary task to bring humanity to God, that is, to bring unbelievers, or godless heathens, to the truth and knowledge of Jesus Christ, and of the unconditional “Yes” of the eternal goodness of God, which is directed to them.<sup>234</sup> God wants humanity to hear and know, understand and finally believe His divine will and work that is already accomplished in Jesus Christ. The problem is humanity’s self-contradictory ignorance regarding God’s eternal free grace and unwillingness, and its slothful neutrality to follow His teaching. Barth suggests that the only way to execute the community’s task is to eliminate this ignorance by declaring the Word of God—the Gospel and the superior law of human existence—very decisively. The community’s declaration is based on the assurance of a future of humanity’s knowledge, joy and liberation in Jesus Christ. If this is true, then the Church will be the place of this joy and liberty for all human creatures.<sup>235</sup>

Furthermore, in order to accomplish its task effectively, Barth states that its content and orientation should be “self-evidently pure and genuine and authentic.”<sup>236</sup> Without this pure characteristic, the quality of the task committed to the community is very questionable and doubtful in relation to two possible temptations, namely, distortions and falsification of

the Gospel (Gal. 1:6). Therefore, Barth urges the community to preach the free grace of God and the Gospel of Jesus Christ as the living Word of the living God of the community in the active power of His Holy Spirit.<sup>237</sup> Its task must be grounded on Jesus Christ, who is the same yesterday, today and forever (Heb. 13:8) and ultimately the pure, omnipotent and the superior “Yes” of the goodness of God to the whole world and humanity of every age. For Barth, the community, as Marcello De C. Azevedo notes, must not lose its own living quality, but must keep proclaiming the Gospel as the eternal Word of God in its unity and constancy.<sup>238</sup> It can live by its commission and its very existence given by God. Barth’s warning is therefore definitely not to neglect its mission, that is, the declaration of Jesus Christ, the Gospel of God, as the superior law of human existence.<sup>239</sup>

Barth points out the necessity of the community’s ministry. The community is in the world and among people. It thus exists actively for the world and people. Its main emphasis must be an act of the free grace of God in Jesus Christ. For Barth, the community’s ministry is understood as the attestation of the Word of God to the rest of humanity in the world. In other words, the most required recognition in the ministry of the community is to know who is Jesus Christ. As already mentioned, the most fundamental truth for Barth is that Christ is the living Word of God, the gracious self-revelation of God and the content of the task commissioned to the community. Christ’s identity is, for Barth, here further extended to be such as “very God and very Man; He as Mediator between the two; He as the Executor of the divine work of grace accomplished for men; He as the man in whom it has already reached its goal and is already valid for all; He as the one Word of God and its one Hearer, Witness and Guarantor in advance of all others.”<sup>240</sup>

Christ’s ministry was to take care of the flock, and to pray for suffering people and weak people, who are extremely disillusioned by bigotry and poverty. In this respect, His community has to concentrate on an active ministry to try to meet a need or solve a problem within all other human communities and all other creaturely occurrence. The responsible ministry to both God and the world is, for Barth, a definite and very significant task for the

Christian community. Thus Barth holds that the ministry of Christ's community takes place in the course of ongoing human history by placing emphasis on "The Great Commission" of Jesus Christ in terms of a right relationship to humanity in the world. The Great Commission, "Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations," can be accomplished by having proper relationships with God and humanity. Its importance as part of the ministry should be placed on both a ministry to God and a ministry to humanity, as Jesus Christ was, with a clear and dissoluble unity interchangeably both in the service of God and of humanity. The ministry must be genuine service to both God and humanity. Barth says: "The ministry of the great, primary and true Minister of Jesus Christ is with clear and indissoluble unity both service of God and of man, and both truly and properly."<sup>241</sup> Obviously, it is, as Barth affirms, "a ministry to the God who speaks to man in His Word, and to the man who is already called and now summoned to hear, perceive and accept the Word of God."<sup>242</sup>

In another way, Barth mentions that the community's ministry has its own limitation. It implies that God does not demand nor expect the community to do more in accomplishing its specific task than He has commissioned it, that is, to serve Him and minister to humanity. For Barth, ministry means active subordination to God from whom it derives and therefore to humanity to whom it turns and to whom it is to serve God in obedience.<sup>243</sup> Its mission and task is to serve and assist both God and humanity in order to be neither arrogant, nor ineffective, in its ultimate accomplishment of the ministry. Barth believes that it is materially determined as a ministry of witness, which is required to manifest the reconciliation of the world to God and the divine covenant. In relation to this definite witness, the community must declare God's only Son Jesus Christ as both the kingdom of God and the new reality of the world. Barth wrote:

It is only the particular people which on the basis of His gracious self-declaration may know about Him, believe in Him and hope in Him. It has to confess Him, therefore, according to the knowledge granted to it. It has to attest Him to the world as the work of God accomplished for it and the Word of God going out to it.<sup>244</sup>

Barth asserts that the Christian community has its own specific function and service. Although the objects of its ministry are directed to both God and humanity, it must not take the place of Jesus Christ. The community might misunderstand its task and role, and eventually become a hindrance to Christ's prophetic task. This is because the community is basically a human creature, and indeed with a sinful nature. The community must be reminded that God as the Creator has created humanity with His Son Jesus Christ and in the power of His Holy Spirit. Its implication is that the community can identify itself by fulfilling its witness with the attestation of Jesus Christ as the one Doer of the work of God and the primary and true witness of this work. The community is not to transcend this true category, but to keep this level properly. For this reason Barth asserts specifically that the community has its limitations in executing its ministry.

Beyond these two above characteristics of its ministry, Barth says that the community also has its promise. He explains why the Church needs this assurance:

The community, the feeble people that it is, needs the assurance that as it undertakes and seeks to fulfil its ministry its cause is righteous, that as it discharges it according to the measure of its knowledge and resources it is not left to its own knowledge and resources, and that it does not finally act in vain. It stood and stands so isolated in relation to the world, to the godless, the indifferent and the pious, to the ancient and the modern, to the western and the eastern, to the middle-class, proletarian and bohemian world.<sup>245</sup>

There are many and varied anxieties in the exercise of the Church's ministry. The Church might be genuinely assailed by the pressure of the anxieties, the almost irresistible temptations and the resultant failures and distortions. In the history of the Church's ministry, it is natural for the Christian community to "face the question whether its whole concern for the witness borne by it, whatever the effects of its activity in this ministry, is not after all a crying in the storm, a writing in the sand or even the water, a futile running up against a cliff."<sup>246</sup> For Barth, all these anxieties are "strong enough to make it possible for the community to discharge its ministry, continually sustaining and renewing this ministry and therefore itself."<sup>247</sup> Barth questions: "What can it oppose to these many and

varied anxieties? How can it keep its courage and the power to endure under this pressure?"

For him, it is the cause for astonishment that:

...there have always been new men and generations ready and willing to take up its ministry with new courage and pursue it along new ways, all sooner or later oppressed by the same anxieties, all followed yet again by others who notwithstanding have still been ready and plainly constrained to take up the same cause, but all obviously needing the assurance to make it possible.<sup>248</sup>

Barth believes that a powerful counter-pressure is necessary for the Christian community to be continually sustained and renewed in the work of its ministry and therefore in its existence. For him, the truth of the promise sustains, protects and renews its ministry. Its ministry of witness is neither divine nor semi-divine, but unequivocally human in speech and action. It thus stands in supreme need of assurance. This is to say that the promise marks the Church's ministry. The promise, by which the ministry of the community is thus always assured, is "...the origin, theme and content of its witness, namely, that which is said and entrusted to the community in and with its gathering, upbuilding and sending in order that it may repeat it to the world to which it is sent according to the measure of its knowledge."<sup>249</sup> The Word of God concerning reconciliation, the covenant, the kingdom and the new reality of the world is the promise and assurance granted to the Christian community. According to Barth, this promise originally came from the risen and living Jesus Christ Himself who is the source, theme and content of its ministry of witness. It is to be noted that with a supremely real and internal promise the community can also mark its ministry in the form of a gift. It is truly a free gift, which is given to it in the power of the Holy Spirit as the power of the personal Word of Jesus Christ. The above promise is not only distinctive in terms of the attestation of Him as the one true Witness, but also includes the origin, meaning and scope of all creaturely history. Furthermore its characteristic is described as unshakable and infallible in relation to "its security in the insecurity, its strength in the weakness, its health in the latent or acute sickness, its wealth in the poverty, and its glory in the gloom of its service."<sup>250</sup>

Jesus Christ is a fulfilled promise; “Fulfilled in Jesus Christ, the promise of its ministry justifies the motto which it has been given: *fluctuat nec mergitur.*”<sup>251</sup>

Barth affirms that the ministry and the witness of the community essentially and initially takes place in the form of the declaration of the Gospel. It always attempts its ministry tasks through introducing into the sphere of world-occurrence the truth that the kingdom of God is for humanity and the source of an eternal life is Jesus Christ. Because human beings lack the knowledge and the grace of God, they might not have the proper foundation for the understanding of the grace, the covenant, reconciliation, the life of Jesus Christ and therefore of the kingdom of God.

Therefore, for Barth, two basic things are crucial for laying the foundation for their understanding and even for Christian life. First, the Christian community needs to help non-Christians or ungodly heathens correct their thinking about God in the form of the explanation of the Gospel. Barth says “the community’s ministry of witness also consists directly in this explaining and unfolding of the Gospel, in making it intelligible.”<sup>252</sup> He further defines this task as the establishment of the true knowledge of faith in Jesus Christ, that is, *intellectus fidei*.<sup>253</sup> In this connection, the self-enunciating content of the Gospel will be an undeveloped and inarticulate declaration or mere assertion. As a matter of fact, to explain the Gospel is to expound, unfold and articulate its content in the enhancement of its unity and simplicity. The community, as the people of God, is required to create and explain this knowledge according to its own human skill and power on the basis of the work of the prophecy of Jesus Christ Himself and the living power of His Holy Spirit. The contents of this knowledge must be the nature, existence and activity of God as Creator, Reconciler and Redeemer, and His grace, covenant and work of reconciliation through the life, death and resurrection of His only Son Jesus Christ.<sup>254</sup> All of its content should be explained to people in human terms so that they can have a vital fellowship with Him.

Secondly, its ministry is, as Craig Carter states Barth’s point, to help people in the world believe and know the love of God in the form of an evangelical address, that is,

proclamation and explication in the form of application.<sup>255</sup> The point is that Jesus Christ has died and risen for them. Thus if they accept this gracious Word of God, eternal life from God will be theirs. Since God loved the world, the Christian community is called to address and appeal this declaration, and explain the content of the Gospel to them with evangelical love. More broadly, the evangelical address as the community's ministry of witness, in Barth, means "the inclusion of all men near and far, from the very first and without fastidiousness even as the great sinners they are, like all members of the community."<sup>256</sup> As the community exists for the world, its evangelical address exists inevitably for the people in the world. Barth's assertion is therefore that the community should not merely proclaim and explain the Gospel itself, but summon people with all its power to make ready them for the knowledge of the living Triune God in their faith as well as in their obedience.

According to the above two aspects of the community's ministry, Barth firmly stresses "a unity in multiplicity." The task laid upon the whole community is, for Barth, to declare and preach the Gospel with the power of the Spirit. God Himself, the Lord of the community is absolutely one God as the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. He is the basis, source and Lord of all. For this reason His community is called and created by Him in order to execute its one task of ministry in multiplicity, that is, what Barth understood as the strength of the unity of its witness. Barth further explains the term multiplicity on the basis of the fact that "the Holy Spirit does not enforce a flat uniformity...specific in each and every case...the ministry and witness of the community necessarily display *de facto* as well as *de iure* an integrated multiplicity."<sup>257</sup> In the execution of its ministry, a particular service is rendered in common in a particular form of thought, speech and action. This implies that the "communion of the Holy Ghost" (2 Cor. 13:13) can participate in its particular ministry and witness, but cannot be separated from its own action of community. The "communion of the Holy Ghost" embraces the whole community. According to Barth, this communion is more clearly defined as an "order" that takes the place of a true and

genuine working fellowship in the ministry and witness of the community in the world. Its fellowship is pluralistic, which makes the community possibly more powerful and visible within the unity of the ministry of the living community of the living Jesus Christ. For Barth, this reality means that there are many members in one body (1 Cor. 12:12). On the other side, the body is not one member, but many (1 Cor. 12:14). As God the Father, Jesus Christ the Son and the Holy Spirit are three, but exist as one, the ministry and the witness of the Christian community is therefore a unity in multiplicity. It further means that there are the pluralistic activities and fellowships in the working of God's ministry, but the one ultimate purpose is to proclaim the Gospel, that is, Jesus Christ. In its plurality, the body of Christ is inevitably edified (Eph. 4:12).<sup>258</sup>

Barth argues that the community's form of ministry and witness must be practical. In this respect, he emphasizes such a theological perspective as (1) the unity (2) the plurality (3) the proclamation or speech and (4) the action or healing. Speech always has to precede the action. That is, the ministry committed to the community should always be practical. In order to accomplish these practical elements the community should practice its ministry by focusing on the following instances, which we will set out in point form:

- (1) to praise, affirm, approve and extol God as the One who in His eternal majesty has become man and the action in which He has taken man, all men, to Himself in His omnipotent mercy;
- (2) to preach the Gospel, that is, Jesus Christ, in the assembly of the community and in the midst of divine service;
- (3) to instruct the community's own members first and the world secondly according to a special gift of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 12:10);
- (4) to execute its ministry's task evangelically;
- (5) to send out the Christian community to the heathen nations to attest the Gospel, that is, the missionary work which is concerned with the establishment of the whole ministry of the Church;
- (6) to conform to the ministry of theology which tests the community's whole action by the standard of its commission, and is specially committed to the witness of the Word of the Lord who gave it;
- (7) to pray for the accomplishment of the action required of the community;
- (8) to exercise the cure of souls as a basic form of the divine and human service of the community;
- (9) to demonstrate the production and existence of definite personal examples of Christian life and action;
- (10) to serve both God and man in the form of diaconate, which is a special ministry, helping of those in physical or material distress both within the community and outside;

(11) to perform a prophetic action, that is, an action based on perception into the meaning of the current events, relationships and forms both of its own history and that of the world around in their positive and negative connexion to the imminent kingdom of God attested by it and therefore in their significance for the concrete form of this witness;

(12) to establish fellowship between men, between Jesus Christ as the Head with the community as His body and each of its members, and between God Himself and the whole world as created by Him.<sup>259</sup>

Barth indicates that the church's special ministry is to praise God. In the ministry of the Christian community, to praise God is to acknowledge, extol and laud the being of God as the only true God. The community's praise of God is intrinsically worthy of itself and its members. Its praise of God eventually brings them satisfaction. For Barth, participating in the praise of God means participating in the community's speech and action. Barth says, "if its praise of God as a specific act of speech is well done it is also itself quite definitely a saving, helpful, purifying and restoring action, and as such an act of witness to the world."<sup>260</sup> The speech of the community is action; therefore its whole speech and action are a praise of God. This praise, as Barth says, "also has its own specific place and form in the ministry of the community, and indeed in that of its speech."<sup>261</sup> Its particular place and form refer to the assembling for divine service in the specific sense. In divine service, the community has to remind itself of its task and witness. Then it has to pray constantly for the insight and strength with which to perform it, and for the world to which it has to direct it.<sup>262</sup> Barth says that:

the whole action of divine service is orientated in accordance with its meaning, shaped, not as something artificial, but as a "liturgy," as the concrete and public performance of service, and fashioned under the control of the affirmation, acknowledgment, and approval, not of any god, but of Emmanuel, so that it takes the form of worthy and salutary confession...<sup>263</sup>

The formal principle of assembly for divine service gives its action the shape of the liturgy. It demands human expressions such as both preaching and prayer. Singing for Barth is also included in divine service. Therefore, "the praise of God which finds its concrete culmination in the singing of the community is one of the indispensable basic forms of the ministry of the community."<sup>264</sup>

For Barth, the community's proclamation of the Gospel, in the midst of divine service, is an action. Preaching is a highly important element in the action. It is primarily distinguished from all other forms of human declaration and communication. This is because preaching is an independent declaration and explanation of the Gospel of God. The content of the community's true preaching is "preaching of Jesus Christ, of the radical alteration of the situation between God and man, between heaven and earth, as it has been effected in Him."<sup>265</sup> Preaching is the original witness concerning Jesus Christ, the kingdom of God, salvation and His redeeming grace. Both the Old and New Testaments are the source of Christian preaching. As Barth asserts, "preaching is attesting communication of the biblical message on the assumption and under the stimulation and guidance of investigation and exposition of the biblical writings."<sup>266</sup> In this sense, preaching is based on biblical studies, that is, the investigation and exposition of biblical writings. Barth argues that scriptural exposition also belongs to the ministry of the community. Preaching "must never become an *exposé* in lecture form of such psychological, sociological, ethical and political learning and convictions as the preacher may also have,"<sup>267</sup> but "declares and expounds the Gospel and addresses man and appeals to him on the basis of it."<sup>268</sup>

Another basic form of the Church's ministry for Barth is "the instruction which is to be given in the community, first to its own members, but also to the world at large."<sup>269</sup> The Christian community, as the earthly-historical existence of Jesus Christ, is also a school. The duty of the community is not simply to attest to the Gospel in the world, but to speak and hear definite information in order for the truth of the Gospel to be imparted to both the young and the old, the educated and the uneducated. The ministry of the Church is not merely for a few members, but for all members of the community. All need to be instructed and subject to the ministry of the community. Christians have both the right and the duty to inform themselves and to gain information. To be sure, Christian instruction in all its forms must always have something of the manner and tone of preaching. This

instruction is linked with the praise of God and preaching. In this respect, Barth highlights the role of the Holy Spirit as the true and proper *doctor ecclesiae*. The Holy Spirit not only creates faith, but also gives information. Therefore the Spirit establishes real knowledge and sets up in the community the specific and sober ministry of instruction.<sup>270</sup> Like the praise of God, instruction for Barth is also one of the indispensable basic forms of the ministry of the community. It is the action of the community, which enables the people of God to bear witness to the world and actually bear it by its very existence.

For Barth, the speech and action of the community are directed outwards to the world, and are therefore apostolic. In this sense, evangelization for Barth is particularly crucial and normative for the accomplishment of its task of ministry. It is because this not only shapes the form of its particular ministry, such as preaching, teaching, and counselling of the Christian community specifically, but also challenges the countless people who theoretically have heard, accepted and responded to the Word of God, to participate actively in the cause of the community.<sup>271</sup> In evangelization, the Gospel is more concretely applied, and the love and grace of God to the people in the world and eventually their salvation, will be assured so that they can believe, obey and come to the responsibility of the community in practice and not just in theory. Furthermore, Barth argues that evangelization serves to awaken the sleeping Church. It, as a task, challenges Christ's Church to be a missionary community.

In a more specific sense, Barth speaks of mission as the very root of the existence and therefore of the whole ministry of the community. The Word which God has pronounced in Jesus Christ concerning the covenant of grace is still alien and must therefore be taken as a new message.<sup>272</sup> The community has to take this message to this world, to the nations or the heathen. For Barth, to be an apostolic Church is to be a missionary Church. In this context, Barth states the meaning and the purpose of missions as follows: (1) the task of mission should be based on the firm belief that Jesus Christ died and rose again for the heathen too. It is to proclaim the salvation for all who have fallen

victim to false beliefs in false gods; (2) the community itself is the acting subject in foreign missions; (3) “the only purpose of missions must be to make known the Gospel to foreign peoples, and they must be pursued only to the glory of God and the salvation of men.”<sup>273</sup> Its ultimate aim is purely to propagate the truth of the Gospel; (4) missions presuppose a sincere respect for the so-called religions, but no attempt at compromise or at finding points of contact and the like; (5) missions are concerned with the establishment of the whole ministry of the Church. They must be carried through in the form of preaching, evangelisation, instruction and the diaconate. They should also contribute to education in the form of missionary schools and physical health in the form of medical missions; (6) the goal of missions is not just to convert non-Christians in the sense of bringing them to a personal enjoyment of their salvation, but “to attest to the heathen the work and Word of God who, as He has created them by His call, wills to make them, too, His witnesses, and to equip them as such”<sup>274</sup>; (7) “missionary work among the nations cannot take the form of mastering and ruling, but only of serving, both in its commencement and its continuation. It has to lead the non-Christians themselves to become witnesses, to become the community, by the awakening call of God.”<sup>275</sup> The purpose of missions is therefore to help the non-Christians themselves establish their own new and native missionary community.

In relation to the speaking community, Barth focuses on the ministry of theology:

In theology the community gives a critical account, both to itself and to the world which listens with it, of the appropriateness or otherwise of its praise of God, its preaching, its instruction, its evangelistic and missionary work, but also of the activity which cannot be separated from these things, and therefore of its witness in the full and comprehensive sense and in relation to its origin, theme and content.<sup>276</sup>

Tim Dakin underscores Barth’s position that all of the community’s practical tasks should be examined by the ministry of theology, that is, on the basis of the Word of God.<sup>277</sup> For Barth, systematic and practical theology are not divided, but are one branch on the one tree. Barth holds that when theology is “executed correctly and resolutely, yet also freely and modestly,” it is “a singularly beautiful and joyful science, so that it is only willingly and cheerfully, or not at all, that we can be theologians.”<sup>278</sup> Theology has a critical task, that of

questioning, analyzing, and criticizing the whole ministry of the Christian community. As a result,

...in the solidarity with the community theology in all its movements must always have in view the surrounding world and its thought and aspiration, its action and inaction, not to draw from it its standards, and certainly not to parley and compromise with it, but in order to maintain a constant awareness of whom and what it speaks when it speaks of man, and also in order that it may bring the *fides* before those who happen to come to its notice in its inner consistency as the *intellectus fidei*, thus making its own contribution to the presentation of the likeness of the kingdom of God.<sup>279</sup>

For Barth, all indolent talk of non-theological laypersons must be quietly refuted. This is because theology is responsible for the reasonable service of the community and its members. In this respect, theology for Barth is an integrating element in the ministry of the community.<sup>280</sup> Every Christian is thus responsible for the ministry of theology and has indeed to think of himself or herself as a theologian. Barth in his work *Evangelical Theology: An Introduction* (1969) asserts that “A community that is awake and conscious of its commission and task in the world will of necessity be a theologically interested community.”<sup>281</sup> He goes on to say, “in order to serve the community of today, theology itself must be rooted in the community of yesterday. Its testimony to the Word and the profession of its faith must originate, like the community itself, from the community of past times, from which that of today arose.”<sup>282</sup> The task of theology is to acknowledge and respect Scripture as the theological norm, and reflect it on the inherited witness of the community. Theology says *credo ut intelligam*, “I believe in order to understand.”<sup>283</sup> In this matter, theology clings to all Church confessions of faith and therefore confirms itself to the community as a genuinely prophetic and apostolic witness. The precise task of theology for Barth is to be a service in and for the community.

Barth also emphasizes prayer as an acknowledgment as well as a confession that the community can exist and live, and eventually will live for its ministerial task by the free grace of God.<sup>284</sup> Prayer is one of the more powerful strengths of the Christian community in the past, present and future. Barth’s view of prayer can be described according to five criteria as follows: (1) prayer rests on God’s command; (2) prayer is petition; (3) prayer is

the act of the community; (4) prayer requires the confidence of its answer; and (5) the forms of Christian prayer—church service, the custom of morning and evening prayer and grace at meals.<sup>285</sup> Prayer for Barth can be defined as an integral part of its ministry, and is characterized by an inseparable union of both thanksgiving and intercession. The former is related to the past for the free grace of God already received in it, and the latter to the future for the same grace which will be needed in it.<sup>286</sup> In the spirit of self-sufficiency the community attempts its own task of ministry. However, without the reserve power which comes from prayer, it often fails its tasks in the crises of human life. Further the community can practice its pastoral care in hope as granted by ceaseless prayer. Thus, prayer for Barth is an important activity in its internal ministry.

For Barth, the cure of souls as the activity of the community is a sign and witness to individuals both within itself and in the nearer or most distant world around. The cure of souls is the community's service for both divinity and humanity. It is not merely a form of human service in the community, but both of God and humanity. As Barth says,

...both God and man according to the standard of the image of Jesus Christ, of the covenant between them established and sealed in Him; and therefore God as the merciful Father, Friend and Helper of man and man in the light of the fact that in his specific time and situation he is called and ordained to be a hearer of the Word of this covenant and a witness of this Word.<sup>287</sup>

The cure of souls is the unique beginning of what the community can do for the service of both God and humanity. Barth notes that "Everything depends upon its constant practical discharge in the Christian understanding of God and man and the divine calling and ordination of man."<sup>288</sup> Like preaching, instruction, evangelisation, missionary work, theology and prayer, the cure of souls is a basic task granted to the Christian community. Barth strongly urges Christians to be responsible for it. The community has to exercise the cure of souls, *mutua consolatio fratrum.*<sup>289</sup>

Barth states that "the production and existence of definite personal examples of Christian life and action" is another active witness of the community.<sup>290</sup> The Christian community in all subsequent periods has been surrounded, accompanied and sometimes

overwhelmed by many others. In relation to the world around, all believers in the community might be models or examples in their special calling and endowment. Christian love and hope enable them to admonish, instruct, encourage and comfort the community and thus to impel it in the ministry of its witness. For Barth, an individual Christian may be an example of Christian freedom or Christian commitment. Christians may arouse respect in their Christian isolation, or awaken interest in their Christian breadth and openness to people. They continually come and go in Christendom as examples to others and as outstanding executives of its action in the world.<sup>291</sup> They become the representatives of a special action of God in the community. They are the witness of Jesus Christ.

Hendrikus Berkhof in his work entitled *Christian Faith: An Introduction to the Study of the Faith* (1979), points out that the “diaconate concept” is also the community’s practical form of ministry in Barth’s ecclesiology.<sup>292</sup> For Barth, this simply means the giving of service to both God and humanity by community members. More specifically it denotes such tasks as “caring for the sick, the feeble, and the mentally confused and threatened, looking after orphans, helping prisoners, finding new homes for refugees, stretching out a hand to stranded and shattered fellow-men of all kinds...”<sup>293</sup> Such a ministry is very unique for the community in the light of its active solidarity with “the least of little ones with the ελαχιστοι (Mt. 25:40, 45)...”<sup>294</sup> In Barth’s theology of mission, as David M. Gill states, pastoral work, social service and other mission-related involvement are “not only a proclamation of human ideas and values but God’s announcement of Himself.”<sup>295</sup> Barth understands that God does not abolish, but rather adopts the human character of our words and actions. The Christian community’s missionary nature, for Barth, is shaped by its own relation to the world and its cultural activities, such as politics, the improvement of society and so on. It implies that all manifold activities are valid and Christians should be involved in them, but the “living Church can only mean, a Church that lives by its faith and therefore by its commission.”<sup>296</sup> The community “confesses Jesus Christ Himself as finally the hungry, thirsty, naked, homeless, sick, imprisoned man and

the royal man as such.”<sup>297</sup> Therefore, His community has to practice such a ministry in the form of preaching, evangelization, the curing of souls, and missionary work in order to reveal the cosmic character of the reconciliation accomplished in Him, of the kingdom of God, of the love for God and one’s neighbour and ultimately the content of the witness.<sup>298</sup>

Barth indicates three problems in the theory and practice of the Christian diaconate as follows: first, the community has to know that the need of individuals is grounded in certain disorders of the whole of human life in society. The community cannot ignore the prevailing social, economic and political conditions, and therefore must not evade its partial responsibility for it. Since the community is in the midst of human society, it has to reflect its proclamation of the Gospel summons on social injustice. In this situation, the community needs the open word of Christian social criticism in order that a new place may be found for Christian action and a new meaning given to it.<sup>299</sup>

Secondly, a welfare state has taken over the tasks which were once discharged by the diaconate. In spite of this, it is still necessary for the community to recall its own particular possibilities and to look for new ones. The community must remember that there are the countless hidden cases of need which cannot be provided for in any state scheme. Therefore, the community must have the detective skill and imagination to discover, and to meet that with which it must find appropriate new ways and methods. The business of the diaconate is to assist the state by placing suitable Christians at its disposal to act within it in this particular way.

Thirdly, the diaconate, like missionary work, is an affair of the community.<sup>300</sup> The community cannot be a genuine Christian community without the responsibility of the diaconate. In the community, there are deacons and deaconesses who are called and fitted and endowed for the fulfilment of this responsibility. They should develop distinctive modes and orders of life in accordance with their special nature and orientation. Barth says, “...this must not be allowed to give rise to the fatal idea that the existence of deacons is a peculiar one in a peculiar status or order rather than normal Christian existence specially

adapted to a special purpose.”<sup>301</sup> For Barth, the diaconate is the obligation of service laid on the whole community. The community must be active in the concrete work of diaconate. Barth raises questions:

What is the real defect if...there is in the community so little readiness for the diaconate in the narrower sense...so that there has to be continual retrenchment in the work of the diaconate? Does it lie only in the worldliness and materialism of the younger generation on which the blame is often far too hastily fixed? Does it lie only in the fact that the working societies of deacons have not always been successful in so fashioning their ministry of the Gospel ...therefore in so discharging it with the freedom and cheerfulness of the Gospel...?<sup>302</sup>

We should avoid rash accusations either on the one side or the other. This is because, as Barth believes: “For either way this deeply unsettling question is addressed to the whole community.”<sup>303</sup>

For Barth, a prophetic action is also the action of the community in the ministry of its witness. Barth urges the community not to ignore its responsibility for the need of prophets. The reason is that the ministry of its witness is not theory, but becomes the prophetic action. This is based on “perception into the meaning of the current events, relationship and forms both of its own history and that of the world around in their positive and negative connexion to the imminent kingdom of God attested by it and therefore in their significance for the concrete form of this witness.”<sup>304</sup> Also its action is continuous from past to future. The community hears the voice of the living God acting and speaking in Jesus Christ in its present form, because He was, is, and will be with His community.

Barth notes that “...‘to-day and here’ means in His work, in the divinely controlled history of the community and the world in its present form.”<sup>305</sup> In this sense, the prophetic action implies “...a puzzling form for Christians as for others.”<sup>306</sup> The Word of God as a new promise and direction cannot only be for Christians and the community. Jesus Christ is not only the Lord of His community, but the Lord of the world. Surely the Christian community should be engaged in a fresh self-examination and self-amendment as *ecclesia semper reformanda*. It should also be at least a length or half-length ahead of the world. It

cannot be free from the prophetic witness. In the prophetic element and character of its witness, the whole Gospel is a message to the community as well as to the world.

For Barth, if the community appropriates the call of prophetic action, the result will be division in the community itself. In other words, when the conflict between the Christian witness and the world comes to be concentrated in this command, the community's ministry tasks such as the singing, prayer, preaching, pastoral care and the diaconate of the community, and even its evangelisation and missionary work will be suspect. More seriously, there will be a "...very effective alliance between priests and false prophets on the one side, and rulers and people on the other, which offered such determined resistance to the prophets of the Old Testament."<sup>307</sup> The community's prophetic action for Barth is indeed a test of the genuineness of its ministry in every other function. To be specific, "...in its preaching, prayer, diaconate, theology etc., its ministry should have this prophetic character regardless of the consequences, and that it should therefore attest this call to advance."<sup>308</sup>

In accordance with this understanding, Barth connects the prophetic character of Christian witness to the establishment of fellowship between the people of different classes in the world, which is "...an indispensable element and mark of all the forms and functions of the Church's ministry."<sup>309</sup> The supreme fellowship for Barth is:

...of the Father with the Son and the Son with the Father in the Holy Spirit, and on this basis the particular fellowship of Jesus Christ as the Head with the community as His Body and each of its members, and on this basis the more general fellowship which God has newly and definitely established between Himself and the whole world as created by Him.<sup>310</sup>

In this content, the witness of the community has to establish fellowship between human beings. This is because, as Barth states, "...in recognition of the one kingdom which has drawn near to all, of the one covenant concluded in the name of all and to the salvation of all, it calls all to free thanksgiving for the one grace of God addressed to all and to the one free service in the sphere of lordship of this grace."<sup>311</sup> This recognition holds and binds all human beings together.

Interestingly, Barth indicates four difficulties for the establishment of fellowship in the course of the Christian mission. The first difficulty would be the problem of national identity among all nations. As the community goes to all nations according to Mt. 28:19, it cannot remove the frontiers and differences between them. On the other hand, it cannot sanction them. Rather it should gather the new members of all peoples and unite them as Christians. In this sense, a national Church for Barth would be a sick Church and it would resist the witness to the fellowship of all nations in the name of the Triune God. The second difficulty is the racial question, which in many parts of the world has become so acute today. Barth recognizes that, in the sphere of the community and outside it, racially different people can be seen and understood in light of their own particularities. However, for Barth this understanding cannot be made to supposed orders of creation or sin, or even necessary dividing of the community into special white, black and brown congregations.<sup>312</sup> This must not happen. It is because the Christian community owes to the world a witness, that is, the mutual fellowship of humanity. In this relation, the third difficulty is the problem of cultural differences. Barth urges the community to take it into account in its ministry of witness. “There is not one Gospel for the cultured and another for the uncultured.”<sup>313</sup> The Gospel of Jesus Christ is for all peoples in the world. Both the cultured and the uncultured intermingle in the community. In this respect, “...the wise of this world are made fools before God and the fools of this world are made wise.”<sup>314</sup> Thus the community for Barth has to establish fellowship beyond these cultural differences. The final difficulty is the problem of sociological divisions with regard to the economic classes, their differences and antitheses, their conflicting interests and ideologies. The community should not “identify itself with a class, or its concerns with the interests, its faith with the ideology or its ethos with the morality of such a class.”<sup>315</sup> Rather it should establish a fellowship between the peoples of different classes. It has to do this by inviting them to a common hearing of the Word, to common praying of the Lord’s Prayer and to the common table of the Lord’s Supper.

The major function of the fellowship for Barth is to lead people in the world to the knowledge of the Gospel of the kingdom of God in the form of both baptism and the Lord's Supper.<sup>316</sup> According to Barth, the former is the sign of purification and the meaningful reception of the individual into membership of the people of God. The latter is the repeated and conscious unification of this people in the form of common eating and drinking. In Barth, both are regarded as an invisible action of God<sup>317</sup> in which the fellowship of the Triune God is established as if Jesus Christ, the Head, establishes it with His body and finally God with the world, by fulfilling the reconciliation through His Son Jesus Christ. The significant point is that only the community can build up the foundation of the mutual fellowship of human beings that promotes commitment to thoughtful teaching, meaningful fellowship, and effective prayer, so that the people of God serve Him as He has equipped them; to the end that non-Christians will be saved and nurtured.<sup>318</sup> Simultaneously, the community will mark a very visible growth within itself. In this regard, both baptism and the Lord's Supper together for Barth are full of meaning, power, and actions that establish fellowship within the community, and finally the fellowship of God with the world.

### C. Barth's Theology of Mission

Having examined the gathering, the upbuilding, and the sending of the Christian community in Barth's Christocentric ecclesiology, it is evident that the theme of mission in general and foreign mission in particular permeates his ecclesiology.<sup>319</sup> For Barth, the Church, as the Christian community, must continually engage in missionary activity. This is because the Christian community is essentially and totally a missionary Church; that is, a people *sent* — an *apostolic* Church.<sup>320</sup> In this respect, Barth strongly urges the individual to have a strong sense of community. That is, personal faith is a product of the communal practices within the gathering, upbuilding, and sending Christian community. The Church is enriched by the mutual fellowship of Christian life. The community has to teach the true Christian community as being the place where there is sharing of the love of God. It has to

learn the Word of God as the attestation of Jesus Christ who is the Saviour for all peoples and Reconciler of human beings with God. It has to enlarge the missionary tasks to non-Christians or ungodly heathens, and the world, and ultimately proclaim God's salvation in the Lord Jesus Christ.<sup>321</sup> In this manner, the individual Christian can be nourished, shaped, and renewed only through his or her communal participation in the Church where the Gospel is preached as a witness to divine revelation and the lordship of the Triune God in the incarnate Word by the Holy Spirit.

As we surveyed Barth's concept of the Christian community based on the Nicene Creed—*una, sancta, catholica, apostolica*, it also became evident that his theology of mission takes into account other cultures or religions in the course of evangelization.<sup>322</sup> Barth holds that the community should be aware of cultural differences and take them into account in its ministry of witness. He advises the Christian community to have a realistic knowledge of the world-occurrence or cross-cultural knowledge, and to exist in total solidarity with the world as well as being in active responsibility for the world. To be specific, realistic knowledge can only be gained by intimate contact both with Jesus Christ and the reconciliation accomplished and being accomplished by Him and with the world itself. In the light of this knowledge the Church can and must exist in total solidarity with the world. For it itself is the world, and is also governed by divine providence and human sin. On the basis of knowledge and solidarity, it must exist in active responsibility for the world. In this context, Barth urges the Christian community to execute its missionary task to the world in the form of the proclamation, explanation and application of the Gospel as the Word of God; this is done specifically with regard to twelve basic forms of the ministry of the community by dividing them into two functions as follows: Word—(1) the praise of God; (2) preaching; (3) instruction; (4) evangelization; (5) mission; (6) ministry of theology—and Action—(7) prayer; (8) the cure of souls; (9) the production & existence of definite personal examples of Christian life and action; (10) diaconate; (11) prophetic action; (12) the establishment of fellowship.<sup>323</sup>

Robert J. Palma, in his work entitled *Karl Barth's Theology of Culture: The Freedom of Culture for the Praise of God* (1983), argues, "Barth was both aware that throughout its whole course, the Church swims along in the stream of culture, and also certain that the church has a special role to play in behalf of culture."<sup>324</sup> He goes on to say, for Barth, "...all spheres of human culture should finally be ordered and viewed, viz., in relation to God and his grace, and that in using his God-given gifts, man may and must praise Him, and put himself thankfully at the service of His grace."<sup>325</sup> Barth understands culture as human activity which reflects genuine human freedom and in turn arises out of the rich and manifold freedom of God Himself. As Palma states referring to George S. Hendry's article on "The Freedom of God in the Theology of Karl Barth," freedom for Barth is God's "gratuity," "option, or choice between alternatives," "self-determination," "initiative," and "energy."<sup>326</sup> These imply the multiplex character of free culture which is based on God's rich freedom. There is a difference between God's own freedom and human freedom. God's freedom is understood as gratuity or free grace and love for humanity, which is fundamental for Barth in determining the nature of free culture and discerning the same. God's deep freedom is in Jesus Christ who ultimately becomes God's freedom for love and humanity. This is to say that God for Barth is free for humanity, free to co-exist with humanity and as the Lord of the covenant, to participate in His history.<sup>327</sup>

Palma summarizes Barth's examples of free culture found in specific areas of culture. First, theological culture or evangelical theology as a free science should avoid a false dependency, such as on one's particular philosophy or ontology, so that the light of the Gospel may dispel the darkness, thereby leading to the hearer's faith, repentance, obedience, love, gratitude, and praise of God. True theological words spoken *extra muros ecclesiae* are right in their results when they comfort the Church in its witness and impel the Church to reform.<sup>328</sup> Secondly, in the artistic realm of culture, Mozart is the paradigm of free artistic culture. Barth finds Mozart as parable of the realm of God's free grace.<sup>329</sup> Mozart was free in terms of the rightness of free culture. Thirdly, in the political and

economic realms of culture, free culture was best exemplified in democracy and socialism respectively. Barth's own life was affiliated with the Social Democrats in both Safenwil and in Germany. Democracy as the paradigmatic political culture for Barth is not the form of State closest to the Christian view.<sup>330</sup> The democratic form of political order should be based on the kingdom of God and the Church's own faith and gospel. In the sphere of economic culture, socialism is best exemplified as a free economic culture. Barth's point of departure was not that of Marxist or socialist ideology, but Jesus' own deeds and teaching. For him, Jesus wanted to abolish self-seeking in property, but wanted to establish the kingdom of God upon this earth. In other words, real socialism is real Christianity.<sup>331</sup> Fourthly, in the realm of scientific and intellectual culture, Jesus Christ is the true witness. There must be freedom from false witness, illusions, ideologies, "isms," and arbitrary presuppositions.<sup>332</sup> Jesus Christ sets us free to receive our life and our world for what they are, namely God's creation entrusted to us. For Barth, Jesus Christ is the centre of God's acts and revelation. Christ came to a fuller recognition of the humanity of God, from whom come the good gifts making human culture possible.<sup>333</sup> Barth found that Christ could immerse Himself in human culture as He never had before. Palma consequently opines that Barth's theological commitment and premises themselves, especially his belief in the "present Dominion of Christ," made him free for letting a cultural scene be seen on its own terms and for what it is in itself.<sup>334</sup> This, Hans Frei called Barth's secular sensibility.<sup>335</sup>

As we have observed, Barth rejects cultural discrimination. In the Gospel of Jesus Christ, there is no distinction between the cultured and the uncultured. Both groups are one in Jesus Christ. Therefore, the community's task of mission for Barth is only to pursue the glory of God and the salvation of human beings. He says:

Everything is falsified if other purposes either predominate or are even admitted. Neither the aim to strengthen confessional positions, nor to extend European or American culture and civilisation, nor to propagate one of the modes of thought and life familiar and dear to the older Christian world by reason of its antiquity, can be the motivating force behind true Christian missions, and certainly not the desire to support colonial or general political interests and aspirations.<sup>336</sup>

Therefore, Barth emphasizes the establishment of fellowship. This, as he believes, unites and binds the peoples of different cultures as Christians. In this relation, he also rejects racism, which possibly becomes a hindrance for the propagation of the Gospel of God to all peoples in the world. In any circumstances, it cannot be any real question for the missionary community. For Barth, the primary task given to the community is to call all peoples to discipleship. In doing so, it is possible for the community to establish a true Christian fellowship in the name of Jesus Christ who is the Lord, Head and centre of His body.

From Barth's perspective, salvation is inclusive in Christ who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life for all peoples in the world and through whom one must go to the Father. Clearly, Jesus Christ as the true witness accomplishes the conversion of non-Christians from ignorance to knowledge, from unbelief to faith, from bondage to freedom. Barth assumes that the human and non-Christian religions are already under the influence of the revealing and redeeming activity of God in Christ through His Spirit.<sup>337</sup> It is the total and genuine existence of God's incarnational grace in Christ for the whole world. In this connection, Peter Harrison, in his article "Karl Barth and the Non-Christian Religions," has investigated that the possibility of a universal salvation (*apokatastasis*) is "broached by Barth in his discussion of election and is carried through into his anthropology."<sup>338</sup> He notes:

The lynchpin of Barth's treatment of election is found in his statement that Jesus Christ is "on the one hand the electing God and on the other elected man." Human election involves participation in the divine self-election...Accordingly, God's predestination is not seen to involve the election of some and the reprobation of others, but instead means that in Jesus Christ God "elects himself" for rejection and humanity for election..."Rejection," wrote Barth, "cannot again become the portion or affair of man," for...on the basis of this decree of His the only truly rejected man is His own Son...<sup>339</sup>

As Joseph D. Bettis has argued, Barth has been labelled a universalist because he clearly and forcefully rejects Arminianism and double predestination.<sup>340</sup> On the possibility of *apokatastasis*, Barth wrote: "No such postulate can be made even though we appeal to the cross and the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Even though theological consistency might

seem to lead our thoughts and utterances most clearly in this direction, we must not arrogate to ourselves that which can be given and rejected only as a free gift.”<sup>341</sup> On the other hand, he maintains that “...there is no good reason why we should forbid ourselves, or be forbidden, openness to the possibility that in the reality of God and man in Jesus Christ...there might be contained the super-abundant promise of the final deliverance of all men.”<sup>342</sup> In light of this statement, Barth does not provide any theological doctrine of universal salvation, but he leaves open the possibility that within God’s freedom all human beings may be saved. Humanity is the object of divine grace and therefore the Word of God should be proclaimed. Barth’s anthropology represents *apokatastasis*, which is based on the Christological principle.<sup>343</sup> God elects humanity through the election of the one person Jesus Christ. Since Christ Himself was human, God’s relation to sinful humanity is therefore His relation to the person Jesus Christ. In this sense, Barth sees Jesus Christ as representing the key to the problem of human nature.

According to Harrison, Barth’s anthropology is ontological; “...we have genuine knowledge of human nature through Jesus Christ but also that human nature is ontologically determined by the man Jesus Christ.”<sup>344</sup> To be a human being is to be with God, for humanity is with God because He is with Jesus. For Barth, Godlessness is not a possibility, but an ontological impossibility for humanity. Accordingly, sin itself is not a possibility, but an ontological impossibility for humanity.<sup>345</sup> Barth’s work *Christ and Adam* (1956) explores such themes as the election of the human being in Jesus Christ, the ontological determination of humanity by Jesus Christ and the resulting ontological impossibility of sin. Barth says: “Our relationship to Christ has an essential priority and superiority over our relationship to Adam...On both sides [in both Jesus Christ and Adam] there is the formal identity of the one human nature which is not annulled or transformed even by sin.”<sup>346</sup> Jesus Christ is the secret truth about the essential nature of humanity and even a sinful human being is still essentially related to Him. In relation to the status of non-Christians, Barth claims: “The fact of Christ is here presented as something that dominates

and includes all men. The nature of Christ objectively conditions human nature and the work of Christ makes an objective difference to the life and destiny of all men.<sup>347</sup> Due to the universal and objective nature of Christ's work, as Harrison has stated Barth's point, "there is no ontological difference between the Christian and the non-Christian, least of all a difference which is in some way dependent on religion, for much in true human nature is unrelated to 'religion', but nothing in true human nature is unrelated to the Christian faith."<sup>348</sup>

Interestingly Barth refuses to identify the Christian community with the elect. Emil Brunner in his work *Dogmatics* (1949) has argued that Barth relativized the difference between Christian and non-Christian.<sup>349</sup> Barth's work *The Humanity of God* (1961) states that "...the so-called 'outsiders' are really only 'insiders' who have not yet understood and apprehended themselves as such...the most persuaded Christian...must and will recognize himself ever and again as an 'outsider'.<sup>350</sup> In Barth's work entitled *Table Talk* (1963), this point of view is affirmed:

The distinction is not between the redeemed and the non-redeemed, but between those who realise it and those who do not. The emphasis in much of today's preaching has to do with salvation in the future, something the preacher can help give, instead of speaking of the perfect salvation already accomplished. We only await its final revelation.<sup>351</sup>

In this connection, mission for Barth is for the salvation of all which has already taken place, and therefore the task of mission is to announce the good news of Jesus Christ to non-Christian.<sup>352</sup> Salvation comes through God's grace in Jesus Christ. It is not to be located in any historico-temporal phenomenon. Christianity is not exclusive as a religion. Religious persons are saved in spite of their own religious persuasions.

For Barth, Christ's capacity to make humans witnesses to His truth cannot be limited within the boundaries of the Christian community. Outsiders of God's community can be His witnesses and can speak words which can seriously be called true.<sup>353</sup> "True words" can be obtained from the most unlikely places, for neither "militant godlessness" nor "intricate heathenism" constitutes an insurmountable barrier for God.<sup>354</sup> In other

words, the more seriously we take belief in Jesus Christ, the more capable we shall be of receiving signs and true words from the worldly sphere.<sup>355</sup> These lights and words, as Barth has argued, should properly be included in God's self-revelation. Barth distinguishes these lights and words from special revelation as follows: "...the critical distinction which has to be made in the relationship between the self-revelation of God in the prophecy of Jesus Christ and the self-attestations of the creature cannot possibly result in the exclusion of the latter, seeing they derive their force from the same God."<sup>356</sup> This is not to say that Barth later came to acknowledge the legitimacy of natural theology, but he attempted to correct his own earlier one-sided view of the religions.<sup>357</sup>

Barth's work *Kurze Erklärung des Römerbriefs* (1956) represents his more positive attitude toward natural knowledge of God. According to him, the world was created by God who has always declared and revealed Himself to it. The world is God's work and therefore His self-witness. This extramural knowledge of God should be taken into account by the Christian community. It may play an important role in the formulation of Christian doctrine as the Church endeavors to interpret the Word of God anew. It should reflect the truth of Jesus Christ in order for it to be recognized as a perspective of the whole truth. This is to say that, for Barth, there are other words outside the walls of the Church, but these are related to the Word we have in Jesus Christ. Barth employs three criteria—conformity to Scripture, to the creeds and confessions and ethical fruits—by which to determine whether these words are true words; this means that other truths are to be judged by the fruits they bear.<sup>358</sup>

Barth's anthropology clearly gives new insights into the status of non-Christians and of other religions. In *Church Dogmatics I/2*, he discusses "Pure Land Buddhism" as a possible model for dialogue between Christianity and other religions within the context of Christian systematic theology. His treatment of Pure Land Buddhism follows logically from the central theme of his theology, that is, God's revelation in Jesus Christ. His stance toward Pure Land is also consistent with his approach to other non-Christian religions. His

analysis and use of Pure Land challenges Christian theologians to be open to the inter-religious dialogue and have a more receptive posture toward non-Christian religions within the context of systematic theology.<sup>359</sup> In *Church Dogmatics* III/2, Barth also cites the anthropologies of Confucius, Martin Buber and Ludwig Feuerbach.<sup>360</sup> He wrote:

What we have called humanity can be present and known in varying degrees of perfection or imperfection even where there can be no question of a direct revelation and knowledge of Jesus Christ. This reality of human nature and its recognition are not, therefore, restricted to the Christian community, to the “children” of light, but, as we are told in Lk. 16:8, the “children of this world” may in this respect be wiser than the children of light, being more human, and knowing more about humanity, than the often very inhuman and therefore foolish Christians.<sup>361</sup>

Barth admits that the knowledge of the “children of this world” may be more valid than that of “foolish Christians.” He further notes: “Even with his natural knowledge of himself the natural man is still in the sphere of divine grace; in the sphere in which Jesus too was man. How, then, can he lack a certain ability to have better knowledge of himself as well as a good deal worse?”<sup>362</sup>

While analyzing Barth’s understanding of the community (missionary) character of the church, it remains necessary here to outline briefly an historical profile of Barth’s continuous theological shifts throughout his own career. Eberhard Jüngel divided Barth’s life into three periods: (1) theological, beginning with the first edition of *The Commentary on Romans* (1919); (2) dialectical theology, *The Christian Dogmatics in Outline* (1927); and (3) dogmatic theology, *Church Dogmatics* and other writings.<sup>363</sup> Barth’s theology in the early stage was centred on an anthropological narrowness and non-dialogue with other religions,<sup>364</sup> but his later approach to other cultures and religions was quite positive as he regarded them as “true words...*extra muros ecclesiae*” (outside the walls of the church), or “lights in the world,” or “parables of the kingdom of heaven.”<sup>365</sup> When Barth was approaching seventy, he consciously and publicly corrected himself, by laying the emphasis on the earthly presence and the impact of God’s action in human history. C. A. Keller claims that Barth’s later anthropology and his theology of religions were more constructive than previously thought.<sup>366</sup> Accordingly, C. S. Song notes that, in the

development of Barth's theology, the positive emphasis on humanity overcomes more and more the negative emphasis on it, which has come to its clearest expression in the treatment of the problem of humankind in the later volumes of *Church Dogmatics*.<sup>367</sup> J. A. Veitch argues that Barth is "diachronically" dialectical: "Although Barth strove to achieve a dialectical balance between Revelation and Religion, the overall emphasis in vol. I is negative; the positive side is emphasized in vol. IV."<sup>368</sup> As Bockmuehl has affirmed, Barth's earlier writing represented a "half-moon theology"—only one half of the Christian message, but his later writings such as *The Humanity of God* (1956), etc, displayed the proper correlation of humanity and God.<sup>369</sup> In his own letter entitled "No Boring Theology"<sup>370</sup> to some South East Asian theologians, the necessity for interfaith dialogue, as well as the freedom for expressing a doxology within one's own distinctive ways, are affirmed in terms of understanding the communities of other cultural-religious traditions.

As Carl Starkloff further stated,

Barth later granted that human values are endowed by God; the onus on Christianity now influenced by his development is to labor to understand the cultures it studies sufficiently to determine where a cultural form or idea or myth is itself able to be a medium of proclamation, through which or on the occasion of which the outpouring of the Spirit may occur.<sup>371</sup>

Likewise, Barth, as J. A. Veitch has correctly observed, "wishes to give a real place in the structure of his theology to the positive aspect of religion which is the human response to, and expression of Revelation."<sup>372</sup> In Barth's later writings, not only is humanity and its culture certainly affirmed, but also interfaith dialogue becomes a new common discussion.

---

## End Notes for Chapter Two

<sup>1</sup>See Everett N. Hunt, Jr., *Protestant Pioneers in Korea*, 15-22.

<sup>2</sup>For evidence on this point, see Heup Young Kim, *Wang Yang-Ming and Karl Barth*, 5-6; Sung-Bum Yun, *Christianity and Korean Thought* (Seoul: The Christian Literature Society of Korea, 1964), 71-82 and *idem*, “SungHak Kwa Shinhak ui Bekyo Yunku: Yul-Gok kwa Karl Barth JungShim Uero,” [A Comparative Study of Sincerity and Theology: Focusing on Yul-Gok and Karl Barth] in *Korean Confucianism and Korean Theology* (Seoul: Methodist Theological Seminary Press, 1998): 388-411.

<sup>3</sup>To take an example, Waldron Scott indicates that Barth’s theology of the mission does not take into account the value of other cultures and religions (For this criticism see Waldron Scott, “Karl Barth’s Theology of Mission,” *Missionology* III/2 [1975]: 209-223). Also Michael Barnes criticizes Barth’s Christocentric theology of mission as his major weakness that limits the mode of revelation of God’s will to the proclamation of the gospel (Michael Barnes, *Christian Identity and Religious Pluralism: Religions in Conversation* [Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1989], 20). This criticism will be evaluated in this chapter, but this thesis on the reception of Karl Barth in Korea does not criticize all aspects of Barth’s theology.

<sup>4</sup>G. Wayne Glick’s article entitled “Karl Barth and the Theology of the Word of God,” in *Brethren Life and Thought* 5 (Spring 1960): 29-38, is helpful to understand Barth’s theological characteristics. In a summary section, Glick analyzes Barth’s theology into five categories: (1) God and His Relation to the World; (2) Revelation and Biblical Authority; (3) Christology; (4) Man; and (5) History and the Kingdom of God. Concerning Barth’s theology, Glick highlights the “Word of God” as utterly crucial to Barth’s thought. Moreover, he explores Barth’s view of revelation in terms of three senses: (1) The revealed Word of God is Jesus Christ; (2) The Bible is the written word. That means it becomes the Word when through it Jesus Christ is disclosed to us and we respond in faith; and (3) There is the Word of God as proclaimed in Christian preaching. The Bible and preaching are dependent upon the essential Word which is Jesus Christ.

<sup>5</sup>Glick, “Karl Barth and the Theology of the Word of God,” 29.

<sup>6</sup>In 1914, 93 German intellectuals supported the war policy of Kaiser Wilhelm. This precipitated Barth’s break with theological liberalism. From 1922 onward Barth began to serve as professor of theology in Germany. He set himself against the anthropologically-centred liberal Protestantism and the natural theology of Catholicism. Interestingly, “through his famed book on Romans in 1922, he became the leader of the so-called Dialectic Theology movement and effected a remarkable turn-around in theology, bringing several decades of liberal supremacy to an end” (Klaus Bockmuehl, “Karl Barth 1886-1986: An Evangelical Appraisal,” *CRUX* 22/3 [Sept., 1986]: 28-32, 28).

<sup>7</sup>Eberhard Busch, “Deciding moments in the life and work of Karl Barth,” *Grail* 2 (Dec, 1986), 59. See also E. Busch’s detailed explanation concerning the development of dialectical theology in Barth, “Dialectical Theology: Karl Barth’s Reveille,” *Canadian Journal of Theology* 16/3 & 4 (1970): 165-174.

---

<sup>8</sup>Bockmuehl, Karl Barth 1886-1986," 28. Refer also to Eberhard Busch, *Karl Barth: His Life from Letters and Autobiographical texts* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976).

<sup>9</sup>From Professor William Klempa's unpublished biographical notes of Karl Barth entitled "Karl Barth Today."

<sup>10</sup>See Karl Barth, "Christian Community and Civil Community," in *Community, State and Church* (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1960), 148-189.

<sup>11</sup>Joseph Bettis, "Political Theology and Social Ethics: The Socialist Humanism of Karl Barth," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 27 (1974): 287-305, 290.

<sup>12</sup>Bettis, 297-298. Also See *CD.*, II/2, 654ff.

<sup>13</sup>Bettis, 299.

<sup>14</sup>William Hordern, "Barth as Political Thinker," *Christian Century* 86/13 (March 26, 1969): 411-413, 412.

<sup>15</sup>See George Hunsinger, ed., and tran., *Karl Barth and Radical Politics* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976), 9-13.

<sup>16</sup>Karl Barth, "Jesus Christ and the Movement for Social Justice (1911)," in *Karl Barth and Radical Politics*, 19.

<sup>17</sup>Hunsinger, ed., and tran., *Karl Barth and Radical Politics*, 9.

<sup>18</sup>See Friedrich-Wilhelm Marquardt, "Socialism in the Theology of Karl Barth," in *Karl Barth and Radical Politics*, 47-76. Also see *idem*, *Theologie und Sozialismus: das Beispiel Karl Barths* (München: Kaiser, 1972).

<sup>19</sup>Helmut Gollwitzer, "Kingdom of God and Socialism in the Theology of Karl Barth," in *Karl Barth and Radical Politics*, 77-78.

<sup>20</sup>*Ibid.*, 85.

<sup>21</sup>See *CD.*, III/4, 544.

<sup>22</sup>*CD.*, III/4, 545.

<sup>23</sup>Gollwitzer, "Kingdom of God and Socialism in the Theology of Karl Barth," 84.

<sup>24</sup>Cf. *CD.*, I/2, 22-23.

<sup>25</sup>Gerald A. Butler, "Karl Barth and Political Theology," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 27 (1974): 441-458, 445.

<sup>26</sup>For a discussion of the Barmen Declaration and a detailed account of its development, see Arthur Cochrane's *The Church's Confession Under Hitler* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962); Rolf Ahlers' *The Barmen Theological Declaration of 1934: The Archaeology of a Confessional Text*, Toronto Studies in Theology, vol. 24 (Lewiston,

---

New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1986); and K. D. Schmidt's *Die Bekenntnisse des Jahres 1934* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1935), esp., 22-25.

<sup>27</sup>Rolf Ahlers, "The First Barmen Declaration," *The Reformed Journal* 34 (1984): 14-20, 15.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid.

<sup>30</sup>See Ahlers, "The First Barmen Declaration," 19-20. It is important to note that Barth owned a substantial debt to theologians such as Athanasius, Anselm, Thomas, Luther, and Calvin. For a discussion of the relationship between Barth and the Reformed traditions, see Phil Butin, "Two Early Reformed Catechisms, the Threefold Office, and the Shape of Karl Barth's Christology," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 44 (1991): 195-214; Douglas J. W. Milne, "A Barthian Stricture on Reformed Theology-The Unconditionality of the Covenant of Grace," *The Reformed Theological Review* 55/3 (Sept-Dec, 1996): 121-133; Klaas Runia, "Authority of the Confession," *The Reformed Theological Review* 18/1 (Feb, 1959): 6-20; Jacques de Senarclens, "Karl Barth and the Reformed Tradition," *The Reformed and Presbyterian World* 30/5 (March 1969): 206-213.

<sup>31</sup>Cochrane, *The Church's Confession under Hitler*, 281.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., 280.

<sup>33</sup>Robert McAfee Brown, *Saying Yes and Saying No: On Rendering to God and Caesar* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986), 22.

<sup>34</sup>For an analysis of Christocentrism in Barth, see George Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth: The Shape of His Theology* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), esp., the chapter entitled "Christ the Center," 225-233 and Jacques de Senarclens, "Karl Barth and the Reformed Tradition," *Reformed & Presbyterian World* 30/5 (March 1969): 206-214. Also Donald G. Bloesch's book *Jesus Christ: Savior and Lord* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1997) explores Christology on the basis of Barth's Christocentrism.

<sup>35</sup>Busch, "Deciding moments in the life and work of Karl Barth," 62.

<sup>36</sup>For the emphasis on praxis in Barth's theology, see Karl Barth, *Evangelical Theology: An Introduction*, tran. G. Foley (New York: Doubleday, 1969), esp., entitled "The Community," 37-47; Tim Dakin, "The Nature of Practical Theology, Repeating Transformation: Browning and Barth on Practical Theology," *Anvil* 13/3 (1996): 203-221.

<sup>37</sup>George Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth*, 4.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., 31. See *CD.*, II/1, 257-321.

<sup>39</sup>See *CD.*, II/1, 602.

<sup>40</sup>Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth*, 36.

<sup>41</sup>See *CD.*, II/1, 51-53.

---

<sup>42</sup>Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth*, 37.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., 39.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., 41.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid.

<sup>48</sup>Frank M. Hasel's article entitled, "The Christological Analogy of Scripture in Karl Barth," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 50 (1994): 41-49, deals with Barth's concept of the Christological analogy of scripture. He explores two aspects: Barth's understanding of the nature of Christ and his understanding of the nature of scripture. Hasel highlights Barth's theological use of the term analogy which is based on the Word of God, Jesus Christ.

<sup>49</sup>See Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth*, 43-48.

<sup>50</sup>See *CD.*, I/1, 321; II/1, 310.

<sup>51</sup>Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth*, 49.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., 55.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid.

<sup>54</sup>See Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth*, 55-63.

<sup>55</sup>See *CD.*, II/1, 244-245. Also cf. Alan R. White, "Coherence Theory of Truth," in *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, vol. 2, ed. Paul Edwards (New York: The Macmillan Company & the Free Press, 1967), 130-133.

<sup>56</sup>See Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth*, 225-233.

<sup>57</sup>See *CD.*, II/1, 328; IV/2, 412.

<sup>58</sup>*CD.*, III/4, 328.

<sup>59</sup>*CD.*, IV/4, 150. See Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth*, 229.

<sup>60</sup>Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth*, 233. For a further discussion of Barth's Christocentrism, see John Thompson, *Christ in Perspective: Christological Perspectives in the Theology of Karl Barth* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1978). This book is most helpful to understand Barth's Christology. It contributes not only to making Barth's mature thought more widely known to English-speaking readers but also in clarifying and deepening out thinking on the current debate on Christology. Thompson attempts to expound Barth's thought on Christology according to the *Church Dogmatics*. He concludes that Barth follows the mainline of Christological thinking in the Church with refreshing new rethinking and modifications. In this book, Thompson describes Barth's understanding of the person, Jesus Christ, as the revelation of God, the reconciler, the atonement, true and exalted man, the risen Lord, and the true witness. In his concluding

---

chapter, he explores Barth's Christology in terms of an eschatological perspective and emphasizes that Jesus Christ as the Word of God is the centre of the *Church Dogmatics* (see Thompson, *Christ in Perspective*, 126-129).

<sup>61</sup>William Klempa, "Barth as a Scholar and Interpreter of Calvin," *Calvin Studies* 7 (1994): 31-49, 36.

<sup>62</sup>See *CD.*, I/1, 393ff. David M. Gill states that "Barth defines the church as the community of people who have been encountered by God's Word and have been led to receive it, to acknowledge it and to offer themselves as living witnesses to it....He approaches ecclesiology by way of reflection upon the implications of biblical Christology" (David M. Gill, Karl Barth, The Church and Ecumenism," *The Hartford Quarterly* 7: 47-61, 48). Thus Barth's doctrine of Scripture is closely linked to his Christocentric ecclesiology and his understanding of the role of the Holy Spirit.

<sup>63</sup>See *CD.*, II/2, x. Also cf. Klempa, "Barth as a Scholar and Interpreter of Calvin," 38.

<sup>64</sup>See Klempa, "Barth as a Scholar and Interpreter of Calvin," 39-41.

<sup>65</sup>Douglas Horton, "God Lets Loose Karl Barth," in *The Christian Century Reader*, edited by Harold E. Fey and Margaret Frakes (New York: Association Press, 1962), 101.

<sup>66</sup>Klempa, 42. Also cf. A. C. McGiffert, "Is Calvin Coming Back," *Christendom* I/2 (Winter 1936), 310-321.

<sup>67</sup>See Klempa, 42-43. Cf. Hans Urs von Balthasar, *The Theology of Karl Barth*, trans., John Drury (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971), 19.

<sup>68</sup>Klempa, 32.

<sup>69</sup>*CD.*, IV/1, 652.

<sup>70</sup>See Daniel B. Spross, "The Doctrine of Sanctification in the Theology of Karl Barth," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 20/2 (Fall 1985): 54-76, 54-55.

<sup>71</sup>See Barth, *CD.*, IV/3, 2, 681-901.

<sup>72</sup>Karl Barth, *Community, State, and Church* (New York: Doubleday, 1960), 135-136.

<sup>73</sup>*Ibid.*, 149.

<sup>74</sup>See *CD.*, I/2, 215ff.

<sup>75</sup>See *CD.*, IV/1, 666.

<sup>76</sup>See Nicholas M. Healy, "The Logic of Karl Barth's Ecclesiology," 269.

<sup>77</sup>*CD.*, IV/1, 661.

<sup>78</sup>For a discussion of the theological relationship between the Holy Spirit and the Christian community in Barth's ecclesiology, see Hans Urs Balthasar, *A Theology of*

---

*History* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1963), 79-90; John Millbank, "The Second Difference: For a Trinitarianism without Reserve," *Modern Theology* 2 (1986): 213-234.

<sup>79</sup>Gill," Karl Barth, The Church and Ecumenism," 55. Also cf. James J. Buckley, "A Field of Living Fire: Karl Barth on the Spirit and the Church," *Modern Theology* 10/1 (January 1994): 81-102, 91 and *CD.*, IV/2, 694.

<sup>80</sup>See *CD.*, IV/1, 725ff; and W. A. Whitehouse and J. B. Soucek, "The Christian View of Man: An Examination of Karl Barth's Doctrine," in *Scottish Journal of Theology* 2 (1949): 57-82, 71-72. Also cf. *CD.*, IV/1, 717-733.

<sup>81</sup>*CD.*, IV/2, 621.

<sup>82</sup>Ibid., 651, 714. Also cf. Buckley, "A Field of Living Fire: Karl Barth on the Spirit and the Church," 87-89. For a sorting out of the strengths and weaknesses of "the Church as an event," see Avery Dulles, *Models of the Church* (Garden City, New York: Image Books, 1978), esp., chapter 5, 81-93.

<sup>83</sup>*CD.*, IV/1, 652.

<sup>84</sup>Verne H. Fletcher, "Barth's Concept of Co-Humanity and the Search for Human Community," *South East Asia Journal of Theology* 9/1 (July 1967): 41-53, 47.

<sup>85</sup>*CD.*, IV/1, 654.

<sup>86</sup>Ibid., 657.

<sup>87</sup>See *CD.*, IV/1, 658-661.

<sup>88</sup>Karl Barth, *Theology and Church*, tran. Louise Pettibone Smith (New York & Evanston: Harper & Row, 1962), 276.

<sup>89</sup>See *CD.*, IV/1, 651-652.

<sup>90</sup>See *CD.*, IV/1, 662 and 668.

<sup>91</sup>Gill, "Karl Barth, The Church and Ecumenism," 50.

<sup>92</sup>Ibid., 49.

<sup>93</sup>See *CD.*, IV/1, 669-724. For an extensive and systematic treatment of the Nicene *credo ecclesiam*, see Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, IV/1, 650ff; *idem*, *Credo*, tran. J. S. McNab (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962), 137-149; *idem*, *Dogmatics in Outline*, tran. G. T. Thompson (New York: Harper and Row, 1959), 141-148.

<sup>94</sup>See *CD.*, IV/1, 669-672.

<sup>95</sup>Cf. *CD.*, IV/3, 865-881.

<sup>96</sup>Cf. Eph. 4:16.

<sup>97</sup>For Barth's use of the threefold office—Christ as Priest, King and Prophet—in his *Church Dogmatics*, see Phil Butin, "Two Early Reformed Catechisms, the Threefold

---

Office, and the Shape of Karl Barth's Christology," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 44 (1991): 195-214.

<sup>98</sup>For Barth's concept of "holiness" in his ecclesiology see Nicholas Wolterstorff, "Liturgy, Justice, and Holiness," *The Reformed Journal* 39 (1989): 12-20. Also see *CD.*, IV/1, 686-701.

<sup>99</sup>See *CD.*, IV/1, 702-703.

<sup>100</sup>*CD.*, IV/1, 703.

<sup>101</sup>*CD.*, IV/1, 705.

<sup>102</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>103</sup>John W. de Gruchy, "Racism, Reconciliation and Resistance," in *On Reading Karl Barth in South Africa*, ed. Charles Villa-Vicencio (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1988), 143.

<sup>104</sup>*CD.*, IV/1, 712.

<sup>105</sup>Barth, *Theology and Church*, 278.

<sup>106</sup>*Ibid.*, 279.

<sup>107</sup>*Ibid.*, 280.

<sup>108</sup>*CD.*, IV/1, 718.

<sup>109</sup>*Ibid.*, 719.

<sup>110</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>111</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>112</sup>*Ibid.*, 724-725.

<sup>113</sup>*Ibid.*, 725.

<sup>114</sup>*Ibid.*, 720.

<sup>115</sup>See *CD.*, IV/1, 713 and 721-722. Also cf. Barth, *Theology and Church*, 283-285.

<sup>116</sup>*CD.*, IV/1, 721. It is true that Barth uses the whole of Scripture as a primary source for his theology as well as of his ecclesiology. As Christina Baxter has commented, there are 4,648 references to the Old Testament and 12,270 to the New in Barth's work *Church Dogmatics*. Especially, Apostle Paul's Epistles such as Romans, Corinthians and Ephesians are frequently quoted in volume IV (See Christina Baxter, "Barth—A Truly Biblical Theologian?" *Tyndale Bulletin* 38 [1987]: 3-27). Barth is concerned that his dogmatic theology shall be in accordance with Scripture; his determination to make Jesus Christ central, not only in his understanding of Scripture but also in his theology, was a determination which sprang from his understanding that Scripture is centred in Jesus

---

Christ. As Baxter goes on to say, Barth is “in this sense a biblical theologian, for he is extremely concerned to discover the original meaning of the biblical texts” (Ibid., 3). Therefore, Barth reminds us that Scripture, as the prophetic and apostolic word, is the instrument by which the community is upheld, and the community has to continually hear this Word with prayer and fellowship by discarding all general and philosophico-historical presuppositions. Christ is fundamentally the Word according to the writings of the prophets and apostles. He verifies Scripture simply by being its content that “as it is read and heard He Himself is present to speak and act as the living Lord of the Church” (CD., IV/2, 675). To reiterate, it is Barth’s point that Jesus is the ultimate source for the upholding of the Christian community, and is present today, and acts here and now. For Barth’s use of Scripture to describe the identity of Jesus Christ in his ecclesiology see Frank M. Hasel, “The Christological Analogy of Scripture in Karl Barth,” *Theologische Zeitschrift* 50 (1994): 41-49; Paul McGlasson, *Jesus and Judas: Biblical Exegesis in Barth* (Atlanta GA: Scholar’s Press, 1991); and Robert T. Osborn, “Christ, Bible and Church in Karl Barth,” *The Journal of Bible and Religion* 24 (April 1956): 97-102.

<sup>117</sup>CD., IV/1, 723.

<sup>118</sup>Ibid.

<sup>119</sup>For Barth, the term “upbuilding” means integration between the works of the Triune God and the works of the apostles, and also the mutual love between the members of the whole Christian community. More clearly, it refers directly to the actual work of construction as well as the development which takes place among true Christian community members. They are not only the body of Christ who are elected, justified, sanctified and called in the name of Jesus Christ the Lord, but also those charged to execute the upbuilding of their own true Christian community.

<sup>120</sup>Spross, “The Doctrine of Sanctification in the Theology of Karl Barth,” 63.

<sup>121</sup>CD., IV/3, 762.

<sup>122</sup>For a discussion of Barth’s understanding of the Holy Spirit in relation to his ecclesiology, see Buckley, “A Field of Living Fire: Karl Barth on the Spirit and the Church,” 81-102.

<sup>123</sup>Spross, “The Doctrine of Sanctification in Karl Barth,” 67.

<sup>124</sup>CD., IV/2, 323.

<sup>125</sup>Ibid.

<sup>126</sup>Ibid., 310-315.

<sup>127</sup>Spross, “The Doctrine of Sanctification in Karl Barth,” 61.

<sup>128</sup>Barth used the German term *Weisung* as equivalent to *Weisheit* (wisdom) and *weise* (wise or way) (Cf. CD., IV/2, 361). Therefore, *Weisung*, in this context, refers to a wise way or the way of life.

<sup>129</sup>Heup-Young Kim, *Wang Yang-Ming and Karl Barth.*, 107.

---

<sup>130</sup>For a detailed explanation of Barth's Christological understanding of humanity see Fletcher, "Barth's Concept of Co-Humanity and the Search for Human Community," 41-53.

<sup>131</sup>Nicholas Wolterstorff, "Liturgy, Justice, and Holiness," *The Reformed Journal* 39 (1989): 12-20, 15.

<sup>132</sup>See *CD.*, IV/2, 803-805.

<sup>133</sup>W. A. Whitehouse, "The Christian View of Man," 63.

<sup>134</sup>Cf. *CD.*, IV/2, 743-745.

<sup>135</sup>*CD.*, IV/2, 817.

<sup>136</sup>See *CD.*, IV/2, 815-816.

<sup>137</sup>*CD.*, IV/2, 732.

<sup>138</sup>*Ibid.*, 733.

<sup>139</sup>Fletcher, "Barth's Concept of Co-Humanity and the Search for Human Community," 44-48.

<sup>140</sup>Cf. *CD.*, IV/2, 818.

<sup>141</sup>Cf. *CD.*, IV/2, 819.

<sup>142</sup>*CD.*, IV/2, 840.

<sup>143</sup>See *CD.*, IV/2, 809.

<sup>144</sup>Barth, *Community, State, and Church*, 150.

<sup>145</sup>Spross, "The Doctrine of Sanctification in Karl Barth," 70.

<sup>146</sup>Kim, *Wang Yang-Ming and Karl Barth*, 148.

<sup>147</sup>Cf. *CD.*, I/2, 365-367.

<sup>148</sup>Cf. Otto Weber, *Foundations of Dogmatics*. vol. 2. trans. Darrell L. Guder (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1983), 377.

<sup>149</sup>Cf. *CD.*, I/2, 364-369 and II/2, 535. It is noteworthy that Barth's early view on humanity (1919-1926) was negative, such as in "God is everything, humanity is nothing" (See his commentary *The Epistle to the Romans*, trans. Edwyn C. Hoskyns [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933]), but later he began to regard the nature of humanity as being explicitly related to God in the context of Christocentricity (See E. Jüngel, *Karl Barth, a Theological Legacy*, trans. Garrett E. Paul [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986], 132 and *CD.*, IV/2, 10).

<sup>150</sup>Kim, *Wang Yang-Ming and Karl Barth*, 59. Also see Stuart D. McLean, *Humanity in the Thought of Karl Barth* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1981).

---

<sup>151</sup>Kim, 159.

<sup>152</sup>Ibid., 160.

<sup>153</sup>CD., IV/2, 31.

<sup>154</sup>Ibid.

<sup>155</sup>Ibid., 37.

<sup>156</sup>Ibid., 44.

<sup>157</sup>Ibid., 146.

<sup>158</sup>Ibid., 150.

<sup>159</sup>Ibid., 151.

<sup>160</sup>Ibid., 153.

<sup>161</sup>Ibid., 150. Furthermore, Barth describes the person of Jesus Christ as “royal man”—traditionally Christ’s kingly function—according to the following four aspects (1) the distinctive presence of royal humanity; (2) royal humanity’s likeness to God; (3) the accomplished life-act of royal humanity; and (4) the significance of the cross for royal humanity (see CD., IV/2, 156–166). Accordingly, Heup-Young Kim emphasizes that Barth’s Christology is based on the royal person Jesus Christ as an eschatologically revolutionary messenger of the Kingdom of God, as the universal embodiment of the divine-human drama of reconciliation, and as the root-paradigm of radical humanity in the unity of knowing and acting and of theology and ethics (Kim, *Wang Yang-Ming and Karl Barth*, 81). Christ Himself is, for Barth, “God’s sincerity toward humanity in the anthropocosmic history,” that is, “the human history of the Word of God in unity with deed” (CD., I/2, 181).

<sup>162</sup>W. A. Whitehouse, “The Christian View of Man,” 67. Heup-Young Kim notes that Barth rejected the dualistic understanding of body and soul, refuting both extreme spiritualization and extreme materialization, for the soul, the inner movement in time, perceives, experiences, thinks, feels, and decides, while its full enactment necessitates the body, the outer movement in space. Thus, the soul and body, for Barth, can be distinguished, but cannot be separated. See Kim, *Wang Yang-Ming and Karl Barth*, 90, 159.

<sup>163</sup>See CD., I/2, 783–795.

<sup>164</sup>See Gill, “Karl Barth, The Church and Ecumenism,” 48.

<sup>165</sup>CD., IV/2, 641.

<sup>166</sup>Karl Barth, *The Faith of the Church: A Commentary on the Apostles’ Creed according to Calvin’s Catechism*, ed. J. L. Leuba, trans. G. Vahanian (New York: Meridian Books Inc., 1958), 136.

<sup>167</sup>CD., IV/2, 643.

---

<sup>168</sup>Ibid., 644.

<sup>169</sup>Ibid.

<sup>170</sup>Ibid.

<sup>171</sup>See *CD.*, IV/2, 646.

<sup>172</sup>Barth develops his account of the central function of the church in terms of “witness,” which is “the sum of what the Christian community has to render” (*CD.*, IV/3, 843). It is in this sense that the primary task of the church is to be a witnessing community by proclaiming Jesus Christ as the Gospel of God.

<sup>173</sup>See Healy, “The Logic of Karl Barth’s Ecclesiology,” 260.

<sup>174</sup>*CD.*, IV/2, 648.

<sup>175</sup>Ibid., 650.

<sup>176</sup>Ibid., 651.

<sup>177</sup>Ibid., 627. It should be noted that Barth’s concept of Jesus as the true life of the community is both the Head and Body of His community, who exists in it as an earthly-historical, as well as heavenly-historical, form. For him, Jesus Christ is both there and here. He is both Head and Body. He “is with God and also with us as the true Son of God and therefore the true Son of Man, in whom we are already united and sanctified” (*CD.*, IV/2, 653). Barth endeavors to highlight his perception of truth that Jesus Christ is the community, but the community is not Jesus Christ. This means that the community cannot exist without its Head, Jesus Christ. The community itself is therefore not the eternal Son of God, the incarnate Word, and the Reconciler of the world with God. That is to say that Barth’s ecclesiological view is rooted in the fact that Jesus Christ Himself is the kingdom of God, and therefore the kingdom of God is the community. In contrast, the community is not the kingdom of God, but the kingdom of God is the community. The point is that the kingdom of God is established in Jesus Christ perfectly and simultaneously in the communion of saints, His body, and on earth through the mighty work of His Holy Spirit. Jesus Christ as the heavenly Head is also “the indwelling power of life and growth which is immanent in the community on earth” (*Ibid.*, 657). His identity gives us the insight to “understand everything that falls to be said concerning its life and growth (both in the extensive and the intensive sense)” (*Ibid.*). Barth thus strongly asserts that “He, Jesus Christ, must increase (Jn. 3:30), and He does in fact increase” (*Ibid.*). As the kingdom of God grows like the seed, the community at the same time grows in the place of its fellowship by hearing and proclaiming the kingdom of God, Jesus Christ. For Barth, it is thus only Jesus Christ who can justify and sanctify all sinful human beings, and ultimately control and create the power of the sending, outpouring and operation of the Holy Spirit for the growth of His own community. Barth keeps reminding us that only the Lord Jesus Christ can determine and govern His community to grow in the absolute quickening power of His Holy Spirit. For a further discussion of Barth’s view of the kingdom of God in relation to the Christian community see John Bolt, “Church and World: A Trinitarian Perspective,” *Calvin Theological Journal* 18/1 (April 1983): 5-31.

<sup>178</sup>See Barth, *Theology and Church*, 284-285.

---

<sup>179</sup>CD., IV/2, 664.

<sup>180</sup>Ibid., 666.

<sup>181</sup>Ibid., 667.

<sup>182</sup>See Bolt, “Church and World: A Trinitarian Perspective,” 8.

<sup>183</sup>CD., IV/2, 668.

<sup>184</sup>Ibid., 670.

<sup>185</sup>Cf. CD., IV/2, 656, 669.

<sup>186</sup>Ibid., 676.

<sup>187</sup>Ibid.

<sup>188</sup>Ibid., 677.

<sup>189</sup>Fletcher, “Barth’s Concept of Co-Humanity and the Search for Human Community,” 49. Also cf. CD., IV/2, 690-718.

<sup>190</sup>CD., IV/2, 678.

<sup>191</sup>Ibid., 679.

<sup>192</sup>See CD., IV/2, 680-681.

<sup>193</sup>For Barth’s use of the phrase “Christocratic brotherhood,” see Karl Barth, *The Humanity of God*, tran. John Newton Thomas & Thomas Wieser (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1962), 65ff; Fletcher, “Barth’s Concept of Co-Humanity and the Search for Human Community,” 49-52.

<sup>194</sup>CD., IV/2, 683.

<sup>195</sup>Accordingly, Barth summarizes the characteristics of “the canon law” as follows: first of all, this basic law in the Christian community must always have the character and intention of a law of service in the context of the lordship of Jesus Christ who not only serves His Father as the servant of God and all others, but also rules His community simultaneously; secondly, the law must be realized as liturgical law in the community. This is to say that the construction of the upbuilding of the true Christian community is possible in the form of mutual edification—common Christian worship—in which the community is edified and edifies itself. Christian worship is definitely the true act of its upbuilding and ultimately orders the whole life of the community; thirdly, Church law is living law. This is because Jesus Christ as the Head of His body as well as attested to in the Holy Scripture, lives in the present and future in all His historical singularity to rule, uphold and order His community (see CD., IV/2, 710); fourthly, Church law is exemplary law. This means that it has a two-sided responsibility—both inward and outward—on the human level. It is because “the inward responsibility to itself involves an outward to the world” (CD., IV/2, 719) through the practice of public worship in the Christian community. For a fuller discussion of the characteristics of “the canon law” in Barth’s Christologico-ecclesiological view of the community, see CD., IV/2, 691-721.

---

<sup>196</sup>CD., IV/2, 639.

<sup>197</sup>See CD., IV/2, 379ff., 534ff.

<sup>198</sup>CD., IV/3, 764.

<sup>199</sup>Marcello De C. Azevedo, “Basic Ecclesial Communities: A Meeting Point of Ecclesiology,” *Theological Studies* 46 (1985): 601-620, 611.

<sup>200</sup>Barth, *The Faith of the Church: A Commentary on the Apostles' Creed according to Calvin's Catechism*, 145.

<sup>201</sup>CD., IV/3, 762.

<sup>202</sup>See Spross, “The Doctrine of Sanctification in the Theology of Karl Barth,” 67-68.

<sup>203</sup>CD., IV/3, 695. Accordingly, Barth describes more concretely the existence of the people of God in world-occurrence in both their visibility and likeness to other historical events as follows: Firstly, the Christian community, that is, the people of God, exists with a total dependence on its environment and yet also in total freedom in relation to it. It is under the twofold determination of its one and total being, just as Jesus Christ exists in this twofold determination of its one existence, as if He is with the same totality in the light of both true man and true God; Secondly, with both its visible and invisible being, the people of God, on the other hand, exist in both its total weakness and its total strength in world-occurrence. The Christian community should be totally weak, to be really strong, as if Jesus Christ neither was strong nor weak except in supreme weakness; Thirdly, the community exists as Jesus Christ causes it to exist by His Holy Spirit. See CD., IV/3, 734-759.

<sup>204</sup>CD., IV/3, 695-696.

<sup>205</sup>Ibid., 697.

<sup>206</sup>Ibid., 697-698.

<sup>207</sup>Ibid., 698.

<sup>208</sup>Ibid.

<sup>209</sup>Cf. CD., IV/3, 769-770.

<sup>210</sup>CD., IV/3, 773.

<sup>211</sup>Barth's picture of humanity is determined primarily not by scientific and philosophical anthropology in general, but by Jesus Christ who becomes the real person existing only in the presence of God and with his fellow-human beings. Barth seeks primarily to identify human nature in the humanity of Jesus. This means that anthropology, for Barth, is not the same as Christology; the knowledge of humanity is not identical with the knowledge of the humanity of Jesus, but it is derived from it. Thus Barth stresses the person Jesus Christ as the special stand-point of Christian faith and the fundamental norm to recognize human existence. For Barth's understanding of humanity in relation to his

---

Christocentric theology see Whitehouse, “The Christian View of Man: An Examination of Karl Barth’s Doctrine,” 57-82.

<sup>212</sup>CD., IV/3, 791.

<sup>213</sup>Ibid., 792.

<sup>214</sup>Ibid., 701.

<sup>215</sup>See CD., IV/3, 752-753 and 760-762.

<sup>216</sup>CD., IV/3, 708.

<sup>217</sup>Ibid., 712.

<sup>218</sup>Ibid., 713.

<sup>219</sup>Ibid., 714.

<sup>220</sup>See Spross, “The Doctrine of Sanctification in the Theology of Karl Barth,” 63. Also cf. Charles T. Waldrop, “Karl Barth’s Concept of the Divinity of Jesus Christ,” *Harvard Theological Review* 74/3 (1981): 241-263, 258.

<sup>221</sup>CD., IV/3, 716.

<sup>222</sup>John Webster, “Assured and Patient and Cheerful Expectation”: Barth on Christian Hope as the Church’s Task,” *Toronto Journal of Theology* 10/1 (1994): 35-52, 39.

<sup>223</sup>CD., IV/3, 721.

<sup>224</sup>Cf. Barth, *Theology and Church*, 281.

<sup>225</sup>CD., IV/3, 751. For the meaning of ontic and noetic in Barth’s *Church Dogmatics* see Robert Brown, “On God’s Ontic and Noetic Absoluteness: A Critique of Barth,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 33 (1980): 535-549.

<sup>226</sup>CD., IV/3, 752.

<sup>227</sup>Ibid., 798.

<sup>228</sup>Cf. CD., IV/3, 798-799.

<sup>229</sup>Craig A. Carter, “Karl Barth’s Revision of Protestant Ecclesiology,” *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 22: 35-44, 39.

<sup>230</sup>At this point, the doctrine of creation needs to be highlighted. God has created humanity for His glory. Both God and humanity exist interdependently and mutually. Barth’s understanding is that God exists as the Creator, and humanity as the creature. See CD., III/1, entitled “the Work of Creation.”

<sup>231</sup>CD., IV/3, 800. Also see Karl Barth, *The Word of God and the Word of Man*, tran. Douglas Horton (New York: Harper & Row, 1957), 276.

---

<sup>232</sup>Fletcher, “Barth’s Concept of Co-Humanity and the Search for Human Community,” 45.

<sup>233</sup>CD., IV/3, 802.

<sup>234</sup>Cf. Jacques Rossel, “From a Theology of Crisis to a Theology of Revolution?” *The Ecumenical Review* 21/3 (July 1969): 204-215, 208.

<sup>235</sup>In other words, “the church is the place where man’s co-humanity may become visible in Christocratic brotherhood” (Barth, *The Humanity of God*, 65). This community, for Barth, is conceived of as offering a guiding pattern for all types of human association (See Fletcher, “Barth’s Concept of Co-Humanity and the Search for Human Community,” 49).

<sup>236</sup>CD., IV/3, 812.

<sup>237</sup>See CD., IV/3, 813.

<sup>238</sup>Marcello De C. Azevedo, “Basic Ecclesial Communities: A Meeting Point of Ecclesiology,” 618.

<sup>239</sup>See CD., IV/3, 809-810.

<sup>240</sup>CD., IV/3, 831.

<sup>241</sup>Ibid.

<sup>242</sup>Ibid.

<sup>243</sup>Ibid., 833.

<sup>244</sup>Ibid., 835. Also cf. Douglas J. W. Milne, “A Barthian Stricture on Reformed Theology—The Unconditionality of the Covenant of Grace,” *The Reformed Theological Review* 55/3 (Sep-Dec, 1996): 121-133, 131.

<sup>245</sup>CD., IV/3, 838.

<sup>246</sup>Ibid.

<sup>247</sup>Ibid., 839.

<sup>248</sup>Ibid., 838.

<sup>249</sup>Ibid., 839.

<sup>250</sup>Ibid., 843.

<sup>251</sup>Ibid.

<sup>252</sup>Ibid., 846.

---

<sup>253</sup> Barth highlights the doctrine of God's act in Christ, who is not simply Jesus, but the historical appearance of the human personality as the eternal Son of God, as well as the incarnate Word of God in the power of His Spirit, by urging the Christian community to recognize His presence. He thus claims that "we cannot act without thinking." This means that the precise task of theology, for Barth, is *credo ut intelligam*, "I believe in order to understand." See Karl Barth, *Evangelical Theology: An Introduction*, 43-44. Also cf. Michael Barnes, *Christian Identity and Religious Pluralism: Religions in Conversation*, 26.

<sup>254</sup> Cf. Milne, "A Barthian Stricture on Reformed Theology—The Unconditionality of the Covenant of Grace," 132-133.

<sup>255</sup> Carter, "Karl Barth's Revision of Protestant Ecclesiology," 41.

<sup>256</sup> CD., IV/3, 853.

<sup>257</sup> Ibid., 855-856.

<sup>258</sup> See CD., IV/3, 857-859.

<sup>259</sup> See CD., IV/3, 843-901. Such are the twelve forms of ministry "based on three key New Testament passages dealing with the gifts of the Spirit: Romans 12, 1 Corinthians 12 and Ephesians 4" (Craig Carter, "Karl Barth's Revision of Protestant Ecclesiology," 42). For a fine summary of these twelve ministries as Barth introduces them, see Wallace M. Alston, Jr., *The Church* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1984), 129-158.

<sup>260</sup> CD., IV/3, 865.

<sup>261</sup> Ibid.

<sup>262</sup> Ibid.

<sup>263</sup> Ibid., 866.

<sup>264</sup> Ibid., 867.

<sup>265</sup> Ibid., 868.

<sup>266</sup> Ibid.

<sup>267</sup> Ibid., 869.

<sup>268</sup> Ibid.

<sup>269</sup> Ibid., 870.

<sup>270</sup> Ibid., 871.

<sup>271</sup> Ibid., 873.

<sup>272</sup> Ibid., 874.

<sup>273</sup> Ibid., 875.

---

<sup>274</sup>Ibid., 876.

<sup>275</sup>Ibid.

<sup>276</sup>Ibid., 879. Also for Barth's understanding of the particular functions of theology in the Church see Karl Barth, *Evangelical Theology: An Introduction*, 1-59; *idem*, *Theological Existence Today!* (London, 1933); *idem*, "Theology," in *God in Action* (Edinburgh, 1936), 44f; *idem*, "Church and Theology," in *Theology and Church*, 286-306; John Webster, "The Church as Theological Community," *Anglican Theological Review* 75/1 (Winter 1993): 102-115.

<sup>277</sup>Dakin, "The Nature of Practical Theology Repeating Transformation: Browning and Barth on Practical Theology," 215.

<sup>278</sup>CD., IV/3, 881. For the relationship between systematic and practical theology see Dakin, "The Nature of Practical Theology: Repeating Transformation: Browning & Barth on Practical Theology," 203-221.

<sup>279</sup>Ibid., 882.

<sup>280</sup>Ibid.

<sup>281</sup>Barth, *Evangelical Theology: An Introduction*, 41.

<sup>282</sup>Ibid., 42.

<sup>283</sup>Ibid., 44.

<sup>284</sup>CD., IV/3, 883.

<sup>285</sup>See CD., III/4, 91-115. Also cf. Lou Shapiro, "Karl Barth's Understanding of Prayer," *CRUX* 24/1 (March 1988): 26-33. For Barth's synthesis of prayer and ethics see John Kelsay, "Prayer and Ethics: Reflections on Calvin and Barth," *Harvard Theological Review* 82/2 (1989): 169-184.

<sup>286</sup>CD., IV/3, 883.

<sup>287</sup>Ibid., 886.

<sup>288</sup>Ibid., 887.

<sup>289</sup>Ibid., 885.

<sup>290</sup>Ibid., 887.

<sup>291</sup>Ibid., 889.

<sup>292</sup>See Hendrikus Berkhof, *Christian Faith: An Introduction to the Study of the Faith*, tran. Sierd Woudstra (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1979), 369-373. Interestingly Berkhof sees the diaconate as "a segment of human labour for renewal." In it "both the renewal as Christ worked for it in his life and the coming total renewal in the Kingdom of God can only indirectly, as it were in a reflection, be represented" (Ibid., 371). Cf. CD., IV/3, 890-895.

<sup>293</sup>*CD.*, IV/3, 891. Barth notes that Jesus as God's grace to the world in person could not find any abiding place. It means His total weakness in the whole world of humanity. In this regard, the people of God elected in Jesus Christ and called to be His witnesses, have to share His weakness for the sake of its most effective and closest connection towards the marginal existence of the Christian community's homelessness in world-occurrence. That is to say that when the people of God can see and recognize the truth of the general human situation such as people who have no permanent home or shelter, or live without peace with God, his neighbour and himself, the strength of God will be effective in this weak humanity on the face of its love and solidarity with them. See *CD.*, IV/3, 744-747.

<sup>294</sup>*CD.*, IV/3, 891.

<sup>295</sup>Gill, "Karl Barth, The Church and Ecumenism," 54.

<sup>296</sup>*Ibid.*, 55.

<sup>297</sup>*CD.*, IV/3, 891.

<sup>298</sup>*Ibid.*, 891-892.

<sup>299</sup>*Ibid.*, 892.

<sup>300</sup>*Ibid.*, 893.

<sup>301</sup>*Ibid.*, 894.

<sup>302</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>303</sup>*Ibid.*, 895.

<sup>304</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>305</sup>*Ibid.*, 896.

<sup>306</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>307</sup>*Ibid.*, 897.

<sup>308</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>309</sup>*Ibid.*, 899.

<sup>310</sup>*Ibid.*, 898.

<sup>311</sup>*Ibid.*, 899.

<sup>312</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>313</sup>*Ibid.*, 900.

<sup>314</sup>*Ibid.*

---

<sup>315</sup>Ibid.

<sup>316</sup>For Barth's doctrine of baptism and the Lord's Supper see Craig Carter, "Karl Barth's Revision of Protestant Ecclesiology," 41-42; Urban T. Holmes, "Barth as Ecumenical Theologian: A Review Article," *Encounter* 28/2 (Spring 1967): 174-181. Also Karl Barth, *CD.*, IV/4 (posthumously, 1967), in which Barth's opposition to infant baptism is expressed.

<sup>317</sup>*CD.*, IV/3, 901. For a critical analysis of Barth's understanding of the Lord's Supper, see Colm O'Grady, *The Church in Catholic Theology: Dialogue with Karl Barth* (London, Dublin & Melbourne: Geoffrey Chapman, 1970), 113.

<sup>318</sup>Barth deems that communal practice of the Christian worship service provides the following consequences: (1) forming particular human fellowship in the knowledge of Christ; (2) mutually recognizes Him as their one Lord and be challenged to love one another as brothers; (3) ordained to eternal life; (4) called by Him to pray with one another (See *CD.*, IV/2, 695-710). Such a mutual interdependence in Christian worship practices, Barth believes, eventually provokes the Christian community to engage in its missionary task. See Hendrikus Berkhof, *Christian Faith: An Introduction to the Study of the Faith*, tran. Sierd Woudstra (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1979), 339-345. Here Berkhof, in accordance with Barth, highlights the importance of fellowship among the people of God as the basis for fellowship with non-Christians; that is, the missionary task given to the people of God is impossible without any communal practices such as mutual pastoral care, diaconal help, nurture of saints, and mission, etc.

<sup>319</sup>For a thorough presentation of Barth's position regarding the mission of the Church see Sheldon W. Sorge, "Karl Barth's Reception in North America: Ecclesiology As A Case Study" (Ph.D. Thesis, Duke University, 1987), 100-130; Carl F. Starkloff, "Karl Barth on Religion: A Study for Christians in Mission," *Missiology* VI/4 (Oct, 1978): 441-461.

<sup>320</sup>*CD.*, IV/3, 684.

<sup>321</sup>Barth, himself a missionary-minded theologian, endeavors to integrate theology as a theory and ethics, or praxis as an action, by regarding ethics as the command of God who is Creator, Reconciler and Redeemer. For this reason, his theology is practical and balanced between theory and praxis.

<sup>322</sup>For Barth's understanding of other cultures and religions, see R. F. Aldwinckle, "Karl Barth and Religious Language," *Canadian Journal of Theology* XI/3 (July 1965): 164-173; Karl Barth, *Theology and Church*, Introduction by Thomas F. Torrance and Translated by Louise Pettibone Smith (New York: Harper and Row, 1962); Garrett Green, "Challenging the Religious Studies Canon: Karl Barth's Theory of Religion," *Journal of Religion* 75/4 (Oct, 1995): 473-486; Peter Harrison, "Karl Barth and the Non-Christian Religions," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 23/2 (Spring 1986): 207-224; Paul Knitter, "Christomonism in Karl Barth's Evaluation of the Non-Christian Religions," *Neue Zeitschrift Für Systematische Theologie und Religions—Philosophie* 13 (1971): 109-121; Owen C. Thomas, "Barth on non-Christian Knowledge of God," *Anglican Theological Review* 46 (1964): 261-285.

<sup>323</sup>See *CD.*, IV/3, 874-878.

---

<sup>324</sup> Robert Palma, *Karl Barth's Theology of Culture* (Allison Park, Pa.: Pickwick Publications, 1983), 4.

<sup>325</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

<sup>326</sup> *Ibid.*, 33. Also cf. George S. Hendry, "The Freedom of God in the Theology of Karl Barth," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 31/3 (1978), 233-235.

<sup>327</sup> *Ibid.*, 34.

<sup>328</sup> *Ibid.*, 57.

<sup>329</sup> See Karl Barth, *How I Changed My Mind* (Richmond, Virginia: John Know Press, 1966), 71-72 and *idem*, "Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart," in Walter Leibrecht, ed., *Religion and Culture: Essays in Honor of Paul Tillich* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1969), 66.

<sup>330</sup> Cf. Barth, "The Christian Community and the Civil Community," 44.

<sup>331</sup> Cf. Barth, "Jesus Christ and the Movement for Social Justice," in *Karl Barth and Radical Politics*, 36.

<sup>332</sup> Cf. *CD.*, IV/3, 447.

<sup>333</sup> See Barth, *The Humanity of God*, 42-45.

<sup>334</sup> Palma, 11.

<sup>335</sup> *Ibid.* Also cf. Hans Frei, "Karl Barth—Theologian," in *Karl Barth and the Future of Theology*, ed. David L. Dickermann (New Haven: Yale Divinity School Association, 1969), 8. Palma also points out strengths and weaknesses of Barth's free theology of culture in his concluding chapter. One of Barth's weaknesses is a tendency towards oversimplification in terms of drawing conclusions and deriving criteria to be used in evaluating culture and in prescribing cultural choices that ought to be made. According to Palma, Barth does not apply the term "Christian" to any human cultural endeavors. In other words, he does not give a large enough place to right and free culture within the context of the kingdom of God. However, Barth's major strengths are: (1) His submission to the Word of God prior to seeking to address and evaluate the spheres of culture in which he finds himself situated. He does not devote his attention to the questions and challenges that human culture has to offer, but seek to give a response by making an appeal to the Word of God; (2) Due to his Christological concentration, Barth did not have to lean on human culture and seek confirmation of his position in various cultural activities and products; (3) Barth felt more free to take human culture on its own terms as he moved away from granting it a general revelatory possibility, and moved in the direction of accepting God's freedom to raise up parables of "His own eternally good willing and doing"; (4) He stresses on the persistent relativity and provisional character of all human cultural endeavors; (5) He recognizes the positive value of human culture and grants that human culture may be both free and right. For a thorough discussion of Barth's strengths and weaknesses regarding free theology of culture see Palma, 71-83.

<sup>336</sup> *CD.*, IV/3, 875.

<sup>337</sup> O'Grady, *The Church in Catholic Theology: Dialogue with Karl Barth*, 107.

---

<sup>338</sup>Peter Harrison, “Karl Barth and the Non-Christian Religions,” *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 23/2 (Spring 1986): 207-224, 216.

<sup>339</sup>Ibid. Cf. *CD.*, II/2, 59, 76, 174-176, 319.

<sup>340</sup>See Joseph D. Bettis, “Is Karl Barth A Universalist?” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 20 (1967): 423-436.

<sup>341</sup>*CD.*, IV/3, 477.

<sup>342</sup>Ibid., 477-478.

<sup>343</sup>See *CD.*, III/2, 41.

<sup>344</sup>Harrison, “Karl Barth and the Non-Christian Religions,” 218. Also cf. *CD.*, III/2, 132-133.

<sup>345</sup>*CD.*, III/2, 136.

<sup>346</sup>Karl Barth, *Christ and Adam*, tran. T. A. Smail (London: Oliver and Boyd, 1956), 9-10.

<sup>347</sup>Ibid., 42.

<sup>348</sup>Harrison, “Karl Barth and Non-Christian Religions,” 219.

<sup>349</sup>Emil Brunner, *Dogmatics* (London: Lutterworth, 1949), vol. 1, 350.

<sup>350</sup>Barth, *The Humanity of God*, 58-59.

<sup>351</sup>Karl Barth, *Table Talk* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1963), 87. Cf. *CD.*, IV/4, 13.

<sup>352</sup>See *CD.*, IV/3, 874.

<sup>353</sup>See *CD.*, IV/3, 118.

<sup>354</sup>*CD.*, IV/3, 121.

<sup>355</sup>Cf. *CD.*, IV/3, 122-125.

<sup>356</sup>*CD.*, IV/3, 152.

<sup>357</sup>See Emil Brunner, “The New Barth,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 4 (June 1951): 123-135, 128-129. Barth’s early polemic against non-Christian religions and natural theology was negative. His formula “revelation is the abolition (*Aufhebung*) of religion” affirms Christianity as the one true religion. His discussion with Emil Brunner in the 1930s represents his negative view regarding natural theology. However, his later writings clearly provide a much more positive view of religion. For Barth’s later theological position on religion, see Owen C. Thomas, “Barth on Non-Christian Knowledge of God,” *Anglican Theological Review* 46 (1964): 261-285; J. A. Veitch, “Revelation and Religion in the Theology of Karl Barth,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 24/1 (Feb, 1971): 1-22.

---

<sup>358</sup>See *CD.*, IV/3, 113-117 and 127-128.

<sup>359</sup>For a detailed analysis of Barth's discussion of Pure Land Buddhism, see Charles T. Waldrop, "Karl Barth and Pure Land Buddhism," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 24/4 (Fall 1987): 574-597.

<sup>360</sup>See *CD.*, III/2, 277.

<sup>361</sup>*CD.*, III/2, 276.

<sup>362</sup>*Ibid.*, 277.

<sup>363</sup>See Jüngel, *Karl Barth, a Theological Legacy*, 22-52, esp., 27. Also see Eberhard Busch, *Karl Barth: His Life from letters and autobiographical texts*.

<sup>364</sup>It is clear that Barth's early treatment of non-Christian religions and cultures was negative. For this reason, Barth's theology has been criticized as "the most extreme form of the exclusivist theory" by Alan Race (Alan Race, *Christians and Religious Pluralism: Patterns in the Christian Theology of Religions* [London: SCM Press, 1983], 11), as well as being called "the conservative evangelical model" by Paul F. Knitter (Paul F. Knitter, *No Other Name?: A Critical Survey of Christian Attitudes Toward the World Religions* [London: SCM, 1985], 80-87; *idem*, "Christomonism in Karl Barth's Evaluation of the Non-Christian Religions," *Neue Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie und Religionsphilosophie* 13 [1971]: 99-121). Michael Barnes criticizes Barth "as being negative on non-Christian traditions, about which he admitted he didn't know much" (Michael Barnes, *Christian Identity and Religious Pluralism: Religions in Conversation*, 42). Eric Sharpe claims that Barth's writings evidence "little or no concern...with the religions of the world, other than as shadowy demonstrations of human pride and human unwillingness to submit to the judgment of God (Eric Sharpe, *Faith Meets Faith* [London: SCM Press, 1977], 90). Hans Küng warns of the danger of the "arrogant domination of a religion claiming an exclusive mission" which arose, albeit unintended, from "the dogmatic repression of the problem of religion by Karl Barth and 'dialectical theology'" (Hans Küng, *On Being a Christian*, tran. Edward Quinn [Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976], 111). As E. C. Dewick claims, Barth's writings uncompromisingly asserts that "the Christian revelation is exclusive" (E. C. Dewick, *The Christian Attitude to Other Religions* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953], 152). Charles Davis notes that the "assessment Karl Barth makes of all religions in the light of Christian faith and revelation would seem entirely negative" (Charles Davis, *Christ and the World Religions* [London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1970], 45). Waldron Scott also points out that Barth simply assigns four and one-half pages for foreign missions, which can be recognized as very common and general mission strategies (Waldron Scott, "Karl Barth's Theology of Mission," 209). Scott states that "Barth considers the missionary task of the Church to consist, not in dialogue and supplementation, but in opposition and supplantation" (*Ibid.*, 217, also cf. Colm O'Grady, *The Church in Catholic Theology: Dialogue with Karl Barth*, 105). Accordingly Scott argues that Barth does not provide any detailed cross-cultural knowledge in order for the Christian community to fulfill its own missionary task more effectively to the whole world, including "uncivilized races" or less-developed countries. W. Scott's assertion is not accurate, for Barth's theology of mission can be observed throughout his work. For example, cf. *CD.*, III/2, 607; III/3, 64f., 183; III/4, 203, 504; IV/1, 153, 318, 527, 671-676, 724-779; IV/2, 263, 275; IV/3, 27ff., 872f., 892, etcs. As we have shown, the above criticisms are misleading. For a fuller discussion of these

---

criticisms see Gavin D'Costa, *Theology and Religious Pluralism: The Challenge of Other Religions* (Oxford: Blackwells, 1986).

<sup>365</sup>See *CD.*, IV/3, 110 and 114-120.

<sup>366</sup>See C. A. Keller, "Versuch einer Deutung heidnischer Religionen: im Anschluss an Karl Barth's Lehre vom Menschen," *Evangelisches Missionmagazin* 100 (1956), 91-92.

<sup>367</sup>See C. S. Song, "The Relation of Divine Revelation and Man's Religion in the Theologies of Karl Barth and Paul Tillich" (Th.D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, 1965), 9 and 25.

<sup>368</sup>Veitch, "Revelation and Religion in the Theology of Karl Barth," 20.

<sup>369</sup>Bockmuehl, "Karl Barth 1886-1986," 30-31.

<sup>370</sup>See "No Boring Theology! A Letter from Karl Barth," in *The South East Asian Journal of Theology* (Autumn 1969), 4-5.

<sup>371</sup>Starkloff, "Karl Barth on Religion: A Study for Christians in Mission," 459.

<sup>372</sup>Veitch, "Revelation and Religion in the Theology of Karl Barth," 21. It should be noted that the so-called "religions" of the nations for Barth are to be highly valued and taken seriously, but they are not permitted to exercise any pressure on the Gospel. In other words, Barth opposes all forms of religious syncretism; "there can be no attempt at compromise or at finding points of contact and the like" (*CD.*, IV/3, 875).

## CHAPTER III

### THE INDIGENIZATION OF KARL BARTH'S CHRISTOCENTRIC ECCLESIOLOGY IN KOREAN CHRISTIAN THOUGHT: SUNG-BUM YUN'S THEOLOGY OF SUNG

As we have examined in Chapter II, Barth's ecclesiology is Christocentric and balanced between word and action. This, coincidentally, is identical with the early Korean Protestant mission policy, namely that of "Nevius Methods," which is based primarily on Bible-centredness, self-principles, and is action-oriented. The community concept and structure in Korean Confucianism is also similar to Barth's doctrine of the Church as the Christian community. Significantly, we have realized that, although his theology is confined within the European context, sufficient attention is also paid to other cultures and religions. That is why an indigenization of his Christocentric theology with Korean Confucianism, is genuinely possible. Accordingly, this chapter will explore in some detail how Barth has influenced one representative Korean Christian movement such as Sung-Bum Yun's theology of Sung, with specific stress on how Yun has responded to Barth's Christocentric ecclesiology, especially on the basis of the Korean people's centuries long-inherited socio-cultural-religious tradition of Confucianism.

Before moving on to our investigation of one representative Korean response to Barth's ecclesiology in this chapter, it is appropriate to sketch the Korean reception of Barth's theology. A brief survey was given in the Introduction. Yet, our discussion would be incomplete without giving a more detailed historical account of the Korean acceptance of Barth's theology.

### A. An Overview of the Reception of Karl Barth's Theology in Korea

Kyung-Ok Chung, the Wesleyan scholar, was the first theologian who introduced the theology of Karl Barth to the Korean Church in the 1930s.<sup>1</sup> Chung graduated from the Methodist Theological Seminary in 1928, where he taught as a professor of systematic theology. His Barth-related works were not published, but his small book entitled *An Exposition of the Doctrinal Statement of the Korean Methodist Church* (1935) interpreted Christian doctrines according to Karl Barth's theology.<sup>2</sup> Due to his theological image as a radical, and his view that the Bible becomes the Word of God to us by the work of the Holy Spirit rather than being a book of God's objective revelation, conservative Korean theologians misunderstood Barth's theology as being too liberal and therefore unacceptable.

It was after 1945 that the number of disciples of Karl Barth increased on the campuses of the Methodist, the Hankuk Theological Seminary (the Presbyterian Church of Korea), and the Presbyterian Seminary of Korea (Tonghap Presbyterian). The Methodist interpreters of Barth's theology attempted to indigenize his Christocentric theology on the basis of Confucianism, the deep-rooted socio-cultural-religious tradition in Korea. However, the Presbyterian interpreters of Barth's theology were firmly committed to the Word-centred theology of Karl Barth.<sup>3</sup> In the 1950s, the Presbyterian Seminary of Korea began to teach the theology of Karl Barth to undergraduate theological students.

Barth's theology became increasingly recognized in Korea in the 1960s and 70s. Historically, the Korean Church began to see its mission through the emergence of the students' revolutionary movement of April 19, 1960, which was against the corrupted Korean government. The students' revolutionary movement is called the heir to the spirit of the March First Independence Movement of 1919, and to the historical tradition of the Korean Christians' struggle for freedom and human rights. In 1962, the members of the Korean National Council of Churches (KNCC) and 204 Korean Christian leaders issued a

statement urging the military government to hand over its political power to civilians as follows:

We resist all forms of dictatorship, injustice, irregularities and corruption. We reject the impure influence of foreign powers on all aspects of economic, culture, ethics and politics. We resolve to make a contribution to the historical development of our country with prayer and service led by the power of the Holy Spirit.<sup>4</sup>

Subsequently, “the Korean Christian Declaration of 1973” shows clearly the awakening of the Korean Church’s socio-political responsibility:

Jesus the Messiah, our Lord, lived and dwelt among the oppressed, poverty-stricken, and sick in Judea. He boldly confronted Pontius Pilate, a representative of the Roman Empire, and he was crucified while witnessing to the truth. He has risen from the dead, releasing the power to transform and set the people free. We resolve that we will follow the footsteps of our Lord, living among our oppressed and poor people, standing against political oppression, and participating in the transformation of history, for this is the only way to the Messianic Kingdom.<sup>5</sup>

“The Declaration of Human Rights in Korea” by the KNCC and “the Declaration of Conscience” by Bishop Daniel Tji were made in 1974. Sixty-six leaders of various churches, and seminaries signed “The Theological Statement of Korean Christians.” Twelve church leaders also signed “The Declaration for the Restoration of Democracy.”<sup>6</sup>

These statements of the 1960s, and 1970s, clearly manifest Korean Christianity’s vision of the church’s mission as being for, and of, the people who were oppressed by poverty, as well as those oppressed by dictatorship. The late 1960s, and the early 1970s, witnessed a remarkable rise of Barthianism in Korea. Moreover, Minjung theology took shape in this period.

For Minjung theologians, the Church as community is an event, in that Jesus Christ exists as the friend or head of His people in accordance with Barth’s fundamental doctrinal affirmation of Jesus Christ as the head of His community. Minjung theologians like Karl Barth, began their theological work in the midst of a host of controversial political and theological concerns.<sup>7</sup> Barth held that the persecution of the Christian Church was inevitable. He provides examples by citing political, state-religions, and anti-God movements during the times of such leaders as Nero, Diocletian, Louis XIV and Adolf Hitler. For Barth, they are evidence of the continual political oppression that Christians

have suffered.<sup>8</sup> Minjung theologians also see the Christian community as “the people” who are persecuted and oppressed either by political dictators, or economically by the bourgeoisie.<sup>9</sup>

Minjung theology was therefore inspired by Karl Barth’s socio-political concern for the poor and oppressed, and Latin American theology of liberation. Barth argued that the community’s proclamation of the Gospel summons the world to reflect on social injustice and its consequences and to alter the conditions and relationships in question. At this point, Minjung theologians shared similar viewpoints with Barth regarding social and political injustice as they addressed contemporary socio-political issues in Korea, such as human rights, social justice and the political interpretation of the Bible. One may say that they were influenced by Barth and applied his theory and practice of theology to a particular social circumstance in Korea in the 1970s.<sup>10</sup>

Minjung theology is also one of the movements that has assimilated Barth’s Christocentric ecclesiology into itself. Minjung theology’s major themes are the person of Jesus Christ as the Lord of the community and the bringer of God’s kingdom, His death and resurrection for the community and the world, and the Holy Spirit’s coming at Pentecost. Basically, Minjung theologians have developed their major theological thought under the influence of contemporary Western theologians. This includes such works as Jürgen Moltmann’s *The Way of Jesus Christ: Christology in messianic dimensions*, Wolfhart Pannenberg’s *Theology & the Kingdom of God* and Dietrich Bonhoeffer’s *Christ the Center*. Karl Barth influenced all these theologians.

Minjung theologians, such as Byung-Moo Ahn, Yong-Bok Kim, Nam-Dong Suh, and Young-Sok Oh, were among those who propagated Barth’s theology in Korea. But they were mainly concerned with theological indigenization employing Barth’s view of the church as a community along with the Korean concept of community and its structure.<sup>11</sup>

An indigenous theological movement was established in Korea. Sung-Bum Yun,<sup>12</sup> the best known interpreter of Barth’s theology and the most influential theologian of the

Methodist Church of Korea, published a book in 1972 entitled *Sung Theology: A Yellow Theology*. In this work, Yun set out a theological method of indigenization in accordance with Karl Barth's Christocentric theology and Korean Confucianism. Although Barth was opposed to all forms of syncretism, Yun argued that theological indigenization is an essential task for Christian theologians. It is an unavoidable syncretistic task in evangelizing non-Christian countries. That is, theological indigenization is a means of mission as well as of understanding other religious beliefs. Yun's other work, *Christianity and Korean Thought* (1964), deals explicitly with Barth's perspectives on the Holy Spirit, mission, social service, and pastoral care. It suggests that ecumenism is the most essential task for the Christian community in Korea, making use of Karl Barth's Christocentric theology.

In 1968, Sung-Bum Yun published an introductory book entitled *Karl Barth*. This book focused on Barth's Christocentrism, including his theology of the Word of God and ecclesiology. It has been reprinted, and continues to be useful to students of theology in Korea. Yun's monumental work, *Hankukjok Shinhak: Song ui Haesokhak* [The Korean Theology: The Hermeneutics of Sincerity] (1972) discusses further the theological method of indigenization on the basis of both Korean Confucianism and Karl Barth's theology.

Subsequently, some Methodist theologians published an important monograph in 1969, entitled *Karl Barth's Theology*. In this volume, June-Kwan Eun's article, "Barth's Doctrine of the Church," presents Barth's ecclesiology by following Barth's discussion of the four marks of oneness, holiness, catholicity and apostolicity. Eun's four books<sup>13</sup> argue that the ecumenical and the missionary tasks are an intra-ecclesiological mandate for Korean Christians. In these volumes, Eun states that Barth's doctrine of the Church can be the best theological paradigm for the accomplishment of such tasks.

It is worth noting that it was the theologically progressive or liberal theologians of the Tonghap Presbyterian, Hankuk Presbyterian churches, and Methodist theologians, who mostly accepted Karl Barth's theology. Professors from Yonsei University Faculty of

Divinity, and Ehwa Woman's University School of Theology also adopted Barth's theology enthusiastically.

During the 1960s, the 1970s, and the 1980s, the socio-political situation in Korea was unsettled, so Korean Christianity was seriously challenged by a number of indigenous theological movements including Minjung and Sung theologies.<sup>14</sup> Both Minjung and Sung theologies were regarded as radical challenges to the conservative Korean Church. Since both took Barth's theology as their theological source and norm, the most conservative Korean theologians accordingly rejected Karl Barth's theology without any scholarly debate, or analysis. Between the 1960s and the 1980s, there was an anti-Barthian movement among conservative Presbyterian theologians. For example, Chul-Won Suh, Professor of Systematic Theology at Chongshin (Hapdong Presbyterian) Theological Seminary, and Young-Han Kim, Professor of Christian Theology at Soongsill University School of Theology, led this movement. Professor Suh strongly resisted Karl Barth's theology, particularly Barth's view of Scripture and divine revelation.<sup>15</sup>

From the mid-1970s, to the late 1980s, graduates of European and North American seminaries returned to Korea and began to teach the views of contemporary theologians including Karl Barth.<sup>16</sup> These include Chun-Gwan Un, Dong-Nam Suh, Kyun-Jin Kim, Chul-Ha Han, Yong-Bok Kim, Byung-Moo Ahn, Chung-Ku Park, and Myung-Yong Kim. The first three are professors of Christian Theology at Yonsei University Faculty of Divinity, which has a Methodist background. The other four are professors at Hankuk Theological Seminary (progressive Presbyterian), the Presbyterian Seminary of Korea (Tonghap), and the Methodist Theological Seminary. Therefore, those who graduated from the above seminaries and Yonsei University have been enthusiastic in adopting Barth's theology, while Chongshin (Hapdong Presbyterian) Theological Seminary graduates have resisted Karl Barth's ideas. Although both the Presbyterian Seminary of Korea (Tonghap) and Chongshin (Hapdong Presbyterian) Theological Seminary are Presbyterian and are influenced by the reformer, John Calvin, the former accepts it enthusiastically, while the

latter objects to Barth's theology. This is because Hapdong Presbyterians regard themselves as conservative, but Tonghap Presbyterians and the other seminaries are theologically liberal and radical. However, the major reason for rejecting Barth's theology is due mainly to denominational schism and competition between Tonghap and Hapdong Presbyterians.<sup>17</sup> The other reason might be that Tonghap Presbyterians were influenced by Princeton Seminary graduates, while Hapdong Presbyterians by Westminster Theological Seminary graduates.

It was true that Barth's Christocentric ecclesiology, and his theology of the Word of God impressed many seminary students. Once they graduated from the seminary and planted churches, they not only adopted Barth's practical theology as their exemplary model for church growth, but they were also eager to apply his ecclesiology in their pastoral ministry. Coincidentally, the mid-1970s, and the 1980s, marked a period of rapid church growth and spiritual revival with an emphasis on both Word-centred evangelism, and socio-political concerns. Many Korean pastors who were influenced by Barth's ecclesiology and his theology of the Word of God were involved in the organization of the Word-centred evangelical movement, namely, "a neo-orthodox movement" in Korea. It arose in 1967 and influenced Reformed and Methodist theologians from the late 1970s on.<sup>18</sup> Professors Bong-Nam Park, Chung-Koo Park, Myung-Yong Kim, Kwang-Sik Kim, Chul-Ha Han,<sup>19</sup> and Kyung-Yun Chung were all active in this theological movement.

There are a number of world-renowned Presbyterian and Methodist congregations, such as Somang, Myungsung, Onnuri, and Kwanglim Church, in which Barth's Christ-centred ecclesiology are evident. These congregations stress evangelism, worship, prayer, fellowship, Bible study, social service and foreign mission.<sup>20</sup> All of the above congregations have at least 20,000 or more members and support many foreign missionaries.<sup>21</sup> Significantly, the senior pastors at the above churches all graduated from the Presbyterian Seminary of Korea, and the Methodist Theological Seminary in Seoul, which principally teach the theology of Karl Barth.

To take an example, the senior pastor at Somang Presbyterian Church is the Reverend Sun-Hee Kwak. He graduated from the Presbyterian Seminary of Korea, and Princeton Theological Seminary. In 1976, he encouraged his congregation to emphasize the Reformed tradition of the *Westminster Confession of Faith and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms*. Since he had a vision of the church as being devoted to evangelism, and to offering biblical teaching to the members, his church concentrates on the spiritual growth of believers through prayer, Bible study, retreats at Prayer Mountain, fellowship, social concerns, and foreign mission. By 1990, its membership had expanded to twenty-two thousand, and currently it supports fifty missionaries, from the isolated rural areas of Korea to Africa, South East Asia, South America, Russia, and China. In Korea, the Reverend Sun-Hee Kwak is known as an interpreter of Barth's theology, and he is famous for his successful pastoral ministry, especially his Christ-centred preaching, which he believes contributed directly to the rapid growth of his congregation within such a short period. He has published many books and articles that deal with ecclesiology on the basis of Calvinism and Barth's theology.<sup>22</sup>

The introduction of Barth's ideas can also be traced to a Korean translation by Kwang-sik Kim of Otto Weber's *Karl Barth's Kirchliche Dogmatik* in 1976. Professor Myung-Yong Kim was eager to introduce Barth's theology to Korea by publishing several articles.<sup>23</sup> Accordingly, Kim translated A. D. R. Polman's book *Karl Barth's Neo-Orthodoxy* into Korean and published it in 1981. In 1986, Professor Bong-Nam Park published the book entitled *Kyueui Hak Bangbup Ron* [How to Understand Karl Barth], which introduced Karl Barth's monumental work, *Church Dogmatics*, to the Korean Church, and to theological students. Since the above books have been published, Barth's theological stature in Korea has increased greatly.

From the late 1980s, Presbyterian and Methodist students have written masters' theses on Barth's theology. It should also be noted, that Baptist and Seoul Theological Seminary (Evangelical Holiness) students have also submitted master's theses on Barth's

theology, especially his ecclesiology. There are now more than forty masters' theses, which deal extensively with Barth's ecclesiology.<sup>24</sup> The particular reason for choosing Barth's ecclesiology as the favourite thesis topic was the fact that theological students were very interested in identifying Barth's Christocentrism within the rapidly growing Reformed and evangelical churches in Korea.

The Baptists tended to be scornful of Karl Barth's theology until the late 1980s. In the early 1990s, that initial distorted attitude changed as Korean Baptist theological candidates wrote masters' theses on Barth.<sup>25</sup>

Although Barth's reception in Korea was mainly among Tonghap Presbyterians and Methodists, the Evangelical Holiness Church (Wesleyan Background) was also enthusiastic in accepting Barth's theology. In the late 1980s, Professor Shin-Keun Lee took a position on the faculty of Seoul Theological Seminary and began to teach the theology of Karl Barth supported by the Evangelical Holiness Church of Korea. Lee completed his doctoral thesis entitled "Entwicklung und Gestalt der Ekklesiologie Karl Barths" at Tübingen University in 1987. His Barth-related works are *The Kingdom of God and Ideology* (1990) and *The Ethics of the Kingdom of God* (1991). His book, *Karl Barth's Ecclesiology* (1989) is an outstanding comprehensive work for understanding the biblical and ecumenical character of Barth's ecclesiology. His other book, entitled *Theology and Church* (1998), emphasizes the Christian community's relationship with non-Christians in the world-occurrence and thus it has become a well-known articulation of Barth's theology of mission. He also translated U. Dannemann's book *Theologie und Politik im Denken Karl Barths* into Korean and published it in 1991.<sup>26</sup>

In any case, since the 1980s, convincing attempts to construct an ecclesiology emphasizing the nature of community are finally receiving attention. Barth's dynamic view of the gathering, upbuilding, and sending of the Christian community has been influential.<sup>27</sup>

We might also note that a doctoral thesis was written by Eae-Young Kim, a graduate of Ehwa Woman's University School of Theology. It was subsequently published in 1991 with the title *Karl Barth's Socio-Political Interpretation of the Christian Community*. Her supervisor, Soon-Kyung Park, is a well-known interpreter of Barth's theology in Korea. Professor Park initially introduced U. Dannemann's work, entitled *Der Zusammenhang von Theologie und Politik im Denken Karl Barths* (1975), to Korea in 1977.<sup>28</sup>

All of the above writings and publications of masters' and doctoral theses are the fruit of Barth scholars' theological contribution to the Korean Christian community. Certainly, Barth's Christocentrism has influenced Korean theologians and theological students to reaffirm the ecclesiological principle, rooted in the Word of God, which has promoted the growth of the Korean Christian community. In the 1980s, the number of Barth interpreters increased dramatically in Korea.

During the 1990s, the number of Barth-related monographs, and articles were numerous, so a full discussion of Barth's theology, and his ecclesiology, has occurred among Korean theologians and pastors. Some important monographs from the Korean Presbyterian perspective are Sang-Young Han's *Karl Barth's Ecclesiology and His Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (1990)<sup>29</sup>; Heup-Young Kim's *Wang Yang-Ming and Karl Barth: A Confucian-Christian Dialogue* (1996); and Jae-Jin Kim's *Die Systematische Anatomie der Theologie von Karl Barth* (1998). There are also a number of Barth-related articles and works produced by the Evangelical Holiness theologians.<sup>30</sup>

Another decisive factor is that both Handeul and Taehan Kidokkyo Seohae (the Christian Literature Society) Publishing Companies have devoted themselves to translating books by and on Karl Barth into Korean, and they continue to publish them.<sup>31</sup> One of their real accomplishments was the publication of Nam-Hong Choi's translation of Karl Barth's *Der Römerbrief* (Handel Publishing Company) in 1997. This remains an important text for the study of Karl Barth's theology at most Korean theological seminaries.

In 1993, a few zealous, young Korean theologians who had completed their advanced degrees in theology at European, and North American universities or seminaries, organized a “Karl Barth Society.”<sup>32</sup> This society has cultivated the seeds sown in the Korean neo-orthodox movement of the 1970s and 1980s in Korea. Its major activity has been to organize a “Karl Barth Colloquium” semi-annually and to sponsor other seminars. The annual publication of Barth-related articles and monographs is also one of their activities. The Korean translation of the first volume of *Church Dogmatics* is being produced by Young-Sok Oh, a Professor of Systematic Theology at Hankuk Theological Seminary. Other members of the Karl Barth Society are also working on Korean translations of other volumes of Barth’s *Church Dogmatics*.

The 1990s have witnessed a widespread and positive reception of Karl Barth’s theology in Korea. It is worthy of note that Professor Shin-Keun Lee, one of the leading members of “Karl Barth Society,” subsequently organized another branch of the Karl Barth Society in Bucheon, Kyunggi Province, Korea, called “Hankuk Shinhak Yunkuso” (The Research Centre for the Studies of Contemporary Theology). The main purpose of this research centre is to publish a large number of Barth-related monographs, pamphlets, and articles. Professor Lee, chair of this centre, published a Korean translation of Barth’s *Theology and Church* in 1998 and of Ulrich Dannemann’s *Theologie und politik im denken Karl Barths* in 1991.

Since many Korean interpreters of Barth’s theology have written and published so extensively, Karl Barth is known as “a father of neo-orthodox theology” or “a father of dialectical theology.”<sup>33</sup> Barth’s theology is generally regarded as basic for the understanding of contemporary theology in Korea. His Christocentric doctrine of the Church as the Christian community still commands attention. His perspective on the nature and mission of the church is particularly significant for the contemporary ecclesiological situation in Korea. Therefore, the theological contributions of the members of Karl Barth Society are marked by a theological passion for the primacy of God, of Jesus Christ and of

the Holy Spirit. This has exerted a noteworthy impact upon a new generation of theological students in Korea.

Having given a specific overview of the Korean reception of Karl Barth's theology, the following section deals with the proper understanding of the indigenization of Barth's Christocentric ecclesiology in the Korean Christian movement. Since the purpose of this thesis is not to suggest an explicit account or a survey of all Korean responses to Barth's theology, we will rather examine his impact through one distinctive figure of the Korean Christian theologian, Sung-Bum Yun, who attempted to contextualize Barth's theology according to the community concept and structure of Korean Confucianism.

The reasons for choosing Sung-Bum Yun as a prominent respondent to Barth in this thesis, are as follows: (1) he was probably one of the best interpreters of Karl Barth's theology to Korean Christians, and he was remembered as a faithful disciple of Barth in Korea in that early period; (2) he maintains that theological indigenization is a basic step for the formation of an indigenous Korean Confucian-Christian theology. Thus he has published many Barth-related books and articles in terms of the community aspects of Confucianism; and (3) his theological characteristics are distinctively Christocentric in accordance with those of Karl Barth.

## B. Sung-Bum Yun's Theology of Sung The Christological Centre of Sung Theology

Before exploring Sung-Bum Yun's response to Barth's ecclesiology, it is important briefly to take into account the main characteristics of Sung theology by which the sufficiency of Yun's response to Barth's theology can be measured.

While Yun constructs his theological framework from Barth's Christocentrism and Korean Confucianism, he distinctively maintains that the Confucian term *sung* becomes a basic source for the formation of Sung theology as well as for the indigenization of Barth's theology within the context of the Korean people's religious and cultural thought. Yun explains, "the term 'sung' refers to 'sincerity', which denotes 'sincere', 'truthful', and

‘faithful’ in relation to the cultural and religious tradition of China, Japan and Korea.”<sup>34</sup> Since its etymology originated from two identical Chinese letters, “word” and “fulfillment,” Yun states that it can be translated as “fulfilled Word,” “true Word” or “faithful Word.” On a technical and specifically hermeneutical level, he declares that:

Sincerity is the way of Heaven; being sincere is the way of the human being. Mencius replaced being sincere with the thinking of sincerity. Sincerity is the equivalent of revelation, and the thinking of sincerity or being sincere is the equivalent of faith. Thus, we may interpret the Confucian term *sung* as God himself, and the one who practices *sung* as the believer.<sup>35</sup>

Thus, Yun insists that the literal meaning of *sung* is “the authentic Word” or “the accomplished Word” in the light of Jesus’ saying at the moment of His death, “It is finished” (John 19:30).<sup>36</sup> For this reason, the true identity of Jesus Christ is, for him, understood not only as truthful, faithful, and the accomplished *sung* of the Gospel, but also as God’s universal and special revelation in Jesus Christ’s humanity and divinity. The existence of Jesus Christ as the Word of God is significantly concentrated and intensified in the meaning of *sung*.

Yun’s focus in that assertion is on the importance of the doctrinal conception of Christ as the *Logos* of the incarnation—the fulfillment of the Word of God, who is the source of life and the light of human beings. Like Barth, he thus places great significance upon the doctrine of creation in relation to *Logos*, who was God and who was in the beginning with God: “all things were made through Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made” (John 1:1-3).<sup>37</sup> For Yun, the *Logos* is not understood in an abstract sense or as ambiguous language, but as a power, which makes events out of nothing (*ex nihilo*).<sup>38</sup> Christ, the Word of God, has the power simply to create out of nothing. However, His function is described as the agent or the means of the divine creation of the world on behalf of God the Father as well as the hand of God, which created the world. Yun, at this point, highlights Jesus Christ as the one who becomes the sustainer and redeemer; “In Him was life, and the life was the light of all people” (John 1:4).<sup>39</sup>

Quoting Barth's statement that "God's revelation is Jesus Christ, the Son of God," Yun refers to the Gospel of John as the most theologically oriented of the New Testament Gospels in its assertion that "the Word was in the beginning, and the Word was with God and the Word was God."<sup>40</sup> In John the term Word refers to God's self-revelation to humanity in Jesus Christ. The presentation of Jesus as the Word of God not only teaches us that the Word is pre-existent, but also leads us to believe in Him as the fullness of divine revelation, grace, and truth. Yun states that the clause, "the *Logos* was with God and was God" (John 1:1), represents Christ as identical with God.<sup>41</sup> Actually, Yun's emphasis, like that of Barth, is on his dominant view of Christ as the pre-existent Creator and Redeemer for all the people in the world. He sees that both the Father and the Son were in the act of creation, but each of their functions was unique and different. That is to say, both the absolute unity and diversity of Christ's function are fundamentally linked to the nature of the Triune God. Therefore creation for Yun is the work of the Triune God.<sup>42</sup>

Yun emphasizes that his theology of Sung is based on Karl Barth's Christocentric theology, by speaking of Jesus Christ as the written (*geschriebenes Wort Gottes*), proclaimed (*verkündigtes Wort Gottes*), and revealed Word of God (*offenbartes Wort Gottes*).<sup>43</sup> He thus follows Barth's view that the power of the Holy Trinity—the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit—helps us believe in Christ as the *Logos*, who existed before all time, created the world, and became the complete incarnate Word of God, the Messiah, so as to achieve His salvation for both the righteous and the sinner. Like Barth, Yun sees Jesus Christ as the unique mediator between God and sinful humanity. To be sure, the *Logos*, Jesus Christ, is God revealing Himself to human beings. Yun therefore asserts that the *Logos* is the starting point for the understanding of the rest of the human beings in the world, and for the accomplishment of the task of theological indigenization within one's inherited cultural and religious tradition.<sup>44</sup>

In order for the Confucian term *sung* to be understood as God's special revelation in His Son Jesus Christ, Yun introduces Yul-Gok's (a great Confucian scholar of Korea,

1536-1584) understanding of *sung*, which mainly includes the following ideas: “the programmes of learning, of sincerity, of the Heavenly Diagram, of the personal affairs in the Heavenly Diagram, and of changing numbers.”<sup>45</sup> *Sung hak chip yo* [The Compendium of the Holy Learning], one of Yul-Gok’s writings, mostly explains the term “*sung*” as representing the notion of “*tao*” (Heaven or the ultimate way of life), in which an immanent and transcendental work of the Triune God must be recognized as a *Gegenüber* to human beings.<sup>46</sup> Yun’s primary insistence is that Yul-Gok’s philosophy of Confucianism is firmly centred on the idea of *sung* as the *tao*, which becomes:

The Alpha and Omega of his Compendium, as Karl Barth mentioned, the work of Jesus Christ in the power of the Holy Spirit is the Alpha and Omega of his *Kirchliche Dogmatik*, and it is also the determinative principle which defines a person and makes one be a sincere human being.<sup>47</sup>

For Yun, Yul-Gok’s fundamental idea of *sung* is very practical in light of the notion of following and serving Heaven (*Sa-Chun*: cosmic parents) as well as one’s earthly parents (*Sa-Chin*), simultaneously.<sup>48</sup> It means that there is no other way to know Heaven or the Ultimate without making such attempts at: “self-cultivation” (*Su-Shin*), “rectification of the family” (*Jae-Ka*), “rectification of the state” (*Chi-Kook*), and “bringing tranquillity and happiness to the world” (*Pyung-Chun-Ha*). Methodologically, these attempts are fulfilled by means of the Neo-Confucian principle of “the extension of knowledge through the investigation of things” (*Kyuk-Mul-Chi-Ge*) and “sincerity of thought and rectification of the mind” (*Sung-Yi-Jung-Sim*) on “what Heaven commands is called human nature” (*Chun-Myung-Yi-Jeong-Sung*).<sup>49</sup> The basic goal of these principles are, for a person as a sincere human being, to be faithful, moral and ethical before becoming a religious or spiritual being. In Yul-Gok, being religious or spiritual is a secondary matter.<sup>50</sup> Yun states that the starting point of Yul-Gok’s teaching is therefore the necessity of one’s sincerity to oneself for the purpose of accomplishing an harmonious life with other people on the earth.

In this perspective, Yun sees that Yul-Gok’s understanding of *sung* is ontological. This is because *sung* itself is not simply a *ri* (reason or principle), but a kind of objective realm of truth, and also the cause of creation, redemption and salvation. In other words, its

fundamental uniqueness is based on “the defining principle of human nature” (*Sung ri hak*).<sup>51</sup> For Yul-Gok, *sung* is the only way for a human being to seek its original nature. Once a person realizes this true nature of *sung*, then it is possible for one to turn from inauthenticity to authenticity, from unfaithfulness to faithfulness, and from insincerity to sincerity. Yun further quotes Yul-Gok’s work, *The Compendium of the Holy Learning*, as follows:

The human will, if there is no sincerity, could not stand; the human reason, if there is no sincerity, could not be adequate and lastly the character, if there is no sincerity, could not be changeable.<sup>52</sup>

Yun definitively identifies Yul-Gok’s idea of *sung* as the basic principle of education, which awakens humanity’s ignorance regarding the existence of an unknown God.<sup>53</sup> A person has to recognize his or her own ignorance so as to acquire intellectual sincerity, and then there will follow knowledge of the divine being as creator, sustainer, and redeemer for all sinful human beings. Accordingly, it is genuinely possible for a person to know the Triune God in the course of ongoing education.

On this particular point, Yun repeatedly insists on the necessity of theological indigenization through education. This approach begins by recognizing that *sung* itself is a virtue inherent in human nature. It is through education that a person can reach to knowledge of the Triune God.<sup>54</sup> Yun goes on to say that, through this educational process, human beings know Christ as “the phenomenon of *sung* and the totality of the Word” on the basis of the doctrine of the incarnation, in which Christ as the concrete realization of *sung* came into human history in flesh.<sup>55</sup> The idea of a personal Christ as the Word of God, Yun has argued, is realized in Yul-Gok’s idea of *sung*. Therefore, Yun notes that:

The Oriental idea of God is *sung* itself. Yahweh of the Jews, Allah of the Islamites, Tengri of the Mongolians, Kami of the Japanese, and Hananim in Tan-gun myth of the Koreans, are nothing other than so many names of the one who is the true Word. And also in more primitive views of God we find the same aspiration for the true Word, when we examine them more deeply. Among the ideas of God, the most advanced idea is that which contains the more comprehensive understanding of the Word. Accordingly, it is not just a prejudiced view of Christians to assert that the Trinitarian view of the Word in Christian theology is the most comprehensive one.<sup>56</sup>

For a detailed understanding of the Confucian term *sung* in relation to the characteristics of Korean religious thought, Yun introduces the ancient Korean Shamanistic ideal of the god, namely *Hananim*, from the Tan-gun myth, which is the account of the Korean national foundation. Yun argues that *Hananim*, in Korea's Shamanistic tradition, is not only the ultimate source of all individual creatures of the universe, but also becomes the Grand One, Great, Ruler, King, and the Lord.<sup>57</sup> Yun goes on to argue that the people of Korea firmly believe that He is the highest spirit or god who provides everything, such as sunlight, wind, rain and snow, in order for agricultural cultivation to produce a very good harvest. This *Hananim*, on the other hand, brings punishment upon those who are neither righteous nor virtuous, while He rewards the good according to their merits. Certainly, this belief, for Yun, has been integrated into Korean life for five thousand years; for instance, even Confucianism in Korea believes in the gods of the sky and the earth. Yun further notes that the amorphous Confucian concept of *ch'on* (Heaven) shows that the concept of *Hananim* has been an integral part of Korean religious belief as well as forming part of cultural patterns and behaviours from primitive times.<sup>58</sup> For this reason, Korean people, as he argues, mainly tend to explain their traditional religious belief in *Hananim* according to the early myth dealing with Tan-gun, who is identified as Hwan-in, the Heavenly Father, and established Korea's first kingdom in 2333 BC.<sup>59</sup>

According to Yun, the Tan-Gun story is a survived fragment of an original truth that was formed under Christian influence (the Oriental or Orthodox branch of the church) between the fourth and eighth centuries, when Nestorian ideas spread to China and thereafter to North Korea.<sup>60</sup> As Yun has stated, it is supposed that Hwan-Ung, the son of Hwan-In, was sent to earth. However, the truth is that Hwan-In came down on earth, and he was eventually incarnated as Tan-Gun. Yun says,

This legendary story is similar to the Christian doctrine of incarnation that God as Christ became human. Korean Christians see these two comparative stories in terms of the standpoint of Christian Trinitarians, that God, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit are counterparts of Hwan-In, Hwan-Ung and Tan-Gun.<sup>61</sup>

In this religious similarity, Yun states that interpretation can be extended more broadly, as if the Triune God overshadowed the Virgin Mary (Luke 1:35) to conceive Jesus Christ, Hwan-In, the Heavenly God, incarnated Himself as Tan-Gun by means of the female bear. It is commonly observed that both the Triune God in Christianity and the trinity—Hwan-In, Hwan-Ung, and Tan-Gun—in the Myth of Tan-Gun are considered as males. The Virgin Mary is the model of the female bear, and bore a son by obeying God's commandment to stay in the cave and eat the garlic. As Mary was humble, obedient and faithful (Luke 1:38), the female bear also demonstrated the same virtues. The climax of the Christian doctrine is centred on the birth of a divinely conceived person, Jesus Christ, as the mediator between God and humanity and as the Saviour for all peoples.

Simultaneously, Tan-Gun is also represented as the *mu*, the sage, the connector of heaven and earth and the reconciler between the Heavenly God and sinful human beings, according to the historical record of the *Samguk Yusa* [The History of Three Kingdom of Korea]. Yun certainly notes that the thinking and practices of the Korean people were, and still are, under the influence of their own indigenous Shamanistic belief of the Tan-Gun myth.<sup>62</sup> He thus claims that the discovery of comparisons between the Bible and the Tan-Gun myth is like finding the lost book of one's family tree.<sup>63</sup> He consequently states that, "the Korean Trinitarian concept of God in the Tan-Gun myth is personal, instructive, and religious."<sup>64</sup>

Accordingly, Yun's root of Christocentrism is *sung* itself, which primarily represents Christ, the Word of God, and substantially refers to the doctrine of the Trinity. By stating the Triune God as evidence for "the unity of God, the oneness of God, and the deity of the three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit,"<sup>65</sup> Yun explicates this according to Barth's understanding of the Trinity that the function of one member of the Trinity may be subordinated to one or both of the other members, but each member's particular function is unique to itself. This Yun calls "functional subordination" that denotes a temporary role of each three persons for the accomplishment of Christ's redemptive task for all sinful human beings.<sup>66</sup> To take a very simple example, the Son Jesus Christ did not become less

than God, did during His earthly incarnation, but He did subordinate Himself functionally to the Father's will. Conversely, the Holy Spirit is subordinated to both the ministry of the Son Jesus Christ and the will of the Father God, but He is not less than they are.

Although the mysterious function of the Trinity is incomprehensible, Yun has claimed that this can be recognized in and through "the Written, Heard, and Spoken Word of God," in which the nature of the Triune God is proclaimed and manifested within the fellowship, the prayer, and the communal worship service of the Christian community.<sup>67</sup> While granting Barth's point that the Word of God is preached at the event of Christian worship service, Yun reminds us of the truth that the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ is one of the highlights of the Christian faith that goes beyond our reason and logic.<sup>68</sup> Therefore, he argues that Jesus Christ, the Word of God, should not be regarded as a "descriptive," but as a "constructive" statement due to His functional uniqueness among the other two persons of the Trinity.<sup>69</sup> For Yun, Jesus Christ as the Law and as the Gospel of *sung* itself extends its theological principle to the element of His unity, oneness, and harmony among the other two persons of the Trinity.<sup>70</sup>

Precisely, *sung*, for Yun, means that "the Word is accomplished or fulfilled."<sup>71</sup> Yun, on the face of this, states that Barth's starting point of theology is the Word of God, Jesus Christ, on the basis of the doctrine of the Trinity. Quite simply, he defines Barth's theology as "Christ-centred" (*Christo-zentrisch*); the Father God and the Holy Spirit are not ignored, but their beings are knowable through the special revelation of Jesus Christ.<sup>72</sup> Clearly, apart from God's self-manifestation in the person of Christ, humans neither know nor understand the true God or the existence of God and the Holy Spirit. The revelation of God is only fulfilled in His Son Jesus Christ. At this point, Yun makes the critical comment that, "Barth seems to be very skeptical regarding human's ability to know the being of the Triune God and the fullness of His activity outside the gracious revelation in Jesus Christ."<sup>73</sup> However, he notes that, "Barth is fundamentally centred on the special revelation of God in His Son Jesus Christ without neglecting the other two persons of the

Trinity, just as once Martin Luther emphasized the primary importance of *sola fide* without discarding the essential elements such as ‘love’ and ‘hope’ in Christ.<sup>74</sup>

Like Barth, Yun thus asserts that Jesus Christ became human so that we might see God through His humanity and divinity. Nevertheless, in Yun, Christ’s humanity is more significant in terms of the fact that, as sinners, we are to be united with Jesus Christ who could create new life through His redemptive work. Christ’s humanity helps us know the Heavenly Father, God in the flesh, and His own personification in His Son Jesus Christ. He is identified in the Word of God, which demonstrates the evidence for His unity with God—God as the Father, Christ as the Son, and the Holy Spirit as the Helper of Jesus Christ.<sup>75</sup> There is only one God, and there is only one mediator between God and humanity. In person, Jesus Christ gave Himself as a ransom for all in order for Himself to be a creative agent between God and sinful human beings. Indeed, Christ as the Word of God, as Yun strongly claims, not only becomes the centre of Sung theology, but the point of *jungyong*—the truth, the peace, and the intermediary between Heaven and earthly people.<sup>76</sup>

More broadly, Yun describes Christ’s humanity as “*kigil*” (disposition or nature) on the basis of Yul-Gok’s theory of “trichotomy”—*yi* (reason), *je* (will), and *kigil* (nature). The actual meaning of *kigil* ultimately refers to the theological expression “union with God,” as well as the Confucian term *jungyong*.<sup>77</sup> The term *jungyong* symbolizes Christ’s function of mediator between God and humans in accordance with the theological interpretation of *sung* as the Word of God, Jesus Christ. According to Yun, Yul-Gok understands *kigil* as the part of the synthesis that combines both *yi* and *je*. Accurately, *kigil* itself implies “the centre or fullness of humanity,” namely, “the true existence of humanity,”<sup>78</sup> this is not simply the fullness of humanity, but the condition of the concentrated existence of true humanity. This is to say that it is an intense condition of “concentration” adopting both *yi* and *je* as intimations of the three-in-oneness.<sup>79</sup> Therefore, Yun’s argument is that the true meaning of *kigil* cannot be realized without knowing the

theological implication of *sung*, for the Confucian term *kigil* is correspondingly derived from both *jungyong* and *sung*.<sup>80</sup>

On another level, Yun also refers the meaning of *kigil* to the theological term “Immanuel” (God with us).<sup>81</sup> He sees that it is clearly related to Yul-Gok’s theory of trichotomy—the principle of the three-in-oneness. He thus thinks that it becomes the basis for the attempt of theological indigenization in Korea. At this point, Yun criticizes orthodox theologians in Korea who understand the Biblical doctrine of the Trinity without paying careful attention to the importance of Christ’s function of humanity in light of Yul-Gok’s theory of trichotomy. Yun, in such a context, advocates that Barth’s theological concentration on Christ as both divine and human is balanced and correct, though his theology of the Trinity is viewed as modalistic which does not fully provide the proper framework for a correct understanding of the incarnation.<sup>82</sup>

In reality, Yun’s most fundamental point is centred on *sung*; that is, “the Word of God is accomplished in His Son Jesus Christ.”<sup>83</sup> By referring to Barth’s view of Jesus Christ as “*die besondere Anthropologie*,” he discusses in entirety and detail the theological implication of *sung* as follows: First, *sung* is the existence (*terminus a quo*) or the accomplishment (*terminus ad quem*) of the Word of God. Here the existence of the Word of God refers to the historical Jesus and includes His whole lifetime on the earth. That is, Christ as the second Adam came to accomplish the law of God and to save sinful humans from eternal death by dying on the cross, and moreover to give new life and truth by being resurrected from the dead. In Christ, the Cross and the resurrection are co-related. This is because the former symbolizes human beings’ wages of sin, and His humiliation as well as His death, but the latter highlights Him as the Creator, the giver of life and of the new life which represents victory over death. Secondly, *sung* achieves a propitiation, intermediation, and reconciliation by the Word of God, Jesus Christ. Modern theology seems to disregard the significance of both the “*historischer Jesus*” and the “*kerygmatischer Christus*.” It means that the principle of the three-in-oneness is neglected. However, the

theology of Sung provides the key method to unite and to make a balance between the “*historischer Jesus*” and the “*kerygmatischer Christus*.<sup>84</sup>

Yun furthermore argues that one of the complexities in Christian theology is the heterogeneous relationship between the law and grace. However, it was only Jesus Christ who accomplished both the law and grace and became the agent between God and sinful human beings. In other words, the Word of God is Christ Himself who accomplished *sung* and became the reconciler between God and human beings. At this point, Yun tries to interpret the term *sung* on the basis of Barth’s Christology—the historical Jesus (law), *kerygmatic* Christ (grace), and *historico-kerygmatic* Jesus Christ (the fulfillment of law and grace). That is, Jesus is historical from the theological doctrine of “Adoptionism,” and Christ pre-existed and was subordinated for the sin of all human beings in the world.<sup>85</sup>

Before we examine Yun’s response to Barth’s ecclesiology, we should note that Yun, for a fuller explanation of theological indigenization, quotes Oscar Cullmann’s work entitled *La Tradition, Problème exégétique, historique et théologique* (1953), Rudolf Bultmann’s *Theologie des N.T.*, (1954) and Paul Tillich’s *Systematic Theology*, vol. I (1951). He recognizes Cullmann’s theological attempt at indigenization as “*Heilsgeschichte*,” Bultmann’s as “*Vorverständnis*” and Tillich’s as “situation.”<sup>86</sup> According to Yun, Cullmann’s Christocentric examination of the total history of revelation and salvation is an organizing principle for the justification of theological indigenization. It means that the task of theological indigenization is for Yun to advocate a functional Christology, since there can be no Christology without a *Heilsgeschichte*. In other words, Christology is for him the doctrine of an “event,” not the doctrine of “natures.”<sup>87</sup>

For Yun, Bultmann’s assertion, that “...a whole series of words found in the oldest stratum of tradition ...gives us a consistent representation of the historical message of Jesus,”<sup>88</sup> helps us understand the methodology of theological indigenization. Bultmann’s programme of demythologization is for Yun at least inseparable in many people’s minds. According to Bultmann, the Bible was written on the basis of the Jewish apocalyptic and

the Gnostic redemption myths.<sup>89</sup> In this sense, Yun sees that the Bible reflects a first-century perspective. It is thus possible for contemporary Christian theologians to reinterpret the outmoded conceptions of the ancient biblical texts into the views of the vast majority of people living today.<sup>90</sup> As Bultmann adopts Martin Heidegger's philosophy of existentialism for his demythologization programme, Yun also develops his theology of Sung on the basis of the thought of the later Heideggerian concept, that is, "*Sprache als das Haus des Seins*" (language as the house of being).<sup>91</sup>

Moreover, Yun adopted Tillich's concept of the "situation." This is similar to Tillich's use of German idealistic philosophy, that is, the method of correlation. For Yun, the Gospel of Jesus Christ is the timeless truth. That is why the Gospel should be translated into contemporary cultural language. As Tillich sees the "situation" as the art, music, politics of a culture, and the whole expression of the mind-set of a given society, Yun in this respect argues that the roles of both Yul-Gok's philosophy of Sung and Tillich's existentialism are able to assure that the theological task of indigenization is authoritative.<sup>92</sup> It means that the contemporary expression should be affirmed by correlating the answers offered by the Bible with the questions being asked by the culture.<sup>93</sup> Clearly, Yun utilizes the existentialist basis of the thought of Rudolf Bultmann, Paul Tillich, and Martin Heidegger, as Karl Barth recognized the presence of Kierkegaardian existentialism in his early writing such as *Die christliche Dogmatik in Entwurf* (1927).

It is also interesting to note that Yun's programme of indigenization is similar to some Western theologians' attempts at theological indigenization or contextualization such as Hans Frei and Douglas John Hall. For instance, Frei has argued that the interpretation of biblical narratives should not be based on the general hermeneutical theory, but on cultural factors and imagination in countercultural movement. Both a sense of historical relativity and existentialist interests play their roles in the development of Frei's theory of biblical interpretation. Frei in his work entitled "The 'Literal Reading' of Biblical Narrative in the

Christian Tradition: Does It Stretch or Will It Break?” elaborates an argument that the reading of Scripture must be an agreement regarding the Bible’s *sensus literalis* that has been acknowledged historically within the Christian community.<sup>94</sup> Based on an historically grounded theological interpretation of Scriptures as narrative, Frei carefully outlines the meaningfulness of a biblical narrative in terms of its contemporary truth and value, by operating out of a coherence theory of truth in the practice of biblical hermeneutics.

Like Yun, Douglas John Hall, in his work entitled *Thinking the Faith: Christian Theology in a North American Context* (1989), also argues the need of theological attempt at contextualization, particularly within a North American context. According to Hall, North American theology has often been seen as a European theology under the name of the so-called “Western theology.” He accepts that North American history contains a rich tradition of European idealism, but in another work entitled *Lighten Our Darkness: Toward an Indigenous Theology of the Cross* (1976) speaks of the kind of theological emphasis appropriate to North America, especially to the remnants of classical Protestantism in the continent of North American situation.<sup>95</sup> John W. de Gruchy rightly observes Hall’s assertion that “Incongruous as they may appear when considered in their original forms, Calvinism and Renaissance/Enlightenment humanism become co-partners in the formation of the North American spirit.”<sup>96</sup> However, Hall does not ignore the remarkable tradition of European theology in a North American context. Yun therefore urges Korean Christian theologians not to be subordinated to Western theology, but to take the cultural and religious thought of the Korean people and a long-inherited Western theological tradition as their primary sources for indigenization.<sup>97</sup> Hall employs Barth’s use of the term freedom, and says, “Not independence from ‘old Europe’, but freedom in relation to that parental civilization and church—this is what is required of us.”<sup>98</sup> In this respect, contextuality in theology for both Hall and Yun means that the Christian community “...can become a theologically alive and obedient disciple community only as it permits its thinking to be receptive to and re-formed by the realities of its world.”<sup>99</sup> Like Yun, Hall sees that “the

summons to contextualization is not a challenge to produce impressive theoretical statements of the faith but to engage in faithful Christian praxis.”<sup>100</sup> In other words, contextualization for both Hall and Yun is “the *sine qua non* of all genuine theological thought.”<sup>101</sup>

#### Sung-Bum Yun’s General Response to Barth’s Ecclesiology<sup>102</sup>

Based on the significance of both the “*historischer Jesus*” and the “*kerygmatischer Christus*,” Yun’s ecclesiology begins with particular attention to the historical identity of Jesus Christ, who is fully divine and human. In response to Barth’s view of the Christian community as “the earthly-historical form of the existence of Jesus Christ Himself,” Yun firmly believes that Christ as *sung* is the fundamental source for the study of the historical Jesus.<sup>103</sup> The source, norm, and medium for the study of the historical Jesus, Yun said, must be more ecstatic—the primitive Christian belief in the form of the personal or communal religious experience—rather than philosophical, rational and technical.<sup>104</sup> For instance, Yun has argued that the question of factual history regarding the truthfulness of Jesus’ virgin birth, His life of miraculous ministry, and resurrection, is relevant, since faith in Jesus Christ is the secret of Church history.<sup>105</sup> Yun at this point sees Barth explaining fully both the “*kerygmatischer Christus*” and the “*historischer Jesus*;” thus Barth entirely recognizes the true divinity and humanity of Jesus Christ as not only a reality in time and space but also as the faith in the *ecclesia invisibilis* and the *ecclesia visibilis*.<sup>106</sup>

Yun states that, in the past, the studies of the historicity and the identity of Jesus Christ were made by some Western biblical theologians, such as R. Bultmann, S. Morton and E. P. Sanders. They tried to seek out who Jesus was, how he preached the kingdom of God to the common people at that time, when he died and was resurrected from the dead, and why he could be regarded as the Son of Man and God simultaneously. At any rate, Yun argues that since they are dependent upon the rational and technical method for the study of the historical identity of Jesus Christ, Asian Christians find it very difficult to understand the mystical union in which the Heavenly Father God is one with His Son Jesus Christ, the preexistent divine Saviour who is very God and at the same very human

in one person. For Yun, it is only “the sincerity (*sung*) of Jesus Christ” that can fully answer the questions of the “*historischer Jesus*” and the “*dogmatischer*” or the “*kerygmatischer Jesus*.” However, Yun, at this point, does not follow Barth’s insistence that the quest for the historical Jesus by Albert Schweitzer, in his monumental study of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, had not only failed, but was in reality impossible and in any case irrelevant to the faith of the Church.<sup>107</sup>

Yun argues that Jesus was a Jew; His cultural tradition and custom seems to have restricted His way of thinking and behaviour.<sup>108</sup> Likewise, Yun has insisted that we are continuously compelled to raise historical questions about Jesus’ cultural boundary. Certainly His life and ministry were for the oppressed or exploited Jewish people in His own time. His teaching was based on the Old Testament, which represents the culture, history, religious lives, moral laws and theological thought of the Jews. Nevertheless, Jesus had crossed the political, social and economic strata to address each individual's genuine needs.<sup>109</sup> This means that Jesus Christ transcended racial barriers that limited the value of non-Jewishness, by treating people with equality by granting self-respect, self-worth and dignity. The true quest, for Yun, is therefore to know that Jesus Christ as *sung* is the source of the liberating truth and salvation. He is the revelation of the righteousness of God manifested to the world in order to transform the whole of humanity of every age and place (*der Eine für alle*) from the fall to righteousness, from death to life, and from old to new, regardless of whether one is a Jew or Greek, old or young, educated or uneducated, and complex or simple.<sup>110</sup>

Having identified *sung* as the fundamental source for the study of the historical Jesus, Yun attempts to validate Barth’s view of the Christian community as the earthly-historical existence of the living Lord Jesus Christ according to the Confucian term *sung*. He argues that the theological task in the study of the historical Jesus is not to justify and defend the systems of Christian doctrines developed in the theology of Karl Barth, but to orient them locally, to indigenize them in Korean life, culture and religion.

By affirming Barth's Christocentrism, Yun further claims that *sung* as Christ will be able to transcend cultural heterogeneity, and to touch the hearts of all peoples in different times and different places. He goes on to argue that Korean Christians are growing in ways of accepting the Gospel of God as a true teaching of Jesus Christ, believing in the person of Christ as their own Saviour who grants eternal life after their physical death, confessing the Christian faith in their thought and worship, and practicing Christ's teachings as an ethical and religious norm for their daily lives. Clearly, the Korean people are well receptive to the Christian faith. As Yun puts it,

Jesus urged the righteous (regardless of Jews or Gentiles) to be faithful to *Torah* and its ethical and moral laws, and to repent and believe the good news of God's compassionate love for a return to righteousness. His preaching was balanced between God's wrath and love; but he placed more emphasis on God's forgiving grace of sins and love for sinners rather than on the nature of God's wrath and its punishment. In Korea, interestingly, the ethical and moral norm such as *Sam-kang-oh-yun* (the three fundamental principles and the five moral disciplines in human relations) have been taught and emphasized in every human life and relationship. Moreover, this Confucian principle was predominant before Christianity was introduced to Korea, and is also, in some ways or in every perspective, similar to the Ten Commandments in the Old Testament as well as in the teachings of Jesus Christ in the Four Gospels. For this coincidental affinity between Christianity and Confucianism, the Korean Christians did not have racial prejudice against a Jewish Christ, but accepted Him as their personal Saviour. Thus, *sung*, as a fundamental idea of the Korean Confucianism, transcends historical, cultural and racial disparity.<sup>111</sup>

From that perspective, Yun claims that the theological uniqueness of *sung* in relation to the nature of *kigil* and *jungyong* provides not only the key to solve the complex and difficult interpretation of God's incarnation and Jesus' resurrection from the dead, but is also a universal concept for a much better study of the historicity of Jesus Christ in the present theological context of Korea.<sup>112</sup> *Sung* for him indeed becomes the instrument of the reconciling Gospel of Jesus Christ.

At a much higher level, Yun argues, "the genuine nature of *sung* is thus seen as the unifying principle of heaven, earth and humanity."<sup>113</sup> Yun accepts Barth's *credo unam ecclesiam*, that is, the community's invisible and its visible being, or the earthly-historical *communio sanctorum*.<sup>114</sup> Like Barth, Yun both distinguishes between the "invisible" and "visible" church but does not separate them. There is only the one body of the one Christ,

who not only suffered and died for us, but also is concealed in the one church as visible form, that is, “the earthly-historical form of Christ’s existence.”<sup>115</sup> For Yun, the church must be grasped only by faith. The love and fellowship of Christ and of all the saints will be hidden, invisible and only a bodily, outward and visible sign of it will be given to us. Thus the true Christian community is, for Yun, “hidden,” relative to and dependent upon the grace, which God has revealed to human beings in His Son Jesus Christ. In other words, the true being of the community as the body of Christ is not to be identified with the official church and its history, but “with the Word of God alone that is the final source of authority in answering true ecclesiological questions.”<sup>116</sup> Like Barth, Yun further speaks of Christ’s Gospel as the key to other additional forms of Christian discipline and ministry such as baptism, the sacrament of the Lord’s supper, and prayer for others. These roles signify Christ’s priesthood as well as ours. Without *kerygma*, the proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, all of these roles are in vain.<sup>117</sup>

In Yun’s view, *sung* is subjectively the reconciling principle of God and humanity, and objectively the realization of reconciliation between person and person or religion and religion. It is specifically integrated between its subjective and objective nature; both natures eventually make possible its extended definition to be realized as the Word of God, which constantly proclaims the hope of peace on earth. It is thus the reality of *sung* that attempts to harmonize all complicated principles of the doctrine of the Trinity by concentrating on the divinity and humanity of Christ. To be sure, *sung* as the Word of God, for Yun, seeks harmony and accord within the family, society, state and religions.<sup>118</sup> In this way, all peoples, regardless of their religious identities, can be united in this harmonious principle of *sung*, and they can further remove all racial discrimination, different ideologies, and religious conflicts. Yun believes that the theology of Sung is therefore the common idea which “can directly be accepted as the most creative and normative thought for all religions on earth beyond the above mentioned contradictions and conflicts.”<sup>119</sup>

With the above-integrated idea of *sung* as a unifying principle for the harmony of all peoples in the world, Yun reaffirms Barth's *credo unam ecclesiam* by exploring the community concept of Korean Confucianism. In Chapter One, we surveyed Confucianism as a principal contribution to the growth of the Korean Christianity and the reception of Barth's theology in Korea. Yun also sees that the Confucian image has significantly formed the Korean Church in her reality and later provided a fertile soil for the reception of Barth's community-based doctrine of the Church in Korea.<sup>120</sup> For this reason, Yun argues that Christianity in Korea grew rapidly due to this predominating influence of Confucianism in which group unity was the core of its identity.<sup>121</sup> That means Confucianism in Korea is centred on the life of the community that extensively develops a true human relationship vertically and horizontally, with social, cultural and religious activities in harmony, by actualizing a sincere life itself to be "the heart of the truth of humanity."<sup>122</sup>

By referring to Barth's concept of the body of Christ that exists in the mutual dependence and support, Yun indicates again that Korean Confucianism puts an emphasis on the group. He argues, "where Westerners like to appear independent, the Korean people wish to conform their fundamental identity to their group."<sup>123</sup> In this sense, he briefly introduces the custom of Korean agricultural communities in which belonging to a group or community was originally a necessity because of the limited land available to agricultural affairs; "wet rice farming requires group control of rice paddy formation, irrigation and fertilizer collection. Communal control of the forests was also important, as the farmers needed the wood both for building and heating."<sup>124</sup> Farmers, Yun argued, were therefore required to be members of their various villages in order to use the land. This is called *Du-Rae* (group community) which not only protected the residents as well as their land, but also took care of road repairs and ceremonies such as ancestral rites, funerals, and weddings, interdependently. As membership is mandatory for all resident families, "there is little dissension, but group harmony prevails."<sup>125</sup>

Correspondingly, Yun affirms Barth's aspect of the Lord's Supper, the so-called "sacraments," in which the visible fellowship—a concrete human *koinonia*—of the body of Christ can be recognized through its communion with its members, its common action in remembrance of its Lord Jesus Christ, and its common proclamation of the death and resurrection of Him.<sup>126</sup> On the basis of this perspective, Yun extensively explains the Confucian concept of group solidarity as follows:

One is expected to put his or her own interests aside in order to contribute to his or her group's goal. Self-restraint is vital to group harmony and personal success. It is also important to avoid upsetting others outside one's community. This is because the pride and shame of each community member is felt by every other community member and is a reflection on the whole community...In Korea, all the community members are interdependent which binds people for mutual benefit, both functionally and emotionally. This could be due to the Korean sense of belonging to a certain group of the community. Groups require all members to have full devotion and total commitment for the group, and then the group will take care of them. One's obligation to his or her community is essential within a community-based society.<sup>127</sup>

For Yun, Korean Confucianism as a whole is thus "a community"; the Korean individual seems to feel alive only when in harmony with the community.<sup>128</sup> The ideal of community-based Confucianism in Korea, as he argues, enables people to transfer the focus of their group identity as they mature. Obviously, it begins with their family, moves on to their school, and eventually centers on their working place.

Yun points out that the relationship between Confucianism and Christianity in terms of a community-based identity is the point of contact that made possible Western Christianity's remarkable growth in Korea. He further argues, "both Christianity itself and Barth's ecclesiology are also community-based which puts the emphasis on the unity in diversity."<sup>129</sup> In this sense, Yun definitely affirms Barth's reference to the *credo unam ecclesiam*, and states boldly that God's saving love for human beings is fulfilled within the community.<sup>130</sup> That is to say that, although salvation in Christ is biblically understood as very personal, it is more communal and interdependent. That means for Yun that God's redemption is actualized through people's daily life in the form of communal solidarity. Like Barth, Yun thus asserts, "salvation takes place within a community of God's people;

there is no salvation outside the body of Christ. Togetherness in diversity makes a community a community of Christ.”<sup>131</sup> He goes on to argue, “togetherness is the heart of Confucianism in Korea that teaches how people must love and share suffering with each other. This eventually brings wholeness to the community.”<sup>132</sup>

“Peace,” “love,” and “justice” for Yun are essential to the wholeness of the community with other human beings, which establishes the communion with God.<sup>133</sup> Human community is only possible when people who have a proper relationship with God, accomplish love, peace and justice. In the concept of Korean Confucianism, love, peace and justice help people to be fully human and a community of persons. It is Yun’s theological hypothesis that when people fulfill love, peace and justice in the community, they “come to know the Gospel of Christ as the source and ground of love, justice and peace.”<sup>134</sup> People can practice their love, peace and justice within the community in which they live. This communal aspect in Korean Confucianism shapes a loving, saving and sharing community of togetherness in Christ. Yun’s key images for the church embody relationally interdependent ideas in terms of Confucian values such as “the traditional family body and social structure in harmonious solidarity, including one’s relationships with his or her own parents and the sovereign.”<sup>135</sup> According to the above statements, we can thus recognize that Yun attempts to integrate Barth’s view of the gathering of the community into the communal aspect of Korean Confucianism, by thoroughly following Barth’s view of *credo unam ecclesiam*. That is, Yun confirms that communal gathering is possible on the basis of peace, love, and justice with the power of the Holy Spirit and Jesus Christ the Lord, according to Barth’s ecclesiology.

For Yun, Korean Christians themselves are Christians with a Confucian background and its corresponding values.<sup>136</sup> This means that the religio-cultural legacy of Confucianism, which has been the sole cumulative tradition during the past five centuries in Korea, is the key to understanding the unique characteristics of Confucianism-influenced Korean Christianity; thus this type of constructive interaction between Yul-Gok’s theory of

*sung* and Barth's theology may possibly create "the horizontal religious oneness and a dynamic religio-cultural synthesis."<sup>137</sup> For example, Yun has asserted that both Yul-Gok's theory of *sung* and Barth's ecclesiology commonly prevail in the worth of human dignity, freedom, and equality, of the possibility of moral greatness, and of one's fundamental relationship with others in a society based on ethical reciprocity.<sup>138</sup> Simultaneously, a fuller picture of one's reality remains open to a true sense of the transcendental before the Heavenly Father God. On the basis of Barth's ecumenism, Yun's continuing emphasis is indeed on a disciplined Korean Confucian-Christian community which "should stand firm on the basis of the authority of Scripture and in mutual fellowship with each other to be faithful to the Gospel of Jesus Christ as *sung*."<sup>139</sup>

Accordingly, Yun's fundamental understanding of the Church as the gathering Christian community is rooted in Barth's particular ecumenical position, that is, the Christological centre of church unity. Yun says approvingly, "To be a Christian is not only to confess Christ as the Head of His body, but also to affirm the priority of our ecumenical commitment at the heart of the conviction that Jesus Christ is the Lord of Lords and the Lord of history too."<sup>140</sup> This is simply to manifest the centrality of God's redemptive grace in His Son Jesus Christ, the authority of His Word, and the unity of His church throughout the world. The church as the body of Christ is thus not so much to be seen as being made up of individual pieces as it should be viewed as the sum total of all its parts. For Yun, the church is under God's hands and that it finds itself under pressure to realize its unity that makes the church the church of Christ. As it is, Yun's intent is clearly to urge the Christian communities in Korea to explore the vitality and faith to take up the continuing challenge of the ecumenical movement in the name of Christ; the task of Korean Protestantism can be said to be the construction of ecclesial unity in Christ.<sup>141</sup>

Yun criticizes the Korean Churches for being too passive in the ecumenical movement. According to Yun, the Protestant Churches in Korea are divided into too many denominations, for the sake of their own schisms, not for evangelism. For instance, each

denomination in Korea claims to be spiritually superior to another, and refuses to join together in worship and fellowship. The problem of denominationalism in Korea particularly obscures the unity of the church given it by God in His Son Jesus Christ. Of course, Yun affirms that there are varieties of Christians with a variety of needs, and there are diverse styles of Christian faith and life. In other words, the organizational life and institutional forms in the Korean Protestant churches of all denominations may vary, but they must know that “there is only One Lord in the church and in the world.”<sup>142</sup> While the Nevius Method positively contributed to the rapid growth of Korean Protestantism, for Yun, “the marked negative characteristic of the Korean Christian community in the process of growth has been a major lack of serious evangelical emphasis on social implications of the gospel and church unity.”<sup>143</sup> Yun says that in early Protestant mission history, “education was emphasized by the Methodists, and on the other hand both church planting and evangelism were the Presbyterians’ major strategy.”<sup>144</sup> This means that theologically conservative Protestantism, namely the evangelistic and pietistic character of Korean Presbyterianism, broke away early from mainline ecumenism and formed its own individualistic and self-centred features without external encouragement from other Christian communities. Yun continues to argue that divisiveness or schism is mostly represented in the Presbyterian churches in Korea, due to their individualistic emphasis on the Christian faith. It is notable that there are about thirty different Presbyterian denominations, out of which a dozen denominations have synods and general assembly organizations.<sup>145</sup> Yun holds that these are contrary to the unity movement of the world church in Christ. Truly, he follows Barth in disallowing any ecclesial division, which would dangerously distort the integrity of Christ’s church as well as the ecclesial accountability for church unity. Like Barth, Yun thus sees that the church is one in and with Jesus Christ.

The church is an integral part of every individual’s personal salvation in Yun’s view when the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus the Messiah is preached as the apostles

preached it in the early church. Like Barth, Yun points out that the unity of the church includes both the visible and invisible church by saying that “the unity of the church is essentially a spiritual unity, which depends entirely on the unity of the Godhead, the cross of Jesus Christ, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit.”<sup>146</sup> That is to say that emphasis should be placed on the common unity in Christ rather than on minor differences of external Christian faith and practice.

In extending the unity of the church, as Yun claims, “the Christian community can ultimately glorify the name of God, and realize the need to work for reconciliation between the members of the Christian communities to heal the pain of division and eventually bring about the unity, peace and harmony of the churches in Korea.”<sup>147</sup> It is only God’s love and the power of the Holy Spirit that brings the fellowship of the whole Christian community to the glory of the Triune God.<sup>148</sup> With such a pastoral dimension, the purpose of church unity for Yun is to help people be restored to their wholeness in Christ and experience the ministry and the power of the Holy Spirit in their very lives. Adducing Barth’s idea in this regard, Yun says, “this type of action consequently makes the members of the Christian community seek to work toward the peace and unity of the church to express their common bond through actions of encouragement and support.”<sup>149</sup>

The key for the authenticity of the church’s doctrine is an accurate understanding of “the unity of the church.” Like Barth, Yun thus defines the church as “one, holy, catholic and apostolic.”<sup>150</sup> Without unity, the church definitely does not exist anymore. The true mark of the church is unity where the sincerity and truth of God’s revealed Word in His Son Jesus Christ is preached and heard, and the gifts of the Holy Spirit are accordingly evident among the members of the body of the Christian community. For Yun, “God is one, Christ is one, the Holy Spirit is one, therefore, the church is one.”<sup>151</sup>

For Yun, the one church exists in its totality in each of the individual communities. As Barth stresses particularly the *ecclesia* in the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed (381), commonly known today as the Nicene Creed, Yun’s theological basis for a representative

church unity is indeed that “wherever or whenever the people of God confess their faithfulness in Christ, the provider of the unity, holiness,<sup>152</sup> catholicity and apostolicity to His community, there the church exists as His body.”<sup>153</sup> Simply put, Yun, in accordance with Barth, acknowledges that the existence of the true church is a matter of faith. His firm conviction is that the essential nature of ecumenical and unity movement is “not to seek merely the organizational unity, but to build a concrete Christian community through the renewal of the churches and of the whole humanity in the sincerity of Christ’s Gospel.”<sup>154</sup>

For Yun, the root of ecumenism is to confirm the Christian community’s true identity in and with Jesus Christ. This is because in Him “the church is the people of God (*Gemeinde*), created by His Word and Spirit, in which God established Christ as the Head and called the church to be His Body.”<sup>155</sup> In Yun’s case, as in Barth’s, the existence of the church as the Christian community is dependent upon the existence of Jesus Christ, and it therefore does not matter which denominations we belong to, if we correctly understand the definition of “the unity of the church.”

In accordance with Barth, Yun clearly states that the Christian community must be “faithful in Christ, strongly enthusiastic for gathering, and diligent in praying.”<sup>156</sup> He certainly believes that such elements would make it possible for the Christian community to be a true body of Christ and God’s witness among the people. To that extent, he asserts that the people of God as the true witness of Christ must be dynamically spiritual and faithful to the Gospel of Christ, and their lives in the world-occurrence should be distinguishable above all other virtuous people.

In his concern for the growth of the Christian community, Yun follows Barth in emphasizing two crucial points. First, “faithfulness to Christ” is the central concern of the community members which guides them into absolute obedience to God’s will in His commandments and the teaching of Christ and His Apostles.<sup>157</sup> According to Yun, true disciples of Christ must not be selfish, arrogant or ignorant of God’s commandments, but must be committed to the obedient pursuit of God’s will and must be trained in Christ’s

moral and ethical teachings. Obedience is, for Yun, primarily a means to the glorification of God, to the realization of His Kingdom on earth, to the expression of love to God and others, and to the growth of understanding in our relationship with God, in which the Holy Spirit works to encourage growth in the form of reciprocal fellowship with, and depth of understanding of the Lord Jesus and His Father.

By asserting Barth's view of "humility" or "selflessness" as a fundamental Christian virtue, which points to a profound congruence as regards the ideal of true humanity, Yun further states that Christ's dramatic display of selflessness and humility would be imitated by the Christian community as the most fundamental Christian virtue.<sup>158</sup> On this particular point, Yun strongly stresses that filial piety can be "a perfect virtue" in the fulfillment of humility, as Barth's Christological centre is based on Christ's humility (*Kenosis-Theorie*). He goes on to argue that,

It is the image of Christ's incarnate life with His complete identification with human nature that would be recognized as having fulfilled the duty of filial piety with His perfect submission and humble obedience to the will of His Heavenly Father; He certainly knew that following His Father's will was the ultimate in filial piety.<sup>159</sup>

Like Barth, Yun sees that the cross denotes the obedient Son of God in light of the personal relationship between the Father and His only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ.<sup>160</sup> Jesus Christ as *sung* manifests His identity as the reality of human history in terms of His suffering and death on the cross. The remarkable theological importance of the cross, according to Yun, lies in its profound implication of God's willed redemption for the Christian community and for all peoples in the world through the Crucifixion of His Son Jesus Christ.<sup>161</sup>

Yun often affirms Barth's Christologico-ecclesiological concept in terms of mutuality. Accordingly, he demonstrates that interpersonal obedience to one another can assist the people of God a great deal in developing their own spiritual growth through interacting relationships with those brothers and sisters in Christ, attaining the whole measure of the fullness of Christ. Yun defines such interacting relationships as the "Christocratic brotherhood" on the basis of Barth's reference to *communio sanctorum*.

Moreover, Yun emphasizes the way of obedience that affects every aspect of life, especially the life of prayer. He sees prayer as a key element for the upbuilding of the community, while Barth puts it in the section on the sending of the community, especially in the ministry of the community. Interestingly, Yun integrates the concept of prayer with the Confucian aspect of obedience, by emphasizing that Korean Christians have demonstrated patience and a persistence in the practice of prayer in spite of their historical sufferings or afflictions. He further sees the necessity of prayer for the Christians of Korea not only practiced in times of trouble at church, but also as an integral part of their individual life. Prayer always encourages full restoration in order for them to have the privilege of communication with God and to call other believers together for concerted fellowship. Yun makes an interesting observation that, for Korean Christians, prayer brings a corporate body together to focus on a common matter and together bring it to the Lord Jesus Christ. In this corporate practice of prayer they fostered an idea that both the vertical relationship with God and the horizontal relationship with others are correspondingly important. These are through confession in Christ and prayers on behalf of each other's welfare. For Yun, prayer obviously motivated Korean Christians to enthusiastically expand God's Kingdom. In this respect, we should note that, Yun reveres Barth's ecclesiology, but he follows Barth's emphasis on prayer that is not only an integral part of the community's ministry, but also an important activity in its ministry.<sup>162</sup>

Yun sees that obedience to the Word of God is the path to spiritual maturity as well as to the upbuilding of the true Christian community. It is because in prayer the people of God are challenged to become committed to reading, meditating on and obeying the written Word of God in the Bible, consequently enabling them to grow spiritually as well as to internalize the ideals of thinking and behaviour—moral values—which pleases God and are best for their lives. Thus obedience to the commandments of Scripture for Yun becomes the essential spiritual principle which helps the Christians respect, understand and fear God's Word. Accordingly, he urges Christian ministers primarily to encourage their church

members in an obedient lifestyle to God's Word. "Obedience" is, in Yun, truly a keypoint of morality, ethics and spirituality for the upbuilding of the Christian community.<sup>163</sup>

Secondly, in accordance with Barth, Yun emphasizes that "worship is the central and vital activity of the people of God, who should take it very seriously, whether it is Bible study, cell group meeting or Sunday morning service."<sup>164</sup> Along with Barth, Yun sees worship as praise and humble submission. God's people should gladly offer their righteous lives to Him through the conscious expression of His worth, greatness, and goodness. In worship, as Yun says, "the Christians learn how to praise God, pray to God, and listen to God by celebrating Christ's life, death and resurrection. And they finally realize that worship is to respond with faith and acts of commitment to God as well as one another."<sup>165</sup>

Yun goes on to say that the zealous attitude to gather for worship services in any circumstance—trouble, trials, sorrow, spiritual frailty, or joy—facilitates fellowship within the Christian community, by increasing its understanding of the mind of Christ. Passion for gathering apparently authenticates a kind of spiritual leverage by which ordinary Christians continue to grow spiritually through the experience of God's love as well as the way of mutual solidarity through Christ. Yun makes it plain that, practically speaking, the spiritual life of a growing believer, that is, a uniting fellowship in diversity, is a kind of mystical union between the Lord Jesus Christ and His body as the spiritual community in whom the living presence of Jesus dwells in His believers.<sup>166</sup>

By paying careful attention to Barth's insistence that the form of the Christian worship service is a liturgical fellowship, Yun speaks of the interconnectedness between all peoples who make up the Christian community; it is only when each member of the body of Christ attempts to build up one another and to pursue one another's good for the edification of the community, that God's Word in His Son Jesus Christ will be fulfilled.<sup>167</sup> The nature of fellowship is, for Yun, the total dependence of believers on Christ and His Spirit, and the actualization of His spoken and written Word. There is no self-importance

and independent spirituality, but only interdependence and harmony with one another.<sup>168</sup> That is to say, that fellowship as the Christian worship service, for Yun, is an impossibility without honest or sincere communication with God as well as with one another.

Therefore, Yun, in accordance with Barth, firmly believes that the most vital aspect of worship is the proclamation of the Gospel of God, *kerygma*, which takes place within the life of the Christian community and the transforming power of the Holy Spirit. It is manifested in mutual love and service, in self-giving and acceptance, drawing people from their separateness into the community of shared faith in Jesus Christ.<sup>169</sup>

While referring to Barth's Christologico-ecclesiological, or pneumatologico-ecclesiological concept of the Christian community, Yun states that worship as a liturgical fellowship is an event in which God's people can rediscover their true identity as the Christian community.<sup>170</sup> In other words, as Yun has asserted, when people hear the content of God's Word, particularly Christ's life, substitutionary death, and resurrection for all peoples, they will have the basic values and attitudes in preparing for mutual sharing with one another, unconditional acceptance of one another, and a determination to discover their true identity as the chosen, justified, and sanctified community of God.<sup>171</sup>

Yun therefore sees that the doctrinal foundation of the church should be solely based on "the Gospel of God," which should be proclaimed, and heard by the people of God.<sup>172</sup> Likewise, the church is where God's people can gather together to encourage and challenge one another to worship Him in spirit and in truth. The church is also a creature of the Gospel in which is empowered the privilege and the freedom of authority for the preaching and hearing of the Word of God. The function of the church is, as Yun states echoing Barth's insistence upon the church as a witnessing *kerygmatic* community to attest, explicate, and explain the Gospel so that the church should be completely free for God's activity in Christ, whose divine foundation and constant renewal should be based on adherence to God's Word in His Son Jesus Christ.<sup>173</sup>

In defining the Gospel as the written, spoken and heard Word of God, Yun places emphasis upon the value of the community-oriented Korean Church, for God's people to rediscover themselves as "the Communion of Saints" (*communio sanctorum*).<sup>174</sup> Like Barth, Yun defines the word "communion" as a congregation, group, community, gathering and assembly, and then refers to it as a "participating fellowship" for mutual benefit, not for individualistic benefit. In effect, Yun understands "communion" as a summary or collective concept in the light of sharing and participating in the unity of the community. In a very definite way, the reality of the people of God is "the Communion of Saints" in whom Christ lives, works and reigns through redemption, through grace and the forgiveness of sins, through the daily cleansing of sins and renewal of life. That people should not remain in sin but should lead a new life in all good works, and not in old evil works, so in the "One" church both justification and sanctification takes place. In Yun's view, the community of saints receives the privilege of Christ's salvific redemption by believing in Christ's presence in the community.

Moreover, Yun states that personal salvation is initially determined by one's faithfulness to Jesus Christ. With this presupposition, he immediately moves to the passage, "Do not give dogs what is holy and do not throw your pearls before swine, lest they trample them underfoot and turn to attack you" (Matthew 7:6).<sup>175</sup> Even though Christ's sacrifice on the Cross was for everyone, His salvation only belongs to the person who has an authentic self-consciousness in Him. Only such a faithful person can find a new life in Christ and at the heart of that new life will be the moral resolution of God's forgiveness and His indwelling Spirit. It is a reality that Christ's redeeming grace provides the individual with both justification and sanctification, and finally frees oneself in order to fulfill God's will and commandment for the holy life. One's true self-identity, in this regard, can be recognized in and through the great holy entity of oneself with Jesus Christ; this implies some significant theological elements, such as the union with Christ, obedience to the Will of God, and a continuous relationship with God. It is because Yun emphasizes

that the Kingdom of God and the Gospel of Jesus Christ are not “cheap” or “trivial,” but inherently “holy” and “precious” like “pearls.”<sup>176</sup> Based on this fact, he asserts that the redeeming grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, including both justification and sanctification, is only given to this individual, who belongs to the group. It is clear that any Christian community-related organization is able to “take priority over all kinds of actions of faith, such as repentance and forgiveness of sins.”<sup>177</sup> Being the people of God is being faithful in Christ on the one hand, and also being ethical and moral in their own neighbouring communities, on the other hand. Therefore, Yun affirms Barth’s point of view that the criteria of peoples’ action and character are judged by their own sincere faithfulness to Jesus Christ as well as by their mutual relationship with others.

Although Yun routinely responds to Barth’s concept of the upbuilding of the Christian community as the event of the communion of saints, he fails to explore the diverse character of *communio sanctorum* that needs defence, protection and preservation. Barth observes that, the community in its human activity was, is, and will always be in danger, but it is strengthened under pressure or persecution.<sup>178</sup> As he correspondingly mentions two forms of danger such as secularisation and sacralisation, it is a matter of law “which is not identical with the Law of the Gospel, with the control of the free grace of God and with the will of Jesus as the Lord and Head of His people.”<sup>179</sup> In this respect, Yun’s response to Barth’s concept of the upbuilding of the community is in Jesus Christ as *sung* who becomes not only the accomplishment of the law but also the paradigm of sincere humanity. Otherwise, Yun describes *sung* as “*jen*” that is, etymologically originated from two Chinese characters “person” (*in*) and “two” (*yi*). The term *jen* literally means a reciprocal relationship between two persons. In its communal aspect, it is fundamentally the realization of the meeting between “I” and “Thou.” As *jen* is closely related to the Confucians’ five cardinal virtues—“human-heartedness,” “righteousness,” “propriety,” “wisdom,” and “faithfulness,” its nature itself is thoughtful, integral and sincere towards others. It is a kind of human attitude that loves and respects others as oneself. Yun explains

that *jen* as the paradigm of communal human relationship thus appears as both the essence of humanism—a sincere humanity or a true human community, and the life-giving spirituality—spiritual communion with the Heavenly God.<sup>180</sup> In a sense, Yun has asserted that, when people relate with each other interdependently, producing a solid touchstone for all inter-personal human relationships in God, they will fulfill *jen*. In other words, it denotes that full humanity is only possible in the form of an interpersonal relationship, which is rooted in the fundamental ethical standard for humanity's mutual life, trust and respect for one another in harmony. He further explains the Confucian term *jen* theologically,

One might consider the relationship of *jen* and filial piety in terms of the doctrine of sanctification and justification. *Jen* has to do with becoming fully human, identifying this with sanctification, which makes clear the supra-humanistic dimensions of this process. Sanctification is possible only when it is based on the premise of justification and *jen*, and filial piety...When filial piety is absent, *jen* becomes degenerate and corrupt...Lacking filial piety means that person gives up to be fully and truly human or being sanctified.<sup>181</sup>

Filial piety, as Yun observed, provides an existential foundation, a living norm and a unifying principle for the establishment of community-oriented human relationships. The centre of filial piety is, for Yun, Christ Jesus who becomes the source of righteousness (*i*), integrity, sincerity (*sung*), and human-heartedness (*jen*).<sup>182</sup>

Yun states that the Law, according to the Five Relationships of the Confucian's cardinal virtues, is seen as the legalistic commandments or ethical obligations for the righteousness of family and society. It is inevitable that Christ as the Filial Son, in the Korean Confucian-Christian context, represents an active fulfillment and authority of the Law, that is, the accomplishment of the righteousness of the Law, which expressed the merciful will of God.

By referring to Barth's insistence upon the identity of Christ as the Head of His community, Yun makes clear that Christ Himself is the Head of His community in terms of *jen* (the righteousness or human-heartedness) before God and the divine justification that all peoples should receive and accept through their own faithfulness in Christ. Yun continues

to make sure that Christ's life and teaching manifest the full meaning or the completion of the Law (Old Testament prophecy) in terms of confirming the truth of *Torah*, which may be summed up in the two commandments of love (Matthew 22: 27-40).

Ultimately, Yun argues, "Christ established for us a father-son relationship with God; in this, God is revealed to us not as a God of *eros*, the love of man and woman, but as a God of *agape*, the love of a father."<sup>183</sup> From the Confucian point of view, the father must have affection and rectitude or dignity to bring his son up perfectly; this implies the theological image of God as having both wrath for the unjust and love for the righteous. Accordingly, Yun calls such a role of the father-son relationship as "affection between father and son," which not only becomes the normative pattern of filial piety, but also represents the ultimate faith-dialogue of the Son Christ Jesus with His Heavenly Father which is at the heart of the New Testament. Truly, the father-son relationship, Yun asserted, is the paradigm (or the ultimate dimension) of filial piety, that enlightens all human relationships.

Although having faith, hope and charity are important for the life of the Christian community, the other elements, such as prudence, fortitude, temperance, justice, order, peace, humility, and obedience, in the teaching of Korean Confucianism, as Yun has argued, must also be stressed and taught as the heart of other Christian virtues. Based on Yul-Gok's thought of Realism or Practical Science, Yun interprets faith as *yi* (knowledge or reason), hope as *kigil* (disposition, nature or boldness) and love as *in* (philanthropy or benevolence). In reality, he sees that *sung* is the fundamental principle, which could unite these three Christian virtues as one in Christ Jesus, the Word of God. Furthermore, Yun notes that, within the Confucian aspect of the father-son relationship, the theological perspective of Christ's humble obedience to His Heavenly Father God symbolizes His own fulfillment of filial piety, in order for the Christian community to take it as an exemplary model for basic human conduct. Yun, in this respect, takes seriously Barth's point of view as follows:

The Old Testament says, “Honour your parents; if you do so you will live long in the land your God Yahweh has given you” (Exodus 20:12). One listens to and obeys one’s parents because one’s forebears are those who both maintain and mediate the covenant with God...Similar content can be found in a familiar passage of the *Classic of Filial Piety*. In human conduct nothing is greater than filial piety. In filial piety nothing is greater than reverencing one’s father; in honouring one’s father nothing is greater than placing him next to Heaven...reverencing one’s father so highly as to place him next to God. The father is not identified with God, but is still in some way associated with Him. There is certain continuity here with Barth’s concept of one’s forebears as “the natural and therefore the closest representatives of God.”<sup>184</sup>

It is definitely at this point that Yun, like Barth, identifies God as the true and original father—Creator, Lord, Redeemer and the Word of Eternal Life (Isaiah 63: 16; Matthew 23: 9).

Yun argues that Christ as *sung* and *jen* came to accomplish His own saving acts—incarnation, redemption, salvation, resurrection, righteousness and sanctification—in history. Accordingly, he quotes Barth in saying, “It was not to dissolve the Law and the prophets but to fulfill them that the real Christ of the New Testament came (Mt. 5:17; Jn. 10:35).”<sup>185</sup> Like Barth, Yun recognizes Christ as not the end of the Law, but the end of sin. For Yun, Christ as *jen* is the fulfillment of Law, the Messiah who was promised for the justification of everyone who believes in Him and who has appeared in fulfillment of the promise.<sup>186</sup> *Jen*, in its essential nature, is for him on the side of *agape*, Christ’s self-giving and self-sacrificing love towards human beings, which stems from one’s faithful relationship with the Heavenly Father God (vertical) as well as earthly parents (horizontal).

In this sense, Yun addresses Barth’s affirmation of the possibility of true Christian community within the upbuilding of the Christian community and Christian love. He insists that *jen* as *agape* is seen as “the ultimate or unconditional love constituted by the mutual relationship between father and son, in which filial piety becomes the centre for an ethical norm and the starting point to discover the bond of true human community.”<sup>187</sup> In fact, there won’t be any other partiality or individualism within this kind of love. It is because *jen* as *agape* creates a complete model for human attitudes and an idealistic pattern of sincere human community in order for a person to be fully human. For Yun, *jen* otherwise

manifests a perfect sincerity and integrity in which a humble, warm and faithful human relationship is consequently brought in the form of unconditional affection.

Likewise, Yun mentions, “this kind of love is ‘love without falsehood’ (Apostle Paul) or ‘sanctified love’ (Karl Barth) which is based not only on the self-sacrificing love of earthly parents, but also on the unconditional love of God (*agape*).”<sup>188</sup> For Yun, love brings reverence for life, which, in the Confucian perspective, means taking care of one’s given physical body from one’s parents, with personal responsibility for being religious with regard to the *tao*. It is wholly for the sake of the fullness of the human community. As the *Classic of Filial Piety* has stated, there should be no harm to the parts of our body—flesh, hair, or bones, since our parents gave them. Taking care of each of the parts of our own body is the beginning of fulfilling our duty of filial piety. In this sense, Yun speaks theologically of our body as “the temple of the Holy Spirit” (1 Cor. 6:19-20), by following Barth’s idea of our bodies as “borrowed gifts” (*Leihgabe*) or “living soul.”<sup>189</sup>

Thus, it is Yun’s insistence that we should fulfill our duty of filial piety to our earthly parents in our own body and with a sincere heart, as we should glorify our Heavenly Father God in our own God-given body and spirit (Cf. John 4: 24). More broadly, Yun indicates that, according to *The Classic of Filial Piety*, “one who respects his parents will not behave arrogantly to others; that is, arrogance to others is ultimately rooted in the lack of respect for one’s parents.”<sup>190</sup> It is for this reason that someone who is arrogant or proud is reluctant to know, believe or respect God as the good Creator and Lord. This unfaithful attitude is clearly observed by Yun as the “original sin” on the basis of Karl Barth’s point of view regarding *confusio hominum*, that is, human’s confusion, ignorance or pride, in relation to the world history which is seen from below. To be sure, Yun argues, “man without God and without parents cannot but become proud and arrogant to others, because both God and earthly parents are the source of humility.”<sup>191</sup>

*Jen* as *agape* is, for Yun, the key element for the fulfillment of the Law (Rom. 13:10) as well as all righteousness that was only possible in Christ’s death and

resurrection. In this regard, he argues that “the act of baptism, as an act of faithful obedience to God, is the transition from an old way of sinful human life to a new life of vital righteousness that a person in the Christian community can perfectly accomplish, revealed in God’s work and Word in Jesus Christ as *jen*. ”<sup>192</sup>

Like Barth, Yun claims that baptism is clearly centred on the truth that the justification and sanctification of sinful human beings before God has been fulfilled in the history of Jesus Christ, which was completed in His crucifixion and resurrection. Christ’s death and resurrection, for Yun, are seen as the accomplishment of *jen*, that is, the revelation of the act of God, which makes each individual member of the Christian community just and holy before Him.<sup>193</sup> It is in Jesus Christ that the cleansing and renewal of the sinful human being can be achieved and confirmed in the administration of baptism.

Christ as *jen*, as Yun has followed Barth, is therefore the effective justification and sanctification of the sinful human being. He is not a law of righteousness but righteousness itself.<sup>194</sup> This means that Christ becomes the real grace or the promised grace of the Ten Commandments in which God in His own person has fulfilled His promise and sought out His people in order for them to find the Word of truth, the higher righteousness of the kingdom of God.

In effect, Yun clearly follows Barth’s Christocentrism, by highlighting the Confucian term “*tao*” as Jesus Christ, the Word of God. Ultimately, *jen* is called the *tao*—the Way, the Truth and the Life—a straight path in which one should be obedient so as to be fully human and sanctified before God (Heaven). The person of *jen*, according to Yun, “cannot ignore the law, but rather fulfill it spontaneously without any burden of legalistic obligation.”<sup>195</sup> It is simply a matter of the mutual relationship between justification (*i*) and sanctification (*jen*) in the light of the paradoxical relationship between the Law (*i*) and the Gospel (*jen*). The term *i*, in Confucian thought, signifies the righteous way (inevitable truth) and human-heartedness at the same time. Without both righteousness (*i*) and human-heartedness (*jen*), the Law cannot be possibly fulfilled in the Gospel of Jesus

Christ. *Jen* (human-heartedness or sanctification) and *i* (righteousness or justification), as Yun has noted,

...are not the same things, but yet at the same time there is an intimate relationship between them. In Confucian thought, it is common to speak of four cardinal virtues, human-heartedness, righteousness, propriety and wisdom, but it is commonly held that propriety and wisdom are included in human-heartedness and righteousness, respectively...a fifth virtue, faithfulness (*shin*), is frequently added to this list. In that case, what are we to make of faithfulness? I think a fitting interpretation would be to consider faithfulness as being constituted by the unity of warm-heartedness and righteousness.<sup>196</sup>

By way of summary, Yun correspondingly echoes Barth's Christologico-ecclesiological concept of church growth—the true upbuilding of the Christian community keeps the balance of both the horizontal and vertical, and from the lower to the higher, or from the higher to the lower—as follows:

Filial piety, referring to the father-son (Father-Son) relationship, is a vertical relationship, which is subjective and existential in character. Human-heartedness, by contrast, is basically horizontal, an inter-personal I-Thou relationship which is objective and social in nature. Finally, integrity (*sung*) of human-heartedness, may be considered as a diagonal vector between the vertical of filial piety and the horizontal of human-heartedness, a third element in which the other two meet and are synthesized...in a theological perspective this integrity may be thought of as hope.<sup>197</sup>

In such a context, Yun defines filial piety to the Heavenly Father as the *ratio essendi* (the basis for existence) and filial piety to one's earthly parents as the *ratio cognoscendi* (the basis for understanding).<sup>198</sup> This means that, for him, sincere filial piety to one's earthly parents is the first and most basic instance in fulfilling God's will; filial piety to one's earthly parents is finally culminated in the Heavenly Father God. This is because God, in the Scriptures, commanded His people to obey their earthly parents in order for them to be blessed.<sup>199</sup> Filial piety as a result produces fullness, peace and a communal beatitude in order for it to proceed to the rectification of the family and the state, and eventually the upbuilding of the true Christian community. That is, it becomes not only a source for forming a stable family-centred community, but also for developing the ethics of an interpersonally organized-community of Christ. Above all, Yun's theological attempt is to

build up the foundation of all ethical concepts in Christ for the edification of His community, which is ultimately derived from Barth's Christocentric theology.<sup>200</sup>

Integrity (sincerity, *sung*),<sup>201</sup> Yun says, is "...diagonal and an integrative principle to ease the tension between vertical and horizontal relationships by becoming the point of contact as well as providing hope against the fear of physical suffering and death."<sup>202</sup> This idea is the centre of the theology of the cross, in which the primary function of Christ is to be the Saviour for all peoples in the sinful world. Therefore, Yun's reception of Barth's credal concept of the *communio sanctorum* in relation to the upbuilding of the community is clearly based on Jesus Christ as *sung*, especially the crucified Son of God, who is not only the representative of the ideal perfection of true humanity, but is definitely a religious or metaphysical, moral or ethical, and a social or historical truth for all mankind.<sup>203</sup> In other words, Christ's nature of righteous integrity (*sung* as *jen*) for Yun, represents the paradigm of sincere humanity and as the eternal Son of God, who becomes the Way, the Truth, and the Life for all peoples.<sup>204</sup> Certainly, Yun's principal encounter with Barth's Christocentric theology is on the grounds of Christ's resurrection from the dead, the touchstone of all Christian theology. This, Yun defines as the fulfillment of the righteousness of the Law and the eschatological saving event through Christian worship service as well as pastoral ministry.

Having examined Yun's response to Barth's concept of the gathering and upbuilding of the community, we recognized that his theological centre is based on the Confucian term *sung* as Christ who becomes the Way, the Truth, and the Life for everyone. Yun explicates *sung* as *jen* and *tao*, and then integrates these with some practical aspects of the Christian community, such as fellowship, *kerygma*, and the Christian worship service. He emphasizes these as being very important for the gathering and upbuilding of the community. It is thus clear that Yun generally follows Barth's doctrine of the church. Three categories of Barth's ecclesiology, the gathering, the upbuilding, and the

sending of the Christian community, are foundational in his basic framework for ecclesiology.

In the section on the sending of the community, Yun attempts to develop Barth's full account of the theology of mission, that is, the fundamental unity of theology with ethics, the unity of theory and praxis. Undoubtedly Yun affirms Barth's view of the sending of the community by arguing the importance of performing the practical ministries of the church for the accomplishment of its missionary task. However, we should note that, unlike Barth, he tends to highlight "the responsibility of social service as the most decisive and fundamental of the ministries of the church as the real community of Jesus Christ."<sup>205</sup> In general, Yun follows Barth's doctrinal concept of the sending of the community, but fails to offer a comprehensive ecclesial imperative for missionary strategy and action. As he himself strongly focused on the social responsibility of the Christian community in relation to its missionary task, his ecclesiological division and structure are slightly different from Barth's. While Barth discusses the sending of the community in the *Church Dogmatics* IV/3 from the perspectives of calling, mission, task and service, Yun's ecclesiological reflection in this section is limited within the community's social service and its missionary task in terms of theological indigenization.

While Barth makes clear the ministry of the community as both *ad extra* and *ad intra*—the two in a very definite order,<sup>206</sup> Yun stresses that social service is the primary task of the Christian community and foreign mission the secondary task.<sup>207</sup> This means that the missionary task will not take place without performing social service. He definitively regards social service as a part of the gathering and upbuilding of the Christian community, which must be fulfilled primarily before executing its missionary task in the world. It is because Yun believes that when the Christian community concentrates upon gathering, namely worship for prayer, preaching, instruction, evangelization, home mission, and mutual fellowship, upbuilding is naturally gained, and then the sending of the community to all peoples will be eventually accomplished.

Although Yun's ecclesiological division and structure is slightly different from Barth's, both Barth and Yun find *kerygma* crucial to the community's social service. Yun refers to Barth in saying that, "...all effective service is dependent upon the church's constant listening to the prophets and apostles called by Him and its constant investigation of Scripture and instruction by it."<sup>208</sup> Yun's concern for the community's social responsibility is firmly rooted in Barth's view that the ministry laid on the community has its limitation, that is, its active subordination to God.

Affirming social service as a ministry of witness, in accordance with Barth, Yun sees that the true service of the church is for both God and humanity.<sup>209</sup> He states that Christians compared to others should be marked by a fullness of friendliness, vulnerability and openness, sharing their wealth with non-Christians.<sup>210</sup> Again he says, "...the Christian community should be active in participating in social actions such as caring for the aged, orphans, childless widows, or the isolated poor."<sup>211</sup>

Appealing to Barth's reference to Jesus Christ as the one Doer of the work of God and the primary and true Witness of this work, Yun challenges Korean Christian leaders by stressing that:

In fact, Christ's ministry was for the lost, the sick, the poor and the outcasts. Korean Christian ministers should repent for neglecting the example of Christ's ministry. Although the Korean church has an abundant resource base, the church unfortunately does very little in reaching out to address social concerns. They need to teach their congregations the love of God as well as the biblical teaching of social concerns by reaching out to those who are stereotypically oppressed and those disillusioned by poverty, bigotry, bias, contempt, depression, fragmentation, and lovelessness.<sup>212</sup>

Furthermore, Yun urges Korean Christians to reach out to prostitutes and rescue them from sexual exploitation, helping them to find their way back as responsible social members of a better human community. It is his conviction that sinful sexual behaviour must be recognized as such, but they might not be able to live without fear of rejection, inhospitality or discrimination, and therefore benefit more fully from the life and ministry of the Christian community. Compared to other conservative Korean theologians, Yun's point of view regarding the issue of equality between male and female is quite

revolutionary. He believes that both male and female are the image of God and thus a woman can be ordained as an elder or minister for the service of the church as well as for the glorification of God. At this point, Yun follows Barth's view of sexual equality that the creation of human beings as male and female forms the climax of the whole.<sup>213</sup>

Yun continues to acknowledge Barth's claim that the church is not just for its members, but for others as well. He claims that the ministerial function of the church is not for gathering itself, but also for upbuilding through executing its task for the people excluded from the members of the Christian community.<sup>214</sup> In this regard, he further suggests that personnel and finances should be pooled to rent or purchase a building as a Christian social service centre. This building, as Yun argued, would house a gym, a small cafeteria, small recreation areas, a media center, a few classrooms, a small prayer room, a private counselling room, and a few bedrooms, etc. There is great potential that can be offered by this center, if it is run and conducted in a wise manner. Yun emphasizes that this task not only addresses patience, tolerance, finances, time and energy to its outer limits, but also calls for a long-term commitment or dedication to those groups of people.<sup>215</sup> He goes on to argue that considerable pastoral care with unconditional love, compassion, and faith will promote this task much better. Often the results may seem futile, but the task of social service in the Christian community must be executed. As Yun strongly puts it, the aim must not be for just quantity, but for quality.

Thus, for Yun, social service is not only the evangelistic outreach of the church in order to win souls for the Lord Christ, but also the basic contribution of God's people in order that both the Christian community and society may grow together towards unity in Christ, who is the source of harmony, peace, and *sung*.<sup>216</sup> That is to say, it is an attempt to recover broken humanity by bringing about peace, love and wholeness to the human community, which should have a sincere faithfulness in Christ, that is, entire evangelization.

Like Barth, Yun's point is that Christian social service is a vocation toward one's neighbour and also toward God. It is a sense of duty carried by the Christian community that builds each individual's pride in the community as a whole, and strengthens the solidarity of the whole community as well. As a result, it demonstrates an obligatory relationship, the community's values and its relationship to society, in the light of authenticating an actual interdependent relationship among the people of God and a feeling of oneness between the self and others. Specifically speaking, it is, for Yun, a kind of listening to the voice of the people, and then living out the social-ethical implications of the one Gospel of Jesus Christ who came down to become one with us in our sinful humanity, dying and rising again, freeing all of us from the bondage of sin.<sup>217</sup>

In Yun's view, as in Barth's, the basic principle of the Christian's social task, therefore, is to reach lovingly out to all people with the good news of Jesus Christ by seeking ways to bring all members of the Christian community into lives of obedience and conformity to God's will. This will be facilitated by praying and caring for suffering and weak people according to the Gospel of Christ.<sup>218</sup>

In this sense, Yun, in accordance with Barth, recognizes that a proper biblical understanding of the Christian community as the body of Christ is only possible if:

...the church is understood—predominantly, if not exclusively—as a charismatic community and God's pilgrim people, His Kingdom of priests. The church should be a radically biblical, caring community of believers totally sold out to Jesus Christ...However, God's plan is not just for believers alone, but for the whole cosmos. Many churches in Korea today are merely institutions strictly using the gifts for their own benefits...God's cosmic plan is being affected greatly by many selfish Korean ministers concentrating on their own congregations and them alone. Churches must be more than institutionalized structures and more than any secular organizations.<sup>219</sup>

The church as a charismatic *koinonia*, for Yun, must make an impact on surrounding communities, for this was and is simple and utter obedience to Christ as well as the church's unconditional responsiveness to Him. Yun suggests that different church growth strategies and models can be helpful in carrying out this responsibility. However, the most necessary and urgent elements are, for him, the preachers who are filled with

faithfulness to God and for the sake of the confessional unity of divided churches, primarily weeping for the lost and shouting with the redeemed.<sup>220</sup> Yun argues that his cosmic task of the Christian community already started with Jesus Christ when He carried the cross for the whole world. Today Korean Christian ministers, according to Yun, must carry the cross at least for the place in which they live just as the word “charismatic” reveals, and then the working and empowering of the grace of God will be effected in every believer’s life. Therefore, the fundamental task of the church as the Christian community is for both Barth and Yun *kerygma*. It will be completely fulfilled by the three substantial tasks of “social service,” “mission for world” and “ecumenism,” which Yun regards as the primary encompassing summons of Christ given to the Christian community.

As we have observed, Yun, unlike Barth, sees that the missionary task is only possible when the Christian community has sufficiently executed its social service for others. It is the responsibility of the Christian ministers to open the doors of opportunity and provide situations where the members of the Christian community are exposed to the need of the world mission, and to inform them that God’s people have been commissioned to “...be His witnesses both in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and even to the remotest part of the earth (Acts 1:8).”<sup>221</sup> By affirming Barth’s insistence that the Christian Community of Jesus Christ is for world mission, Yun urges the Korean Church to take upon herself the missionary responsibility in her own land and for the whole world. This task is not to bring the entire world to Christ, but unquestionably to bring Christ to all the unreached peoples of the world.

Taking Christ to the world, for Yun, means to share the lives of non-Christians in other parts of the world, and to understand how they live with their own cultural traditions, by evangelizing them for Christ. That is to say that “the Christian community has the means to take Christ’s message to every culture, and once it gets there, Christians will be able to express it in a form they may understand.”<sup>222</sup> Yun states that communicating the Gospel of

Christ to other cultures will only be effective when Christians can appreciate their view of life and the world. Cross-cultural communication at the deepest level is possible only when Christian missionaries or ministers understand the worldview of the people to whom they minister. In other words, if the Christian missionaries know the recipient's language and culture, they can preach a meaningful gospel that will be heard and responded to. This is because people will better understand the Gospel from the perspective of their own worldview. Although Yun primarily stresses the importance of understanding other cultures, he goes on to agree with Barth that the Christian community must execute its missionary task to the world in the form of the proclamation, explanation, and application of the Gospel of God.

As Barth recognizes the value of other cultures and religions, Yun also emphasizes that "the Church must realize the importance of culture in communicating Christ, if God's people are ever to complete their missionary task of establishing a church in every people's group."<sup>223</sup> Culture, according to Yun, includes knowledge that informs the dimension of all areas of life, and values by which it judges human relationships to be moral or immoral. In other words, a person's perception of life is molded, and a system of ideas and symbols is also formed through culture.

While Barth construes evangelism as the declaration of the Word of God to humanity, Yun sees that evangelism is not merely presenting God's truth to another people. It vitally involves pre-understanding a people's culture, that is, their associated patterns of behaviour and products such as their long-inherited ideas, feelings, and values, indigenizing the message of God so that it may become meaningful to them. In this sense, Yun sees that Confucianism is a philosophy, not a rival theology to Christianity but a purely rational system. As we already noted in Chapter One, the Jesuits deemed Christianity essentially compatible with Confucianism, while Taoism and Buddhism were considered idolatrous.<sup>224</sup> That is to say that Yun's programme of indigenization is not

totally religious syncretism but makes use of philosophical terms which are available from Confucianism to make the Christian gospel understandable in the Korean context.

Yun interestingly goes on to argue that “Jesus’ own ministry and teaching can be called a form of indigenization,” but this integral part has been ignored by most Western and Korean theologians.<sup>225</sup> For Yun, the call for indigenization is a required task entirely for Korean theologians. He says,

...if they have accepted the Westernized Gospel of Jesus Christ without any attempt of indigenization or critical concern, it cannot but say that they are shamefully subordinated to Western theology. It is not only a theological servility, but also their intended ignorance of Jesus’ teaching. It is in this sense that Easterners, especially the Christians of Korea, should consider the call for indigenization of Western Christian theology into their own precious cultural and religious heritages, as the humble obedience of the people of God to Jesus’ own teaching of indigenization in the Bible.<sup>226</sup>

Therefore, the primary source of indigenization should be the cultural and religious thought of the Korean people themselves, in the form of not neglecting a long theological tradition in Western countries as well as their painstaking endeavor of theological studies. The starting point of the task of indigenization, for Yun, “...is to know and eventually integrate the intimate relationship between Europeanized Christian theology in the West and other unique cultural and spiritual heritages in the East.”<sup>227</sup> Therefore, the Christian community, as Yun urges, must see the need for this type of contextualization, for without it the Church has no message to offer to the world.<sup>228</sup>

Some Korean theologians unfortunately misunderstood and misinterpreted the genuine intention of Yun’s summons to indigenization as directly opposed to Karl Barth’s Christ-centred theology by “...identifying its task as the unacceptable figure of polemical discussion between Emil Brunner and Karl Barth regarding the problem of Natural theology.”<sup>229</sup> Yun sees that Korean theologians are passive and slothful in discussing some controversial theological issues. This is because they are for Yun quite one-sided due to their firm conviction about the absolute authority of the Scripture as the inspired, as well as the infallible, Word of God.

Yun's chief difference from Barth's view of the church's mission is a matter of carrying out theological indigenization according to one's traditional culture and religion. Barth, in the debate with Emil Brunner, rejected any kind of notion of a point of contact fearing as a result of his conflict with Nazism the idea that God is revealed elsewhere than in Christ. Thus, the strong statement of Barmen, "Jesus Christ as attested to us in Holy Scripture is the one Word of God whom we must hear."<sup>230</sup> The negative implication was: "We reject the false doctrine that the Church can and must as the source of its proclamation, recognize other events and powers, forms and truths, as the revelation of God outside and alongside this one Word of God."<sup>231</sup> Although in this same volume Barth speaks of other truths or lights outside the walls of the Church, he sees these as proceeding from Christ who is the true Light. In this perspective, Barth was opposed to all forms of syncretism seeking some kinds of point of contact, but Yun sees theological indigenization as equivalent to the missionary task given to the Christian community. Yun endeavors to interpret the Confucian term *sung* as the key concept. For Yun, this could be used as an adequate and applicable Oriental category for the understanding of Barth's theology, especially his concept of "God's special revelation in Jesus Christ," but also for the accomplishment of theological indigenization.<sup>232</sup> *Sung* itself, for him, does not distort the true nature of the biblical concept of "revelation," but preserves its original meaning even in an alien cultural and spiritual field. This is because:

...the concept of sincerity is far more understandable for us than the theological term "revelation." This concept of sincerity is a very familiar concept to our Oriental people, regardless of religion. This concept is familiar even to atheists. Christ is not only the Lord of Christian people but also the Lord of non-Christians.<sup>233</sup>

By approving Barth's Christocentrism, Yun thus indicates that the Gospel of Christ is a personal message from God to the hearer, not a theological treatise. This is because God's purpose is, for him, ultimately to save the lost, and bring them into conformity with His Son, Jesus Christ. God always speaks within concrete historical situations, and the cultural context is the instrument through which He reveals Himself. Yun adds,

The whole message of God is an eloquent witness of God's meeting with humans and His proper relationship with them in their own cultural contexts. And He spoke to Abram, Moses, David, and other Israelites within a changing Hebrew culture. Certainly He became a sincere Word who lived in time and space as a member of the Jewish society.<sup>234</sup>

Yun goes on to argue that the indigenization of Barth's theology into the context of Korea's particular cultural and religious tradition is consequently not to explicate the Word of God by employing such a complicated theological term as revelation, but to start reinterpreting through the pre-understanding of the Confucian conception of *sung* as the content of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, especially for the people of Korea. When this missiological attempt has been made correctly, according to Yun, the proclamation of the Word of God will be much more effective even to atheists. The term *sung* for him is seen as an integrated conception of Barth's Christocentric theology and Korean Confucianism. Thus, Yun's fundamental emphasis is always on the Gospel of God—the absoluteness of Christ as the Saviour for everyone—in accordance with Barth's Christocentric theology, even if he insists on the necessity of theological indigenization with the Confucian term *sung* in the course of evangelization.

Unfortunately, Yun fails to explicate Barth's comprehensive presentation of six "speech" ministries and six "action" ministries, which together constitute the scope of the church's ministry. While Yun fundamentally acknowledges social service as the most decisive aspect before executing the community's missionary task, he seems to ignore the importance of both concrete action and concrete speech, which Barth considers as inseparable for the effective ministry of the church.

In spite of this difference, Yun endeavors to follow Barth, by supporting his emphasis upon the ministry of the community in the form of the proclamation, explanation, and application of the Gospel as the Word of God. Reminding the community to have a realistic knowledge of the world-occurrence and to exist in total solidarity with the world according to Barth's account, Yun strongly urges the Christian community:

...to develop its ability to communicate with others, and to understand the message of God and its context in order for it to be proclaimed adequately to the receptor

who has another worldview and culture. Such an attempt to communicate the gospel to another culture will bridge the gap between the message of God and the context of the respondent's culture. Yet, some would fear whether in the process of adapting the message to a different worldview, the truth of God's Word would be distorted.<sup>235</sup>

Yun explains that concern regarding twisting the Word of God can be "...eliminated by applying an appropriate contextualization on the basis of the revealed Word of God in His Son Jesus Christ."<sup>236</sup> For him, contextualization means a truly biblical indigenization that essentially requires a thorough grasp of the Gospel and of the context into which it must be expressed in terms of the receptor's needs and worldviews.<sup>237</sup> In this respect, Yun claims that "the Christian community needs to understand the gospel in its original historical and cultural setting."<sup>238</sup> The culture of the Bible includes those places and circumstances in which God's message was given. According to Yun, this could be the culture of Athens at the time of Paul, Nineveh in Jonah's time, or Jerusalem during Christ's time.

For Yun, the primary responsibility of the Christian community then is to study the scriptures thoroughly in their particular context. Any sound system of hermeneutics must take into account the cultural context in which the message was originally communicated, the background and syntax and style, the characteristics of the audience and the special circumstances in which the message was given. In the New Testament, as Yun asserted, the early Church Apostles' preaching such as Peter's sermon at Pentecost (Acts 2) and Paul's address on Mars Hill in Athens (Acts 17), would be understood as an attempt to contextualize the truth of the Gospel of God so that people could understand it. They knew the cultural context and how to adapt God's message to the needs of the hearers. Yun says of Paul that, "he lived in the world of his day, moved in its cultural setting and ideas, used their linguistic values and imagery, and shared with the men of that time the way in which the world portrayed itself."<sup>239</sup> Yun goes on to say that "This is the man who said, 'I make myself like a Jew, to win the Jews...I have become all things to all men so that by all possible means I might save some. I do this for the sake of the gospel' (1 Cor. 9:19-

23)."<sup>240</sup> On this point, by referring to Barth's concept of the sending of the community, Yun pinpoints that:

...the Bible clearly mandates the contextualization of the gospel. It is thus vital and necessary for the evangelization of the world and the fulfillment of the great commission in the form of indigenization.<sup>241</sup>

To be sure, Yun allegorically describes the missionary task of the Christian community as "the cultivation and preservation of the soil (John 12:20)."<sup>242</sup> This is because he believes that when the individual accepts Christ as Saviour, the seed of the mission is already planted. Therefore, in Yun's case, it is explicitly claimed that the Gospel must be framed in terms of a given culture's own world thought; God's revealed truth in His Son Jesus Christ must be contextualized in such a way that it may be grasped, understood and accepted by the mind set of another culture. Agreeing with Barth that the Christian community must always have the character and intention of a law of service in the context of the lordship of Jesus Christ, Yun makes clear that what is preached must be true to the source from which it came, the Bible—the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and at the same time relevant to the receptor.<sup>243</sup>

Yun's reception of Barth's concept of the sending of the community is mainly based on the fact that mission is participation in God's redeeming work in His world, which He began in His Son Jesus Christ and is continuing with His co-workers in the world. Obviously, Yun, like Barth, sees that mission is a theology of humanization because God became human in His Son Jesus Christ. By acknowledging Barth's point that the community of Jesus Christ really exists for the world, Yun holds that the task of the Christian community is thus to preach the love of God, the forgiveness of sins, peace and rest, that will eventually lead them to the Saviour Jesus Christ. In accordance with Barth, Yun also claims that the task of the community members is not only to witness to their vision granted by God and to take action with what they have witnessed, but also to which individual Christians are called upon to give people the love of Christ.<sup>244</sup>

On the one hand, Yun firmly grasps Barth's ecclesiological account of the Christian social mandate, by asserting that the mission can be defined as helping human neighbours so that they will be able to stand up as liberated people before God together with their community. On the other hand, he goes on to ground social responsibility on a larger theological truth, that namely mission is to participate closely in the lives of people within the community and to gain freedom in Christ by overcoming sufferings by the victory of the Christian faith. He makes social responsibility an important part of the church and develops it as an ethical mandate commissioned of all sincere Christian individuals.

Drawing from Barth's teaching regarding the community's charity towards the world, Yun states boldly, "...executing the missionary task is to bring the message of salvation to all peoples in order for them to have compassion for the community and to practice the love of Christ to others."<sup>245</sup> In Yun's case, as in Barth's, executing the missionary task is to put into practice the things that the people of God have learned from the biblical principles of evangelization so as to create a uniting community in the one Gospel of Jesus Christ in the whole world so that each individual member of the Christian community may be integrated into the world. Like Barth, Yun thus stresses that faith without action is dead. The action that needs to be taken is the spreading the Gospel of Christ throughout this world, whether that is to one's neighbour, or across the globe. Awareness of the missionary task, in Yun, is viewed as an educational process to allow Christians to evaluate their own values and life's direction by comparing them with non-Christians' lives, especially the worthiness of being spiritually faithful and sincere in Christ.<sup>246</sup>

In short, Yun's affirmation is, therefore, as Barth stressed, "a unity in multiplicity" in the ministry and witness of the community, that such an obedient action can eliminate the theology of church-centredness and the individualistic one-sidedness of Christianity, while fostering the theology of other worldliness.<sup>247</sup> In this way, as Yun argues, the church exists for the world, because God has sent out the community of believers into the world to

proclaim the Gospel of Christ. Clearly Barth and Yun share the common ground that the call of the Christian community is to spread the Gospel of Jesus Christ to all parts of the world by having sympathy for the poor heathen. The image and the reality of the mission fundamentally, in Barth and Yun, are “the proclamation, *kerygma*, of the Word of God,”<sup>248</sup> which can confirm the Lord of the Church as the Lord of all nations, that is, the beginning of the discovery of the Christological centre of ecumenical possibilities.<sup>249</sup>

Also, one of the most striking aspects of Yun’s reception of Barth’s ecclesiology is that he is definitely willing to follow Barth’s view of the Holy Spirit who empowers, guides, and maintains the community of Christ. In order for both the Confucian term *sung* and Barth’s Christocentrism to be harmonized and finally to bear the good fruit of indigenization, as Yun has claimed, the transcendent and immanent functions of the Holy Spirit are indispensable.<sup>250</sup> Yun stresses that the power of the Holy Spirit helps human beings communicate with God, and establish a cooperative relationship among all peoples in the world, by transcending their cultural and religious differences. In other words, the role of the Holy Spirit makes it possible not only to communicate between God and human beings vertically, but also to have a cooperative relationship between human beings horizontally; the power of the Holy Spirit transcends the cultural and religious differences between Eastern and Western people. Interestingly, he sees that both the work of the Holy Spirit and the role of people, who have received the power of the Holy Spirit, are equivalently significant. His understanding is that the work of the Holy Spirit helps the hearers of the Christian message to integrate its entire truth into their own specific context of inherited culture and religion.<sup>251</sup>

Stating the Holy Spirit as the enlightening power of the living Lord Jesus Christ according to Barth’s viewpoint, Yun boldly insists that the power of the Holy Spirit does not destroy intrinsic attributes of other religions, but rather explores their profound teachings in terms of identifying Christ as the absolute self-manifestation of God, as the fullness of truth, and as the eschatological presence of the Holy Spirit.<sup>252</sup> Yun ultimately

acknowledges Barth's position that the supernatural work of the Holy Spirit becomes the agent of Jesus Christ, and empowers the Christian community to gather, buildup, and ultimately send the Gospel of Christ to all peoples.<sup>253</sup>

However, the theological difference of Yun from Barth's Christologico-ecclesiological, or pneumatologico-ecclesiological concept is, as already stated, that the missionary task of the Christian community should be fulfilled in the form of theological indigenization within one's traditional context. Nonetheless, Yun always confirms Barth's theological principle of *tätigkeitsbereich* (the action of theology in the field) as his theological source and criterion.

For the justification of theological indigenization, Yun therefore suggests his own biblical interpretation of Jesus' teaching in parables, according to the Gospel of Matthew. One of them is the parable of the hidden treasure in the field (13: 1-23, 44), where there was a man who found treasure in a field and sold all his worthless goods to buy that treasure. Here "treasure" means the valuable thing, which might be regarded as the contents of the theological truth, the Gospel of Jesus Christ, but "worthless goods" denotes the method or idea for the studies of Christian theology. For Yun, the field is the place to know the realm of ordinary people's lives as well as the truths of Jesus' teachings in spiritual things. It is certainly "the world of other religions, where the missionary task of the Christian community should be accomplished in the form of transplanting the Word of God into their unique cultural and spiritual traditions, effectively and practically."<sup>254</sup> Yun has argued that one message can produce different results in different fields. This means that the fullness of the Word of God is absolute, but its interpretation and practical reflection are dependent upon one's inherited field; the matter is fundamentally not who is the preacher, but who is the hearer of the contents of Christian faith and how one is to interpret them according to his or her indigenous cultural and spiritual context.

Indigenization, for Yun, is thus the primary task of doing theology and the fulfillment of the special revelation of God in His Son Jesus Christ. This is because he

fundamentally believes that both culture and religion go together and they are reciprocally dependent upon each other, distinctively in the course of religious assimilation or contextualization. In such a context, Yun extensively defines the field as the Christian community or the church by asserting that the theology of Karl Barth is balanced between theory and practice at the same time; especially, Barth considers that the contents of theological truth should be proclaimed, taught, and practiced in the field of the Christian community. The field as the church (*tätigkeitsbereich*), in Barth and Yun, is the place for the fulfillment of theology (theory) and action (praxis) which can make the proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ operative and effective. To put it concretely, the field as the Christian community exists in the midst of the sinful world of other pluralistic religions. Yun, from that point forward, insists that cross-cultural understanding is primarily necessary to transplant the contents of theological truth, essentially the Gospel of Jesus Christ, into the human mind, but the form of theological methodology is the secondary element for a more profound attempt of indigenization later.<sup>255</sup>

Regarding Barth's reference to the ministry and witness of the community as its own action and speech in the midst of sinful and suffering humanity, Yun says in a carefully worded statement:

...executing the church's integral task of theological indigenization is to put the Word of God into practice...human ethical responsibility in the *missio Dei* is a presupposition. But ultimately if God does not give the growth, everything is in vain. Correspondingly human ethical responsibility finally involves two aspects; one is hearing the Word of God and the other is putting it into practice. Therefore the solutions to technical problems in theological indigenization are made possible through the power of the Holy Spirit. Its power consequently leads to a reformation of Christian theology and Christian education in Korea.<sup>256</sup>

It is precisely at this point, for Yun, that the content and the truth of the Gospel of Jesus Christ will not be distorted in the course of executing the task of theological indigenization. Based on the nature of Barth's Christocentric theology, Yun consequently highlights Jesus Christ as the absolute truth and self-manifestation of God who can be the Head of all heathen religions.<sup>257</sup> Christ, for him, is the key for the integration of the Confucian term *sung* and Barth's theology. It is in this sense that, as Yun has stated, in the Korean

Christian-Confucian context, Jesus Christ is the *sung* of an ultimate reality—the fulfillment of the Word of God—who provides the eternal Way, Truth and Life.<sup>258</sup>

Highlighting Barth's Christocentrism, Yun likewise explains that the heart of the teaching of Confucianism, especially in Korea, is to know the reality of *sung* in order for one to be fully human—knowing is acting. In other words, without knowing *sung*, the person neither attempts to be fully human or finds the *tao* (way) of truth and life. In this regard, Yun demonstrates that, “only those who realized their own reality in *sung* can be humble and obedient to the Ultimate (Heaven or God), and then they are able to execute their task of social service and foreign mission.”<sup>259</sup>

By paying full attention to Barth's description of the contents of the Gospel as a “message, *kerygma*, and proclamation,” Yun considers *sung* the touchstone of all knowledge concerning heaven and earth, human being and nature, beginning and end, limited and infinite, life and death, and ultimately the source of the whole.<sup>260</sup> In any case, Yun's positive reception of Barth is fundamentally on the ground of Barth's Christocentrism.

#### A Further Appraisal of Yun's Ecclesiologial Response to Barth

Yun's theology of Sung expresses the importance of theological indigenization or contextualization. Jesus Christ as *sung* is the centre of Yun's theological framework. His theological methodology is based on the Korean Confucian context for the purpose not only of applying the Confucian term *sung* as Christ Himself, but also for integrating Barth's Christocentric idea of the Church as the Christian community. Yun's principle is fundamentally to form the idea of *sung*—Jesus Christ—as the most basic foundation for the gathering, upbuilding and sending of the Korean Confucian-Christian community. Thus, both Barth's Christocentric ecclesiology and Yul-Gok's theory of *sung*, in Yun's theology, establish an indigenized Korean theology, which is unique and particular in the context of Korean Confucianism and Christianity.<sup>261</sup>

By adopting the Confucian term *sung* as the basic idea for understanding Barth's Christocentric theology, Yun elaborates his theology in accordance with Barth's work, the *Church Dogmatics*. He defines Barth's theology as Christocentrism or Word-centred (*das Wort*). Barth's theology is, as Yun has seen, concentrated in Jesus Christ; Christ becomes the source of all reconciliation and of all true fellowship, particularly the centre of everything for the gathering, upbuilding, sending and the new life of the Christian community in "glaube" (faith), "hoffnung" (hope) and "leibe" (love).<sup>262</sup>

Yun states that Barth's concern with systematic theology, especially ecclesiology, is based on the presence of Jesus Christ as "*das Wort Gottes*" and the living witness of the Christian community.<sup>263</sup> By affirming Barth's theological point of contact as always being Jesus Christ, he expounds the contents of *sung*—*i*, *ch'eng*, filial piety, *jen*, *jungyong*, and *tao*—as the person of Jesus Christ. He argues that Jesus Christ becomes the paradigm for the understanding of an important study of the relationship between grace and obedience, justification and sanctification, Gospel and Law, and the righteousness of God and the sinfulness of human beings.

Yun generally agrees with Barth regarding the identity of Jesus Christ as both the Head of His community and as a servant for all human beings. However, his great dependence upon Barth is particularly evident in that Jesus Christ as a servant for all people becomes the guarantor and true witness of their reconciliation. At this point, he correctly observes Barth's affirmation of Jesus Christ as the Crucified and Risen in a heavenly-historical form of existence, by arguing that "Christ humbles Himself by identifying Himself with the sinful human beings."<sup>264</sup> In the light of this theological perspective, Yun highlights the correlated Confucian concept of sincerity and *jungyong*, which basically means not force or power but moral and ethical authority. He goes on to say that,

*Sung*, in this sense, is not only the fundamental basis of *jungyong*, but also the harmony of all ideas and things. This is because the core of the concept of *sung* is centred on *jungyong*. In other words, *sung* as "sincerity" itself is theologically related to the doctrine of revelation in terms of the cultural and religious context in Korea, that is, the Christian-Confucian context.<sup>265</sup>

Most significantly, Yun emphasizes Barth's reference to unity in the plurality of the community under the headship of Jesus Christ who is simultaneously God Himself and a human being. Accordingly, he holds that the human Jesus is divine (*jung*), Christ is the Saviour (*yong*) for all peoples in the world. For him, Jesus and Christ cannot be divided; Jesus Christ is truly God/human, just as the law and the grace cannot be separated, but rather are fulfilled in Christ as reconciler by depending upon each other, mutually and respectively.<sup>266</sup> Yun also affirms Barth's view of the Church as both *invisibilis* and *visibilis*.

Unlike Barth, Yun tends to emphasize the importance of ethical duty for the upbuilding of the Christian community. For instance, he argues, "the redemptive function of Christ, in the context of Korean Christianity and Confucianism, can be understood when we try to explicate His distinctive identity as the Filial Son. This is because the unique nature of Jesus Christ as the Filial Son significantly becomes the fundamental norm of Christian-Confucian moral ethics for the building of the family-centred Christian community. Performing the duty of *hyo* or filial piety, in the Korean Christian-Confucian context, is for Yun regarded as a sincere attempt to accomplish something for our own community, that is, "an unconditional obedience to the Word of God for the purpose of upbuilding a perfect and genuine Christian community."<sup>267</sup>

Quite clearly, Yun states that such a humble and obedient action of the Christian community, in practicing the *tao* of filial piety, is like "*imitatio Christi*" based on Barth's point of view.<sup>268</sup> Practicing the *tao* is the way of fulfilling sincerity. This is because, as Yun asserted, it is considered as "...the process of achieving one's humanity by cultivating oneself with *i*, *jen*, and *ch'eng*, of regulating one's family, of bringing perfect integration to society and to the state, and of pacifying the Empire (that is, the world)."<sup>269</sup> The striking point of this principle is that its order is originated from "the Will of Heaven" (the Ultimate), in which both individual and communal ethics, that is, the interpersonal I-Thou relationship, are obvious. Here a new unity, as an inevitable element of one's sincere

compassionate intention, brings about a communal solidarity between individuals and the whole society; it actually gives guidance to others by rendering mutual assistance. This is only possible within the family-based community.<sup>270</sup> In Yun's understanding, accomplishing God's Will, in a community-based Confucian society, is to know the true nature of filial piety as the *tao* of Heaven and furthermore practice it sincerely. This is only possible in the father-son relationship within a family-centred community.

For Yun, Christ, as the Son of the Heavenly Father God, is portrayed as the most humble and obedient Filial Son; whom we recognize as the ultimate subjectivity of wisdom (*jen*), integrity (*ch'eng*), and true humanity—the incarnated Son of God or the Word as flesh (*sung*). Christ as *sung*, is therefore the most exemplary, real, concrete, and historical Son of filial piety, and the fulfillment of the perfect integrity of God's Will. Christ as *sung*, Yun has strongly argued, is “the center of Korean Christian-Confucian ethics as well as the fundamental reality of human history, who provides a life-giving unity between Heaven and earth, between Heaven and humans, and between oneself and others.”<sup>271</sup>

Since the difference between Barth's theology and Yun's is a matter of defining the name and the nature of the Ultimate, including the definitions of Heaven, God and *sung*, according to their own cultural and religious traditions, Yun indeed places the focus on the reality of *sung* as “the fulfillment of the Word of *tao*” in the context of Korean Confucianism.<sup>272</sup> The Word (*sung*), in Yun's concept, is denoted by the Ultimate (Heaven), and fulfilling the Word of *tao* means generically being fully human. Here, most of all, it is clear that in Barth, the person of Jesus Christ is identified as the Word of God and as the Saviour for all sinful peoples in the world, while Yun's principle of *sung* is commonly based on the goodness of human beings; one constantly must make an effort to be fully human and to be sincere to oneself and others. This means that Yun's theology of Sung seems to be limited to the context of the Korean Confucianism, which particularly focuses on the importance of ethical morality, rather than faith for the pursuit of one's eternal life after death, within the family or group-based community.

Accordingly, Yun fails to develop Barth's concept of *hominum confusio*, which describes humanity as sinful and speaks of a struggle to overcome estrangement and alienation from God the Creator. It, however, does not mean that Yun totally rejects Barth's view of human fallibility, but he rather tends to see the image of a human being in harmony with society and the universe on the basis of human perfectibility. Yun substantially takes into consideration the heart of Confucian teachings that a human being's self-realization and self-fulfillment; that is, of acquiring wisdom or sagacity, are all important, while Barth teaches Jesus Christ as "divine-human truth."<sup>273</sup> To be more specific, the human being is the centre in Confucianism, while Jesus Christ is the centre of Christianity, especially in Barth's concept of the Christian community. For Barth, a human being should fulfill his or her true identity of being created in the image of God. Thus, human confusion needs to be overcome by being justified and sanctified by the truth of God revealed in Jesus Christ, and being recreated according to the true image of God which we behold in Jesus Christ. A criticism of Yun's view of human goodness is thus that it requires a more articulate theory of human fallibility and sinfulness according to Confucianism as well as Barth's teaching of human fallibility.<sup>274</sup>

In spite of these differences between them, it is perhaps not surprising that Yun goes so far as to follow Barth's Christocentric doctrine of the Christian community, which is obviously mission-centred, by directing its unique and distinctive truth—the whole reality of the special revelation of God, which has been set forth and revealed in Jesus Christ—to all peoples. Therefore, he explicitly affirms Barth's insistence that the basic function of the church as the Christian community is to proclaim and explicate the Gospel spoken by God, that is, Jesus Christ, in order for fallen human beings to be justified, saved and sanctified by the continuous work of God through His Son Jesus Christ.<sup>275</sup>

In accordance with Barth, Yun's theological centre is primarily based on the unique nature of the person of Jesus Christ as "the Revealed, the Written, and the Preached Word of God."<sup>276</sup> To this extent, this doctrine, as Yun has asserted, is centred on the event of

special revelation itself—the birth, life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and the Son of God become human, the Word made flesh. The Church is thus, for him, the place for the community of all believers in Christ who are charged with their own fundamentally required tasks and activity, namely the proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, to the non-believers in the world.<sup>277</sup>

On the basis of Barth's theology, Yun represents his own idea of the tasks of the Christian community as ecumenism, social service, and foreign mission, but he does not fully take into account the rest of Barth's dogmatic work. For instance, Yun does not sufficiently explicate Barth's doctrinal affirmation of *catholica* and *apostolica*. Also he fails to develop Barth's doctrine of the people of God in world-occurrence in terms of Yul-Gok's theory of *sung*. Basically, his ultimate concern of the Christian community's task is in pursuing the unity of the church, for the Christian ecclesial community formation will enhance the expansion of the Kingdom of God. That is to say that Yun's most positive reception of Barth's ecclesiology is ecumenism, which determines the true nature of the Church and ultimately affirms the centrality of Jesus Christ as the sincere source for making the world one. Thus, he maintains that the main purpose of establishing the unity of the true church in Christ as *sung* is to gain a feeling of oneness among church members to unite in prayer, fellowship and worship service, for unity is the essence of the true church.<sup>278</sup>

As we have noted, Yun consistently emphasizes church unity, social service and mission as the most important ecclesiological themes, but he fails to acknowledge Barth's practical element of the community's form of diaconate, that is, a special ministry for both the community and outside. He always places social service as the community's primary task and foreign mission as secondary. Unlike Barth, Yun deems that the secondary matter which should take place after the task of social service is the work of missions, which must continue to grow and strengthen in order for the body of the Christian community to take

action by awakening non-believers to understand the Christian truth revealed in Jesus Christ.

Although Yun follows Barth's ecclesiological order, his reception of Barth's aspect of social service and mission is principally based on the content of the task of the community such as the "message, *kerygma*, proclamation." As the primary function of social service is to help dwellers of a slum area to find their own identity and self-help in the Gospel of Christ, one of the fundamental elements of the church mission is, in Yun's theology, to make known Jesus Christ as the Way, the Truth, and the Life to everyone. Thus the effort of the Korean Church for Yun is to continue to have a passion for missions by becoming a missionary body of Jesus Christ in her land—in the context of her own cultural-religious circumstance—and for the surrounding world.<sup>279</sup> Like Barth, Yun therefore considers missionary service as a normal part of Christian obedience in which the Korean Church should make her own contribution for the life of the church and for the world in the present as well as in the future.<sup>280</sup>

Having investigated Yun's theology of Sung and his ecclesiological response to Barth, we have acknowledged that Yun sought to integrate Barth's theology and Yul-Gok's theory of *sung* for the formation of indigenous Korean theology. Yun sees contextualization or indigenization as the impetus in searching for a new way to make Barth's theology more suitable to Korea's respective cultural and religious setting, that is, Confucianism. Therefore, he urges theological students and theologians to have a pre-understanding of Confucianism, which inspired, informed and confined the syncretic structure of the social and religious tradition of the Korean people throughout their long-inherited history.

Aron Park criticizes Yun's unique attempt at theological indigenization according to the neo-Confucian concept of *sung*, and Barth's Christocentric theology as problematic in that it is still debated by the most conservatively-oriented Korean theologians. His question to Yun is:

How can an indigenous theology, namely the theology of Sung, expound the contents of Christian faith such as the doctrines of the Holy Spirit, the forgiveness of sins, and the second coming of Jesus Christ, principally the history of salvation? To be specific, how can the historical events of Christ's birth, death and resurrection, exist in the context of Yul-Gok's philosophy of neo-Confucianism?<sup>281</sup>

Park argues, "Yun's theology of Sung cannot provide a historical turning point, which becomes the salvation event, the so-called missionary mandate."<sup>282</sup> The nature of *sung* as the likeness or symbol of Christ for Park does "not offer room for hearing, believing and repenting, for proclaiming and comprehending the message of the Gospel, the omnipotent grace of God in Jesus Christ."<sup>283</sup> Jae-Sik Chung further notes,

Confucianism does not know the way of salvation through the redeeming grace of the Lord Jesus Christ...Yun's theology of Sung merely becomes a theoretical basis for the comparative studies of Christianity and neo-Confucianism, particularly of Christian-Confucian ethics of filial piety.<sup>284</sup>

Therefore, the question, for Chung, is how Barth's Christocentric theology of the Christian community can be indigenized and contextualized by employing the ideology of Korean neo-Confucianism, especially within the context of *sung*, by integrating the contents of the Christian message into the local language and cultural perspective. Chung states that,

Yun's theological achievement is a progressive indigenization from the traditional theological thought of Korean evangelicalism...he radically challenged the ultra-conservative fundamentalist theology, which not only has dominated the history of Korean Christianity, but also put its essential message on the salvation of individual souls through the redeeming work of Jesus Christ...such an attempt at indigenous contextualization of the Christian faith, namely the theology of Sung, could stand in the way of a more penetrative encounter between Christianity and the local culture by not going far enough to discern deeper meanings of the cultural items under consideration in the context of the whole local culture.<sup>285</sup>

Indeed, there is at least one issue that is still debated by conservative Korean theologians regarding Yun's theological attempt at indigenization.<sup>286</sup> That is the danger of syncretism—conceptual ambiguity and a possible distortion of the Christian message by carrying out the task of theological indigenization. As Yun certainly uses the categories, concepts and concerns of Korean Confucian culture as well as of the Shamanistic myth of Tan-Gun, he seems to ignore the potential danger of cultural continuity and pluralism in the course of theological indigenization. This could create another form of Christian paganism, such as *Taejonggyo* (the religion of Tan-Gun, the mythical ancestor of Korean people),

*Chondogyo* (the religion of the Heavenly Way), *Taeulgyo* (the religion of Kang Chung-San), *Donghak* (the united religion of Buddhism, Confucianism, and Christianity) and so forth. We should remind ourselves that the main characteristics of Korean Christian life and theological reflection are traditionally more conservative, more legalistic and one-sided; that is, authentically in the “puritanical-fundamentalistic-revivalistic” character.<sup>287</sup> Therefore, Yun’s attempt might continually raise questions regarding the problem of syncretism or distortion of the Christian doctrine, which would be complex and filled with ambiguities in understanding the Christological singularity or the truth of God revealed in His Son Jesus Christ.

However, as Yun firmly believes, it is true that Confucianism contributed directly and indirectly to individual stability and social solidarity, as well as morality in Korea. Moreover, its strong ethical legacy for both personal and group harmony became the leading system of thought in the culture, society, economy and politics of the Korean people. Due to this stabilizing influence of Confucianism, as we have examined in Chapter One, it was also natural that Roman Catholicism and Protestantism were initially introduced and developed by Korean Confucian scholars who were not only eager to reform their corrupted Confucian government, but also apparently saw Christianity as a new ideology which could build a political as well as a family system of harmony and morality for the people of Korea. Clearly, Korean Christianity was most strongly influenced by Confucianism and still is.<sup>288</sup> Accordingly, we cannot deny Yun’s insistence that Korean Christianity is strikingly a Confucian-influenced Christianity and that therefore the indigenization of Karl Barth’s theology within the Korean Confucian context is a viable theological enterprise.

---

### End Notes for Chapter Three

<sup>1</sup>During this period, the Korean Church was subject to state controls and lost its identity as the true body of Christ with the trials it faced and the confusion which subsequently set in (See Chai-Yong Choo, “A Brief Sketch of a Korean Christian History from the Minjung Perspective,” in *Minjung Theology: People as the Subjects of History*, ed. Yong-Bock Kim [Singapore: The Commission on Theological Concerns, The Christian Conference of Asia, 1981], 74). The Korean Church not only “yielded to the enforcement of the Japanese Shrine (Shintoism), but became captive to those who were striving for ecclesiastical authority” (Jung-Young Lee, “The American Missionary Movement in Korea, 1882-1945: Its Contributions and American Diplomacy,” 399).

<sup>2</sup>For Chung’s other works, see Kyung-Ok Chung, *Naneu Eirokae Salalda, Nanen Eirokae Whachulda* [I Lived and Proclaimed] (Seoul: Kohyung Suewon, 1982). For Chung’s life and theological characteristics, see Sung-Bum Yun, “Kyung-Ok Chung’s Personality and His Theological Contribution to the Church in Korea,” in *YSBS.*, VI, 347-357. Also for the theological trend of the Methodist Church in Korea during the 1930s and onward, see Sung-Sam Lee, *History of the Methodist Church and the Methodist Theological Seminary in Korea* (Seoul: Hankuk Kyoyuk Publishing Co., 1977).

<sup>3</sup>For details on the rise of Barthianism in Korea in the 1930s and the 1940s, see Chang-Sik Lee, “A Historical Review of Theological Thought for the Last One Century in Korea,” *East Asia Journal of Theology* 3/2 (1985): 321-326.

<sup>4</sup>Chai-Yong Choo, “A Brief Sketch of a Korean Christian History from the Minjung Perspective,” 75.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>Further details on this theological trend in Korea can be found in Taik-Poo Chun, *The History of Christian Development in Korea* (Seoul: The Christian Literature Society, 1985) and Seung-Tae Kim, *Historical Reflection of Korean Christianity* (Seoul: Word of Life Press, 1994).

<sup>7</sup>See Yong-Bok Kim, “Karl Barth’s Political Theology and Korean Minjung Theology,” in *Korean Minjung and Christianity* (Seoul: Hyungsung Sa, 1981), 264-288.

<sup>8</sup>Barth, *CD.*, IV/2, 664-665. Also cf. IV/3, 694, 767.

<sup>9</sup>David Kwang-Sun Suh, “Minjung and Theology in Korea: A Biographical Sketch of an Asian Theological Consultation,” in *Minjung Theology*, 17-18.

<sup>10</sup>For an additional reference see Heup-Young Kim, *Wang Yang-Ming and Karl Barth: A Confucian-Christian Dialogue*, 1-12.

<sup>11</sup>For example, Yong-Bok Kim’s *Korean Minjung and Christianity* (Seoul: Hyungsung Sa, 1981) represents Minjung theologians’ understanding of *kongdongchae* (community) which was inspired by Barth’s socio-political approach. For a further similar theological understanding regarding “the people of God” or “Christian community” between Minjung theologians and Karl Barth, see Byung-Mu Ahn. “The Korean Church’s Understanding of Jesus,” *International Review of Mission* 74/293 (Jan, 1985): 81-91; Arnulf Camps, “A Reflection on ‘Theology by the People’,” *Ministerial Formation* 29 (Mr,

---

1985): 3-6; Yong-Bock Kim, ed., *Minjung Theology: People as the Subjects of History* (Singapore: The Commission on Theological Concerns, The Christian Conference of Asia, 1981); and Hyun-Kyung Chung, "Han-pu-ri: Doing Theology from Korean Women's Perspective," *Ecumenical Review* 40 (January 1988): 27-36.

<sup>12</sup>Sung-Bum Yun (1916-1979) was formerly principal of the Methodist Theological Seminary, Seoul, Korea, and taught Systematic Theology there. He studied at Doshisha University, Japan, and also at Basel University, Switzerland, under Karl Barth. His major research area was the theological indigenization of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, especially as an indigenous Korean Christian-Confucian theology on the basis of Karl Barth's Christ-centred ecclesiology.

<sup>13</sup>*Church, Mission and Education* (Seoul: Chunmangsa, 1982), *Ecclesiology in light of Basileia and Ecclesia* (Seoul: Taehan Kidokkyo Seohae, 1998), *Practical Ecclesiology* (Seoul: Taehan Kidokkyo Seohae, 1999), and *The Witness of the Word of God* (Seoul: Sungkwan Munhwasa, 1980).

<sup>14</sup>See Chai-Yong Choo, "A Brief Sketch of Korean Christian History from the Minjung Perspective," 76.

<sup>15</sup>For some evidence of this, see Young-Han Kim, *Barth eaisu Moltmann kagi* [From Barth to Moltmann] (Seoul: The Christian Literature Society, 1982) and Chul-Won Suh, "Critique of Karl Barth's Theology," *Shinhak Jinam* 258 (Spring 1999): 160-171.

<sup>16</sup>Since both the Presbyterian Seminary of Korea, and the Methodist Theological Seminary have taught Karl Barth's theology from the early 1960s, it was around the late 1970s that the theology of Karl Barth was taught at most seminaries such as Ehwa Woman's University School of Theology, Yonsei University Faculty of Divinity, Hankuk, Reformed, and Seoul Theological Seminaries.

<sup>17</sup>For a historical background of the denominational conflict between Tonghap and Hapdong Presbyterians in Korea, see Tail-Poo Chun, *The History of Christian Development in Korea* (Seoul: The Christian Literature Society, 1985); Eui-Hwan Kim, "A Historical Review of Korean Christian Theology (1900-1945): Focusing the Presbyterian and Methodist Church," *Shinhak Jinam* 65/4 (Winter 1998): 7-33; Seung-Tae Kim, *Historical Reflection of Korean Christianity* (Seoul: Word of Press, 1994); and Dong-Sik Yu, "A Historical Survey regarding the Formation of the Korean Christian Theology," *Kidokkyo Sasang* (June 1968): 112-117.

<sup>18</sup>See Chul-Ha Han, "Analysis of Theological Circumstance in Korea," *Church and Theology* 2 (1966): 83-97.

<sup>19</sup>After Chul-Ha Han completed his doctorate at the Union Theological Seminary in New York, he was very active in introducing Karl Barth's theology to Korea. His Barth-related works are as follows: "An Asian Critique of Western Theology," *Evangelical Review of Theology* 7/1 (April 1983): 34-47; "Is there God outside of the Church?" *Church and Theology* 6 (1973): 22-32; "Karl Barth's Interpretation of Anselm's Theology," *ibid.*, 3 (1970): 100-120; and "Korean Theology and Church," *ibid.*, 4 (1971): 46-73.

<sup>20</sup>See *Somang Presbyterian Church Calendar* published in 1998 and *The Assembly Meeting of The Presbyterian Church in Korea* published in 1998.

---

<sup>21</sup>For detailed statistics of the congregational number of the Presbyterian Church and other Protestant denominations in Korea since the 1980s, see the Ministry of Culture & Information, *The Present State of Religious Organization in Korea* (Seoul, 1980) and The Christian Academy, *The Phenomenon and Structure of Holy Spirit Movement in Korea* (Seoul: The Christian Literature Society, 1982), 229.

<sup>22</sup>For his understanding of Barth's theology, see Sun-Hee Kwak, "The proclamation of the Word of God and the Korean Church," *Church and Theology* 5 (1972): 47-55; *idem*, "The Task of the Church for the Contemporary Society," *ibid.*, 6 (1973): 85-93; and *idem*, "The Scripture as the Word of God: Calvin's View of Scripture," *ibid.*, 4 (1971): 168-187.

<sup>23</sup>Myung-Yong Kim's thesis topic for a doctorate is "Der Gottesbegriff Karl Barths in der heutigen Diskussion" (Th. D. Thesis, Tübingen University, 1985). And his published articles are "Karl Barth's Theological Reflection on Socio-political Movements," *Kidokkyo Sasang* (Aug, 1986): 90-105 and "Karl Barth's Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans," *Theology and Church* 20 (1988): 103-133.

<sup>24</sup>For a fuller list of Barth-related masters' and doctoral theses by Korean theological students one can access the Korea Library Computer System, which is available at most Korean theological seminaries.

<sup>25</sup>The following theses were written by Baptist Theological Seminary graduates: Myung-Soo Kim's "Karl Barth's Doctrine of God" (1995); and Won-Bong Lee's "Karl Barth's Ecclesiology" (1995).

<sup>26</sup>There are six masters' theses, which were supervised by Professor Shin-Keun Lee: In-Sook Hong's "Karl Barth's Theology of Mission and His Ecclesiology" (1987); June Huh's "Karl Barth's Doctrine of Reconciliation" (1995); Bo-Kyung Kim's "Karl Barth's Understanding of Sin" (1988); Seo-Taek Oh's "Karl Barth's Ecclesiology: An Examination of Church Dogmatics IV/1, 2, and 3" (1994); Seong-Seok Park's "Karl Barth's View of the Relationship between Church and State" (1994); Byung-Hoo Soen's "Karl Barth's Doctrine of Election" (1991); and Soon-Chul Yang's "Political Ethics in Karl Barth's Doctrine of Reconciliation" (1993).

<sup>27</sup>For example, the following three masters' theses, which have been written by Presbyterian Seminary graduates, have examined Barth's ecclesiology: Jae-Eun Lee's "Karl Barth's Ecclesiology in relation to His Theology of Mission" (1993); Chul-Min Kim's "Karl Barth's Doctrine of the Church" (1993) and Dok-Man Lee's "Karl Barth's Ecclesiology" (1992). Two other masters' theses have also commanded particular attention as exemplary works: Jung-Keon Chun's "Karl Barth's Doctrine of the Church" (1993); and Young-Hwan Kim's "A Biblical Doctrine of the Church on the Basis of Karl Barth's Ecclesiology" (1994).

<sup>28</sup>Park's other Barth-related works are "Socio-political Issue and Task in Christian Theology," *Shinhak Sasang* 19 (1979); "Theory and Praxis in Communism and Christianity," *Kidokkyo Sasang* (March 1983); and "Karl Marx and Karl Barth," *Soongshil University Research Centre for Theology and Sociology* (1988).

<sup>29</sup>In this work, Han developed Barth's theology of mission systematically and asserted that Barth's theology is biblical as well as practical.

---

<sup>30</sup>Some of their works are as follows: Keun-Hwan Kang's "Korean Church's Ecclesiological Principle on the basis of Karl Barth's Doctrine of the Church," *Seoul Theological Seminary Journal* 2 (Feb, 1991); Dok-Hyung Han's "Karl Barth's Theology and Hermeneutics," *Christian Thought* 467 (November 1997): 91-109; Shin-Keun Lee's "Karl Barth's Understanding of the Kingdom of God," *Seoul Theological Seminary Journal* 5 (December 1994): 201-216; and Chang-Kyun Mok's *Theological Debate in the Twentieth Century* (1995).

<sup>31</sup>Some of Taean Kidokkyo Seohae's Korean translations and publications of Barth-related works are as follows: Karl Barth, *Homiletik: wesen und vorbereitung der predigt*, tran. In-Kyu Jeong (1999); *idem*, *The Humanity of God*, tran. Kyung-Yun Chun (1994); *idem*, *Kurze erklarung des Römerbriefes*, tran. Kyung-Yun Chun (1966); Georges Casalis, *Karl Barth's Life and Theological Thought*, tran. Young Choi (1993); and Karl Barth Society in Korea, *The Word of God and Theology* (1995). Also Handel's publication is: Karl Barth, *Letzte Zeugnisse*, tran. Mee-Hyun Chung (1997).

<sup>32</sup>The leading members of the "Karl Barth Society" in Korea are Professors Shin-Keun Lee, Kwang-Sik Kim, Kyun-Jin Kim, Jong-Ho Choi, Myung-Yong Kim, Mee-Hyun Jeong and Young-Sok Oh. There are also many members of this society who graduated from the Presbyterian Seminary of Korea, the Methodist, Hankuk, and Seoul Theological Seminaries. Kyun-Jin Kim, Professor of Christian Theology at Yonsei University School of Theology, is presently a leading figure in the "Karl Barth Society" in Korea.

<sup>33</sup>The Karl Barth Society, preface to *The Word of God and Theology* (Seoul: The Christian Literature Society, 1995). As we have observed, Barth's theological impact upon Korean theologians is not confined to Presbyterians and Methodists, but is also found among the Baptists and the Evangelical Holiness Church. For theological trends in Korea in the 1990s and Korean theologians' understanding of Barth's theology, see Yong-Kyu Park, "The Birth of Korean Evangelicalism," *Shinhak Jinam* 65/3 (Fall 1998): 270-303.

<sup>34</sup>Sung-Bum Yun, *Hankukjok Shinhak: Song ui Haesokhak* [The Korean Theology: The Hermeneutics of Sincerity] (Seoul: Sunmyung Munhwasa, 1972), 17. The Confucian concept *sung* (sincerity or integrity), in particular, implies a very deep-rooted cultural, religious, and social substance in the mind of Korean people. It extensively refers to one's sincere or faithful relationship with others and with God (Heaven). See Yun, *Ibid.*, 16-24.

<sup>35</sup>Sung-Bum Yun, "Theology of Sincerity: an attempt to form a Korean theology," *The Northeast Asia Journal of Theology* 5-6 (1970), 74-75.

<sup>36</sup>Yun, *Hankukjok Shinhak*, 31. Yun further suggests that the term *sung* refers to "gottlicher Verstand" in the case of using Kant's terms and "Tat-Wort," "Redlichkeit" or "Wahrhaftigkeit." Those terms generally refer to truth, the possibility of Word (*Rede*) or the source of the Word. In the Korean language, the etymology of Word is interestingly derived from terms such as *muri* (head), *mari* (top), *marir* (origin), *maru* (source) or *mara* (cause). In this sense, the Word implies originality or an ultimate source of existence in the Korean people's religious concept. For example, in Korean Shamanism, the Word (*Tao*) is considered as coming from heaven, where an unknown god exists and speaks some valuable truth or instruction for the people on earth, through the Shamanistic performer, namely, *Mu-dang*. For a detailed explanation of this see Korean National Research Centre, *Dictionary of Korean Words* (Seoul: Dosan Donga, 1999), 1547-1548; Research Centre for the Study of North Korean Social and Scientific Languages, *Dictionary of Old Korean*

---

Words (Seoul: Sahae Kwahak Publish Press, 1992), 748; and Yun, "Theology of Sincerity," 74.

<sup>37</sup>Sung-Bum Yun, *Hankukjok Shinhak: Song ui Haesokhak* [The Korean Theology: The Hermeneutics of Sincerity] (Seoul: Sunmyung Munhwasa, 1972), 61. Also cf. *idem*, "Theology of Sung," in *YSBS.*, II, 31 and Martin Heidegger, *Platonslehre von der Wahrheit, mit einem Brief über den Humanismus* (1954), 60ff.

<sup>38</sup>Yun, "Theology of Sincerity: an attempt to form a Korean theology," 73.

<sup>39</sup>Sung-Bum Yun, "Korean Confucianism and Korean Theology," in *YSBS.*, II, 75.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., 77. Also cf. Sung-Bum Yun, "The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit," in *YSBS.*, IV, 482-483 and Barth, *CD.*, I/1, 172-173.

<sup>41</sup>Yun, "Korean Confucianism and Korean Theology," 75. Quoting Bultmann's work *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (1957), Yun further explains that the Hebrew terms *dhabar* and *ruah* spell differently, but both mean the Word of God. In this respect, the Greek terms *λόγος* and *νόος* represent both God and His Son Jesus Christ. Therefore, Jesus Christ as *Logos* becomes God. See Yun, *Hankukjok Shinhak*, 24 and cf. R. Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, 6ff.

<sup>42</sup>Yun, "The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit," 486.

<sup>43</sup>Sung-Bum Yun, *Karl Barth* (Seoul: The Christian Literature Society of Korea, 1968), 110. Also cf. Barth, *CD.*, I/1, 88-120.

<sup>44</sup>Yun., "Korean Confucianism and Korean Theology," 75.

<sup>45</sup>Sung-Bum Yun, "Christian Confucianism as an attempt at a Korean Indigenous Theology," *Northeast Asia Journal of Theology* 24-25 (1980), 108.

<sup>46</sup>Yun, "Theology of Sincerity," 76. Quoting the existentialist Karl Jaspers' such works as *Philosophische Glaube angesichts der Offenbarung* (1962) and *Vom Ursprung und Ziel der Geschichte* (1952), Yun claims that Jesus Christ's universal function of salvation for all peoples can be expressed by the Korean language *sung*. See Yun, *Hankukjok Shinhak*, 30.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., 75.

<sup>48</sup>Sung-Bum Yun, "Tae-Gae and Yul-Gok's Understanding of the Heaven," in *YSBS.*, II, 468.

<sup>49</sup>Yun, "Christian Confucianism as an attempt at a Korean Indigenous Theology," 108.

<sup>50</sup>Yun, "Tae-Gae and Yul-Gok's Understanding of Heaven," 471.

<sup>51</sup>Yun, "Theology of Sincerity," 75.

---

<sup>52</sup>Yun, *Hankukjok Shinhak*, 22. Also cf. Yul-Gok, *Compendium*, from chapter “Sincerity.” Yun is also influenced by Jürgen Moltmann who has stressed the transcendence of God over time by thinking of Him primarily as the God of the future. Quoting Moltmann’s *Theologie der Hoffnung* (1969), Yun claims that the theology of Sung emphasizes what God will be and do. Accordingly, he asserts that God is changeless and timeless. God is not restricted within a particular geographical location such as Europe or North America. He cannot be localized, because He has access to the whole of the creation at all times. In this respect, the theological description of the existence of God for Yun should not be confined within the European languages, but expressed according to one’s particular cultural languages. For Yun, the Korean Confucian term *sung* is able to express God’s true nature, i.e., “*Gottesbeweis aus Gott*.” This is because the term *sung* contains both “sincerity” (*vere deus*) and “disposition” (*vere homo*). See Yun, *Hankukjok Shinhak*, 48-49 and cf. Moltmann, *Theologie der Hoffnung* (1969), 256ff.

<sup>53</sup>Sung-Bum Yun, “The Idea of God in Neo-Confucianism, especially in Tae-Gye and Yul-Gok,” in *Hankuk Yookyo Ya Hankukjok Shinhak* [Korean Confucianism and Korean Theology] (Seoul: Methodist Theological Seminary Press, 1998), 475.

<sup>54</sup>Yun also quotes Pascal, “humanity can be ultimately blissful in God, but miserable without God.” See Yun, “Theology of Sincerity,” 76 and cf. Pascal, *Pensées et Opuscules* (Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1935), 15, 42.

<sup>55</sup>Yun, “Theology of Sincerity,” 76. Yun asserts that if Yul-Gok’s idea of *sung* was interpreted biblically, it would not be difficult for the evangelization of non-Christians in Asia, particularly China, Japan, and Korea. Yun, adopting an extreme point of view, urges that “all religions must take this *sung* (sincerity) as their ultimate goal, and try to reach it. Methodology can be diverse, such as autonomy or theonomy, but the main task of the Christian community is to proclaim this truthful and faithful teaching of *sung* to the ignorant human beings accurately” (*Ibid.*).

<sup>56</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>57</sup>Yun, “Theology of Sung,” in *YSBS.*, II, 35. Also cf. Spencer J. Palmer, *Korea and Christianity* (Seoul: Hollym Corporation, 1967), 8.

<sup>58</sup>Yun further quotes Emmanuel Aegetter’s work *Les Grandes Religions* (Paris, 1956) for the explanation of the Korean concept of *ch’on*. As Aegetter sees Asian the concept of heaven as “*une civilisation*” or “*une étiquette*,” Yun argues that Korean people’s concept of “*ch’on*” is based on their deep-rooted respect for heaven and humanity. Thus, *ch’on* for Korean people, as Yun has argued, is the most objective truth for the understanding of universe, heaven and earth, and human being. See Yun, *Kidokkyo wa Hankuk Sasang*, 41-49. Also cf. Soederblom, *Das Werden des Gottesglaubens* (1926), 194 and Eliade, *Das Heilige und das Profane, vom Wesen des Religiösen* (1957), 70.

<sup>59</sup>The historical record of the Tan-gun myth is contained in the *Samguk Yusa* [Remained History of the Three Kingdoms] (Seoul: Chosun munhakhoe, 1929) compiled by a Buddhist priest, Iryon (1206-1289), who lived during the reign of King Chung-ryol of the Koryo dynasty (918-1393 AD).

<sup>60</sup>See Yun, “Theology of Sung,” 33-34.

<sup>61</sup>Yun, “Theology of Sung,” 34-35.

---

<sup>62</sup>Ibid. With reference to this myth, see James H. Grayson, “The Myth of Tan’gun: A Dramatic Structural Analysis of a Korean Foundation Myth,” in *Korea Journal* 37/1 (Spring 1997): 35-52.

<sup>63</sup>Yun, “Theology of Sung,” 35. Also, cf. Palmer, *Korea and Christianity*, 14.

<sup>64</sup>Yun, “Theology of Sung,” 35. Yun further indicates that the concept of *Hananim* in the Tan-gun myth is quite different from the relative-dualistic principle of *yin* and *yang* in Chinese Neo-Confucian philosophy, which understands Heaven as a *yang* and Earth as a *yin*. Yun sees that a Trinitarian idea of God in Korean Neo-Confucianism is itself unique and religiously transcendental. The following literatures are helpful for an understanding of the Tan-Gun myth and the concept of *Hananim*: Sung-Bum Yun, “Hwan-in, Hwan-ung, Hwan-gon-un got Hananim-ida” [Hwanin, Hwanung, Hwangom, truly Gods], *Sasangge* (May 1963): 263-264; *idem*, “The Idea of God in the Neo-Confucianism, especially in Tae-Gye and Yul-Gok,” 474-476; Se-Myong Paek, “*Hankuk sasang-ui urae wa changnae*” [Korean Thought, Its Origin and Future], *Hankuk sasang* III/4 (April 1960): 263-264; and Pyong-Do Yi, *Kuksa Taegwan* [General Survey of the National History] (Seoul, 1954), 26.

<sup>65</sup>Yun, *ST.*, 63.

<sup>66</sup>Yun, “Theology of Sung,” 77.

<sup>67</sup>Ibid., 82.

<sup>68</sup>At this point, Yun agrees with Paul Tillich’s assertion that “reason does not produce an object of ultimate concern by logical procedures...” (See Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, vol. I, 66). For Yun, Jesus Christ’s virgin birth, crucifixion, and bodily resurrection cannot be understood, but should be believed. This means that the believer needs a firm conviction before he or she makes what Tillich called “an ultimate commitment to the ultimate.” As Tillich has argued that the contents of faith grasp reason, Yun believes that our absolute faith in Christ is primary, but reason or logic is secondary for the understanding of paradoxical statements in Christian theology. Thus, Yun applies Tillich’s concept of “an ultimate commitment” to the Confucian concept of *shin* (faith), which implies an ultimate trust for human relationship within family-centred Confucian community. Without this Confucian term *shin*, Jesus Christ’s life, death, and resurrection, as Yun argues, cannot be explained to the people of Korea. This is because the term *shin* grasps reason (*ri*) and knowledge (*ji*). See Yun, *Kidokkyo wa Hankuk Sasang*, 111-121.

<sup>69</sup>Yun, *ST.*, 64.

<sup>70</sup>Yun, “Theology of Sung,” 79.

<sup>71</sup>Yun, *ST.*, 64.

<sup>72</sup>Yun, “Theology of Sung,” 79.

<sup>73</sup>Ibid., 93.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., 79.

<sup>75</sup>Ibid.

---

<sup>76</sup>Ibid., 77.

<sup>77</sup>Yun, *ST.*, 65-66. Yul-Gok's unifying principle of *yi* (objective, reason) and *je* (subjective, will), namely, the nature of *kigil*, aesthetically refers to the sincere faith of human beings and also Heaven's unconditional grace for all peoples on the earth. This is eventually united with another of his theories such as *jungyong*, that implies the mutual relationship between Law and Gospel; *jung* belongs to the Law of humanity in the sense of one's justice, benevolence, and righteousness, but *yong* signifies the Gospel of propriety, wisdom and sincerity. Here *yong* is more identical with Christ who is not only seen as the provider of gracious redemption, salvation, and the forgiveness of sins, but as the Head of His Christian community.

<sup>78</sup>Ibid., 66.

<sup>79</sup>Ibid.

<sup>80</sup>For the explanation of the Confucian term *sung* as "God's fulfilled Word," Yun extensively quotes Martin Heidegger's works such as *Platonslehre von der Wahrheit, mit einem Brief über den Humanismus* (1954), *Sein und Zeit* (1962) and *Underwegs zur Sprache* (1957). See Yun, *Hankukjok Shinhak*, 11-35.

<sup>81</sup>See Yun, *Hankukjok Shinhak*, 24 and cf. Barth, *CD.*, IV, 1ff.

<sup>82</sup>See Yun, "Theology of Sung," 91.

<sup>83</sup>Yun, "Theology of Sung," 82.

<sup>84</sup>See Yun, *ST.*, 66-67.

<sup>85</sup>See Yun, *ST.*, 62 and cf. Barth, *CD.*, III/2, 485; IV/2, 48, 53.

<sup>86</sup>See Sung-Bum Yun, *Kidokkyo wa Hankuk Sasang* [Christianity and Korean Thought] (Seoul: Daehan Kidokkyo Seohae, 1964), 37, 111, 227.

<sup>87</sup>See Yun, *Kidokkyo wa Hankuk Sasang*, 126, 227 and cf. O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963), 9.

<sup>88</sup>R. Bultmann, "The Study of Synoptic Gospels," in *Form Criticism: Two Essays on New Testament Research*, eds. R. Bultmann and Karl Kundsin (New York: Harper, 1941), 46ff.

<sup>89</sup>See R. Bultmann, "New Testament and Mythology," in *Kerygma and Myth*, ed. Hans Bartsch (New York: Harper & Row, 1961), 1-44.

<sup>90</sup>See Yun, *Kidokkyo wa Hankuk Sasang*, 11, 37-38, 227.

<sup>91</sup>See Yun, *Kidokkyo wa Hankuk Sasang*, 116, 120, 222, 228ff. Also cf. Martin Heidegger, *Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes* (1962) and *idem, Being and Time* (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), 85, 163-168.

<sup>92</sup>Yun, *Kidokkyo wa Hankuk Sasang*, 111 and cf. Paul Tillich, *Theology of Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959), esp., Chapter VI, entitled "Protestantism and Artistic Style," 68-75.

---

<sup>93</sup>See Yun, *Kidokkyo wa Hankuk Sasang*, 111. Also cf. Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, vol. I, 1-8 and *idem*, *Theology of Culture*, esp., Chapter XV, entitled “Communicating the Christian Message: A Question to Christian Ministers and Teachers,” 201-213.

<sup>94</sup>See Hans W. Frei, “The ‘Literal Reading’ of Biblical Narrative in the Christian Tradition: Does It Stretch or Will It Break?” in *The Bible and the Narrative Tradition*, ed. Frank McConnell (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 36-77 and *idem*, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974).

<sup>95</sup>In *The Canada Crisis* (Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1980), Hall specifically speaks to the Canadian situation out of this same classical Protestant tradition.

<sup>96</sup>See John W. de Gruchy, *Liberating Reformed Theology: A South African Contribution to an Ecumenical Debate* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1991), 114 and cf. Douglas John Hall, *Thinking the Faith: Christian Theology in a North American Context* (Minneapolis, MN.: Augsburg, 1989), 166.

<sup>97</sup>See Yun, *Hankukjok Shinhak*, 11-29.

<sup>98</sup>Douglas John. Hall, *Thinking the Faith*, 21.

<sup>99</sup>*Ibid.*, 85.

<sup>100</sup>*Ibid.*, 20. Also cf. Sung-Bum Yun, “A Theological Approach to the Indigenization of the Gospel,” *Northeast Asia Journal of Theology* 3 (1969): 29-37, 29-31.

<sup>101</sup>Douglas John Hall, *Thinking the Faith*, 21. Also cf. Yun, preface to *Hankukjok Shinhak*, i. Hall defines the meaning of contextuality in Christian theology as follows: (1) A dimension of the whole task; (2) A conscious element; (3) The context as contributor to theological discourse; (4) Christian immersion in the context; (5) Context, form, and content; and (6) Theology as the meeting of stories. For a detailed discussion, see Douglas John Hall, *Thinking the Faith*, esp., entitled “Defining Contextuality,” 75-93. Also for Hall’s other contextual theology-related literatures see *Confessing the Faith: Christian Theology in a North American Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996); *Hope against Hope: Towards an Indigenous Theology of the Cross* (Geneva: World Student Christian Federation, 1971); *Professing the Faith: Christian Theology in a North American Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993); and *The Reality of the Gospel and the Unreality of the Churches* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975).

<sup>102</sup>Like Barth, Yun prefers to use the phrase “Christian community” rather than “Church,” in referring to the people of God, the believing, and the spiritual community. Basically, Yun’s ecclesiological attempt is to explain the characteristics of the Korean Church as community-based in Confucianism, and to integrate it with Barth’s Christ-centred ecclesiology for the church in Korea.

<sup>103</sup>Yun, *Karl Barth*, 176.

<sup>104</sup>Yun, *ST.*, 67. Also, cf. Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, vol. I, 65-67.

<sup>105</sup>Yun, *Karl Barth*, 165. Cf. Barth, *CD.*, IV/1, 662.

---

<sup>106</sup>Yun, *ST*, 67. Also cf. *idem*, *YSBS.*, II, 103; and Barth, *CD.*, IV/1, 654-655.

<sup>107</sup>See Yun, *ST.*, 67-84. And cf. the letters exchanged with Adolf von Harnack in 1923: H. Martin Rumscheidt, *Revelation and Theology: An analysis of the Barth-Harnack correspondence of 1923* (Cambridge: University Press, 1972), 35 and *passim*; Eberhard Busch, *Karl Barth: His life from letters and autobiographical texts*, trans. J. Bowden (London: SCM, 1976), 448 and *passim*.

<sup>108</sup>Yun, "Theology of Sung," 87.

<sup>109</sup>*Ibid.*, 88.

<sup>110</sup>Yun, *ST.*, 73-74.

<sup>111</sup>*Ibid.*, 71.

<sup>112</sup>*Ibid.*, 69.

<sup>113</sup>Yun, "Theology of Sung," 37. It is important to note that the thought of Confucius embraced no consideration of the supernatural, except for an impersonal divine order referred to as heaven, which left human affairs alone as long as relative order and good government prevailed on earth. In this sense, Confucianism was a religion without a god. See Yun, "Korean Confucianism and Korean Theology," 416-420.

<sup>114</sup>Yun, *Karl Barth*, 176. Cf. Barth, *CD.*, IV/1, 670-671.

<sup>115</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, VI, 30.

<sup>116</sup>*Ibid.*, 33.

<sup>117</sup>See Yun, *Karl Barth*, 171-173.

<sup>118</sup>Korean culture is particularly centred on the inevitability of harmony and accord within the family, society, and the state. Yun stresses that without the proper basis of harmony and sincerity in every society, there would not be any ethics, religion, or philosophy for the true life of human beings. Therefore, for him, *sung* itself not only manifests a harmony and unity, but ultimately the special revelation of God in His Son Jesus Christ. This is due to His universal function of salvation for all peoples in the world. See Yun, "Korean Confucianism and Korean Theology," 428-435.

<sup>119</sup>Yun, *ST.*, 77.

<sup>120</sup>Sung-Bum Yun, "The Concept of Humanity in Confucianism and Christianity," in *YSBS.*, II, 452.

<sup>121</sup>*Ibid.*, 431. For the influence of Confucianism upon every sphere of Korean people's lives, see Everett N Hunt. Jr., *Protestant Pioneers in Korea* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1980).

<sup>122</sup>Yun, "The Concept of Humanity in Confucianism and Christianity," 450.

<sup>123</sup>Sung-Bum Yun, "Filial Piety and Contemporary Ethics," in *YSBS.*, III, 290.

---

<sup>124</sup>Sung-Bum Yun, “Cur Deus Homo and the Contextualization of the Gospel of God,” in *YSBS.*, I, 340.

<sup>125</sup>Yun, “The Concept of Humanity in Confucianism and Christianity,” 405.

<sup>126</sup>Sung-Bum Yun, “Religious Thought in Korean Shamanism,” *YSBS.*, I, 150-151.

<sup>127</sup>Yun, “Korean Church and Christianity,” in *YSBS.*, II, 417-419.

<sup>128</sup>Ibid., 406.

<sup>129</sup>Ibid., 405.

<sup>130</sup>Ibid., 410.

<sup>131</sup>Yun, *Karl Barth*, 176.

<sup>132</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, II, 410.

<sup>133</sup>Ibid.

<sup>134</sup>Ibid.

<sup>135</sup>Ibid., 407 and 419.

<sup>136</sup>Ibid., 421.

<sup>137</sup>Ibid., 396. Also see *ibid.*, 439.

<sup>138</sup>Ibid., 431. Also cf. Sung-Bum Yun, “Comparison of Yun-Gok’s Theory of Sung and Barth’s Theology,” in *YSBS.*, II, 410.

<sup>139</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, I, 215.

<sup>140</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, II, 453.

<sup>141</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, I, 204.

<sup>142</sup>Ibid., 201.

<sup>143</sup>Ibid., 129.

<sup>144</sup>Ibid., 67.

<sup>145</sup>For the characteristics of Korean Presbyterian Church refer to Keun-Won Park, “Reformed Witness in Korea: A Historical Reflection,” *The Reformed World* 39/ 4 (1986): 608-616.

<sup>146</sup>Sung-Bum Yun, “Barth’s Understanding and Interpretation of the Holy Spirit,” in *YSBS.*, IV, 474.

<sup>147</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, VI, 100-101.

---

<sup>148</sup>See Yun, *YSBS.*, I, 267 and 273.

<sup>149</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, VI, 100. Therefore, Yun claims that when the churches are one in Christ, both world mission and social service will be very effective.

<sup>150</sup>Yun, *Karl Barth*, 177.

<sup>151</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, IV, 484.

<sup>152</sup>Yun explains that, in Korean Confucianism, “holiness” was and is one of the most important virtues which has influenced every sphere in both society and the individual. In this sense, the ethics of Korean Confucianism can be deontological. There are three levels which indicate the case for holiness: (1) the explicit statements in the book of *The Holy Learning* by Yul-Gok Lee; (2) the definition of holiness is equivalent to the term “sung” (sincerity) as a standard for what is spiritual, moral, and ethical; and (3) the norm for what is the good, just, right, faithful, and sincere standard of acting and being. Based on the above statements, Yun argues that the mainspring of Korean ethics is relatively referred to the concept of “holiness,” which is practiced and consequently actualized within the community. Accordingly he deems that the Korean Confucian community is sincere and thus becomes an idealistic model for the gathering and upbuilding of the Christian community. See Yun, “Christian Confucianism as an Attempt at a Korean Indigenous Theology,” 101-110.

<sup>153</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, VI, 39.

<sup>154</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, VII, 349-350. See *idem*, “The Theological Task of the Korean Church,” in *YSBS.*, VI, 99-101.

<sup>155</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, I, 131.

<sup>156</sup>Sung-Bum Yun, *Hankuk Sahae Ya Hankuk Kyohae Ye Kajae* [Korean Society & the Task of Korean Church] (Seoul: Methodist Theological Seminary Press, 1998), 18.

<sup>157</sup>Sung-Bum Yun, “Korean Protestantism: past and future” in *Hankuk Jongkyo Moonhwa Ya Hankuk Juk Kidokkyo* [Religion, Culture in Korea and Korean Christianity] (Seoul: Methodist Theological Seminary Press, 1998), 212.

<sup>158</sup>See Sung-Bum Yun, *Hyo ya Jongkyo* [Filial Piety and Religion] in *YSBS.*, III, 223.

<sup>159</sup>Yun, *Hyo ya Jongkyo*, 158.

<sup>160</sup>Cf. John 14:7 & ff.

<sup>161</sup>Yun, *Hyo ya Jongkyo*, 145. Douglas John Hall also maintains that the heart of the theology of the cross is the cross of Christ, i.e., “God’s abiding commitment to the world.” Like Yun, the theological importance of the cross, for Hall, is “...the world that the biblical God loves and wills to redeem. The transcendent and transforming *agape* of the ‘high and holy One of Israel’ is as firmly fixed upon ‘fallen’ creation as the cross of the Christ is planted in the ‘place of the skull’” (Hall, *Thinking the Faith*, 26).

<sup>162</sup>See Yun, *YSBS.*, VI, 18.

---

<sup>163</sup>Yun, *Karl Barth*, 159.

<sup>164</sup>Yun, *Christianity and Korean Thought*, 72-73. Also See *idem*, "The Great Revival of The Korean Church," in *YSBS.*, I, 159-170.

<sup>165</sup>Sung-Bum Yun, "A Great Revival of the Korean Church," 164.

<sup>166</sup>Yun, *Christianity and Korean Thought*, 152.

<sup>167</sup>Ibid., 154.

<sup>168</sup>Ibid.

<sup>169</sup>Sung-Bum Yun, "Kerygma and Rediscovery of the Christian community," in *YSBS.*, VI, 25.

<sup>170</sup>Ibid., 34. Cf. Barth, *CD.*, IV/2, 623.

<sup>171</sup>Ibid., 33.

<sup>172</sup>Yun, *Christianity and Korean Thought*, 252.

<sup>173</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, VI, 34. In accordance with Barth, Yun also maintains that the church represents a witness to the incarnation of the Heavenly Father God in His Son Jesus Christ. Cf. *CD.*, IV/3, 2, 729 and Yun, *Karl Barth*, 176.

<sup>174</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, I, 150.

<sup>175</sup>Yun, "A Theological Approach to the Indigenization of the Gospel, 32.

<sup>176</sup>Ibid.

<sup>177</sup>Ibid., 33.

<sup>178</sup>See Barth, *CD.*, IV/2, 661-663.

<sup>179</sup>Barth, *CD.*, IV/2, 667.

<sup>180</sup>Yun, *Hyo ya Jongkyo*, 65.

<sup>181</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, III, 202.

<sup>182</sup>Ibid., 211.

<sup>183</sup>Yun, *Hyo ya Jongkyo*, 153.

<sup>184</sup>Ibid., 150-151. Also, cf. Barth, *CD.*, III/4, 277-278.

<sup>185</sup>Yun, *ST.*, 90. Cf. Barth, *CD.*, I/2, 489.

<sup>186</sup>Yun, *ST.*, 86.

---

<sup>187</sup>Yun, *Hyo ya Jongkyo*, 211.

<sup>188</sup>Ibid., 166.

<sup>189</sup>Ibid., 167. Also cf. Barth, *CD.*, III/1, 236, 244 and III/4, 358ff.

<sup>190</sup>Yun, *Hyo ya Jongkyo*, 163.

<sup>191</sup>Ibid., 164.

<sup>192</sup>Yun, *ST.*, 90.

<sup>193</sup>Ibid.

<sup>194</sup>Ibid., 87. Cf. Barth, *CD.*, IV/3, 2, 798.

<sup>195</sup>Yun, *Hyo ya Jongkyo*, 212.

<sup>196</sup>Ibid., 214.

<sup>197</sup>Ibid., 215.

<sup>198</sup>Cf. Barth, *CD.*, IV/2, 37.

<sup>199</sup>Cf. Exodus 20:12 and Proverbs 23:24-25; 30:17.

<sup>200</sup>See Yun, *Hyo ya Jongkyo*, 158.

<sup>201</sup>As already mentioned, the term *sung* is composed with two identical Chinese characters such as “*un*” (word) and “*cheng*” (fulfillment or accomplishment). Its fundamental meaning is the “fulfillment of one’s word,” that is, a kind of wholeness, integrity, perfect oneness without falseness, faithfulness/trustworthiness, earnestness, genuine, or realization. It also means “true integrity” or “fulfilling the *tao*” or “to be fully human” with an integral harmony. Yun ontologically applies its definition to John 1:14; “The Word became flesh,” that is, “God became man.” Thus Yun, on the basis of Barth’s Christocentrism, pinpoints that one of the most important Christological functions is centred on Christ’s sincerity in order for Him to be fully human as the eternal Son of God, i.e., to be accomplished as *sung* itself for all peoples. See Yun, *Hyo ya Jongkyo*, 214-216.

<sup>202</sup>Yun, *Hyo ya Jongkyo*, 214.

<sup>203</sup>Ibid., 216.

<sup>204</sup>Yun, *ST.*, 91. Also Yun claims that Christ’s mission was certainly for the accomplishment of the Law of God as well as for the fullness of the Kingdom of God on earth, which was made possible through His perfect submission to the will of God. In this respect, he reaffirms Barth’s insistence that both the reconciliation of the world with God and the sanctification of humanity is accomplished in Christ. See Yun, *Hyo ya Jongkyo*, 158.

<sup>205</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, VI, 179.

<sup>206</sup>See Barth, *CD.*, IV/3, 832.

---

<sup>207</sup>Yun, “Yul-Gok’s Theory of Sung and Karl Barth’s Theology,” 403.

<sup>208</sup>Sung-Bum Yun, “Korean Society and Christian Community’s Social Responsibility, in *YSBS.*, VI, 179. Cf. Barth, *CD.*, IV/3, 832.

<sup>209</sup>Yun, *Christianity and Korean Thought*, 235.

<sup>210</sup>*Ibid.*, 246.

<sup>211</sup>*Ibid.*, 253.

<sup>212</sup>Yun, “Korean Society and Christian Community’s Social Responsibility,” 246-247.

<sup>213</sup>For this issue, see Yun, *Christianity and Korean Thought*, 136-138 and Barth, *CD.*, III/1, 203ff, 288-289.

<sup>214</sup>Yun, “Korean Society and Christian Community’s Social Responsibility,” 244.

<sup>215</sup>*Ibid.*, 247.

<sup>216</sup>*Ibid.*, 169.

<sup>217</sup>*Ibid.*, 182.

<sup>218</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, VII, 91.

<sup>219</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, VI, 244-245.

<sup>220</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, VII, 99.

<sup>221</sup>Yun, “Cur Deus Homo and Contextualization of the Gospel of God,” 340.

<sup>222</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, II, 451.

<sup>223</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, I, 27. Also see *idem*, *YSBS.*, VII, 160-161 and *idem*, *Christianity and Korean Thought*, 25.

<sup>224</sup>See Chapter One, Section D, entitled, “The Confucian-Christian Context in Korean Christianity,” esp., 41-45.

<sup>225</sup>Yun, “A Theological Approach to the Indigenization of the Gospel,” 29.

<sup>226</sup>*Ibid.*, 30.

<sup>227</sup>*Ibid.*, 32. Cf. Paul Tillich, *Theology of Culture*, esp., Chapter IV. entitled, “Aspects of a Religious Analysis of Culture,” 40-51 and Douglas John Hall, *Thinking the Faith*, 126-144.

<sup>228</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, I, 89.

---

<sup>229</sup>Yun, “A Theological Approach to the Indigenization of the Gospel,” 29. The following are some Korean theologians who criticize Yun’s theology of Sung and his attempt of theological indigenization: Kyung-Yun Chun, “Can the Western Christianity be Contextualized?” *Kidokkyo Sasang* III (1972) and Bong-Rae Park, “Christianity and Korean Theology,” in *Kidokkyo Sasang* II (1971).

<sup>230</sup>For a discussion of the Barmen Declaration and a detailed account of its development, see Chapter Two Section A. entitled, “The Distinctive Characteristics of Barth’s Theology,” esp., 95-99.

<sup>231</sup>Barth, *CD.*, IV/3, 86ff.

<sup>232</sup>Yun, “Theology of Sincerity: an attempt to form a Korean Theology,” 71-72.

<sup>233</sup>Ibid., 72.

<sup>234</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, I, 324.

<sup>235</sup>Ibid., 337-338.

<sup>236</sup>Ibid., 338.

<sup>237</sup>See Yun, *YSBS.*, I, 88 and 327. Cf. Douglas John Hall, *Thinking the Faith*, entitled “The Bible and Theological Contextuality,” 118-122.

<sup>238</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, I, 331.

<sup>239</sup>Ibid., 286.

<sup>240</sup>Ibid.

<sup>241</sup>Ibid., 287.

<sup>242</sup>See Yun, *YSBS.*, I, 288-300, 339.

<sup>243</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, I, 331.

<sup>244</sup>See Yun, “How to Understand the Contextualization of the Gospel of God,” in *YSBS.*, I, 331-334.

<sup>245</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, VI, 100.

<sup>246</sup>See Yun, *YSBS.*, I, 267 and *ibid.*, VII, 342.

<sup>247</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, VI, 33.

<sup>248</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, VII, 348.

<sup>249</sup>Ibid.

<sup>250</sup>Yun, *Karl Barth*, 180.

---

<sup>251</sup>Yun, *ST.*, 105. Also see Yun, "Koreanized Theology," in *YSBS.*, I, 278-296 and *idem*, *ST.*, 125.

<sup>252</sup>Yun, "Cur Deus Homo and the Contextualization of the Gospel of God," 337-340. Also see *idem*, "The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit," 492-499 and *idem*, *Karl Barth*, 179-180.

<sup>253</sup>Yun, *Karl Barth*, 177.

<sup>254</sup>Yun, "A Theological Approach to the Indigenization of the Gospel," 32.

<sup>255</sup>See Yun, "A Theological Approach to the Indigenization of the Gospel," 30-31.

<sup>256</sup>Yun, "A Theological Approach to the Indigenization of the Gospel," 37.

<sup>257</sup>Yun, *Karl Barth*, 180.

<sup>258</sup>Yun, *ST.*, 93.

<sup>259</sup>Yun, *Hyo Ya Jongkyo*, 210. Yun also notes that Karl Barth describes such an attitude as the decisive action of the whole human beings, which cannot be distinguished as either internal or external. See Yun, *Hyo ya Jongkyo*, 211.

<sup>260</sup>See Yun, *ST.*, 96-98.

<sup>261</sup>For Yun, Yul-Gok's neo-Confucian philosophy, the theory of *sung*, was and still is considered as the core of Korean cultural and religious tradition. Even though, Buddhism, Shamanism and Taoism are also the other religious elements that have been deeply practiced by the people of Korea throughout the centuries, Confucianism is, for him, determined as the most essential figure for the positive acceptance of Western Christianity. See Yun, "Korean Church and Korean Christianity," in *YSBS.*, II, 428-435.

<sup>262</sup>Yun, *YSBS.*, II, 175.

<sup>263</sup>Yun, *Karl Barth*, 158. Also see *idem*, *YSBS.*, II, 388-411.

<sup>264</sup>Yun, *ST.*, 91.

<sup>265</sup>Ibid., 65.

<sup>266</sup>Yun, *Karl Barth*, 168.

<sup>267</sup>Yun, *ST.*, 93.

<sup>268</sup>See Yun, "Theology of Sung," 106.

<sup>269</sup>Yun, *Hyo ya Jongkyo*, 242.

<sup>270</sup>Yun sees that Tillich's method of correlation can be useful for the theological attempt at indigenization, but cannot be fully applied to the Korean context. This is because Tillich's method is based on a European context, especially German idealism. For this reason, Yun argues that family-based Confucian community ethics, that is, the father-son relationship, becomes a good source for the understanding of the relationship between the

---

Heavenly Father God and His Son Jesus Christ. See Yun, *Kidokkyo wa Hankuk Sasang*, 16-19.

<sup>271</sup>Yun, *Hyo ya Jongkyo*, 251.

<sup>272</sup>Yun, *ST.*, 91.

<sup>273</sup>See Barth, *CD.*, IV/3, 165.

<sup>274</sup>In this respect, Yun does not pay full attention to Barth's theology of humanity and fails to develop his view regarding the community's provisional representation of sanctification as God leads His people on the way, and in a movement so that they can acquire the goal and the direction towards it. For a fuller discussion of this position, see Yun, *ST.*, 129-148.

<sup>275</sup>Sung-Bum Yun, "Mission," in *YSBS.*, VII, 347-348.

<sup>276</sup>Yun, *Karl Barth*, 110. Yun also describes the function of God's Word in Christ as "Gottes Urteil" (God's decision), "Gottes Weisung" (God's revelation) and "Gottes Verheissung" (God's promise) in accordance with Barth. See Yun, *YSBS.*, II, 175 and *idem*, *ST.*, 144.

<sup>277</sup>Yun, "Kerygma and Rediscovery of the Christian Community," 26.

<sup>278</sup>Sung-Bum Yun, "Ecumenical Movement," in *YSBS.*, VII, 335. Also see *idem*, *Christianity and Korean Thought*, 154.

<sup>279</sup>Sung-Bum Yun, "Contextualization of Christianity," in *YSBS.*, VII, 197.

<sup>280</sup>Yun argues further that both God's incarnation and Christ's Crucifixion were and are and will be for the accomplishment of the universal salvation for all peoples—the object of God's compassionate grace—in the whole world for those who put their faith in Christ as their own Saviour (Yun, *Karl Barth*, 158). Truly Christ as *sung* is for Yun not only the Way, the Truth, and the Life for all peoples, but also transcends cultural, political, and social discrimination in the world. In this perspective, his central theme of theology is the person of Jesus Christ who becomes authentic sincerity, the true fulfillment of the Word of the Ultimate (Heaven), and the incarnation of the Word of God (Yun, *ST.*, 101). It is clear that Yun generally follows Barth's idea of the sending of the Christian community. However, unlike Barth, he tends to see that mission is truly an attempt to form an indigenous Christian theology according to one's own cultural and religious tradition.

<sup>281</sup>Aron Park, "The Problem of Koreanized Theology," in *YSBS.*, II, 350-351.

<sup>282</sup>Ibid., 351.

<sup>283</sup>Ibid., 352.

<sup>284</sup>Chai-Sik Chung, "Confucian-Protestant Encounter in Korea: Two Cases of Westernization and De-Westernization," *Ching Feng* 34/1 (Jan, 1991), 71-72.

<sup>285</sup>Ibid., 74.

---

<sup>286</sup>The following represents some Korean theologians' works, which negatively criticize Yun's theology of Sung; Eui-Hwan Kim, "A Critical Concern of Sung Theology," in *YSBS.*, II, 323-333; Kwang-Sik Kim, *Contextualization and Interpretation* (Seoul: Daehan Kidokkyo Seohae, 1987); *idem*, *Mission and Indigenization* (Seoul: Daehan Kidokkyo Seohae, 1975); and Dae-Sung Oh, "A Study of Sung-Bum Yun's Theology of Sung" (Th. M. Thesis, Mokwon University, 1988), especially 36-41.

<sup>287</sup>For the theological characteristics of Korean Christianity see Chul-Ha Han, "An Asian Critique of Western Theology," *Evangelical Review of Theology* 7/1 (April 1983): 34-47; Sung-Hwan Pyun, "Other Religions and Theology," *East Asia Journal of Theology* 3/2 (1985): 327-353; Sook-Jong Lee, "A Study of the Relationship of the Korean Church to the Indigenous Culture of Korea," *Asia Journal of Theology* 9/2 (1995): 230-247; and Tong-Shik Ryu, "Culture and Theology in Korea: The P'ung-Ryu Theology," *East Asia Journal of Theology* 3/2 (1985): 310-319.

<sup>288</sup>For fuller evidence on this point see Donald N. Clark, *Christianity in Modern Korea* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1986), 51; James H. Grayson, "The Study of Korean Religions & Their Role in Inter-Religious Dialogue," *Inculcuration* 3/4 (1988), 8; *idem*, *Korea: the Religious History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 215-216; and Heup-Young Kim, *Wang Yang-Ming and Karl Barth: A Confucian-Christian Dialogue*, 4.

## CONCLUSION

The main purpose of this thesis was to explore Karl Barth's reception in Korea, by investigating in some detail how Barth's theology was indigenized in Korea. This was done by examining Barth's influence on one representative Korean Christian movement, Sung theology, with specific stress on Barth's Christocentric doctrine of the Church as the Christian community and community-oriented Korean Confucianism.

In Chapter One, we discussed the question why Barth's Christocentric theology was assimilated and why it is still receptive in Korea by exploring the historical development of Korean Protestantism and its impact on cultural and religious changes in Korea. In so doing, we argued that Korean Confucianism and its community concept and structure have been the important factors for the rapid growth of the Christian community and later provided the basic foundation for the reception of Karl Barth's Christocentric theology, especially his doctrine of the Church as the Christian community in Korea. We also observed that the early Protestant mission policy, namely "the Nevius Methods," made an important contribution to the rapid growth of Korean Christianity and the favourable reception of Barth's theology in Korea. This is because "the Nevius Methods" is characterized as Word-centred evangelism, the self-principle and action-oriented,

which is quite similar to Barth's theological principle of Christocentrism and his theory and action-balanced theology.

In the second chapter, an analysis of Barth's concept of ecclesiology was presented through a discussion of what constitutes the true church, the upbuilding of the Christian community, and the missionary task of the Christian community. We discovered that Barth's ecclesiology, namely, the gathering and upbuilding of the Christian community, are strikingly similar to the Korean Confucian tradition of gathering and upbuilding integrity. Therefore, such a unique affinity between them facilitated rapid church growth in Korea and helped Korean Christian theologians accept Barth's Christocentrism as their theological norm and source. Since Barth's theology has been misunderstood as being too exclusive to be useful in theological indigenization with other cultures and religions, we have also attempted to prove that Barth is a true missionary-minded theologian; and Barth's theology of mission, especially his doctrine of the sending of the Christian community, pays sufficient attention to other cultures and religions.

In order to prove the possibility of the indigenization of Barth's theology with Korean Confucianism, we have chosen Sung-Bum Yun's theology of Sung and then examined his ecclesiological response to Barth, by comparing their convergences and divergences, in Chapter Three. Having identified Yun's theology of Sung as the most indigenized Korean theology on the basis of Barth's theology and community-based Korean Confucianism, we have concluded that Yun's theology is radically dependent upon Barth's Christocentric theology. By following Barth's ecclesiology, Yun describes Korean Christians as being enthusiastic to be the gathering, upbuilding, and sending

Christian community by bearing witness to the Gospel of Jesus Christ as the Way, the Truth and the Life. Also, he attempts to show that the Confucian term *sung* as Jesus Christ, whose true identity as the Word of God, is an absolute truth for all religions and for all peoples in the world. Jesus Christ thus becomes the centre and the starting point of Yun's theology in terms of three interrelated forms; Jesus Christ as the "Revealed," "Written," and the "Spoken Word of God." Positively speaking, Yun's attempt is to look anew at the Korean cultural tradition and heritage, and to make a significant contribution to its restoration and creative development for the purpose of constructing a genuine Korean theology by indigenizing Barth's Christocentric theology as theory and praxis-balanced Western Christian theology.

Having given a specific overview of the Korean reception of Barth's theology in the beginning of Chapter Three, we have also recognized that Barth, for the Korean Christian community, is remembered as "a father of neo-orthodox theology" or "a father of dialectical theology." Significantly, his Christocentric and community-based ecclesiology continues to make an impact on contemporary Korean ecclesiological theology and practice.

## Bibliography

### I. Works on Karl Barth

Ahlers, Rolf. *The Barmen Theological Declaration of 1934: The Archaeology of a Confessional Text*, Toronto Studies in Theology, Vol. 24 . Lewiston, New York: Edwin Mellen, 1986.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Community of Freedom*. New York, Bern, Frankfurt am Main & Paris: Peter Lang, 1989.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The First Barmen Declaration." *The Reformed Journal* 34 (1984): 14-20.

Aldwinckle, R. F. "Karl Barth and Religious Language." *Canadian Journal of Theology* XI/3 (July 1965): 164-173.

Allen, Edgar Leonard. *A Guide to the Thought of Karl Barth: the sovereignty of God and the word of God*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 19--.

Alston, Wallace M., Jr. *The Church*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1984.

Azevedo, Marcello De C. "Basic Ecclesial Communities: A Meeting Point of Ecclesiology." *Theological Studies* 46 (1985): 601-620.

Balthasar, Hans Urs von. *A Theology of History*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1963.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Theology of Karl Barth*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1971.

Barnes, Michael. *Christian Identity and Religious Pluralism: Religions in Conversation*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1989.

Barth, Karl. *Against The Stream: Shorter Post-War Writing 1946-52*. London: SCM, 1954.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Christ and Adam*. Translated by T. A. Smail. London: Oliver and Boyd, 1956.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Church Dogmatics*, Vol. IV/1, 2 & 3. Edited by G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936-1969.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Church and the Political Problem of Our Day*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1939.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Community, state, and Church: three essays*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1960.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Credo*. Translated by J. S. McNab. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Dogmatics in Outline*. Translated by G. T. Thompson. New York: Harper and Row, 1959.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Translated by Edwyn C. Hoskyns. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Evangelical Theology: An Introduction*. Translated by G. Foley. New York: Doubleday, 1969.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Faith of the Church: A Commentary on the Apostles' Creed according to Calvin's Catechism*. Edited and translated by J. L. Leuba and G. Vahanian. New York: Meridian Books, 1958.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The German Church Conflict*. London: Lutterworth, 1965.

\_\_\_\_\_. *How I Changed My Mind*. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox, 1966.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Humanity of God*. Translated by John Newton Thomas & Thomas Wieser. Atlanta: John Knox, 1962.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Introduction to Evangelical Theology*. Don Mills, Ont.: Burning Bush, 1985.

\_\_\_\_\_. "No Boring Theology! A Letter from Karl Barth." *The South East Asian Journal of Theology* (Autumn, 1969): 4-5.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Protestant Theology in the Nineteenth Century: Its Background and History*. London: SCM, 1972.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Table Talk*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1963.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Teaching of the Church Regarding Baptism*. London: SCM, 1948.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Theological Existence Today!* London, 1933.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Theology and Church*. Translated by Louise Pettibone Smith. New York, Evanston: Harper & Row, 1962.

\_\_\_\_\_. Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart." In *Religion and Culture: Essays in Honor of Paul Tillich*, edited by Walter Leibrecht. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1969.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Word of God and the Word of Man*. Translated by Douglas Horton. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.

Baxter, Christina. "Barth—A Truly Biblical Theologian?" *Tyndale Bulletin* 38 (1987): 3-27.

Berkhof, Hendrikus. *Christian Faith: An Introduction to the Study of the Faith*. Translated by Sierd Woudstra. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1979.

Bettis, Joseph. "Is Karl Barth A Universalist?" *Scottish Journal of Theology* 20 (1967): 423-436.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Political Theology and Social Ethics: The Socialist Humanism of Karl Barth." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 27 (1974): 287-305.

Bloesch, Donald G. *Jesus Christ: Savior and Lord*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1997.

Bockmuehl, Klaus. "Karl Barth 1886-1986: An Evangelical Appraisal." *CRUX* 22/3 (Sept, 1986): 28-32.

Bolt, John. "Church and World: A Trinitarian Perspective." *Calvin Theological Journal* 18/1 (April 1983): 5-31.

Bromiley, Geoffrey William. *An Introduction to the Theology of Karl Barth*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.

Brown, Robert McAfee. "On God's Ontic and Noetic Absoluteness: A Critique of Barth." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 33 (1980): 535-549.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Saying Yes and Saying No: On Rendering to God and Caesar*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.

Brunner, Emil. *Dogmatics*, Vol. 1. London: Lutterworth, 1949.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The New Barth." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 4 (June 1951): 123-135.

Buckley, James J. "A Field of Living Fire: Karl Barth on the Spirit and the Church." *Modern Theology* 10/1 (January 1994): 81-102.

Busch, Eberhard. *Karl Barth: His Life from Letters and Autobiographical Texts*. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Dialectical Theology: Karl Barth's Reveille." *Canadian Journal of Theology* 16 (1970): 165-174.

Butin, Phil. "Two Early Reformed Catechisms, the Threefold Office, and the Shape of Karl Barth's Christology." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 44 (1991): 195-214.

Butler, Gerald A. "Karl Barth and Political Theology." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 27 (1974): 441-458.

Carter, Craig A. "Karl Barth's Revision of Protestant Ecclesiology." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 22: 35-44.

Chi, Tong-Sik. *Karl Barth ui Solgyo ui Songgyok*. [The Characteristic of Karl Barth's Preaching]. Seoul: The Christian Literature Society of Korea, 1970.

Choi, Jong-Hyun. *Karl Barth's Impact upon Korean Church*. Seoul: ChongShin Theological Seminary Press, 1984.

Chun, Kyung-Yun. *Adam and Christus*. Seoul: The Christian Literature Society of Korea, 1976.

Cochrane, Arthur. *The Church's Confession Under Hitler*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962.

Come, Arnold B. *An Introduction to Barth's "Dogmatics" for Preachers*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963.

Cone, James. *For My People*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1984.

Dakin, Tim. "The Nature of Practical Theology: Repeating Transformation: Browning and Barth on Practical Theology." *Anvil* 13/3 (1996): 203-221.

Davis, Charles. *Christ and the World Religions*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1970.

D'Costa, Gavin. *Theology and Religious Pluralism: The Challenge of Other Religions*. Oxford: Blackwells, 1986.

Deschner, John. "Karl Barth as Political Activist." *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 28/1 (Fall 1972): 55-66.

Dewick, E. C. *The Christian Attitude to Other Religions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.

Dickermann, David L., ed. *Karl Barth and the Future of Theology*. New Haven: Yale Divinity School Association, 1969.

Dulles, Avery. *Models of the Church*. Garden City, New York: Image Books, 1978.

Evans, Donald. "Barth on Talk about God." *Canadian Journal of Theology* 16 (1970): 175-192.

Eun, Jun-Kwan. *Church, Mission and Education*. Seoul: Chunmangsa, 1982.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Ecclesiology in light of Basileia and Ecclesia*. Seoul: Taehan Kidokkyo

Seohae, 1998.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Practical Ecclesiology*. Seoul: Taehan Kidokkyo Seohae, 1999.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Witness of the Word of God*. Seoul: Sungkwan Munhwasa, 1980.

Ferguson, Sinclair B., David F. Wright, and J. I. Packer, eds. *New Dictionary of Theology*. Downers Grove, Illinois, Leicester, England: InterVarsity, 1988. S.v. "Karl Barth," by J. B. Webster.

Fey, Harold E., and Margaret Frakes, eds. *The Christian Century Reader*. New York: Association Press, 1962.

Fletcher, Verne H. "Barth's Concept of Co-Humanity and the Search for Human Community." *South East Asia Journal of Theology* 9/1 (July 1967): 41-53.

Gill, David M. "Karl Barth, The Church and Ecumenism." *The Hartford Quarterly* 7: 47-61.

Glick, G. Wayne. "Karl Barth and the Theology of the Word of God." *Brethren Life and Thought* 5 (Spring 1960): 29-38.

Green, Clifford. "Liberation Theology? Karl Barth on Women and Men." *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* XXIX/3 & 4 (Spring & Summer 1974): 221-231.

Green, Garrett. "Challenging the Religious Studies Canon: Karl Barth's Theory of Religion." *Journal of Religion* 75/4 (Oct, 1995): 473-486.

Gruchy, John W. de. "Racism, Reconciliation, and Resistance." In *On Reading Karl Barth in South Africa*, edited by Charles Villa-Vicencio. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1988.

Han, Chul-Ha. "An Asian Critique of Western Theology." *Evangelical Review of Theology* 7/1 (April 1983): 34-47.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Is there God outside of the Church?" *Church and Theology* 6 (1973): 22-32.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Karl Barth's Interpretation of Anselm's Theology." *Church and Theology* 3 (1970): 100-120

Han, Dok-Hyung. "Karl Barth's Theology and Hermeneutics." *Christian Thought* 467 (November 1997): 91-109.

Harrison, Peter. "Karl Barth and the Non-Christian Religions." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 23/2 (Spring 1986): 207-224.

Hasel, Frank M. "The Christological Analogy of Scripture in Karl Barth." *Theologische Zeitschrift* 50 (1994): 41-49.

Heppe, Heinrich. *Reformed Dogmatics: set out and illustrated from the sources*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 1978.

Holmes, Urban T. "Barth as Ecumenical Theologian: A Review Article." *Encounter* 28/2 (Spring 1967): 174-181.

Hordern, William. "Barth as Political Thinker." *Christian Century* 86/13 (March 26, 1969): 411-413.

Hunsinger, George. *How to Read Karl Barth: The Shape of His Theology*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

\_\_\_\_\_, edited and tran. *Karl Barth and Radical Politics*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976.

Jenson, Robert W. *Alpha and Omega: A Study in the Theology of Karl Barth*. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1963.

Jüngel, Eberhard. *Karl Barth: A Theological Legacy*. Translated by Garrett E. Paul. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.

The Karl Barth Society. *The Word of God and Theology*. Seoul: The Christian Literature Society, 1995.

Keller, Adolf. *Karl Barth and Christian Unity: the influence of the Barthian movement upon the churches of the world*. New York: Macmillan, 1933.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Versuch einer Deutung heidnischer Religionen: im Anschluss an Karl Barth's Lehre vom Menschen." *Evangelisches Missionmagazin* 100 (1956): 91-92.

Kelsay, John. "Prayer and Ethics: Reflections on Calvin and Barth." *Harvard Theological Review* 82/2 (1989): 169-184.

Kim, Heup-Young. *Wang Yang-Ming and Karl Barth: A Confucian-Christian Dialogue*. London, New York and Lanham: University Press of America, 1996.

Kim, Kyun-Jin. *Hegel Ka Barth*. [Hegel and Barth]. Seoul: Taehan Kidokkyo Chulpansa, 1983.

Kim, Myung-Yong. "Karl Barth's Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans." *Theology and Church* 20 (1988): 103-133.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Karl Barth's Theological Reflection on Socio-political Movements." *Kidokkyo Sasang* (Aug, 1986): 90-105.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Der Gottesbegriff Karl Barths in der heutigen Diskussion." Th. D. Thesis, Tübingen University, 1985.

Kim, Yong-Bok. "Karl Barth's Political Theology and Korean Minjung Theology." In *Korean Minjung and Christianity*, edited by Young-bok Kim. Seoul: Hyungsung Sa, 1981.

Kim, Yong-Han. *Barut'u eso Molt'uman kkaji: Hyondae Shinhak sasang ui Kaehyokchuumjok chomyong*. [From Barth to Moltmann: Reflections on modern theological thought]. Seoul: Taehan Kidokkyo Chulpansa, 1982.

Knitter, Paul. "Christomonism in Karl Barth's Evaluation of the Non-Christian Religions." *Neue Zeitschrift Für Systematische Theologie und Religions-Philosophie* 13 (1971): 109-121.

\_\_\_\_\_. *No Other Name?: A Critical Survey of Christian Attitudes Toward the World Religions*. London: SCM, 1985.

Klempa, William. "Barth as a Scholar and Interpreter of Calvin." *Calvin Studies* 7 (1994): 31-50.

Küng, Hans. *On Being a Christian*. Translated by Edward Quinn. Garden City, NY.: Doubleday, 1976.

Kwak, Sun-Hee. "The proclamation of the Word of God and the Korean Church." *Church and Theology* 5 (1972): 47-55.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Task of the Church for the Contemporary Society." *Church and Theology* 6 (1973): 85-93.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Scripture as the Word of God: Calvin's View of Scripture." *Church and Theology* 4 (1971): 168-187.

Lee, Shin-Keun. *Karl Barth ui Kyohae'ron*. [Karl Barth's Doctrine of the Church]. Seoul: Sungkwang, 1989.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Karl Barth's Understanding of the Kingdom of God." *Seoul Theological Seminary Journal* 5 (December 1994): 201-216.

McConnachie, John. *The Barthian Theology and the Man of Today*. London: Hodder, 1934.

McGlasson, Paul. *Jesus and Judas: Biblical Exegesis in Barth*. Atlanta GA: Scholar's,

1991.

McLean, Stuart D. *Humanity in the Thought of Karl Barth*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1981.

Millbank, John. "The Second Difference: For a Trinitarianism without Reserve." *Modern Theology* 2 (1986): 213-234.

Milne, Douglas J. W. "A Barthian Stricture on Reformed Theology-The Unconditionality of the Covenant of Grace." *The Reformed Theological Review* 55/3 (Sept-Dec, 1996): 121-133.

Mohler, Richard Albert. "Evangelical Theology and Karl Barth: representative models of response." Ph. D. Thesis, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1989.

Mok, Chang-Kyun. *Theological Debate in the Twentieth Century*. Seoul: Tynalno, 1995.

Nicholls, William. "Liberation as a Religious Theme." *Canadian Journal of Theology* 16 (1970): 140-154.

O'Grady, Colm. *The Church in Catholic Theology: Dialogue with Karl Barth*. London, Dublin & Melbourne: Geoffrey Chapman, 1970.

Osborn, Robert T. "Christ, Bible and Church in Karl Barth." *The Journal of Bible and Religion* 24 (April 1956): 97-102.

Pak, Dong-Rang. *Barth ui songso haesok*. [Barth's Interpretation of the Scripture]. Seoul: The Christian Literature Society of Korea, 1970.

Palma, Robert J. *Karl Barth's Theology of Culture*. Allison Park, Pa.: Pickwick, 1983.

Park, Soon-Kyung. "Socio-political Issue and Task in Christian Theology." *Shinhak Sasang* 19 (1979).

\_\_\_\_\_. "Theory and Praxis in Communism and Christianity." *Kidokkyo Sasang* (March 1983).

\_\_\_\_\_. "Karl Marx and Karl Barth." *Soongshil University Research Centre for Theology and Sociology* (1988).

Park, Yong-Kyu. "The Birth of Korean Evangelicalism." *Shinhak Jinam* 65/3 (Fall 1998): 270-303.

Race, Alan. *Christians and Religious Pluralism: Patterns in the Christian Theology of Religions*. London: SCM, 1983.

Rhodes, John Stephen. *Karl Barth and the Base Communities: A Dialogue on Praxis and Interpretation*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1987.

Rossel, Jacques. "From a Theology of Crisis to a Theology of Revolution?" *The Ecumenical Review* 21/3 (July 1969): 204-215.

Rumscheidt, H. Martin. *Revelation and Theology: An analysis of the Barth-Harnack correspondence of 1923*. Cambridge: University Press, 1972.

Runia, Klaas. "Authority of the Confession." *The Reformed Theological Review* 18/1 (Feb, 1959): 6-20.

Schlunk, Martin. "Theology and Missions in Germany in Recent Years." *International Review of Missions* 27 (1938): 463-478.

Schmidt, K. D. *Die Bekenntnisse des Jahres 1934*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1935.

Scott, Waldron. "Karl Barth's Theology of Mission." *Missiology* III/2 (1975): 209-224.

Scroope, Michael Wayne. *Eschatological Mission: its reality and possibility in the theology of Karl Barth and its influence on modern mission theology*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms International, 1987.

Senarcens, Jacques de. "Karl Barth and the Reformed Tradition." *The Reformed and Presbyterian World* 30/5 (March 1969): 206-214.

Sharpe, Eric. *Faith Meets Faith*. London: SCM, 1977.

Shapiro, Lou. "Karl Barth's Understanding of Prayer." *CRUX* 24/1 (March 1988): 26-33.

Snyder, Dale Norman. *Karl Barth's Struggle with Anthropocentric Theology*. Gravenhage: Boekhandel Wattez, 1966.

Song, C. S. "The Relation of Divine Revelation and Man's Religion in the Theologies of Karl Barth and Paul Tillich." Th.D. diss., Union Theological Seminary, 1965.

Sorge, Sheldon Warren. "Karl Barth's Reception in North America: Ecclesiology As A Case Study." Ph.D. Thesis, Duke University, 1987.

Spross, Daniel B. "The Doctrine of Sanctification in the Theology of Karl Barth." *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 20/2 (Fall 1985): 54-76.

Starkloff, Carl F. "Karl Barth on Religion: A Study for Christians in Mission." *Missiology* VI/4 (1978): 441-461.

Suh, Chul-Won. "Critique of Karl Barth's Theology." *Shinhak Jinam* 258 (Spring 1999): 160-171.

Thomas, Owen C. "Barth on non-Christian Knowledge of God." *Anglican Theological Review* 46 (1964): 261-285.

Thompson, John. *Christ in Perspective: Christological perspectives in the theology of Karl Barth*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.

Thorne, Phillip R. *Evangelicalism and Karl Barth: his reception and influence in North American evangelical theology*. Pittsburgh, PA.: Pickwick, 1995.

Torrance, Thomas Forsyth. *Karl Barth, biblical and evangelical theologian*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1990.

Un, Chun-Gwan. *Karl Barths Ansicht über die Kirche: Karl Barth ui Kyohoeron ihae*. [Karl Barth's Doctrine of Ecclesiology]. Seoul: The Christian Literature Society of Korea, 1970.

Un, J. K. "The Christian Community as mission-event." Ph. D. Thesis, Pacific School of Religion, 1968.

Veitch, J. A. "Revelation and Religion in the Theology of Karl Barth." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 24/1 (Feb, 1971): 1-22.

Villa-Vicencio, Charles, ed. *On Reading Karl Barth in South Africa*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W. B. Eerdmans, 1988.

Waldrop, Charles T. *Karl Barth's Christology: its basic Alexandrian character*. Berlin & New York: Mouton, 1984.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Karl Barth's Concept of the Divinity of Jesus Christ." *Harvard Theological Review* 74/3 (1981): 241-263.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Karl Barth and Pure Land Buddhism." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 24/4 (Fall 1987): 574-597.

Weber, Otto. *Foundations of Dogmatics*. Vol. 2. Translated by Darrell L. Guder. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1983.

Webster, John. "Assured and Patient and Cheerful Expectation": Barth on Christian Hope as the Church's Task." *Toronto Journal of Theology* 10/1 (1994): 35-52.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Church as Theological Community." *Anglican Theological Review* 75/1 (Winter 1993): 102-115.

White, Alan R. "Coherence Theory of Truth." In *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Vol. 2, edited by Paul Edwards, 130-133. New York: The Macmillan & Free, 1967.

Whitehouse, W. A., and J. B. Soucek. "The Christian View of Man: An Examination of Karl Barth's Doctrine." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 2 (1949): 57-82.

Wolterstorff, Nicholas. "Liturgy, Justice, and Holiness." *The Reformed Journal* 39 (1989): 12-20.

Xiaofeng, Liu. "God is God-in memory of Karl Barth." *Chinese Theological Review* (1989): 66-76.

Yun, Sung-Bum. *Barth ui yong ihae wae kisul ui munje: hanguk kwaui taehwarul wihan hana ui sido*. [Barth's Understanding of the Holy Spirit: An Attempt to Integrate Barth's Theology and Korean Christianity]. Seoul: The Christian Literature Society of Korea, 1970.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Karl Barth*. Seoul: The Christian Literature Society of Korea, 1968.

## II. Works on Korean Christian Thought

Adams, Edward B. 'The Adams Evangelistic Fund', *Korea Mission Field*. Seoul: Evangelical Missions in Korea, 1930.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Korea Guide: A Glimpse of Korea's Cultural Legacy*. Seoul: International Publishing House, 1988.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Through the Gates of Seoul: Trails and Tales of Yi Dynasty*, 2 vols. Seoul: Taewon, 1974.

Ahn, Byung-Mu. "The Korean Church's Understanding of Jesus." *International Review of Mission* 74/293 (Jan, 1985): 81-91.

Akiko, Yamashita. "Korean Shamanism and Christianity: A Shaman's Story." *Japanese Religions* 21/2 (July 1996): 299-322.

Allen, Horace N. *Korea: Fact and Fancy*. Seoul: Methodist Publishing House, 1904.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Things Korean*. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1908.

Allinson, Robert E. "The Ethics of Confucianism and Christianity: the delicate balance." *Ching Feng* 33/3 (Sept, 1990): 158-175.

*Annual Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society for 1885*.

*Annual Report of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church for*

1886.

*Annual Report of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., for 1888.*

Bary, Wm. Theodore de and Haboush Kim, eds. *The Rise of Neo-Confucianism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.

Biernatzki, William E., Luke Jin-Chang Im, and Anselm K. Min, *Korean Catholicism in the 70s*. New York: Orbis Books, 1975.

Bishop, Isabella Bird. *Korea and Her Neighbors*. Seoul: Yonsei University Press, 1970.

Brown, G. Thompson. "Why Has Christianity Grown Faster in Korea Than in China?" *Missionology: An International Review* XXII/1 (January 1994): 77-88.

Buswell, Robert E., Jr. "Buddhism in Korea," In *The Religious Tradition of Asia*, edited by Joseph M. Kitagawa, 347-353. New York: Macmillan, 1987.

Camps, Arnulf. "A Reflection on 'Theology by the People.'" *Ministerial Formation* 29 (Mr, 1985): 3-6.

Chai, Yong-Choo. "History of the Protestant Church in Korea from a new point of view." *Asia Journal of Theology* 1/2 (1987): 506-514.

Chang, Chi-Yon. *Chosun Yu Kyo Yon Won*. [Confucianism in Chosun Period]. Seoul, 1921.

Chapman, Cynthia R. "On Heaven-Humanity Harmony and Divine-Human Reconciliation: A Confucian-Christian Dialogue." *Ching Feng* 34/2 (June 1991): 121-124.

Chi, Myong-Kwan. "Theological Development in Korea." *International Review of Mission* 74: 293 (Jan, 1985): 73-79.

Ching, Julia. *Confucianism and Christianity: A Comparative Study*. Tokyo, New York & San Francisco: Kodansha International, 1977.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Chinese Religions*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Book, 1993.

Choe, Kil-Song. "Community Ritual and Social Structure in Village Korea." *Asian Folklore Studies* 41/1 (1982): 39-48.

Choi, Byung-Hon. *Theology Monthly Report*. Seoul: Sungsan Yuramki, 1907.

\_\_\_\_\_. *All Religions Are Fulfilled in One*. Seoul: The Literature Society of the

Korean Church, 1922.

Choi, Han-Duek. *Hankuk Yookyu Sasang Yonku*. [A Study of Korean Confucianism]. Seoul: Chulhak Kwa Hyunsill Sa, 1992.

Choi, Min-Hong. *A Modern History of Korean Philosophy*. Seoul: Seong-moon Sa, 1983.

Choi, Myung-Keun. *Changes in Korean Society Between 1884-1910 as a result of the Introduction of Christianity*. New York: Peter Lang, 1997.

Choy, Bong-Youn, *Korea: A History*. Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle, 1971.

Chun, Taik-Poo. *The History of Christian Development in Korea*. Seoul: The Christian Literature Society, 1985.

Chung, Chai-Sik. "Confucian-Protestant Encounter in Korea: Two Cases of Westernization and De-Westernization." *Ching Feng* 34/1 (1991): 51-81.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Global Theology for the Common Good: Lessons from Two Centuries of Korean Christianity." *International Review of Mission* 85 (Oct, 1985): 523-538.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A Korean Confucian encounter with the modern world: Yi Hang-no and the West*. Berkeley, CA.: Institute of East Asian Studies, 1996.

Chung, Chulhee. "Social Movement Organizations and June Uprising." *Korea Journal* 37/1 (Spring 1997): 81-97.

Chung, David. "The Han-San-We-I, Principle in Far Eastern Society." *Transaction of the Korea Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 38 (1961): 93-118.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Religious Syncretism in Korean Society." Ph. D. Thesis, Yale University, 1959.

Chung, Doo-Yong. *Christianity and Confucianism*. Seoul: Sungkwang Munhwasa, 1994.

Chung, Edward Y. J. *The Korean neo-Confucianism of Yi T'oegue and Yulgok: a reappraisal of the "Four-Seven Thesis" and its practical implications for self-cultivation*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995.

Chung, Hyun-Kyung. "'Han-pu-ri': Doing Theology from Korean Women's Perspective." *Ecumenical Review* 40 (Jan, 1988): 27-36.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Struggle To Be The Sun Again: Introducing Asian Women's Theology*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1990.

Chung, Yong-Do. *Kidokkyo wai Yukyo*. [Christianity and Confucianism]. Seoul: Sung Kwang, 1994.

Clark, Allen D. *A History of the Church in Korea*. Seoul: Christian Literature Society of Korea, 1971.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Religions of Old Korea*. Seoul: The Christian Literature Society, 1961.

Clark, C. A. *The Korean Church and the Nevius Methods*. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1930.

Clark, Donald N. *Christianity in Modern Korea*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1986.

Cook, M. "Jesus from the Other Side of History: Christology in Latin America." *Theological Studies* 44 (1983): 258-287.

Dallet, Charles. *Historie de l'Église de Corée*. Paris: Victor Palmé, 1874.

Davies, Daniel M. "Henry G. Appenzeller's Contribution to Science Education in Korea." *Journal of Education* 37 (1990): 4-48.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Impact of Christianity upon Korea, 1884-1910: six key American and Korean figures." *Journal of Church and States* 36 (Aut, 1994): 795 -820.

Davis, George T. B. *Korea for Christ*. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1910.

Deuchler, Martina. *The Confucian Transformation of Korea: a study of society and ideology*. Cambridge, Mass.: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University Press, 1992.

Diaz, Hector. *A Korean Theology*. Immense, Switzerland: Neue Zeitschrift fur Missionswissenschaft, 1986.

Dore, Ronald and Zoe Mars, eds. *Community Development: comparative case studies in India, the Republic of Korea, Mexico and Tanzania*. Guildford, London, Oxford, Worcester: Billing & Sons Limited, 1981.

Douglas, J. D., ed. *New 20th-Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker, 1991. S.v. "Korea."

Eckert, Carter J., Ki-Baik Lee, Young-Ick Lew, Michael Robinson, and Edward W. Wagner. *Korea, Old and New: A History*. Seoul: Ilchokak Publishers, 1990.

Fenwick, M. C. *The Church of Christ in Corea*. New York: Geroge G. Doran, 1911.

Fu, Pei-Jung. "The Confucian Heaven and the Christian God." *Ching Feng* 31/2 & 3 (August 1988): 177-124.

Gale, James S. *Korea in Transition*. New York: Young People's Missionary Movement of the United States and Canada, 1909.

\_\_\_\_\_. *History of the Korean People*. Seoul: Royal Asiatic Society, 1983.

Gilmore, George W. *Korea From its Capital*. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian Board of Publications, 1882.

Grayson, James Huntley. *Early Buddhism and Christianity in Korea: A Study in the Implantation of Religion*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Korea: A Religious History*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1989.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Myth of Tan'gun: A Dramatic Structural Analysis of a Korean Foundation Myth." *Korea Journal* 37/1 (Spring 1997): 35-52.

Griffis, William E., and Henry G. Appenzeller, *A Modern Pioneer in Korea*. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1912.

Haboush, Jahyun Kim. "Filial Emotions and Filial Values: changing patterns in the discourse of filiality in late Chosun Korea." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 55 (June 1995): 129-177.

Han, Chul-Ha. "Analysis of Theological Circumstance in Korea." *Church and Theology* 2 (1966): 83-97.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Korean Theology and Church." *Church and Theology* 4 (1971): 46-73.

Han, Hyung-Cho. *Chu hei aese Chung Yak-Yong kaji*. [From Chu hei to Yak-Yong Chung]. Seoul: Saekaesa, 1996.

Han, Yongu. *Chosun Chongi Sahoe Kyongje Yongu*. [Politics and Economy in the Chosun Dynasty]. Seoul: Uryu munhwasa, 1983.

Harrington, Fred Harvey. *God, Mammon, and the Japanese: Dr. Horace N. Allen and Korean-American Relations, 1884-1905*. Madison, Wisc.: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1966.

Harry, Rhodes A., ed. *History of the Korea Mission, Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.* Seoul: Presbyterian Church of Korea, Dept. of Education, 1984.

\_\_\_\_\_. *History of the Korean Mission*. Seoul: Choson Mission Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., 1934.

Huc, I'Abbe. *Christianity in China, Tartary and Thibet*. London: Longmans and Robert, 1894.

Hulbert, H. B. *The History of Korea*, Vol. I. Seoul: The Methodist Publishing House, 1905.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Passing of Korea*. New York: Doubleday, 1906.

Hunt, Everett Nichols, Jr. *Protestant Pioneers in Korea*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1980.

Huntley, Martha. *Caring, Growing, Changing: A History of the Protestant Mission in Korea*. New York: Friendship, 1984.

\_\_\_\_\_. *To Start a Work: the foundations of the Protestant mission in Korea, 1884-1919*. Seoul: Presbyterian Church of Korea, 1987.

Hyun, Younghak. "The Cripple's Dance and Minjung Theology." *Ching Feng* 28/1 (1985).

Jacobs, Norman. *The Korean Road to Modernization and Development*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1985.

Jo, Yung-Hwan. *Korea's response to the West*. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Korea Research & Publications, 1971.

Johnston, Geoffrey and A. Hamish Ion. *Canadian Missionaries and Korea: Two Case Studies in Public Opinion*. Donner Canadian Foundation & The Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada, 1988.

Kalton, Michael C. *The four-seven debate: an annotated translation of the most famous controversy in Korean neo-Confucian thought*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994.

\_\_\_\_\_. "An Introduction to Sirhak." *Korea Journal* 15 (May 1975): 29-46.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Neo-Confucian Studies Phase II: Future." In *Korean Studies and Its Tasks and Prospectives: Proceedings of the 5<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Korean Studies*, Vol. 2, 256-270. Seoul: The Academy of Korean Studies, 1988.

Kang, Hi-Woon. "Development of the Korean Ruling Class from Late Silla to Early Koryo." Ph. D. Thesis, The University of Washington, 1964.

Kang, Shin-Myung. *Modernization and Christianity in Korea*. Seoul: SugSill University Press, 1983.

Kang, Wi-Jo. *Christ and Caesar in modern Korea: a history of Christianity and politics*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1997.

Keum, Jang-Tai. *Tongso Kyosop kwa Kuntae Hanguk Sasang-ui Chui-ekwanhan Yon-gu*. [A Study on the Tendency of Korean Thoughts through the Modern Interaction between East and West]. Seoul: Sunggyun-gwan University, 1978.

Kim, Byong-Suh. "The Explosive Growth of the Korean Church Today: a sociological analysis." *International Review of Mission* 74/293 (Jan, 1985): 59-72.

Kim, C. I., and Chang-Boh Chee, eds. *Aspects of Social Change in Korea*. Michigan: The Korea Research and Publications, 1968.

Kim, Chai-Choon. "The Presbyterian Church in Korea." *Reformed and Protestant World* 28/1 (March 1964): 21-26.

Kim, Chang-Mun, *Catholic Korea, Yesterday and Today*. Seoul: Catholic Korea Publishing Co., 1964.

Kim, Eui-Hwan. "A Historical Review of Korean Christian Theology (1900-1945): Focusing the Presbyterian and Methodist Church." *Shinhak Jinam* 65/4 (Winter 1998): 7-33.

Kim, Ha-Tai. *Tongso Chorhak ui Mannam*. [The Meeting of Eastern and Western Philosophies]. Seoul: Chonro Sojok, 1985.

Kim, Heup-Young. "Jen and Agape: Towards a Confucian Christology." *Asia Journal of Theology* 8/2 (1994): 335-364.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Sang-Myung yei Sahae-Yooju-Junki ya Asian Shinhak." [A Sociocosmic Biography of the Exploited Life and Asian Theology]. *Kangnam University Journal of Humanity and Society* 5 (1998): 99-118.

\_\_\_\_\_. "A Tao of Asian Theology in the 21st Century: From the Perspective of the Ugumch'i Phenomenon." *The Continuation Committee of the Congress of Asian Theologians* (1998): 60-72.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Two 'Concrete-Universal' Ways: Their Convergence and Divergence." *Ching Feng* 35/1 (March 1992): 4-12.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Wang Yang-Ming and Karl Barth: A Confucian-Christian Dialogue*. London, New York and Lanham: University Press of America, 1996.

Kim, Hyung-Chan, "Yun Chi-ho in America: The Training of a Korean Patriot in the South, 1888-1893." *Korea Journal* 18/6 (June 1978): 15-24.

Kim, Ill-Soo. "Organizational patterns of Korean-American Methodist Churches: denomination and personal community." In *Rethinking Methodist History*, edited by Russell Richey and Rowe Kenneth, 228-237. Nashville: Kingswood Books, 1985..

Kim, In-Su. *Protestants and the formation of modern Korean nationalism, 1885-1920: a study of the contributions of Horace G. Underwood and Sun Chu Kil*. New York: P. Lang, 1996.

Kim, Joseph Chang-Mun. *Catholic Korea: Yesterday and Today, 1784-1884*. Seoul: St. Joseph, 1984.

Kim, Kwang-Ok. "The Role of *Madangguk* in Contemporary Korea's Popular Culture Movement." *Korea Journal* 37/3 (Autumn 1997): 5-21.

Kim, Kwang-Sik. *Contextualization and Interpretation*. Seoul: Daehan Kidokkyo Seohae, 1987.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Mission and Indigenization*. Seoul: Daehan Kidokkyo Seohae, 1975.

Kim, Kyung-Jae. "History and Prospects of the Protestant Church in Korea." In *Korea and Christianity*, edited by Chai-Shin Yu, 161-190. Seoul, Berkeley, Toronto: Korean Scholar Press, 1996.

Kim, Man-Gap. *Sociology and Social Change in Korea*. Seoul: Seoul National University Press, 1982.

Kim, Myung-Hyuk. "Ancestor Worship in the Korean Church." *Evangelical Review of Theology* 8 (Oct, 1984): 236-245.

Kim, Quee-Young. "Korea's Confucian Heritage and Social Change." *Journal of Developing Societies* IV (July-October 1988): 255-269.

Kim, Seung-Tae. *Historical Reflection of Korean Christianity*. Seoul: Word of Press, 1994.

Kim, Sung-Hae. "Liberation Through Humanization: with a focus on Korean Confucianism." *Ching Feng* 33/1-2 (April 1990): 20-46.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Silent Heaven Giving Birth to the Multitude of People." *Ching Feng* 31/4 (Dec, 1988): 195-224.

Kim, Tae-Hwan. "An Empirical Study of the Factors Contributing to Rapid Church Growth in Korea." D. Min. Thesis, The Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1984.

Kim, Yang-Sun. "Ross Version and the Korean Protestantism." In *The Paeksan Hakpo*, 401-461. Seoul, 1967.

Kim, Yong-Bock, ed. *Minjung Theology: People as the Subjects of History*. Singapore: The Commission on Theological Concerns, The Christian Conference of Asia, 1981.

Korea National Christian Council, *Prayer Calendar of Christian Missions in Korea*. Seoul, 1950-1983.

Korean Overseas Information Service. *Korea: its history and culture*. Seoul, Korea, 1994.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A Handbook of Korea*. Seoul: Ministry of Culture & Information, 1979.

Koyama, Kosuke. "The Asian Approach to Christ." *Missiology: An International Review* 12/4 (Oct, 1984): 435-447.

Küng, Hans and Julia Ching. *Christianity and Chinese Religions*. New York: Doubleday, 1989.

Kydd, Ronald A. N. "Canadian Pentecostalism and the Evangelical Impulse." In *Aspects of the Canadian Evangelical Experience*, edited by G. A. Rawlyk. Montreal, Kingston, London, Buffalo: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1997.

Lancaster, Lewis R., and C. S. Yu, eds. *Introduction of Buddhism to Korea: New Cultural Patterns*. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1989.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Assimilation of Buddhism in Korea: Religious Maturity and Innovation in the Silla Dynasty*. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1991.

Lee, Chang-Sik, "A Historical Review of Theological Thought for the Last One Century in Korea." *East Asia Journal of Theology* 3/2 (1985): 321-326.

\_\_\_\_\_. "A Study of A Chinese Nestorian Sutra, 'Jesus Messiah'." *Northeast Asia Journal of Theology* 13 (Sept, 1974), 46-52.

Lee, Hee-Dok. *Koryo Yukyo Jungchi Sasang ui Yunkoo*. [Confucian Political Idea During the Koryo Dynasty]. Seoul: Ilhokak, 1983.

Lee, Hwain-Chang. *Confucius, Christ, and Co-partnership: competing liturgies for the soul of Korean American women*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1994.

Lee, Hyosung. "Church Growth Through Mission to the Community: A Model of Outreach for a Korean Church." D. Min. Thesis, Erskine Theological Seminary, 1998.

Lee, Jung-Young. "The American Missionary Movement in Korea, 1882-1945." *Missiology* 11 (October 1983): 387-402.

\_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Ancestor Worship and Christianity in Korea*. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen, 1983.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Ancestor Worship and Christianity*. Lewiston: E. Mellen, 1988.

\_\_\_\_\_, ed. *An Emerging Theology in World Perspective*. Mystic, Connecticut: twenty-third Publication, 1988.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Christian syncretism with other religions in Korea." In *Essays on Korean Heritage and Christianity*, edited by Sang Hyun Lee. Princeton Junctions, New Jersey: Association of Korean Christian Scholars in North America, 1984.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Korean Shamanistic Rituals*. New York: Mouton, 1981.

Lee, Ki-Baik. *A New History of Korea*. Translated by Wagner, Edward W with Edward J. Shultz. Seoul: Ilchokak Publishers, 1984.

Lee, Man-Gap. *Sociology and Social Change in Korea*. Seoul: Seoul National University Press, 1982.

Lee, Peter K. H. "Contextualization and Inculcation of Christianity and Confucianism in the Contemporary World." *Ching Feng* 34/2 (June 1991): 84-93.

Lee, Peter K. H., and Liu, Shu-hsien. "A Confucian-Christian Dialogue: Liberating Life as a Commitment to Truth." *Ching Feng* 33/3 (Sept, 1990): 113-135.

Lee, Sang-Bok. *Asian thought and Culture: A Comparative Study Between Minjung Theology and Reformed Theology from a Missiological Perspective*. New York, Washington, D. C., Bern, Berlin, Vienna, Paris: Peter Lang, 1996.

Lee, Sang-Taek. *Religion and Social Formation in Korea: Minjung and Millenarianism*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1996.

Lee, Sookjong. "A Study of the Relationship of the Korean Church to the Indigenous Culture of Korea." *Asia Journal of Theology* 9/2 (1995): 230-247.

Lee, Sung-Nyong, ed. *Korean Studies Today*. Seoul: Institute of Asian Studies, Seoul National University Press, 1970.

Lee, Tae-Young. "Seoul as a missionary-sending city." *Kukminilbo*. May 27, 1999.

Lee, Un-Sunn. *Korean Feminist Theology in a Postmodern Age: A Dialogue with Confucianism, Feminism and Pedagogy*. Waegwan, Korea: Benedict, 1997.

Lin, Timothy Tian-Min. "The Concept of Man in Confucianism and Christianity." *Northeast Asia Journal of Theology* 14 (March 1975): 20-24.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Confucian Concept of *Jen* and The Christian Concept of Love." *Ching Feng* 15 (1972): 162-171.

Liu, Shu-Hsien. "On Confucius' Attitude Toward Gods, Sacrifice, and Heaven." *Ching Feng* 34/1 (Jan, 1991): 16-27.

Luhmann, Frederick J. "Respect for Older Persons: A Confucian Perspective." *Journal of Religion and Aging* 3/4 (Spring/Summer 1987): 83-90.

Lundell, In-Gyeong Kim. *Bridging the gaps: contextualization among Korean Nazarene Churches in America*. New York: Peter Lang, 1995.

Mackie, Steven G. "God's People in Asia: A Key Concept in Asian Theology." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 42 (1989): 215-240.

Mason, Edwards, Mahn Je Kim, Dwight H. Perkins, Kwang Suk Kim, and David C. Cole. *The Economic and Social Modernization of the Republic of Korea*. Cambridge, MA and London, England: Harvard University Press, 1980.

McCully, Elizabeth A. *A Corn of Wheat: The Life of Rev. W. J. McKenzie of Korea*. Toronto: Westminster, 1904.

McGrath, Alister E., ed. *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Modern Christian Thought*. Oxford, England & Cambridge, MA.: Blackwell, 1993. S.v. "Korean Christian Thought."

Min, Kyung-Bae. "Image of Jesus Understood by the Korean Christians." *Je Sam II* [The Third Day, a monthly journal of theological ideas] (April 1972): 81-117.

Min, Kyong-Suk, *Catholic Socio-Religious Survey of Korea, Part I, Findings of Content Analysis, The Spiritual Ethos of Korean Catholicism*, 2. vols. Seoul: Social Research Institute, Sogang University, 1971.

Mingana, A. *The Early Spread of Christianity in Asia and the Far East: A New Document*. Manchester: The University Press, 1952.

Moffett, Samuel H. *The Christians of Korea*. New York: Friendship, 1962.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Church in Korea." *The Japan Christian Quarterly* 39/3 (Sum, 1973): 125-131.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Korea" In *New 20th Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*. Grand

Rapids, Michigan: Baker 1991.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Protestantism: Its Influence on Modernization in Korea." In *Modern Transformation of Korea*, 194-201. Seoul: Sejong, 1970.

Moon, Hee-Suk. *A Korean Minjung Theology: An Old Testament Perspective*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1985.

Nahm, Andrew C. *Korea: tradition and transformation: a history of the Korean people*. New Jersey: Hollym International Corp., 1988.

Neville, Robert Cummings. "Confucian-Christian Incompatibilities." *Ching Feng* 37/4 (November 1994): 195-216.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The 'Puritan Ethics' in Confucianism and Christianity." *Ching Feng* 34/2 (June 1991): 100-103.

Nevius, Helen Sanford Coan. *The Life of John Livingston Nevius, for forty years a missionary in China*. New York, Chicago: Fleming H. Revell, 1895.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Our Life in China*. New York: R. Caster, 1869.

Nevius, John Livingston. *China and the Chinese*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1869.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Method of Mission Work*. London: China Inland Mission, Morgan & Scott, 1898.

Ogden, Graham S. "Biblical and Confucian Thought: A Consideration of Some Common Teachings." *Taiwan Journal of Theology* 4 (March 1982): 215-227.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Numerical Sayings in Israelite Wisdom and in Confucius." *Taiwan Journal of Theology* 3 (1980): 145-176.

Oh, Dae-Sung. "A Study of Sung-Bum Yun's Theology of Sung." Th. M. Thesis, Mokwon University, 1988.

Oh, Kang-Nam. "Christianity and Religious Pluralism in Korea." *Religious Studies and Theology* 6/3 (September 1986): 27-38.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Sagehood and Metanoia: The Confucian-Christian Encounter in Korea." *Journal of the Academy of Religion* 61/2 (1993): 303-320.

Oh, Yun-Tae. *The History of Korean Christianity*. Seoul: Haesun Munhwa sa, 1978.

Paik, George. *The History of Protestant Mission in Korea, 1832-1910*. Seoul: Yonsei University Press, 1973.

Pak, Chong-Hong. "Historical Review of Korean Confucianism." *Korea Journal* 3 (May 1964): 5-11.

Palais, James B. "Confucianism and the Aristocratic/Bureaucratic Balance in Korea." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 44 (1984): 427-468.

Palmer, Spencer J. *Korea and Christianity: The Problem of Identification with Tradition*. Seoul: Hollym Corporation Publishers, 1967.

Park, Bong-Rang. "A Response to Sung-Bum Yun's Theological Attempt of Contextualization." In *Korean Religion, Culture and Christianity*, 370-392. Seoul: Methodist Theological Seminary Press, 1988.

Park, Keun-Won. "Reformed Witness in Korea: A Historical Reflection." *The Reformed World* 39/ 4 (1986): 608-616.

Park, Pong-Bae. "Christianity in the Land of Shamanism, Buddhism and Confucianism." *South East Asia Journal of Theology* 14 (1972-1973): 33-39.

Park, Hyung-Kyu. "The Search for Self-identity and Liberation." *International Review of Mission* 74/293 (Jan, 1985): 37-48.

Park, Jae-Soon. "Jesus' Table Community Movement and the Church." *Asia Journal of Theology* 7 (April 1993): 60-83.

Park, Keun-Won. "Evangelism and Mission in Korea: a reflection from an ecumenical perspective." *International Review of Mission* 74/293 (Jan, 1985): 49-58.

Park, Sung. "Theology of Han (the Abyss of Pain)." *Quarterly Review* 9/1 (Spring 1989): 48-62.

Park, Sung-Ho. "Minjung Theology: A Korean Contextual Theology." *Pacific Theological Review* (Winter 1985).

Park, Sun-Hee. "An Empirical Study of the Physical Changes Exhibited in Korean Shamans during Spirit-possession." *Korea Journal* 37/1 (Spring 1997): 5-34.

Phillips, E. H., and Eui Young Yu, eds. *Religions in Korea: Beliefs and Cultural Values*. Los Angeles: Center for Korean-American and Korean Studies, California State University, 1982.

Poitras, Edward W. "Christian Identity in Korea Today." *The Japan Christian Quarterly* 44/1 (Winter 1978): 81-84.

Pyun, Sunghwan. "Other Religions and Theology." *East Asia Journal of Theology* 3/2

(1985): 327-353.

Reid, Darrel R. "Towards a Fourfold Gospel: A. B. Simpson, John Salmon, and the Christian and Missionary Alliance in Canada." In *Aspects of the Canadian Evangelical Experience*, edited by G. A. Rawlyk. Montreal, Kingston, London, Buffalo: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1997.

The Research Centre for the Study of Korean Confucianism, ed. *Chosun Yuhak ei Hakpales*. [The Schools of Korean Confucianism]. Seoul: Yemoonseowon, 1996.

Ri, Jean Sangbae. *Confucius et Jesus Christ: La Premiere Theologie Chrétienne en Corée D'apres L'oeuvre de Yl Piek lettore Confuceen 1754-1786*. Paris: Editions Beauchesne, 1979.

Ro, Bong-Rin and Nelson L. Marlin, eds. *Korean Church Growth Explosion*. Seoul: Word of Life Press, 1983.

Rore, Ronald and Zoe Mars. *Community Development: Comparative Case Studies in India, the Republic of Korea, Mexico and Tanzania*. Paris & London: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1981.

Rozman, Gilbert, ed. *The East Asian Region: Confucian Heritage and Its Modern Adaptation*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Rule, Paul A. "Jesuit and Confucian?: Chinese Religion in the Journals of Matteo Ricci SJ." *The Journal of Religious History* 5/2 (Dec, 1968): 105-124.

Ryu, Dong-Sik. *Hankuk Jongkyo wa Kidokkyo*. [Korean Religions and Christianity in Korea]. Seoul: The Christian Literature Society of Korea, 1965.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Vein of Korean Theology*. Seoul: Jungmangsa, 1982.

Ryu, Tongshik. "Culture and Theology in Korea: The P'ung-Ryu Theology." *East Asia Journal of Theology* 3/2 (1985): 310-319.

*Saemaul Undong*. [New Community Movement]. Seoul, Korea [1973].

Shearer, Roy E. "The Evangelistic Missionary's Role in Church Growth in Korea." *International Review of Mission* 54 (1965): 462-470.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Wildfire: Church Growth in Korea*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1966.

Shim, Il-Sup. "The New Religious Movements in the Korean Church." *International Review of Mission* 74/293 (Jan, 1985): 103-108.

Shin, Susan S. "The Tonghak Movement: From Enlightenment to Revolution." *Form 5* (Winter-Spring 1978-1979): 1-78.

Sin, Yong-Ha. *Formation and Development of Modern Korean Nationalism*. Seoul: Daekwang Munhwasa, 1989.

Smith, Huston. *The World's Religions*. San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1991.

Soltau, T. Stanley, *Korea: The Hermit Nation and its Response to Christianity*. London: World Dominion, 1932.

Song, Kon-Ho. "A History of The Christian Movement in Korea." *International Review of Mission* 74/293 (Jan, 1985): 19-36.

Soon, In-Soo. *Yul-Gok Sasang Ui Kyuyuk Leeyum*. [Yul-Gok's Philosophy of Education]. Seoul: Moonuem Sa, 1996.

Speer, Robert. *Missions and Politics in Asia*. New York: Revell, 1898.

Suh, David Kwang-Sun. "American Missionaries and A Hundred Years of Korean Protestantism." *International Review of Mission* 74/293 (Jan, 1985): 5-18.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Theology of Story Telling: a theology by minjung." *Ministerial Formation* 31 (Sept, 1985): 10-22.

Thornberry, Mike. "The Encounter of Christianity and Confucianism: How Modern Confucianism Views the Encounter." *Southeast Asia Journal of Theology* 10/1 (July 1968): 47-62.

Trollope, M. N. "An Old Map and Its Story." *The Korea Magazine* 2/9 (September 1918): 386-396.

Tu, Wei-Ming. *Humanity and Self-Cultivation: Essays in Confucian Thought*. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1979.

Underwood, Horace G. *The Call of Korea, Political-Social-Religious*. N.Y., Chicago, Toronto, London & Edinburgh: Fleming H. Revell, 1908.

Underwood, Horace Horton. *Modern Education in Korea*. New York: International Press, 1926.

Underwood, Lillias H. *Underwood of Korea*. N.Y., Chicago, Toronto, London & Edinburgh: Fleming H. Revell, 1918.

Weems, Benjamin B. *Reform, Rebellion, and the Heavenly Way*. Tucson, AZ.: The University of Arizona Press, 1966.

Wells, Kenneth, ed. *South Korea's minjung movement: the culture and politics of dissidence*. Honolulu, Hawaii: University of Hawaii Press, 1995.

Whang, In-Joung. *Management of Rural Change in Korea: The Saemaul Undong*. Seoul: The Institute of Social Sciences Korean Studies Series 5, Seoul National University Press, 1981.

Whiteley, Marilyn F. "Sailing for the Shore: The Canadian Holiness Tradition." In *Aspects of the Canadian Evangelical Experience*, edited by G. A. Rawlyk. Montreal, Kingston, London, Buffalo: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1997.

Wickeri, Philip L. "Asian Theologies in Review." *Theology Today* 41 (Jan, 1985): 458-462.

Woo, Chol-Such. "Modern Korean Society and Roman Catholic Christianity." *Soong Chun Journal* 5 (1974).

Woodbury, Frederick M. "The Nevius Methods: their particular application to missionary work in Korea." B.D. Thesis, Presbyterian College, Montreal, PQ., 1953.

Yamashita, Akiko and Patricia Yamada. "Korean Shamanism and Christianity: A shaman's story." *Japan Religion* 21 (Jl, 1996): 299-322.

Yang, Key P., and Gregory Henderson. "An Outline History of Korean Confucianism." *Journal of Asian Studies* 18 (February 1959): 269-270.

Yang, Nak-Heong. *Reformed Social Ethics and the Korean Church*. New York: P. Lang, 1996.

Yi, Hyo-Jae. "Christian Mission and the Liberation of Korean Women." *International Review of Mission* 74/293 (Jan, 1985): 93-102.

Yi, Pyongdo. *Han'guk yukuyksa*. [History of Korean Confucianism]. Seoul: Asea munhwasa, 1987.

Yi, Tae-Jin. "The Influence of Neo-Confucianism on 14th-16th Century Korean Population Growth." *Korea Journal* 37/2 (Summer 1997): 5-23.

Yang, Key P., and Gregory Henderson. "An Outline History of Korean Confucianism." *Journal of Asian Studies* 18 (February 1959): 269-270.

Yao, Xinzong. "Jesus and Confucius: A Comparison." *Scottish Journal of Religious Studies* 16: 37-50.

Yi, Ik. "Ch'ilguk," *Songho Saesol*. [Minute Explanations on Various Topics by Songho Yi Ik]. Seoul: Kyonghi ch'ulp'an-sa, 1967.

Yi, Pyong-Do. *Han Kuk Yu Hak Sa Choko*. [History of the Korean Confucianism]. Seoul National University Press, the Department of History, 1959.

Yoo, Youngsik. *Earlier Canadian missionaries in Korea: a study in history, 1888-1895*. Missisauga, Ont.: Society for Korean & Related Studies, 1987.

Yoon, Yee-Heum. "The Contemporary Religious Situation in Korea." A paper presented in the Conference on Religion and Contemporary Society in Korea, Center of East Asian Studies, University of California at Berkeley, November 11-12, 1988.

You, In-Jong. "The Impact of the American Protestant Missions on Korean Education from 1805 to 1932." Ph.D. diss., The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1967.

Yu, Chai-Shin, ed. *Korea and Christianity*. Seoul: Berkeley, Calif.: Korean Scholar Press, 1996.

Yu, Chai-Shin and R. Guisso, eds. *Shamanism: the spirit world of Korea*. Berkeley, California: Asian Humanities, 1988.

Yu, Dong-Sik. "A Historical Survey regarding the Formation of the Korean Christian Theology." *Kidokkyo Sasang* (June 1968): 112-117.

Yu, Hong-Yul. *Han'guk Ch'onjukyhoe-sa*. [The History of Korean Catholic Church]. Seoul: K'at'ollik Ch'ulpansa, 1964.

Yu, Tong-Sik. *Minsok Chongyo wa Hanguk Munhwa*. [Folk Religion and Korean Culture]. Seoul: Hyundae Sasang Sa, 1978.

Yun, Sung-Bum. "Christian Confucianism As An Attempt At A Korean Indigenous Theology." *Northeast Asia Journal of Theology* 24-25 (1980): 101-110.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Ethics East and West*. Translated by Michael C. Kalton. Seoul: Christian Literature Society, 1977.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Hankukjok Shinhak: Song ui Haesokhak*. [The Korean Theology: The Hermeneutics of Sincerity]. Seoul: Sunmyung Munhwasa, 1972.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Hankuk Jongkyo Moonhwa Ya Hankuk Juk Kidokkyo*. [Religion, Culture in Korea and Korean Christianity]. Seoul: Methodist Theological Seminary Press, 1998).

\_\_\_\_\_. *Hankuk Sahae Ya Hankuk KyoHae Ye KaJae*. [Korean Society and the Task of Korean Church]. Seoul: Methodist Theological Seminary Press, 1998.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Hankuk Yookyo Ya Hankuk Juk Shinhak*. [Korean Confucianism and Korean Theology]. Seoul: Methodist Theological Seminary Press, 1998.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Hwan-in, Hwan-ung, Hwan-gon-un got Hananim-ida.” [Hwanin, Hwanung, Hwangom, truly Gods]. *Sasangge* (May 1963): 263-264.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Hyo*. [Filial Piety]. Seoul: Taehan Kidokkyo Sohoe, 1973.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Hyo ya Jongkyo*. [Filial Piety and Religion]. Seoul: Methodist Theological Seminary Press, 1998.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Hyundae wa Hyodo*. [Filial Piety in Contemporary Society]. Seoul: Eulgi Munhwasa, 1975.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Kidokkyo wa Hankuk Sasang*. [Christianity and Korean Thought]. Seoul: Daehan Kidokkyo Seohae, 1964.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Korean Culture, Religion and Christianity*. Seoul: Methodist Theological Seminary Press, 1998.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Sanghwal Shin ya-ang wa Sangmyung Sasang*. [Practical Christian Faith and the Idea of Life]. Seoul: Methodist Theological Seminary Press, 1998.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Shinhak Juk Inkan Hak Kwa Hyunhai Shinhak Ja Dul*. [Theological Anthropology and Modern Christian Theologians]. Seoul: Methodist Theological Seminary Press, 1998.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Sungseo Yeunkoo: Romaseo wa Galadiaseo*. [Romans and Galatians]. Seoul: Methodist Theological Seminary Press, 1998.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Tae-Gye wa Yul-Gok uei Chun Ehae Sasang.” [Tae-Gye and Yul-Gok’s Understanding of the Heaven]. In *Korean Confucianism and Christianity*, 461-473. Seoul: Methodist Theological Seminary Press, 1998.

\_\_\_\_\_. “A Theological Approach to the Indigenization of the Gospel.” *The Northeast Asia Journal of Theology* 3 (1969): 29-37.

\_\_\_\_\_. “A Theological Approach to the Understanding of the Indigenization of Christianity.” In *Korean Religion, Culture and Christianity*, 447-461. Seoul: Methodist Theological Seminary Press, 1988.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Theology of Sincerity—an attempt to form a Korean theology.” *The Northeast Asia Journal of Theology* 5-6 (1970-1): 71-77.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Sung Theology: A Yellow Theology*. Seoul: Sunmyung Muwhasa, 1972.

Yun, Tae-Rim. *Uisik Kujosangulo bon Hankukmin*. [The Mental Structure of Korean People]. Seoul: Hyunamsa, 1970.

**III. Secondary References**

Baum, Gregory. *Liberation Theology and Marxism*. Montreal, PQ.: McGill University Press, 1986.

Bethune-Baker, J. F. *An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine*. London: Methuen, 1903.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Nestorius and His Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1908.

Boff, Leonardo. *Introducing Liberation Theology*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1987.

Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Christ the center*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Christology*. London: Collins, 1966.

Bruce, A. B. *The Humiliation of Christ in Its Physical, Ethical, and Official Aspects*. New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1892.

Bultmann, R. "New Testament and Mythology." In *Kerygma and Myth*, edited by Hans Bartsch. New York: Harper & Row, 1961.

Bultmann, R., and Karl Kundsins, eds. *Form Criticism: Two Essays on New Testament Research*. New York: Harper, 1941.

Burkitt, C. *Early Christianity Outside the Roman Empire*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1899.

Cullmann, O. *The Christology of the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963.

Ferguson, Sinclair, David F. Wright and J. I. Packer, eds. *New Dictionary of Theology*. Downers Grove, Ill., Leicester, England: InterVarsity, 1988. S.v. "Liberation Theology," by H. M. Conn.

Frei, Hans W. "The 'Literal Reading' of Biblical Narrative in the Christian Tradition: Does It Stretch or Will It Break?" In *The Bible and the Narrative Tradition*, edited by Frank McConnell, 36-77. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.

Gruchy, John W. de. *Liberating Reformed Theology: A South African Contribution to an Ecumenical Debate*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1991.

Gutierrez, G. *A Theology of Liberation*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1973.

Hall, Douglas John. *The Canada Crisis*. Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1980.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Confessing the Faith: Christian Theology in a North American Context*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Hope against Hope: Towards an Indigenous Theology of the Cross*. Geneva: World Student Christian Federation, 1971.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Lighten Our Darkness*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Professing the Faith: Christian Theology in a North American Context*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Reality of the Gospel and the Unreality of the Churches*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Thinking The Faith: Christian Theology in a North American Context*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989.

Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

Hudson, Winthrop S. *American Protestantism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Kelly, J. N. D. *Early Christian Doctrines*. New York: Harper and Row, 1960.

Kirk, J. Andrew. *Liberation Theology: An Evangelical View From the Third World*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1979.

Loofs, Friedrich. *Nestorius and His Place in the History of Christian Doctrine*. New York: Lenox Hill, 1975.

McGovern, Arthur F. *Liberation Theology and Its Critics: Toward an Assessment*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1989.

Moltmann, Jürgen. *Jesus Christ for Today's World*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Hope for the Church: Moltmann in dialogue with practical theology*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1979.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Theology of Hope: on the ground and the implications of a Christian Eschatology*. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Trinity and the Kingdom The Doctrine of God*. New York: Harper & Row, 1981.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Way of Jesus Christ: Christology in messianic dimensions*. London: SCM, 1990.

Pannenberg, Wolfhart. *The Idea of God and Human Freedom*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1973.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus, God and man*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Spirit, faith, and Church*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Theology and the Kingdom of God*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969.

Saeki, P. Y. *The Nestorian Documents and Relics in China*. Tokyo: Maruzen, 1951.

Schall, James. *Liberation Theology in Latin America*. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1982.

Segundo, J. L. *The Liberation of Theology*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1976.

Sigmund, Paul E. *Liberation theology at the Crossroads: Democracy or Revolution?* New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Song, Choan-Seng. *The Compassionate God*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1982.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Theology from the Womb of Asia*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1986.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Third-eye Theology: theology in formation in Asian settings*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1984.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Tell us our names: story theology from an Asian perspective*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1984.

Sweet, William W. *The American Churches*. New York & Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1947.

Tillich, Paul. *Systematic Thology*, Vol. 1. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1951.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Theology of Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959.