



Title	Kanzo Uchimura's and Karl Barth's Studies on Romans
Author(s)	Sasaki, Kei
Citation	Journal of the Graduate School of Letters, 5, 27-40
Issue Date	2010-03
Doc URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2115/42863
Type	bulletin (article)
File Information	JGSL5_002.pdf



[Instructions for use](#)

Kanzo Uchimura's and Karl Barth's Studies on Romans

Kei SASAKI

Abstract: In this paper, I will compare the most representative work of Kanzo Uchimura, one of the most representative Japanese Protestant Christians between the Meiji and early Showa era, *Romasho no Kenkyuu* (*A Study on Romans*) with also the most representative work, studying the same Epistle of the New Testament, *Der Römerbrief*, written by the most prominent Protestant theologian of modern Europe, Karl Barth. Both works were written in almost the same period. Although these two works were written on completely opposite sides on the globe, they have some interesting similarities, not only superficially but also substantially. For example, both give very orthodox comments on the verses many times. However, the differences between the two works are very suggestive to understand Uchimura's indigenous Christian Faith. Uchimura is extremely particular about the Apostle Paul's character and personality, on the other hand, he does not talk about God as "ultra-transcendental" as Barth does. These kinds of observations of their works will be useful to answer my ultimate question, "How We Become Christians," namely what exactly our Japanese Christianity was and what it is now, and how we Japanese have become and now become Christians.

(Received on December 15, 2009)

Introduction

I have already written three papers on 内村鑑三 (Uchimura Kanzo, 1861-1930), one of the most representative Christian thinkers between the Japanese Meiji and early Showa era. I have been scrutinizing some of his articles included in his huge number of volumes to know his thoughts so deeply that I could explain his rather complicated Christian faith much clearer, and thus could get some hints to find the answers to the question "how did and do we Japanese become Christians?" In my past three papers, my results focused mainly on the relationships between Uchimura's Christian faith and Japanese or Asian moralistic thought, for example Confucian or Shintoist ones. This time, I will take a slightly different approach than before and compare Uchimura's most representative work, 『羅馬書の研究〔*Romasho no Kenkyuu*〕』¹ (*A Study on Romans*) with the also most representative work studying the same Epistle of the New Testament, *Der Römerbrief*,² written by the most prominent Protestant theologian of modern Europe, Karl Barth (1886-1968). The original reason why I wanted to compare these two books

is simply that they were written at almost the same time (the former was written in 1921–1922, the latter in 1919).³ These two works, written on completely opposite sides on the globe, have also considerably different styles of thinking from each other as I will show later. I think that these differences are very suggestive for us when we are trying to figure out the indigenous factors or ways, that we Japanese understand the Christian faith and become Christians. The aim of this paper is to show these distinctively.⁴

I The Similarities between Uchimura's and Barth's Works

Comparing Uchimura's *Romasho no Kenkyuu* and Barth's *Der Römerbrief*, there are some interesting similarities in their appearances, even though they could be only superficial or coincidental.

First, these two works, the commentaries on the most important Epistle of the Apostle Paul in the New Testament, were published on opposite sides of the globe in completely different places, but in nearly the same period of the crisis after World War I and just as the approaching thunder of World War II began to be heard. At this point, it would be useful to remind ourselves that they, Uchimura and Barth, were pacifists in a sense,⁵ which we know from their writings.

However, as you can see from the life-spans of the two authors, Uchimura wrote *Romasho no Kenkyuu* late in his life, around age 61–63, but Barth wrote *Der Römerbrief* near the beginning of his academic life. This may be a factor in some of the differences in their works. In this paper, however, I would like to look at only the works themselves and will not address any biographical influences.

Second, their works have a similar feature in their quantity; Uchimura's is almost 450 pages in Japanese and is the biggest of all of his works.⁶ Barth's is much longer and is almost 570 pages in German (nearly 1,000 pages in Japanese!) and is also his biggest book except for his tremendously huge systematic works, *Die Kirchliche Dogmatik*.⁷ It might not be said whether the number of pages in these books is absolutely many or not, but it can be said that these two works are not so small relatively.⁸ However, even if they are similar in their big size as a whole, interestingly enough, the number of pages written on each of the chapters, namely discussions by the authors, are very different from each other, which I will mention again in section II.

Third, concerning the contents of these two works, we can find a particular similarity between them, which is that both Uchimura and Barth, maintain a very orthodox Christian creed, for example, about the Trinity, the Redemption and the Cross,⁹ the resurrection of the dead, and so on. This is a most interesting point so I would like to examine it in more detail here.

For example, Uchimura writes on Romans, chapter 8, where “the word ‘Holy Spirit’ is used many times, in verses 16, 23, 26, and so on,”¹⁰ discussing the Trinity:

“Namely, here *are the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Christ, and the Holy Spirit*. However, it seems as if these three are separate things but then again they refer to the same one. . . . Here, the Holy Spirit, Christ, and God are mysteriously put side by side. God is not one, but made up of three, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the teaching of the so-called Trinity is shown here. Looking at Romans Chapter 8, we can see that *it is actually by the co-working of God the*

Father, Christ, and the Holy Spirit, that human beings are saved. In other words, it is the work of God the Trinity.”¹¹

Very interestingly, Barth expresses his creed in the Trinity in his comments on the same chapter 8:

“. . . Nevertheless the paradox remains: the Spirit becomes a thing in the midst of other things; what is intangible and impossible, unknown and unobservable, becomes concrete and possible, known and observable. Such is the paradox of the Spirit. Describable only in negatives, He nevertheless exists, and we must preserve the paradox; that is to say, daring to account Him as though He were a thing among other things and the occasion of our behaviour, we must, paradoxically, worship Him *as the third Person of Godhead, . . .*”¹²

Barth's argument is very complicated, or to say, “paradoxical (ly),” as I will discuss in detail in section II, but he surely keeps the orthodox dogma of the Trinity even though he does not mention it so many times in his work.¹³

Uchimura also upholds the orthodoxy of the Redemption and the Cross at many points in his work. For example, he makes the following comments on Romans 3:24. “they are now justified by his grace as a gift, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus” (NRSV):

“The last phrase of the verse 24 is ‘through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus’ (NRSV). . . . *Namely, due to the existence of the redemption of Christ, people can live, being justified only through one's faith alone.* To see the Cross of Christ as redemption from the sins of all people is indispensable as the foundation of evangelicalism. Now, even though 新神学[Shin Shingaku=New Theology]¹⁴ is rejecting this as obsolete thoughts, the precious fruit of the redemption itself continue to stand forever as a miraculous medicine to cure the injuries of our souls.”¹⁵

Very interestingly again, Barth comments on almost the same passage in Romans 3:25, which, Uchimura says, “is not only the center of Romans but also really the center of the New Testament.”¹⁶ “. . . Christ Jesus, whom God put forward as a sacrifice of atonement by his blood, effective through faith. He did this to show his righteousness, because in his divine forbearance he had passed over the sins previously committed” (NRSV), mentioning the Redemption and the Cross:

“Consequently, in Jesus also atonement occurs only through the faithfulness of God, *by his blood*: only, that is to say, in the inferno of His complete solidarity with all the sin and weakness and misery of the flesh; in the secret of an occurrence which seems to us wholly negative; in the extinguishing of all the lights — hero, prophet, wonderworker — which mark the brilliance of human life, a brilliance which shone also in His life, whilst He lived a man amongst men; and finally, in the absolute scandal of His death upon the Cross. . . . ‘In the picture of the Redeemer (“Erlöser” in the original German) the dominant colour is

blood' (Ph. Fr. Hiller), because, in the way of the Cross, in the offering of His life, and in His death, the radical nature of the redemption ("Erlösung" in the original German) which He brings and the utter novelty of the world which He proclaims are first brought to light."¹⁷

Here too, Barth's rhetorical or paradoxical writing style is remarkable, but also it can be said that his statements are clearly orthodox.¹⁸

As the last example of the similarities between Uchimura's and Barth's orthodoxy, let's look at some statements in which they discuss the resurrection of the dead. 1 Corinthians, chapter 15, is the place where Paul discusses the resurrection of the dead thematically. Both Uchimura and Barth wrote about this chapter in other writings,¹⁹ so, in the works, which I am analyzing here, it cannot be said that they investigate this theme thoroughly. However, they wrote about it in such a way that we can catch a clear glimpse of what must be their thorough arguments in their other writings.

Uchimura comments on Romans 6:9-13, "We know that Christ, being raised from the dead, will never die again; death no longer has dominion over him. . . . So you also must consider yourselves dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus. . . . No longer present your members to sin as instruments of wickedness, but present yourselves to God as those who have been brought from death to life," (NRSV), and writes the following:

"The spiritual unity between Christ and Christians is written here. If we have a real experience of dying and being resurrected with Christ in baptism, we must be dead to sin like He died to sin, and we must be alive like He is now alive to God. We have already thrown away our lives of serving sins and Satan, and entered the life of serving justice and God. . . .

Faith is unity with Christ. So it means to be resurrected with Him, to die to sin and to be resurrected to justice. A life wholly following God and serving justice, this is purified life, this is purification itself. . . ."²⁰

I think that in these sentences we can read Uchimura's relatively orthodox thoughts about the resurrection of the dead, but, interestingly enough, he also expresses his particular tendency in his interpretation of Paul. I am referring to the latter part of the above citation, where he gradually shifts his arguments to his most favorite themes, "righteousness" and "purity/purification" and the comments on the following parts of Romans, chapter 6, pertain exclusively to "purification," also exclusively for even close to 40(!) pages (but as you might guess, Barth doesn't, although he discusses "righteousness"²¹).

Of course, Barth does not ignore the same verse, and also mentions the resurrection of the dead:

". . . But there is a third alternative — we may 'fight as mercenaries, now on the other side of sin against God, and now on the side of God against sin, or we may even serve sin in our material life, and God in our spiritual life' (Zahn). This alternative is, however, ruled out. Ye have passed from death to life. There is no third alternative between death and life. In the war which is waged between them, there are no deserters, no mediators, and no neutrals.

Where the mountain is, there is no cavern; and where the cavern is, there is no mountain.

. . . Thus, in its questionableness and dereliction, our mortal body becomes a poem of love, a vessel of honour, and a weapon of the righteousness of God. If a man has not passed from death to life, how can he be capable even of hearing this demand? This is the crux of the matter, for grace, breaking through both mysticism and morality, transforms the indicative into an imperative, and we encounter the absolute demand that the impossible shall become possible (vi. 19)²²

This is also a very complicated and convoluted argument but it certainly doesn't deny the resurrection of the dead. As far as it doesn't, we can say that it is orthodox.

I think that from the above passages, we can confirm some similarities between Kanzo Uchimura's *Romasho no Kenkyuu* and Karl Barth's *Der Römerbrief*. The first two points that I addressed are merely formal or superficial similarities, however, the third point is a more substantial argument and in that way, worth noting. Some people might say that it is quite natural for both authors to give very similar comments on the same verses of the Bible because both are treating the very same Epistle of Paul. However, in as far as it concerns the theme of this paper, I think that this similarity represents a much deeper meaning. Exactly speaking, it makes clear some important features of Uchimura's way of studying or thinking about Romans and the Bible.

From my observations above, it can be said that Uchimura wrote very orthodox comments at many of the same points in the Epistle as Barth did. This could mean that Uchimura's faith is very orthodox. I think the reason why he wrote very orthodox comments at also very orthodox places, just as Barth did, is that his studies on the Bible might basically depend on very orthodox Western commentaries.²³ This is a quite simple conjecture, but to confirm it is very suggestive in distinguishing Uchimura's indigenous way of interpreting the Bible, which I will try to show in the latter part of this paper.

II The Differences between Uchimura's and Barth's Works

In this section of my paper, I would like to show that, although they have some remarkable similarities, which I made clear above, Uchimura's *Romasho no Kenkyuu* and Barth's *Der Römerbrief* have distinctive differences, and that these differences would help us to understand some unique aspects of Uchimura's Christian faith and, by the same token, to find the answer to my initial and ultimate question "How we become Christians."²⁴

First, as in the previous section, let's look at the formal features of their differences (see Figure 1 below).

Regardless of only this superficial numerical and relative observation (because each is written in different languages on pages having different sizes),²⁵ we can point out something interesting. While it might be said that Barth wrote almost constantly on every chapter in similar quantity, especially in the first half of the Epistle, the amount of pages which Uchimura wrote on every chapter are, sometimes, extremely varied. For example, we should note some chapters like 4, 9,

Figure 1

The number of chapters in Romans	The number of pages which Uchimura wrote on the chapter	The number of pages which Barth wrote on the chapter (German original)
General remarks	10	-
I	93	29
II	19	22
III	54	41
IV	8	37
V	25	45
VI	19	47
VII	18	46
VIII	54	65
IX	12 ²⁶	44
X		20
XI	7	37
XII	51	59
XIII	20	22
XIV	(7) ²⁷	20
XV	6	14
XVI	14	3

10, 11, and 14, on which Uchimura wrote only a little, but Barth, we can say, wrote constantly the same quantity.²⁸ We can notice immediately that Uchimura wrote an enormous number of pages on chapter 1 (I will revisit and argue this particularity below).

Save for this exception, we can find that both wrote relatively much on the same chapters like 3, 6, and 8. Especially, on chapter 8, on which Uchimura wrote “This chapter, where the completion of salvation is explained, is the pinnacle of Paul’s faith and the culmination,”²⁹ both authors wrote the most (except for chapter 1 for Uchimura). It is very natural for every reader of Romans to understand that chapter 8 is the center of the Epistle in some senses. So this numerical feature about chapter 8 might show Uchimura’s orthodoxy from another aspect.

However, these numerical features of both works, which look formal or superficial at a glance, are a very important breakthrough in order to understand some particular aspects of Uchimura’s faith.

Now, we can ask, why did Uchimura write so much (91 pages!) on chapter 1? The answer is simple; because he wanted to write so many things about Paul, especially about his character and personality. Uchimura spends 38 pages, commenting only on Romans 1:1–7 in his four lectures titled “Paul’s Self-introduction.”³⁰ He wrote on 1:1:

“Look back on verse 1 as a whole. He [Paul] says that Paul is a slave of Jesus Christ, a Called Apostle, and a person who is set apart for the Gospel. In these are his humility and conviction, his trust and resolution, his gratitude and joy. His words came out of his real experiences and at the same time are rich in teachings. . . . We can find no end to the depth of interest that verse 1 of Romans chapter 1 offers as the opening words of the greatest Christian who has ever existed, the Apostle Paul, who was the greatest missionary to the Gentiles.”³¹

We can find many examples of this kind of praise of Paul in this part of Uchimura's work:

“And there are many people in the world who urgently give their philosophies and their opinions but will never expose themselves. To make every effort to avoid expressing all of their own feelings, emotions, intentions, and moods, and to avoid exposing their own bare appearances, is the habit of the noble. Paul, however, is a person who will never regret that he outspokenly presents his own appearance as it is, with his own belief. Here exists his greatness and also his gracefulness. Namely verses 8–15 [of chapter 1] are this pure self-disclosure.”³²

This kind of praise of Paul's character and personality seems to be slightly excessive in these kinds of commentaries, because, on the contrary, Barth's writings about Paul's character and personality are strikingly cool, rather Barth is almost indifferent to such things. He comments on the same verse, 1:1:

“However great and important a man Paul may have been, the essential theme of his mission is not within him but above him — unapproachably distant and unutterably strange. His call to apostleship is not a familiar episode in his own personal history: . . . Paul, it is true, is always himself, *and moves essentially on the same plane as all other men.*”³³

The contrast between Uchimura and Barth on this point is crystal clear. In the first place, Barth hardly describes Paul as the alleged author of this Epistle, and almost never discusses his character nor his personality. In addition, Barth does not praise Paul and puts him distinctly in the same category as all other men.³⁴

Whereas, Uchimura's rhetoric of the praise of Paul reaches almost an ecstatic level, when commenting on 1:11–12, “for I am longing to see you so that I may share with you some spiritual gift to strengthen you or rather so that we may be mutually encouraged by each other's faith, both yours and mine” (NRSV):

“. . . *Here we see Paul's humility and thoughtfulness.* As great as he is — as too qualified to be their [Romans'] master he is — this is as modest as possible. These, his graceful humility and subtle feelings make the fragrance of his personality rich and full-flavored all the more. To not make oneself great and to not put oneself on a pedestal is characteristic of the great.

When we look at both the subtle emotions of verse 11 and the modest graces of verse 12, we perceive Paul's preciousness more and more. . . . In the place where one who knows what a master is but doesn't know what a friend is, there cannot be done the work of a true missionary. Today, we must take serious note that even as great as Paul was, he adopted these attitudes willingly.”³⁵

We could say that, here, Uchimura not only praises Paul sky-high, but perhaps also has a desire to identify himself with Paul. Uchimura, as the “master” of the Non-Church Movement, that he

founded, would have wanted to imitate the way of Paul as a missionary.

We find here a kind of personalism,³⁶ namely the loyal relationship between master and pupil. Uchimura respected Paul's relationship with the Roman believers, which could be a model for his own relationships with his pupils, and I think it is the first distinctive feature of Uchimura's work on Romans, which, however, we do not find at all in Barth's discussion of the same passage.

Next and last but not least, I would like to suggest the most impressive difference between Uchimura's and Barth's works on Romans on a more abstract or theological level. Rather, I should say that it would be a remarkably distinctive feature of Barth's style of writing. However, we can be sure that such a feature is lacking in Uchimura's style completely.

As I have already showed in section I of this paper, Uchimura is very orthodox at some of the same places in his commentary as Barth is. As another example of such orthodoxy, I can also cite a very orthodox description by Uchimura, concerning the so-called dogma of "justification by faith." He comments on 3:26, ". . . that he [God] himself righteous and that he justified the one who has faith in Jesus" (NRSV):

". . . Namely, God made Jesus stand to be a sacrifice of atonement. God crucified him and so punished people through him and justified them. Namely, God revealed his own righteousness to punish the human race, and at the same time, opened the way to forgive their sins and to justify them. To punish and to forgive, to assign sins and to justify, God did two things at the same time with the Cross of Jesus. Namely, that 'he himself is righteous and in order to justify the ones who have faith in Jesus,' God exalts his own righteousness and at the same time justifies people. But why did the verse not specify 'the whole human race' but limit it to 'the ones who have faith in Jesus'? Of course, in principle all people were justified by the Cross, but every principle produces its value when it is applied to individual cases. So the individuals who have faith in Jesus are really justified. Namely, only when one repents one's sins and believes in and follows the Lord, Jesus Christ, then one is justified by God for the first time. Only through faith can one make this special righteousness — namely the righteousness received by the unrighteous — one's own."³⁷

We can say that this is very orthodox expression of "justification by faith" and, parallel to Uchimura's statements, we can also find very similar sentences written by Barth, which comment on almost the same place, 3:28. "For we hold that a person is justified by faith apart from works prescribed by the law" (NRSV):

"Righteousness *by the blood of Jesus* (iii, 25) is always righteousness *apart from the works of law*; apart, that is, from every thing human which may, before God and man, be declared righteous. Concerning this righteousness men can boast only in hope — that is, in God."³⁸

However, if we compare their arguments about "justification by faith" or "righteousness" minutely, a rather remarkable difference between Uchimura's and Barth's thoughts will be brought into sharp relief. In turn, let's look at Barth's comment on 3:27:

“The righteousness of God is a vast impossibility; and as such it forms an absolute obstacle to the claim of any human righteousness to be either an anticipation of what will finally be or a relic of what once has been. We have nothing of which to boast, nothing past or future, nothing before or after the ‘Moment’ — which is no moment in time — when the last trumpet shall sound and men stand naked before God, and when, in their nakedness, they shall be clothed upon with the righteousness of God. And so, in the presence of Jesus, all that men are and have and do is in itself naught but the righteousness of men, and, in the sight of God and men, remains illusion, unless, under the judgment of God, it ceases to be the righteousness of men.”³⁹

Here also, Barth's style of argument is strikingly complicated, that is to say, paradoxical and eschatological as usual as in his work, *Der Römerbrief*. Is human righteousness at all possible or impossible? Is human righteousness actually an illusion or a reality?⁴⁰ Does it happen now or in the future? I can pick out so many these kinds of paradoxical sentences from his work:

“*God declares*: He declares His righteousness to be the Truth behind and beyond all human righteousness and unrighteousness.”⁴¹

“The Righteousness of God in us and in the world is not a particular form of human righteousness competing with other forms; rather, *your life is hid with Christ in God* (Col. iii. 3).”⁴²

“‘Our’ righteousness can be genuine and permanent only as the Righteousness of God.”⁴³

“If we believe in Jesus, God's righteousness and His declaration of the Righteousness are proved and showed as the impossible possibility.”⁴⁴

....

Why does Barth press us with these paradoxical or contradicting expressions? In my opinion, Barth wants, in a short, to persuade us that God is “ultra-transcendental.”

“. . . ; incomprehensible and meaningless is all confusing of time and eternity, every intrusion into *this* world (to which even all the so deep worlds-behind-this-world and “the higher worlds” belong) or appearance in it of the sovereignty of God as a concrete, tangible thing — and we must include here every ‘substratum of divinity’, every ‘higher world’: unintelligible and meaningless is all other-worldliness, if other-worldliness is thought of merely as improved worldliness, all improper notions of immanence, every non-radical idea of transcendence, every kind of relative relation between God and man, every divinity which presents itself as being or having or doing what men are or have or do, every human figure which calls itself in any way divine. When all this middle-realm between God and man is clearly recognized, it must be discarded.”⁴⁵

Barth's theological thoughts, which are called "dialektische Theologie" or "Theologie der Krisis," is, in the end, to consider God as exhaustively transcendental and to emphasize the insurmountable rift between God and human beings. From this, as far as we are talking about anything of human beings or of this world, and also as far as with any human languages, we cannot talk about God or any of God's works logically nor rationally. So any writing style of Barth's describing them cannot be but extremely paradoxical or contradictory.

Turning now to Uchimura's theological thoughts, we cannot find such an "ultra-transcendentalism." He writes:

"... One who was justified was only considered righteous, but has not yet become righteous. From now on one should become truly righteous. So believers should aim for and proceed toward perfection as children of God. The effort to become a little Christ, it must be the ordinary state in the life of faith. There are many people who don't know this and are satisfied just because they have only repented, have been only justified, and only baptized, which causes, by and large, the impotence of Christians and the decay of the Christian church."⁴⁶

This concept of "righteousness" described by Uchimura has a substantially this-worldly moralistic coloring that something could be done on our side, in other words, the human side, which is completely different from Barth's idea about it. However, in my opinion, Uchimura's theological thoughts are transcendental enough to be considered orthodox. On this point, Barth's thoughts are extremely transcendental, which I would call "ultra-transcendental."

Conclusion

In this paper, I have compared Uchimura's *Romasho no Kenkyuu* and Barth's *Der Römerbrief*, and by doing so, have uncovered more distinctive features of Uchimura's faith. In section I, I was able to find some similarities between these two works. Those similarities begin with the simple fact, for example, that for their respective authors, these works were their largest works. After looking at the mere formal similarities, I also looked at the content and found that both authors uphold a fairly consistent orthodox faith within their writings. In section II, I investigated the differences between these two works and found some very interesting facts. Uchimura spends a great deal of time talking about Paul and praising his character and personality. Barth, however, hardly mentions Paul at all, much less praises him. Conversely, I discovered that Barth is "ultra-transcendental," but Uchimura does not show as much transcendental thought in his *Romasho no Kenkyuu*.

Combining the discovery of these new features with the characteristics that I have uncovered in my previous three papers on Uchimura allows us to see his Christianity in a clearer light. However, I think that there are even more features which need to be brought out of his works in order to make a more complete picture of his life and faith, and it is this which will be my next challenge. Of course, hopefully, these discoveries will lead me to find more answers to my ultimate question of what exactly our Japanese Christianity was and what it is now, and how we

Japanese have become and now become Christians.

Notes

- 1 内村鑑三(Uchimura Kanzo)『羅馬書の研究〔Romasho no Kenkyuu〕』(A Study on Romans),『内村鑑三全集〔Uchimura Kanzo Zenshuu〕(Uchimura Kanzo Complete Works)』, 26卷(Vol. 26), 16-450頁(pp. 16-450). Originally, these were records of his lectures and were printed separately in his journal, 『聖書之研究〔Seisho no Kenkyuu〕』(The Biblical Study) from 1921 to 1922. After that they were published together as one book and that is now included in his *Zenshuu*.
- 2 Karl Barth, *Der Römerbrief 1922*. The first edition of this book was published in 1919, but it was almost completely rewritten and published as the second edition in 1922, which is usually treated as his *Der Römerbrief*.
- 3 John F. Howes summarized four parts of Uchimura's *A Study on Romans* and he noted that, "These summaries of how Uchimura treated key portions of Romans open the way to a more thorough comparison of his conclusions to those of Barth." (Howes, *Japan's Modern Prophet: Uchimura Kanzô 1861-1930*, p. 297). This paper is in part, my development of his suggestion, although my approach is quite different than his.
- 4 In this paper, I will discuss neither the thoughts of Paul himself nor the interpretations of those thoughts themselves by Uchimura or Barth directly.
- 5 The reason I use the phrase "in a sense" is the following; Uchimura became an absolute pacifist and was against the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905) but he had been not against the Sino-Japanese War (1894-95) (e.g., see N. Suzuki, *Uchimura Kanzo*, pp. 129ff.) Likely Barth was not against all wars. For example, he wrote "We must not overlook the fact that this war [namely, the second world war against fascism] is being fought for a cause which is worthy to be defended by all the means in our power-even by war; and, further, that this cause could no longer be defended by any other means than by war" (Barth, *A Letter to Great Britain from Switzerland* [London: The Sheldon Press, 1941], p. 5).
- 6 Uchimura wished to add to his amanuensis' transcripts of his lectures, namely *Romasho no Kenkyuu*, so he wrote 「[羅馬書]講演約説〔[Romasho] Kouen Yakusetsu〕」(Romans Lecture Supplement), *Uchimura Kanzo Zenshuu*, Vol. 27, pp. 19-112. This Supplement begins with Uchimura's discussion of Romans, chapter 6, and covers a total of 93 pages in Uchimura's Complete Works. A comparison of the content in *Romasho no Kenkyuu* and "[Romasho] Kouen Yakusetsu" would be undoubtedly an interesting attempt because we can imagine a slightly delicate situation for the reason why Uchimura added the supplement. (See the editor's explanation about *Romasho no Kenkyuu* in the *Zenshuu*. (See *Uchimura Kanzo Zenshuu*, Vol. 26, pp. 566f.) However, in this paper, I would like to discuss only the main work of *Romasho no Kenkyuu*.
- 7 See Bibliography. These works were written from 1932 to 1968.
- 8 Looking at several other commentaries on Romans including The International Critical Commentary, which Uchimura himself used, in general most are around 450 pages long, so it could be said that this is a standard length for a commentary on Romans. See the commentaries included in the Bibliography.
- 9 The relationships between the Redemption (German "Erlösung") and the Cross, and also the Atonement (German "Vrsöhnung"), seem to have considerably complicated theological discussions. However, in this paper, I will not address this issue, so I will simply write the Redemption "AND" the Cross.
- 10 Uchimura, *Romasho no Kenkyuu*, in *Uchimura Kanzo Zenshuu*, Vol. 26, p. 303. English translations of Uchimura's sentences in this paper are all by Sasaki.
- 11 *ibid.*, pp. 303f. Emphasis is Uchimura's.
- 12 In principle, I used the English translation; K. Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 274 (German original *Der Römerbrief 1922*, S. 281). Emphasis by Sasaki. See Bibliography.
- 13 Barth again mentions, although indirectly, the Trinity on another page of this work: "Were we to know more of God than the groans of the creation and our own groaning; were we to know Jesus Christ otherwise than as crucified; were we to know the Holy Spirit otherwise than as the Spirit of Him that raised Jesus from the dead; . . ." (K. Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 314 [German original *Der Römerbrief 1922*, S. 324]).
- 14 「新神学〔Shin-Shingaku=New Theology〕」was a movement inside the Protestant church in the middle of the Meiji era. It was primarily accepted by intellectuals, had a humanistic and rationalistic tendency, and/or was influenced by Unitarianism, denied the Trinity, and claimed an instinctive direct connection with divinity. It

- also denied the Redemption of the Cross. Uchimura was fiercely critical of this movement. See La Fay, Michelle 「内村鑑三における聖書「註解」の方法〔Uchimura Kanzo ni okeru Seisho Chuukai no Houhou〕」(Uchimura Kanzo's Method of Biblical Commentary), Hokkaido University unpublished dissertation, 2003, pp. 91-105.
- 15 Uchimura, *Romasho no Kenkyuu* in *Uchimura Kanzo Zenshuu*, Vol. 26, p. 185.
- 16 *ibid.*, p. 23.
- 17 Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, pp. 105f. (*Der Römerbrief* 1922, S. 87).
- 18 Barth has an affinity with “theologia crucis,” which connects human weakness and contradiction to the Cross, an important thought, especially after Luther. However, this affinity is not seen in Uchimura’s thoughts. Barth concentrates extremely on the concept of “the Cross:” “Now, the life of Christ is His oboedientia passiva, His death on the Cross. It is completely and solely and exclusively His death on the Cross. . . . ; for there is no second or third or any other aspect of His life which may be treated independently or set side by side with His death. Neither the personality of Jesus, nor the ‘Christ idea’, nor the Sermon on the Mount, nor His miracles of healing, nor His trust in God, nor His love of His brethren, nor His demand for repentance, nor His message of forgiveness, nor His attack on tradition, nor His call to poverty and discipleship; neither the implications of His Gospel for social life or for the life of the individual, nor the eschatological or immediate aspects of His teaching concerning the Kingdom of God — none of these things exist in their own right. Everything shines in the light of His death and is illuminated by it. No single passage in the Synoptic Gospels is intelligible apart from the Cross [with the German original, I corrected this last word from the English translation “the death”].” Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 159. (*Der Römerbrief* 1922, S. 148).
- 19 Uchimura has some articles on 1 Corinthians, chapter 15, like 「哥林多前書第15章の研究〔“Korinnto Dai 15 Shou no Kenkyuu”〕」(A Study on 1 Corinthians, Chapter 15), which is included in Vol. 24 of *Uchimura Kanzo Zenshuu*, Barth has a brief commentary on the 1 Corinthians, chapter 15, “Die Auferstehung der Toten.”
- 20 Uchimura, *Romasho no Kenkyuu* in *Uchimura Kanzo Zenshuu*, Vol. 26, pp. 243f.
- 21 See my papers, especially “Kanzo Uchimura’s Insistence on Purity.” These sections of Uchimura’s work, lectures 28-33, are titled 「潔めらるゝ事〔Kiyomeraruru koto〕」(Being Purified) 1-6, and cover a total of 38 pages. In this part of Romans, Barth does not discuss this theme. In first place, the Chinese character written “潔,” which is pronounced “Isagiyo-i” in Japanese, originally means “manly” and the meaning of “pure/purify/purification,” the Japanese pronunciation is “kiyo-i,” developed out of this. So in German, it means “männlich” or “rein/reinigen/Reinigung” but in Barth’s work, this concept does not seem important. In addition, Uchimura gives the following two Chinese characters “潔” and “聖” both the same pronunciation, “kiyo-i/meru.” But the latter character means “sacred” in English and “heilig” in German, and Barth discusses this concept many times. Uchimura ties these two different concepts “潔” (rein/pure) and “聖” (heilig/sacred) together by purposely using the same pronunciation “kiyo-i/meru.” By doing this, the concept of “sacred=聖” might be expanded to a somewhat broader one.
- 22 Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 211 (*Der Römerbrief* 1922, S. 209). It seems to me that in their works on *Romans*, Barth mentions this theme much more often than Uchimura. Barth comments on other verses, for example 8:11, “If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through his Spirit that dwells in you” (NRSV), mentioning the resurrection of the dead, as following: “The same God that raised Jesus from the dead (and reveals the unlimited to the limited in it superiority [the English version is missing this one line]) shall also quicken (lebendig machen) your mortal bodies. . . . Thus, according to the unobservable reality, our body is no second, other thing, existing side by side with the Spirit of God that dwelleth in us: the Spirit is rather the altogether restless death of the body, and as such also its altogether restless life. But all this is — according to the unobservable reality. Therefore the Gospel of the Resurrection of our body — which must be distinguished radically from every form of Pantheism and Spiritualism and Materialism — cannot refer to any past or present or future, but only to the all-embracing Futurum resurrectionis: *He shall quicken*” (Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, pp. 288f. (*Der Römerbrief* 1922, S. 296f.)) Uchimura said that “Chapter 8 of *Romans* is the pinnacle of Paul” (Uchimura, *Romasho no Kenkyuu* in *Uchimura Kanzo Zenshuu*, Vol. 26, p. 295), but he doesn’t make these kinds of comments on the verses of this chapter (See, *ibid.*, pp. 294-300). By the way, “Futurum resurrectionis” is one of the key-terms in Barth’s *Der Römerbrief*.
- 23 This can be confirmed by looking at the list of books housed in the Uchimura Kanzo Collection at Hokkaido University. See also the editor’s explanation about *Romasho no Kenkyuu* in *Zenshuu*, [Uchimura Kanzo

Zenshuu, Vol. 26, pp. 572].

24 See Bibliography.

25 Absolutely, in Japanese translation, Barth's work has almost twice as many pages as Uchimura's work, which, of course, is originally in Japanese.

26 Uchimura discusses both chapters 9 and 10 of Romans in only one lecture of his work.

27 In this one lecture, Uchimura explains the following chapters 14–16 as a whole, so, in reality, he doesn't comment on chapter 14 separately at all.

28 It might be interesting to scrutinize the meaning of the differences in the quantities between Uchimura's and Barth's works, but in this paper, I wanted to only do an overall comparison of the two works.

29 Uchimura, *Romasho no Kenkyuu in Uchimura Kanzo Zenshuu*, Vol. 26, pp. 295. Interestingly enough, Barth didn't say such a thing about chapter 8 in particular.

30 *ibid.*, pp. 26–64.

31 *ibid.*, pp. 42–43.

32 *ibid.*, pp. 66f.

33 Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 27 (*Der Römerbrief 1922*, S. 3). Emphasis is Sasaki's.

34 Barth writes about relationships between the author, Paul and himself in the introduction of the second edition of *Der Römerbrief*: “The Word ought to be exposed in the words. Intelligent comment means that I am driven on till I stand with nothing before me but enigma of the matter; till the document seems hardly to exist as a document; till I have almost forgotten that I am not its author; till I know the author so well that I allow him to speak in my name and am even able to speak in his name myself.” (Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 8 [*Der Römerbrief 1922*, XIX].) Emphasis by Sasaki.

35 Uchimura, *Romasho no Kenkyuu in Uchimura Kanzo Zenshuu*, Vol. 26, p. 74.

36 I termed this particular tendency of Uchimura's “パウロ道[Paul-Dou]” in a previous paper (See Bibliography). The Non-Church Movement which Uchimura founded is based on a “Confucist educational model between a master and pupil.” This distinctive kind of relationship was pointed out, for example, by Mark Mullins in his book *Christianity Made in Japan*. (Japanese translation, p. 87). Also, John F. Howes makes note “of a very close relation between teacher and pupil.” Howes, “The Non-Church Movement in Japan,” p. 128.

37 Uchimura, *Romasho no Kenkyuu in Uchimura Kanzo Zenshuu*, Vol. 26, p. 191.

38 Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 112 (*Der Römerbrief 1922*, S. 94).

39 Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 109 (*Der Römerbrief 1922*, S. 91).

40 There is no word that corresponds to the word “illusion” but there is a word that indicates “not real” (“*Kein realer Faktor*” in the German original; emphasis is Barth's).

41 Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 101 (*Der Römerbrief 1922*, S. 83).

42 Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 102 (*Der Römerbrief 1922*, S. 84).

43 *ibid.*

44 Barth, *Der Römerbrief 1922*, S. 89. But this sentence is missing in the English translation.

45 Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 108. However, Sasaki revised the English translation based on the German original, *Der Römerbrief 1922*, S. 90. Emphasis is Barth's.

46 Uchimura, *Romasho no Kenkyuu in Uchimura Kanzo Zenshuu*, Vol. 26, p. 241.

Bibliography

Barth, Karl. “Die Auferstehung der Toten.” In *Theologische Blätter*, Vol. V (1926): 1–14.

———. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Translated by Edwyn C. Hoskyns. London/Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1968 (1933).

———. *Die Kirchliche Dogmatik*. 30 Bde. u. Reg.-Bd. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 1993.

———. *A Letter to Great Britain from Switzerland*. London: The Sheldon Press, 1941.

———. *Der Römerbrief 1922*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2005¹⁶.

Howes, John F. *Japan's Modern Prophet: Uchimura Kanzô 1861–1930*. Vancouver • Toronto: UBC Press, 2005.

———. “The Non-Church Movement in Japan.” In *The Transactions of the Asiatic Society [sic] of Japan* (Third Series, Vol. 5). Tokyo: The Asiatic Society of Japan, December 1957, 119–137.

- La Fay, Michelle. *Uchimura Kanzo niokeru Seisho "Chuukai" no Houhou* (『内村鑑三における聖書「註解」の方法』 [*Uchimura Kanzo's Method of Biblical Commentary*], unpublished dissertation [2003]).
- Lohse, Eduard. *Der Brief an die Römer* (Meyers kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, Bd. 4). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003⁵.
- Mullins, Mark R. *Christianity Made in Japan*. University of Hawai'i Press, 1998. (Japanese translation; Takasaki Megumi (高崎恵)『メイド・イン・ジャパンのキリスト教』, トランスビュー, 2005.)
- Ota, Yuzo. *Uchimura Kanzo: Sono Sekaishugi to Nihonshugi o Megutte* (『内村鑑三 — その世界主義と日本主義をめぐって —』 [*Uchimura Kanzo: On his Cosmopolitanism and Japanism*]). Tokyo: Kenkyusha (研究社), 1977.
- Sanday, William. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Epistle to the Romans* (The International Critical Commentary). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902⁵.
- Sasaki, Kei. "How We Japanese Become Christians." In *Journal of the Graduate School of Letters*, Vol. 2 (Sapporo: The Graduate School of Letters, Hokkaido University, 2007): pp. 31-45. <http://eprints.lib.hokudai.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/2115/20477/1/SASAKI.pdf>
- . "Kanzo Uchimura's 'Insistence on Purity'." In *Journal of the Graduate School of Letters*, Vol. 3 (Sapporo: The Graduate School of Letters, Hokkaido University, 2007): 39-53. <http://eprints.lib.hokudai.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/2115/32410/1/SASAKI.pdf>
- . "Kanzo Uchimura's Christian Faith as 'パウロ道(Paul-Dou)'." In *Journal of the Graduate School of Letters*, Vol. 4 (Sapporo: The Graduate School of Letters, Hokkaido University, 2009): 37-46. <http://eprints.lib.hokudai.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/2115/37064/1/SASAKI.pdf>
- Schlier, Heinrich. *Der Römerbrief* (Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, Bd. VI). Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1979.
- Schmithals, Walter. *Der Römerbrief: Ein Kommentar*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlags-haus Gerd Mohn, 1988.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. *Der Brief an die Römer* (Das Neues Testament Deutsch, Bd. 6). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989⁴.
- Suzuki, Norihisa (鈴木範久). *Uchimura Kanzo* (『内村鑑三』 [*Uchimura Kanzo*]). Tokyo: Iwanami-Shoten (岩波書店), 1984.
- Suzuki, Toshiro (鈴木俊郎). *Uchimura Kanzo Den* (『内村鑑三伝』 [*A Biography of Uchimura Kanzo*]). Tokyo: Iwanami-Shoten (岩波書店), 1986.
- Uchimura, Kanzo (内村鑑三). *Uchimura Kanzo Zenshuu* (『内村鑑三全集』 [*Uchimura Kanzo Complete Works*]) (40 vols.). Tokyo: Iwanami-Shoten (岩波書店), 1980-1983.
- . *Uchimura Kanzo Nikki Shokan Zenshuu* (『内村鑑三日記書簡全集』 [*The Complete Works of Uchimura Kanzo's Diaries and Letters*]). 8 vols. Tokyo: Kyoubunkan (教文館), 1962-1965.
- . *Uchimura Kanzo Seisho-Chuukai Zenshuu* (『内村鑑三聖書注解全集』 [*The Complete Works of Uchimura Kanzo's Biblical Commentaries*]). 17 vols. Tokyo: Kyoubunkan (教文館), 1960-1962.
- Wilckens, Ulrich. *Der Brief an die Römer* (Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, V/2). Köln: Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1980.

The Bible

- Nestle-Aland, Novum Testamentum Graece. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006²⁷.
- The New Oxford Annotated Bible (New Revised Standard Version). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.