

## CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

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

#### 1.1.1 The Importance of Sanctification

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

#### 1.1.4 An Brief Analysis of Previous Approaches

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 1.2 The Definition of 'Reformed'

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 1.3 The Purpose and Goals of This Research

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

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

---

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

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



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

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

---

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

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

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

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

## 1.4 The Central Hypothesis

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

## 1.5 The Method of Research and Its Procedure

### 1.5.1 Method of Research

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

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

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

### 1.5.2 Procedure of Research

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

## CHAPTER 2 JOHN CALVIN AND SANCTIFICATION

### 2.1 Introduction

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 2.1.1 Previous Approach

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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



## 2.1.2 A General Evaluation of John Calvin

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### 2.1.3.1 Romanism

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 2.1.3.2 Libertinism

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

## 2.1.4 Calvin’s Theology and Doctrine of Sanctification

### 2.1.4.1 The Theological Method and Characteristics of Calvin

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### 2.1.4.2 The Structure of His Theology

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **2.1.4.3 The Position of Sanctification in His Theology**

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

## **2.2 Calvin's Doctrine of Sanctification**

### **2.2.1 The Conception of Sanctification**

#### **2.2.1.1 Anthropological Presupposition**

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 2.2.1.2 Harmartiological Presupposition

### 2.2.1.2.1 Original Sin

#### 2.2.1.2.1.1 The Definition of Original Sin

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### 2.2.1.2.1.2 The Cause of Original Sin

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 2.2.1.2.2 Voluntary Sin: Personal Sin

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

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

#### 2.2.1.2.2.1 Pride

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **2.2.1.2.2.2 Sloth**

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 2.2.1.2.2.3 Hypocrisy

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

‘5.2.1.2.2.1 The Discrepancy between Faith and Life.’

**2.2.1.2.2.4 Avarice**

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

### 2.2.1.2.3 The Bondage of Will and Grace

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 2.2.1.3 Christological Presupposition

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **2.2.1.3.2.1 Kingship**

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **2.2.1.3.2.2 Royal Priesthood**

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

#### **2.2.1.3.2.3 Prophetic Office**

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

## 2.2.1.4 Soteriological Presupposition

### 2.2.1.4.1 Union with Christ

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 2.2.1.5 The Definition of Sanctification

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 2.2.2 The Motivation and Goal of Sanctification

### 2.2.2.1 The Motivation of Sanctification

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



### 2.2.2.2 The Goal of Sanctification

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 2.2.3.2 The Role of God in Sanctification

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 2.2.3.3 The Human Role in Sanctification

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

### 2.2.3.3.2 Self-Examination for Self-Correction

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

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

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

### 2.2.3.3.3 Watchfulness

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **2.2.3.3.4 Self-Offering**

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 2.2.4 The Nature of Sanctification

### 2.2.4.1 Visibility or Invisibility?

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 2.2.4.2 Forensic or Factual?

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

### 2.2.4.2.1 Forensic Sanctification

#### 2.2.4.2.1.1 The Sanctification of Christ

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **2.2.4.2.2 Factual Sanctification**

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

they can have one or two.

#### 2.2.4.2.2.4.1 Love

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

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

#### 2.2.4.2.2.4.2 Modesty and Humility

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

---

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

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

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



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

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

#### 2.2.4.2.2.4.3 Docility and Meekness

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### 2.2.4.2.2.4.4 Ordered Life

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### 2.2.4.2.2.4.5 Purity

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

#### 2.2.4.2.2.4.7 Mutual Communion and Unity

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

Calvin connects the unity of the church to union with Christ

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

The crucial corollary of this unity is that all the elect share the goods of Christ in this unity, viz., in Christ’s body with one another. The unity of faith is attained “when all-from the highest to the lowest - aspire towards the Head.”<sup>498</sup> To keep the unity in Christ is the mark of Christian maturity. The saints matured by learning and advancing the church order established by God “with common accord.” They gathered “by one bond.”<sup>499</sup> Calvin’s idea of unity is taken from to the teaching of the Apostle Paul that we should “maintain unity of mind in the bonds of peace”(Eph. 4:2).<sup>500</sup> This unity needs our “humility, meekness, patience,” tolerance, and support for one another.<sup>501</sup> Our unity is kept by our mutual

---

<sup>492</sup> *Comm.* on Lk. 10:30, CO 45, 613. *Serm.* on Deut. 5:19, CO 26, 351.

<sup>493</sup> *Comm.* on Gal.5:14, CO 50:251. “Praesertim vero imago Dei vinculum coniunctionis sacrosanctum esse debet.”

<sup>494</sup> *Comm.* on Mt. 25:40, CO 45, 689; cf. *Serm.* on Deut. 2:1-7, CO 26, 5-16.

<sup>495</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.7; 4.1.3.

<sup>496</sup> Jane Dempsey Douglass, “Calvin’s Relation to Social and Economic Change,” *Church & Society*, Vol. 74, no. 4 (1984): 75.

<sup>497</sup> *Institutes* 4.1.2.

<sup>498</sup> *Institutes* 4.1.5.

<sup>499</sup> *Institutes* 4.1.5.

<sup>500</sup> *Institutes* 4.12.13.

<sup>501</sup> Letter to the French Church of Frankfort, 24<sup>th</sup> June 1556; LC 3, 437, 277.

subjection. Calvin insisted that mutual subjection includes mutual servitude according to love.<sup>502</sup>

This can be an answer to '5.2.1.2.3.3 Separatism' and '5.2.1.2.3.4 Individualism' and will be applied to '5.3.4.2 Self-Denial for Unity and Cooperation'.

### 2.2.4.3 Gradualness and Instantaneousness

Concerning the necessity of continual strife in connection with the gradualness of sanctification, Calvin explicated it as follows: Even after the sudden death-blow against self-love, the struggle between the old man and the new man continues, for the self-centred principle never dies. Without God's restraint, "our hearts will violently boil with a proud and insolent contempt of God."<sup>503</sup> We must choose the will of God rather than our own desires, "however virtuous they may be."<sup>504</sup> In *Institutes* 3.3.9, Calvin stressed continuous sanctification as follows:

And indeed, this restoration does not take place in one moment or one day or one year; but through continual and sometimes even slow advances God wipes out in his elect the corruptions of the flesh, cleanses them of guilt, consecrates them to himself as temples renewing all their minds to true purity that they may practice repentance throughout their lives and know that this warfare will end only at death...In order that believers may reach God's image, God allocates them a race of repentance throughout all their lives.

Our life is like a journey, which is a struggle.<sup>505</sup> Though the Christian is freed from bondage to sin through regeneration, he does not obtain full freedom in order to feel no more annoyance from their flesh. It implies that he must struggle to overcome remaining sin.<sup>506</sup> Because we are so weak, our spiritual progress is slow.<sup>507</sup> We "cannot succeed all at once" in removing our weakness, but we "must persevere in seeking the remedy for it, until we have been completely cured."<sup>508</sup> Since we are grafted in Christ, though we do not immediately "cease entirely to sin, we become at last victorious" in the fight.<sup>509</sup> If "we

---

<sup>502</sup> Serm. on Eph. 5:21, CO 51, 230.

<sup>503</sup> *Comm.* on Ps. 19:13, CO 31, 206. "...quia nisi nos contineat Deus, furiose ebulliet superbia contra Deum."

<sup>504</sup> Letter to Marquis de Vico, July 19, 1558 ; LC 3, 504, 440.

<sup>505</sup> *Comm.* on Phil. 3:13, CO 52,52. "Comparat autem vitam nostram stadio, cuius spatium nobis ad currendum definierti Deus..."

<sup>506</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.9.

<sup>507</sup> *Institutes* 3.6.5.

<sup>508</sup> Letter to Mademoiselle De..., the 12<sup>th</sup> of January 1549; LC 2,233, 205

<sup>509</sup> *Comm.* on Rom 6:6, CO 49, 108. "...non quod statim desinamus in totum peccare, sed ut simus tandem in pugna superiores."

keep following however faintly,” our progress in sanctification is certain.<sup>510</sup>

In view of Christ’s sanctifying work, Calvin explicated continual sanctification as follows: “Christ does each day in the church rather than what he has already accomplished.” “By his Word, God alone sanctifies temples to himself for lawful use.”<sup>511</sup>

In relation to instant conversion, Ganoczy writes that Calvin’s thought on repentance as a sudden and miraculous “beginning” applies only to exceptional cases of conversion where only a few members among many people are snatched “from perdition at a time.” Conversion generally happens in a gradual manner whether individual or collective.<sup>512</sup> A. N. S. Lane offers a similar point, “Calvin could speak of his own “sudden conversion” to the Protestant cause, but he does not seem to have regarded it as the norm.”<sup>513</sup> W. Bouwsma also insists that Calvin always “emphasised the gradualness rather than the suddenness of conversion.”<sup>514</sup>

On the contrary, Pete Wilcox holds the view that Calvin never distinguished between initial conversion experience and general conversion experience. Rather, Calvin regarded “a sudden conversion experience as the norm.”<sup>515</sup> Wilcox mainly presented Calvin’s commentary on the Prophets in the Old Testament. In his Commentary on Micah 4:3, Calvin explicated it as follows: Because of “the wickedness and perversity of our flesh,” “even the best of us would never offer themselves to God, without being first subdued, and that by God’s powerful correction.”<sup>516</sup> God’s first correction of our perversity is “the beginning of the kingdom of Christ.” In his commentary on Ps. 81:14, Calvin averred, “Men by their own free-will cannot turn to God, until they first change their stony hearts into hearts of flesh.”<sup>517</sup> This renovation is “a work surpassing that of the creation itself.” In his commentary on Isa. 65:25, Calvin stressed that people like cruel and untamed beasts “begin to abstain from doing injury when the Lord subdues their wicked inclination.”<sup>518</sup> Calvin rejected human preparation for their conversion in the sense that conversion

---

<sup>510</sup> Letter to the Duchess of Ferrara, June 10, 1555; LC 3, 384,129.

<sup>511</sup> *Institutes* 4.1.6,

<sup>512</sup> Alexandre Ganoczy, *The Young Calvin*, tr. David Foxgrover and Wade Provo (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1987), p.251.

<sup>513</sup> A. N. S. Lane, “Conversion: A Comparison of Calvin and Spener,” *Themelios*, Vol. 13, no. 1 (1987-88): 20.

<sup>514</sup> William J. Bouwsma, *John Calvin: A Sixteenth-Century Portrait* (New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), p. 11.

<sup>515</sup> Pete Wilcox, “Conversion in the Thought and Experience of John Calvin,” *Anvil* Vol. 14, no. 2 (1997): 121.

<sup>516</sup> *Comm.* on Mic. 4:3, CO 43, 345. “...denique hic notatur malitia et perversitas carnis nostrae, quia nunquam se offerrent Deo etiam optimi quique, nisi prius subacti, et qualiter? Nempe violenta correctione Dei.”

<sup>517</sup> *Comm.* on Ps. 81:14, CO 31, 766. “...non esse hanc conversionem in libero hominum arbitrio, donec ex cordibus lapideis Deus carnea reddiderit.”

<sup>518</sup> *Comm.* on Isa. 65:25, CO 37, 434.

happens “when a sinner is slain” by God’s formidable wrath.<sup>519</sup> His commentary on Jonah 3: 6-8 offers another example of instant conversion. “The Ninevites, who had no knowledge of the true doctrine of religion, who were imbued with no religious principles, were so suddenly converted by the preaching of Jonah.”<sup>520</sup> Calvin’s other commentary on instant conversion is Haggai 2:6-9. Men “are thus powerfully, and in an extraordinary or supernatural manner influenced, so that they follow *spontaneously* at the same time. ...It will indeed be a wonderful conversion, because “the nations who previously despised God, and regarded true religion and piety with the utmost hatred, shall habituate themselves to the ruling power of God.”<sup>521</sup> (Italics are my emphasis).

Calvin’s commentary on Acts 9:1-6 more clearly delivers to us his view of the immediacy of conversion, which he recognized as a norm. Christ’s voice with his glorious presence made the heart of Paul *suddenly* “a fleshy heart of a stony heart,” i.e., “it received softness from the Spirit of God” (italics are my emphasis).<sup>522</sup> Calvin understood this event as “the beginning of our conversion,” in which the Lord “changes the stubborn affections of our heart, to the end he may have us to be apt to be taught.”<sup>523</sup> We can know Calvin recognized the instant conversion as a norm in the following statement, “when as the Lord does mortify our flesh, he subdues us and brings us under, *as he did Paul*” (my emphasis).<sup>524</sup> This corresponds to Calvin’s own experience of sudden conversion, which was written in the preface of his commentary on the Psalms. Given Saul’s sudden conversion, Calvin’s sudden conversion, and Pete Wilcox’s statements above,<sup>525</sup> the views of A. Ganoczy, A.N.S Lane, and W. Bouwsma are invalid.

The immediacy of sanctification can be observed from another angle. Calvin depicted ‘once and for all’s sanctification, i.e., definite conversion in relation to committing serious sin. In contrast to Philip Jacob Spener who considered nominal Christians committing serious sin as “non-Christians in need of conversion,” Calvin “treated them as erring sheep in need of discipline.”<sup>526</sup> That is to say, Calvin held the view that once converted to God,

<sup>519</sup> *Comm.* on Ezek. 13: 22-23, CO 40, 299. “Itaque haec vera est ad conversionem praeparatio, ubi peccator occiditur, . . . .”

<sup>520</sup> *Comm.* on Jon. 3: 6-8, CO 43, 253. “...Ninevites, qui nunquam veram pietatis doctrinam gustaverant, qui nullis rudimentis fuerant imbuti, tam cito conversi fuerint ad Ionae praedicationem?”

<sup>521</sup> *Comm.* on Haggai 3:7-9, CO 44, 105.

<sup>522</sup> *Comm.* on Acts 9:6, CO 48, 203. “...cor autem Pauli ex ferreo repente carneum evasit, postquam illi a spiritu data est mollities. . . .”

<sup>523</sup> *Comm.* on Acts 9:5, CO 48, 202. “...ut prae fractos cordis nostri affectus mutet, quo nos sibi dociles habeat.”

<sup>524</sup> *Comm.* on Acts 9:5, CO 48, 202. “...quum carnem nostram mortificat Deus, non aliter nos subigit quam Paulum.”

<sup>525</sup> Wilcox’s view that Calvin incorporated the concept of a sudden conversion, which was written in the preface of Psalms, “into the 1559 *Institutes* as well as into the *Lectures of the Minor Prophets*” is notable. Pete Wilcox, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

<sup>526</sup> A. N. S. Lane, “Conversion: A Comparison of Calvin and Spener,” *Themelios*, Vol. 139, no.1 (1987-88):

one remains a believer even though he commits any serious sin. In his commentary on the Hebrews 6:1, Calvin referred to definite regeneration. Though “regeneration is not indeed made perfect in them,” because the seed of new life is in them, “however small it may be,” “they cannot be deemed dead before God.” In other words, because he has eternal life due to regeneration, the Christian has nothing to do with dead works, i.e., sin which “leads us to death” or “proceed from the spiritual death of the soul”. Repentance as our first conversion to God is ‘once and for all’. Likewise, sanctification as the first regeneration, which is being born again as a Christian, is ‘once and for all’..

To sum up, for Calvin, Christian sanctification as the first conversion, which is initiated by God’s intervention, is instant, but the whole process of sanctification is gradual. The Christian continually grows to the sound extent of the image of God in the grace of God. Immediacy and gradualness of conversion are consistently experienced. This will be applied to ‘5.3.1.4 Maintaining between Instantaneousness and Gradualness.’

#### 2.2.4.4 Perfection and Imperfection

In Calvin’s view, the perfection of sanctification signifies the single-hearted integrity and sincerity which we are enabled to attain when we can totally offer ourselves to God through the Holy Spirit. In this sense, perfection is merely the antonym of double-heartedness.<sup>527</sup> It is a total, complete, integral response to God’s grace and command. It is “the entire devotion” of our heart and soul excluding any fiction or hypocrisy as in Job’s case.<sup>528</sup>

Calvin denied that any Christian has grown into the full stature of Christ in this world. “Our holiness shall never be perfect as long as we are in this world, for we always carry our infirmities.” Because “though sin may not overpower us, yet it dwells in us,” “we continually battle against it to get the upper hand.”<sup>529</sup> Christian faith will gradually progress more and more. “Each day in some degree our purity will increase and our corruption be cleansed,” while we live in this world.<sup>530</sup> The Church is holy “in the sense that it is daily improving, but not yet perfect.” The Church “is daily progressing but has not yet arrived at its goal of holiness.”<sup>531</sup> That Christ “daily sanctifies all his people, cleanses and polishes them, and wipes away their stains” is an evidence that the saints “are still sprinkled with some defects and spots, and that something is lacking to their

---

20.

<sup>527</sup> *Comm.* on Jer. 29:13, CO 37, 596. “...propheta cor totum opponit duplici.”

<sup>528</sup> *Serm.* on Job 1:1, CO 33, 27-8.

<sup>529</sup> *Serm.* on Eph. 1:17-19; *SEC*, 103.

<sup>530</sup> *Institutes* 3.2.19.

<sup>531</sup> *Institutes* 3.2.19.

sanctification.”<sup>532</sup>

Pete Wilcox argues that “Calvin sees the Christian life of repentance and renewed forgiveness in the light of the tension between the present age and the next.”<sup>533</sup> Insofar as Christians are new creatures, they experience the fullness of salvation; insofar as they are still subject to sin, they live in constant need of repentance and faith. Insofar as Christians are in Christ, their salvation is complete. Insofar as they are still in the world, they experience a constant progress of regeneration towards its final consummation.<sup>534</sup> His argument of Calvin’s tension between sanctification as ‘already’ accomplished and not ‘yet’ completed is quite pertinent.

## 2.2.5 The Modes of Sanctification

In a broad sense, these modes can be regarded as the means of sanctification because God sanctifies us by these ways.

### 2.2.5.1 Self-Denial

Calvin regarded self-denial as the core of Christian life.<sup>535</sup> Self-denial is the way to receive the grace of Christ.<sup>536</sup> It is to mortify self-will and consecrate our will to God’s service, for we are not our own but God’s. Calvin posited *Nostrum non sumus - Dei sumus* (We do not belong to ourselves - we belong to God) as a basic principle of self-denial. Self-denial is to let neither our reason nor our will “sway our plans and deed,” but to let God’s “wisdom and will rule all our actions.”<sup>537</sup> The Christian should totally resign himself to the Lord that “every part of his life” might be “governed by God’s will.”<sup>538</sup> This commitment helps us to bear adversity. Calvin regarded adversity as God’s rule, not our destiny. We can look to the love and mercy of God in various adversities.

Self-denial “not only erases from our minds the yearning to possess, the desire for power, and the favor of men, but it also uproots ambition and all craving for human glory and other more plagues.”<sup>539</sup> It is also to eradicate such ungodliness and worldly desires as pride, arrogance, ostentation, avarice, desire, lasciviousness, effeminacy and other evils in connection with our self-love.<sup>540</sup> We are called to fight “against everything that might turn

---

<sup>532</sup> *Institutes* 4.8.12.

<sup>533</sup> Pete Wilcox, “Conversion in the Thought and Experience of John Calvin,” *Anvil* Vol. 14, no. 2 (1997): 119-120.

<sup>534</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>535</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.

<sup>536</sup> The title of *Institutes* Book III.

<sup>537</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.1.

<sup>538</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.10.

<sup>539</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.2.

<sup>540</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.3.



us aside from walking in the right path.”<sup>541</sup> Hence, we should “neither desire nor hope for, nor contemplate any other way of prospering than by the Lord’s blessing.”<sup>542</sup>

Calvin depicted self-denial in view of our relationship with our neighbours. God calls us to self-denial “to edify our neighbor in his eternal interests than consult our own selfish desires.”<sup>543</sup> Self-denial is “the rule which the Holy Spirit lays down to reconcile us to one another.”<sup>544</sup> It designates “to yield our right” for our neighbor and “to strive against ourselves.”<sup>545</sup> Our duty to our fellow men is based on God’s image in them rather than any worth belonging to them. This self-denial happens when we fulfil our duty of love. Our duty to our neighbour is fulfilled by our true love. The right attitude to help brethren excludes arrogance, contempt, and pride as a giver. We must see and help them “with a feeling of mercy and humaneness” “as if we experienced and bore it.” Each man should perceive that “in all his greatness he is a debtor to his neighbours.”<sup>546</sup> It enables us to be “imbued with lowliness and with reverence for others.”<sup>547</sup> Self-denial serves us in the right attitude towards our fellow man and our God.<sup>548</sup>

Self-denial needs radical treatment similar to the scriptural teaching of plucking out one of one’s eyes and cutting off one’s hands because self-love is lethal.<sup>549</sup> It denotes a crucial first step in which a believer leaves himself behind to serve God.<sup>550</sup> Calvin explicated self-denial as the temple sacrifices.<sup>551</sup> As a knife slays an animal in sacrifice, only the sword of the Holy Spirit slays our corrupt nature in order that we ourselves can be offered to God. It is impossible to serve God sincerely with both our soul and body if we even slightly agree with idolaters.<sup>552</sup> Christians must not dare “to appropriate the smallest portion of the glory which God claims for himself.”<sup>553</sup>

Likewise, self-denial asks our total sacrifice. We can find similar expression in his letter to Farel, where Calvin confessed about his own self-denial as follows: “I offer up my heart presented as a sacrifice to the Lord.” “I have no other desire than that, setting aside all consideration of me, they may look only to what is most for the glory of God and the advantage of the Church.” “I submit my will and my affections, subdued and held - fast, to

---

<sup>541</sup> Letter to the Prince Porcien, May 1563; LC 4, 645, 308.

<sup>542</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.8.

<sup>543</sup> Letter to the French Church in Frankfurt, March 3, 1556; LC 3, 437, 274.

<sup>544</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>545</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.5.

<sup>546</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.7.

<sup>547</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.4.

<sup>548</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.4-7.

<sup>549</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.4.

<sup>550</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.8.

<sup>551</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.5.

<sup>552</sup> Letter to A French Seigneur, October 18, 1548; LC 2,228, 179.

<sup>553</sup> *Comm.* on Ps., 9:1.

the obedience of God.”<sup>554</sup>

Ronald S. Wallace held that Calvin’s idea of self-denial was influenced by Thomas à Kempis’ work, *On the Imitation of Christ*.<sup>555</sup> In any way, for Calvin self-denial can be achieved only by the grace of God, namely, through the Holy Spirit. Self-denial is our imitation of Christ’s self-denial.

### 2.2.5.2 Bearing the Cross

According to Calvin, the whole Christian life is the bearing of a cross as Christ showed to us by his example of bearing the cross through all his life.<sup>556</sup> This cross designates “harsh and difficult conditions” such as disablement of body or mind, poverty, unemployment, disaster, bereavement, boredom, inner and outward frustration, and slander.<sup>557</sup> God’s will is not to exempt us from persecution, but to prove “the patience of all his children.”<sup>558</sup> This trial is foreordained for us, so that we cannot avoid this situation. In this cross, “we should dedicate our lives as a sacrifice to Him.”<sup>559</sup> It is the burdens of our life, which sometimes remain despite our best efforts.

Calvin regarded the cross as poverty, famine, disease, exile, and death as a useful discipline to awaken a sense of our duty in this world. The suffering of the cross tests and reinforces faith, develops persistence and humility, purifies the impulses of the flesh, and induces Christians to look up to heaven.<sup>560</sup> Our sickness is also useful for our sanctification, “if we testify our obedience by resigning ourselves to his (God’s) good pleasure, - if we give proof of our faith by resisting temptation- if we take advantage of the consolation which he gives us in order to overcome the troubles of the flesh.”<sup>561</sup> The cross restrains our stupid and empty confidence in our flesh by showing our incapacity and fragility.<sup>562</sup> With the remedy of the cross, God restrains our unrestrained flesh lest we become proud and swollen with other good things like honours or riches.<sup>563</sup> Sometimes, our adversity comes from the discipline of the God of our tribulations.<sup>564</sup> Through this discipline, the believer repents of his sin and learns that he must rely on God at all levels of

---

<sup>554</sup> Letter to Farel, August 1541; LC 1, 73, 280; CO 9,17-18.

<sup>555</sup> Ronald S. Wallace, *Calvin, Geneva, and the Reformation* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1988), p.191.

<sup>556</sup> *Institutes* 3.8.1.

<sup>557</sup> *Institutes* 3.8.2.

<sup>558</sup> Letter to the Church of Angers, 19<sup>th</sup> April 1556; LC 3, 432, 262.

<sup>559</sup> *Ibid.*, p.264.

<sup>560</sup> *Institutes* 3.8.4.

<sup>561</sup> Letter to Monsieur De Falas, 16<sup>th</sup> of November 1546; LC 2,178, 82.

<sup>562</sup> *Institutes* 3.8.2.

<sup>563</sup> *Institutes* 3.8.5.

<sup>564</sup> *Institutes* 3.8.6.

his being.<sup>565</sup> “God’s wrath towards his Church is...only intended to bring her back to well-doing.”<sup>566</sup> The cross is a means by which God quickens believers and keeps them alert lest they should lie asleep or grow sluggish with too much rest.

Calvin held that suffering often stems from persecution for righteousness’ sake.<sup>567</sup> “Not only they who labour for the defence of the Gospel but they who in any way maintain the cause of righteousness, suffer persecution for righteousness.” In this manner, Christian life for Christ’s disciple sometimes causes various afflictions.<sup>568</sup> If we have a good conscience before God and men, we may stand uncomplainingly all the false censures and disparages which our adversaries hurl at us.<sup>569</sup> Furthermore, even when we are in the midst of pain, groaning and tears, we must bear our cross cheerfully, because suffering is not only necessary but also good for our salvation.<sup>570</sup> These thoughts bring us spiritual joy “however much in bearing the cross our minds are constrained by the natural feeling of bitterness.”<sup>571</sup> In the end, it will be our blessing<sup>572</sup> because Christ will be glorified by our cross.<sup>573</sup> Accordingly, Calvin could delineate the scent of martyrdom as follows: “For if the confession of the faith before a crooked and perverse generation be a sacrifice grateful to God, how much more sweet-smelling will that savour be, which is diffused abroad for the salvation of many!”<sup>574</sup>

Calvin criticized Nicodemism for its evasion of the cross. For Calvin, Nicodemism means dissemblance between one’s faith and behaviour, for example, Nicodemite designates the person who feigns to be an unbeliever, though he is really a believer like Nicodemus in the Bible because he fears persecution. Calvin referred to Nicodemite behaviour as “sloth and negligence.”<sup>575</sup> Nicodemism is ‘dissemblance’ different from hypocrisy, which is the opposite of true faith. The inner heart is a Protestant but the outer behaviour follows Catholic rites because of fear of persecution. Nicodemism is the evasion from the cross.

Briefly, bearing the cross is a means of our sanctification, by which our flesh is mortified and it trains us to imitate the example of Christ.

### 2.2.5.3 The Meditation on the Future Life

---

<sup>565</sup> *Institutes* 3.8.4.

<sup>566</sup> Letter to the church of Geneva, 1<sup>st</sup> of October 1538; LC 1, 25, 87.

<sup>567</sup> *Institutes* 3.8.7.

<sup>568</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.1.

<sup>569</sup> Letter to Richard Le Fevere, 19<sup>th</sup> January 1551; LC 2, 273, 297.

<sup>570</sup> *Institutes* 3.8.10 and 11.

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

<sup>572</sup> *Institutes* 3.8.7.

<sup>573</sup> *Institutes* 3.8.8.

<sup>574</sup> Letter to Godfrey Varaglia, 17<sup>th</sup> December, 1557: LC 4, Appendix no.13, 427.

<sup>575</sup> Letter to Martin Luther, 1545; LC 1, 124, 442.

According to Calvin, our whole soul is enmeshed in such enchantments of the flesh as “riches, power, honour,” “avarice, ambition and lust” and “the seeking of happiness on earth.”<sup>576</sup> So we are inclined to forget not only death but also mortality itself, “as if no inkling of it had ever reached us,” we are sure of earthly immortality.<sup>577</sup> Our mind will never sincerely meditate the life to come “unless it be previously imbued with contempt for the present life” by the cross of adversary.

In order that we might not be captivated by a brutish love of this world, God “instructs his followers in the vanity of the present life by continual proof of its miseries.”<sup>578</sup> By wars or tumults, robberies, exile, barrenness of the earth, fire, the depravity of our spouses and the like, God shows us the mortality of all the goods on earth. This enables us to recognize the uncertainty and vanity of this world. Recognizing this life “to be of itself nothing but misery” prompts believers to devote themselves entirely “to meditate upon that eternal life to come.”<sup>579</sup>

In comparison with the eternal life to come, we can “despise this life and long to renounce it on account of bondage of sin.”<sup>580</sup> Such meditation for the life to come can comfort believers so that they might bear their difficulties.<sup>581</sup> If believers look to the power of the resurrection, they will recognize that the “cross of Christ will at last triumph over the devil, flesh, sin, and wicked men.” At that day when the Lord judges the world, he “will wipe away every tear from their eyes, will clothe them with ‘a robe of glory...and rejoicing’.” At the last judgment day, Christ will “grant rest to the unhappy and unjustly afflicted” and will “repay with affliction the wicked who afflict the godly.”<sup>582</sup>

In addition to despising this life, Calvin stressed that this life is a divine and generous gift.<sup>583</sup> We should use this life with gratitude to God’s generosity. Whereby, we arouse “our hope and desire to seek after the full revelation” of divine generosity. Our present experience of regeneration is a foretaste to induce us to long for the whole participation in Christ to provide us in the life to come. The gift of life that we are enjoying here is the foretaste of ultimate life in Christ.<sup>584</sup> If we participate in the suffering of Christ, we will certainly partake in his glory. Those who meditate on heavenly life are those whose minds have been “raised above this world by a taste of the heavenly life.”<sup>585</sup> This life cannot take place through the unaided efforts of man’s own mind, but only by means of participation in

---

<sup>576</sup> *Institutes* 3.9.1.

<sup>577</sup> *Institutes* 3.9.2.

<sup>578</sup> *Institutes* 3.9.1.

<sup>579</sup> *Institutes* 3.9.4.

<sup>580</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>581</sup> *Institutes* 3.9.6.

<sup>582</sup> *Institutes* 3.9.6.

<sup>583</sup> *Institutes* 3.9.3.

<sup>584</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>585</sup> *Comm. on Ps. 30:6, CO 31, 295. “qui coelestis vitae gustu supra mundum feruntur.”*

the sacramental worship of the Church.<sup>586</sup>

To sum up, our meditation on the life to come helps us to mortify the desire of our flesh towards this world and to long for the glory of our resurrection in our sufferings.

## 2.2.6 The Means of Sanctification

For Calvin, the means of sanctification can be described as the exercise of faith or the ways of grace.<sup>587</sup> Interestingly, F. Wendel observed that for Calvin, the preaching and the teaching of the Gospel “promote the collective sanctification” of the church members, while the sacraments “contribute to their individual sanctification.”<sup>588</sup> His standpoint of preaching seems valid, but his opinion of the sacraments is not completely legitimate, given that the Lord Supper can also promote our collective sanctification because it stresses our partaking in Christ’s one body, though each one partakes in it after examining one’s conscience.

Calvin held that God works in two ways for our sanctification. One is “by his Spirit, illuminating their minds and forming their hearts to the love and cultivation of righteousness, he makes them a new creation.” The other is “by his Word, he arouses them to desire, to seek after, and to attain the same renewal.” The former is Gods’ work within the elect, the latter is from outside them.<sup>589</sup> The reason why we do not call the Spirit a means of sanctification is that He is the Subject that sanctifies us and we cannot use Him for our sanctification. We must recognize that the Spirit makes the means of sanctification efficacious.<sup>590</sup>

### 2.2.6.1 The Instrumental Role of the Church

According to Calvin, the church is a divinely formed body, within which God effects the sanctification of his people. God uses the church as a definite earthly means for the salvation of his elected people.<sup>591</sup> Although he is not utterly restricted by these means, he usually works within them. The church gives and fosters the life of Christ to believers in the proclamation of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments.<sup>592</sup> The reason is that God’s sanctifying grace is in Christ and Christ is presented in the proclamation of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments.

---

<sup>586</sup> *Comm.* on Ps. 84:2, CO, 31, 780.

<sup>587</sup> Cf. the title to *Institutes* 3:20.

<sup>588</sup> Wendel, *op. cit.*, p. 292.

<sup>589</sup> *Institutes* 2.5.5.

<sup>590</sup> *Comm.* on Eph. 1:13, CO 51, 153; Letter to Henry Bullinger, Geneva, June 26, 1548; LC 2,224, 182.

<sup>591</sup> Wendel, *op. cit.*, p.292.

<sup>592</sup> *Institutes* 4.1.4.

## 2.2.6.1.1 The Word of God

### 2.2.6.1.1.1 The Holy Spirit, the Bible and Its Interpretation

Cyris Hee-Suk Moon depicts Calvin as an interpreter of the Bible by the Holy Spirit.<sup>593</sup> The interpretation by the Holy Spirit makes it possible that people avoid both the rigid methodological or mechanical interpretation and the dangers of a literal reading of the text.<sup>594</sup> As Moon points out, Calvin interpreted the Bible in light of the testimony by the Holy Spirit.<sup>595</sup> In the application of the Bible to our life, as we can see in Apostle Peter's case of the dietary Laws in the Old Testament, God's command through the Holy Spirit has more authority than the written commandment of God. This means that the application of God's word to our life rests on the interpretation by the Holy Spirit rather than a literal one.<sup>596</sup> Not only literalistic interpretation of the Bible, but also the viewpoint of Libertines as Spiritualists, i.e., the Anabaptists who forsake Scripture and rely on the direct leading of the Holy Spirit<sup>597</sup> was rejected by Calvin. For "God does not supply day by day oracles direct from heaven" any longer since Jesus Christ,<sup>598</sup> and "the Spirit that introduces any doctrine or invention apart from the gospel is a deceiving spirit, and not the Spirit of Christ."<sup>599</sup>

For Calvin, the application of the Bible for our holy life is never automatic or literal. It needs meditating upon the law in the Spirit and analyzing present situations with faith that God is truly present and active in them.<sup>600</sup> D. Douglass points out that Calvin recognized "the importance of reading the texts in the original languages," viz., Greek and Hebrew, and of learning the meaning of "biblical stories in their historical and cultural contexts."<sup>601</sup> Because it needs some discipline, Calvin did not allow the individual to interpret the Bible. The task was given to special men, i.e., pastors and teachers. The fanatics "who pretend to be favoured with secret revelations of the Spirit" and proud men "who imagine that to them the private reading of Scriptures is enough," and that "the ordinary ministry of the church" is unnecessary were considered as crazy.

---

<sup>593</sup> Cf. Eifon Evans also estimates Calvin as a theologian of the Holy Spirit in his article, "John Calvin: Theologian of the Holy Spirit," *Reformation and Revival*, Vol. 10, no. 4 (2001): 99.

<sup>594</sup> Cyris Hee-Suk Moon, *The Ecumenical Review* 39 (Ja., 1989): 42-43.

<sup>595</sup> Cf. T. H. L. Parker, *Calvin's Preaching* (Louisville, Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), p.2.

<sup>596</sup> *Institutes* 2.8.7 and 8.

<sup>597</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.14. "[T]hey assert, restored to the state of innocence, now need not take care to bridle the lust of the flesh, but should rather follow the Spirit as their guide, under whose impulsion they can never go astray."

<sup>598</sup> *Institutes* 1.9.1-3; Parker, *op. cit.*, p.2.

<sup>599</sup> *Comm.* on Jn. 14:26, CO 47, 335. "Atqui impostor est spiritus, non Christi, qui extraneum aliquod ab evangelio commentum ingerit."

<sup>600</sup> *Institutes* (1536) 1. 26.

<sup>601</sup> Jane Dempsey Douglass, "Calvin's Teaching What Still Remains Pertinent?," *The Ecumenical Review*, Vol. 39 (Ja., 1989): 26.



Briefly, Calvin stressed the inseparable relationship between the Spirit and the Word. Hence, for their sanctification Christians should learn the Word from the church in light of the Holy Spirit. This part can be applied to ‘5.2.1.2.4.3 Mysticism,’ ‘5.2.1.2.4.4 Spiritual Enthusiasm,’ ‘5.3.1.2 Harmony between Spirituality and Rational,’ ‘5.3.4.3 Maintaining the Balance between Institutionalism and Individualism.’

### 2.2.6.1.1.2 Preaching

In regard to the definition and justification of preaching, Calvin explained that preaching is “the primary means by which God’s presence becomes actual to us and by which God’s work is accomplished in individual life and in the community.”<sup>602</sup> Calvin stressed the role of preaching as a means of conversion, on the basis that “I will teach sinners your ways, and the wicked will be converted unto you” (Ps.51:13).<sup>603</sup> Pure preaching must be in continuity with Christ and the apostles. The justification of preaching “is rooted in the will of God” rather than “in the effectiveness for education or reform.”<sup>604</sup> Preaching is a witness of God’s will towards the world regardless of its acceptance.<sup>605</sup>

Calvin delineated the aim of preaching as follows: First, the aim of preaching is to convert people to God. Gospel is to be exclaimed “to us in order that our vices should be extirpated in such a way that God would appear to reign in our midst.”<sup>606</sup> The declaration of the Gospel and doctrines intends to awaken faith and certify the communal sanctification of the church members. Secondly, a more comprehensive purpose of preaching is the edification of the congregation.<sup>607</sup> It consists of teaching, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness.<sup>608</sup> Edification needs the affection of the preacher. Thirdly, the ultimate purpose of preaching is to communicate Christ to sinners estranged from God. The preaching of the Gospel enables us to participate daily in all the benefits Christ has acquired for us.<sup>609</sup>

Because private Bible reading is not sufficient, the congregation must convene to be instructed. Preaching is like a mother breaking bread for her infants and putting the crumbs

---

<sup>602</sup> *Institutes* 4.14.26; John H. Leith, “Calvin’s Doctrine of the Proclamation of the Word and Its Significance for Today,” in *John Calvin & the Church: A Prism of Reform* ed. by Timothy George (Louisville in Kentucky: Westminster/ John Knox Press, 1990), p. 206.

<sup>603</sup> For Calvin, preaching is essentially teaching. T. H. L. Parker, *Calvin’s Preaching* (Louisville: Westminster, John Knox Press, 1992), p.35.

<sup>604</sup> John H. Leith, “Reformed Preaching Today,” *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, Vol.10, no.3 (1989): 227.

<sup>605</sup> *Comm.* on Is. 6:10, CO 36, 135-138

<sup>606</sup> Sermon on Act 5:13-16; *Sermons on the Acts of the Apostles*, ed. by W. Balke and W. H. Th Moehn (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verslag des Erziehungsvereins, 1994), *Supplementa Calviniana*, vol. 8, p.46. It is written as SC.

<sup>607</sup> Sermon. 24 on 2 Tm: 3:16-17, CO 54, 287; cf. T. H. L, Parker, *Calvin’s Preaching*, pp.11-12.

<sup>608</sup> Sermon. 24 on 2 Tm: 3:16-17, CO 54, 288-294.

<sup>609</sup> Sermon. on Acts 4:21-26, SC 8:46.

in their mouths so that they can eat.<sup>610</sup> It is similar to nourishing a baby.<sup>611</sup> Preaching is the divine work as well as a human work.<sup>612</sup> Accordingly, a preacher should be careful of the fidelity to Scripture, the skill of syntax and rhetoric, and the liveliness of the delivery. For Calvin, preaching is done in the light of a biblical and theological vision of reality.<sup>613</sup>

For Calvin, the preaching is to be listened to as if God himself were speaking.<sup>614</sup> For this purpose, preaching should be simple. The qualifications of a preacher are humility and trust in Scripture, obedience to the teaching which he is urging on the congregation, and courage to proclaim the truth on the authority of God's Word.<sup>615</sup> The congregation should be entirely submissive to a preacher's message from God. This acquiescence to the Word of God is the work of the Holy Spirit. Through submission of a preacher and congregation to the authority of God, preaching becomes a means of sanctification.

### 2.2.6.1.1.3 Law and Gospel

#### 2.2.6.1.1.3.1 The Third Use of the Law

Calvin saw the Law as a revelation of the eternal will of God. For Calvin, the Law had a threefold function. First, the *usus elencticus legis* is the function to guide men to Christ by uncovering, accusing, and condemning their sin.<sup>616</sup> The Law functions as a mirror showing us the spots on our face in order that "we can contemplate our poverty" and weakness.<sup>617</sup> Secondly, the *usus politicus legis* is the function to control misdeeds and criminal acts for the political order of life. This is necessary for Christian godly and stable life.<sup>618</sup> Thirdly, the *tertius usus legis* is the function to instruct Christians to obey God's commandment and will.<sup>619</sup> As Dowey puts it, for Calvin, because the curse of the *usus elencticus legis* "is removed" and "justification by works of any kind is banished, the Law can return to its original and proper role," which is the expression of God's love.<sup>620</sup> As Paul Jacob points

---

<sup>610</sup> Serm. 12 on 2 Tm: 3:14-15, CO 54, 150- 151.

<sup>611</sup> T. H. L. Parker, *Calvin's Preaching*, p.141.

<sup>612</sup> John H. Leith, "Calvin's Doctrine of the Proclamation of the Word and Its Significance for Today," in *John Calvin & the Church: A Prism of Reform* ed. by Timothy George (Louisville in Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1990), p. 211.

<sup>613</sup> John H. Leith, "Reformed Preaching Today," *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, Vol.10, no. 3 (1989): 230-31.

<sup>614</sup> *Institutes* 4.1.5.

<sup>615</sup>; Serm. on Deut. 1:43, CO 26.304; Serm. on 1 Tim. 1:2; CO 25. 713-714.

<sup>616</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.6. Luther called it "the true...most important and the highest" use of the law (*WA* 40.533; *LW* 26, 91, and 310-13).

<sup>617</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.1.

<sup>618</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.10.

<sup>619</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.12. Hans-Joachim Kraus, "The Contemporary Relevance of Calvin's Theology," in *Towards the Future of Reformed Theology: Tasks, Topics, Traditions*, ed. David Willis & Michael Welker (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999), p. 331.

<sup>620</sup> Edward Atkinson Dowey, Jr., "Law in Luther and Calvin," *Theology Today* 41 (1984/85): 152.

out, Calvin's doctrine of sanctification is no more than an unfolding of the doctrine of the *tertius usus legis*.<sup>621</sup> Calvin called the *tertius usus legis* the *usus in renatis* (the use for the regenerated), which was regarded as the Law's principal use for believers,<sup>622</sup> while the first use of the Law might be the primary use for unbelievers.<sup>623</sup> This is where Calvin differed from Luther who stressed the theological use of the Law rather than the third use "for fear that it would undercut the clear tension between Law and Gospel" and would threaten "to destroy the preaching of the gospel."<sup>624</sup> Stephen W. Ramp points out that Calvin did not worry about distinguishing between the first and the third uses of the Law from the pulpit because he wanted to condemn human corrupt nature and purify it from all kinds of filths.<sup>625</sup>

The Law points to our sin and compels us to repent of it.<sup>626</sup> It serves as "a whip to an idle and balky ass to arouse to work" and as "a constant sting that will not let him [Christian] stand till" ([ ] is my addition).<sup>627</sup> Calvin also designated that the office of the Law is "to call us back from our wandering, and to lead us to the mark set before us."<sup>628</sup> The Law forms human life according to "the archetype of divine purity."<sup>629</sup> This purity is described as loving God and neighbour. Loving God is proved by loving our neighbour.<sup>630</sup> The situational ethics of Fletcher that "the ruling norm of Christian decision is love: nothing else" should be criticized for antinomianism by reason that it does not have any

---

<sup>621</sup> Paul Jacobs, *Prädestination und Verantwortlichkeit bei Calvin* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968 reprint), p. 103.

<sup>622</sup> *Institutes* (1536), ed. Rev. Ed., tr. annotated by Ford Lewis Battle (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 1. 35-36.

<sup>623</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.12.

<sup>624</sup> Jesse Couenhoven, "Grace as Pardon and Power: Pictures of the Christian Life in Luther, Calvin, and Barth," *Journal of Religious Ethics*, Vol. 28, no. 1 (2000): 67; David J. Lose, "Luther and Calvin on Preaching to the Human Condition," *Lutheran Quarterly*, ns.10 (autumn, 1996): 291. cf. Mary Lane Potter, "The Whole Office of the Law in the Theology of John Calvin," *The Journal of Law and Religion*, Vol. 3, no. 1 (St. Paul: 1985): 117. Calvin did not strive "to ignore the punitive function of the moral law, as the papists were wont to do."; Merwyn S. Johnson also is of the opinion that for Calvin, "the third use of the law parallels directly the first use of the law." Merwyn S. Johnson, "Calvin's Handling of the Third Use of the Law and Its Problems," *Calviniana*, p. 48.

<sup>625</sup> Stephen W. Ramp, "John Calvin on Preaching the Law," *Word and World*, Vol. 21, no. 3 (Luther-Northwestern Theological Seminary, 2001): 267-269; cf. Michael S Horton insists that "Calvin combined the civil and moral use until the 1559 *Institutes*, although there is a reference to the "three-fold use," in the 1539 edition." Michael S. Horton, "Calvin and the Law-Gospel Hermeneutic," *Pro Ecclesia*, Vol. 6, no. 1 (Northfield: Center for Catholic and Evangelical Theology, 1997): 35.

<sup>626</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.4.

<sup>627</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.12.

<sup>628</sup> *Comm.* on Jer. 5:5, CO 37, 613. "...quoniam hoc est legis officium, revocare nos ab errore, et deducere ad finem nobis propositum."

<sup>629</sup> *Institutes* 2.8.51.

<sup>630</sup> *Comm.* on 1Cor. 8:3, CO 49, 430. "...si Deum diligamus. Nam si hoc fit, proximos quoque in ipso diligemus."

norm to know what love is.<sup>631</sup> God's law reveals to us the certain norm of true love. Accordingly, Calvin could base his sixteen sermons of the Decalogue on the third use of the Law. As the rule of perfect righteousness,<sup>632</sup> the Law clearly informs us "what things are to be followed, and what things are to be avoided."<sup>633</sup> In light of Alasdair MacIntyter's view that the *telos* of the law is true human freedom and the latter is formed by the former,<sup>634</sup> Calvin's third use of the law for our sanctification is legitimate.

#### 2.2.6.1.1.3.2 Moral Law and Christ's Law

Calvin defined moral law as "the testimony of the natural law" and of conscience "engraved on the minds of men."<sup>635</sup> Moral law is never wholly lost in the fall.<sup>636</sup> Man has a "natural instinct to cherish and preserve society."<sup>637</sup>

For Calvin, the core of the natural Law is piety and justice. Especially, justice as seed implanted in all men<sup>638</sup> "is the name given to the rectitude and humanity which we cultivate with our brethren, when we endeavour to do good to all, and when we abstain from all wrong, fraud, and violence."<sup>639</sup> Justice as mainly the precepts of the second table is exercised in and through conscience. As William F. Keesecker comments, Calvin regarded justice or equity as "part of the Law of nature engraved on our hearts." It is the Golden Rule that "we should not do to anyone except what we would wish done to us." It is "the whole sum of the Law and the Prophets."<sup>640</sup> However, Keesecker failed to distinguish the Law of nature and the Law of Christ. The former is fundamentally deontological but the latter is fundamentally dispositional. Christian sanctification is accomplished not by natural Law but by Christ's Law.

Jesus Christ clarifies and interprets the moral Law of Moses as natural law. The teaching of Christ offers all fitted "for the conduct of life and all that is needful to be

---

<sup>631</sup> Fletcher, *Situational Ethics*, p.69. Also see I. John Hesselink, "Christ, the Law, and the Christian: An Unexplored Aspect of the Third Use of the Law in Calvin's Theology," in *Reading in Calvin's Theology*, ed. by Donald K. McKIM (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984), p.183.

<sup>632</sup> *Comm.* on Rom. 10:5, CO 49, 197. "...vera pietatis regula..."

<sup>633</sup> *Comm.* on Rom. 4:23, CO 49, 86. "...quae facta imitanda, et quae cavenda..."

<sup>634</sup> Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*, second edition (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984), p. 78

<sup>635</sup> *Institutes* 4.20.16..

<sup>636</sup> For further study, see Rae Simon, "Calvin, Natural Law and Contemporary Ethics: a Brief Note," *The Reformed Theological Review*, Vol. 30, no.1 (Ja.-Ap.,1971): 14-20.

<sup>637</sup> *Institutes* 2.2.3.

<sup>638</sup> *Institutes* 2.2.13.

<sup>639</sup> *Comm.* on Gen. 18:19, CO 23, 259.

<sup>640</sup> William F. Keesecker, "The Law in John Calvin's Ethics," in *Calvin and Christian Ethics: Fifth Colloquium on Calvin & Calvin Studies*, ed. Peter De Klerk (Grand Rapids: Calvin Studies Society, 1987), p.36; John Calvin, *Sermons on Job*, selected and tr. by Leroy Nixon, with an introductory Essay, by Harold Dekker (Grand Rapids: Baker use, 1979), p. 13.

known.”<sup>641</sup> The actions of Christ can also be presented as an example of love, of well-ordered emotions, of perseverance and moderation in adversity, for Christian sanctification.<sup>642</sup> In contrast, the moral Law of Moses is far from being a perfect expression of the divine ideal. It was accommodated to the limitation of a people who had only very primitive concepts of God’s character. As God’s true prophet, Jesus Christ reveals God’s will in our heart in order that we might be sanctified by being obedient to it in the Holy Spirit. That is to say, without Christ, the Law is not perfect in the sense that only Christ enables Christians to be free from the shackles of the Law and to live the Law of love.<sup>643</sup> The law of love is to “govern our wills, our endeavours and our actions.”<sup>644</sup> Love is affection and action which is guided and inspired by the Law. The law of love is a guide in those settings where Scripture is not explicit.

Briefly, natural law functions to restrain social wrongs and promote social justice for social sanctification, but it should be interpreted and compensated for by Christ’ law.

### 2.2.6.1.1.3.3 Law and Gospel

Calvin explicates the difference between the Law and the Gospel in their roles of sanctification as follows: The Gospel is a means of “spiritual regeneration,” by which we are transformed into the image of God.<sup>645</sup> The Gospel “produces of itself reverence, fear, and obedience.”<sup>646</sup> The Gospel is the gracious promise of mercy towards us and the object and the foundation of faith.<sup>647</sup> The grace of God in the gospel of Jesus Christ “nourishes us without support of the law.”<sup>648</sup> Conversely, the judgment of the Law against us “disturb our faith rather than to establish it.”<sup>649</sup> “The Law, on the other hand, even though it prescribes the rule of a good life, does not change the heart for a righteous.”<sup>650</sup> It cannot do anything more than remind us of our duty. Only the Gospel’s promise can move us to grateful obedience.<sup>651</sup> When it is used by the Holy Spirit, moral law as a pedagogue and

---

<sup>641</sup> *Comm.* on Jn. 13: 36, CO 47, 319. “...audimus ex ore Christi, quaecunque ad usum vitae apta et cognitu necessaria sunt.”

<sup>642</sup> *Comm.* 1 Jn. 3: 16, CO 45, 340; *Comm.* on Jn. 11:33, CO 47, 265.

<sup>643</sup> Cf. Serm. on Gal. 4:8-11.CO 50, 595-608. Apart from Jesus Christ, “this is no more than minor baggage,” “than a mockery.”

<sup>644</sup> *Institutes* 2.8.49.

<sup>645</sup> *Comm.* on Gen. 1:26, CO 23, 26. “Dicit Paulus nos per evangelium transfigurari in imaginem Dei...regeneratio spiritualis nihil aliud est quam eiusdem imaginis instauratio.”

<sup>646</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Thess. 2:13. “...quae reverentiam, timorem et obedientiam ex se generet.”

<sup>647</sup> *Institutes* 3.2.7, and 29.

<sup>648</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.7.

<sup>649</sup> *Institutes* 3.2.7.

<sup>650</sup> *Calvin: Commentaries* of The Library of Christian Classics (Institute for the Christian Information & Data, 1999), p.281.

<sup>651</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.12.

spur can promote true piety.<sup>652</sup>

#### 2.2.6.1.1.3.4 The Decalogue

William J. Carl III insists, “The Decalogue is a corrective to...antinomian, libertarian society.” It offers us “some walls that provide structure for our lives” that might prevent us from harming ourselves, and leads “to deeper freedom as they become internalized.”<sup>653</sup> Carl III’s insistence on Calvin’s viewpoints seems germane, given that Calvin regarded the Decalogue as the basis of civil law<sup>654</sup> and as a guide for the new life of forgiven Christians.<sup>655</sup> Unlike the early Luther who did not consider the Decalogue as an ethical blueprint for being a Christian,<sup>656</sup> Calvin stressed the Decalogue as a guide to be applicable for Christians of all ages “to the end of the world.”<sup>657</sup> Hugo Röthlisberger criticizes Calvin for reducing the will of God to the Decalogue without any consideration of the Sermon on the Mount, the apostolic exhortations, and injunctions in catechetical instruction for Christian life.<sup>658</sup> His critique seems illegitimate, given that Calvin expounded the Decalogue in the light of Christ’s teaching, i.e., the Sermon on the Mount and the entire instructions of the New Testament.<sup>659</sup> Briefly, in his teaching of Christian holy life, Calvin preferred to refer to Christ’s birth, life, teaching, death, and resurrection rather than the law.<sup>660</sup>

In *Institutes* 2.8.15-59, Calvin expounded the Decalogue in detail. Briefly, the Decalogue directs and helps us to love God and our neighbours. It intends “the fulfilment of righteousness to form human life to the archetype of divine purity.”<sup>661</sup> That is, it

---

<sup>652</sup> *Institutes* 4.20.2, 3.

<sup>653</sup> William J. Carl III, “The Decalogue in Liturgy, Preaching, and Life,” *Interpretation*, Vol. 43, no. 3 (Richmond: Union Theological Seminary Press, 1989): 269.

<sup>654</sup> *Institutes* 4.20.15.

<sup>655</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.12.

<sup>656</sup> David Wright, “The Ethical Use of the Old Testament in Luther and Calvin: A Comparison,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* Vol. 36, pp. 471, 473. Luther did not regard the Decalogue as an ethical standard for the reason that it needs deJudaization and Christianisation because of its Judaic character, which was described in the prologue, the promise of long life in the land in the Fourth Commandment, the ban on images, and the specification of the Sabbath. Conversely, in his Large Catechism, Luther viewed the Decalogue as “the true foundation from which all good works must spring, the true channel through which all good works must flow.” [Large Catechism, para. 311; *The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, Theodore G. Tappert, ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978), p. 407]. That is to say, Luther early took a negative attitude towards the Decalogue against the legalism of the Roman Church and later a positive against antinomianism.

<sup>657</sup> *Institutes* 2.7.13.

<sup>658</sup> Hugo Röthlisberger, *Kirche am Sinai - Die Zehn Gebote in der christlichen Unterweisung* (Zurich: Zwingli, 1965). pp. 130f., 143f., 101.

<sup>659</sup> *Institutes* 2.8.51-59.

<sup>660</sup> Cf. I. John Hesselink, “Christ, the Law, and the Christian: An Unexplored Aspect of the Third Use of the Law in Calvin’s Theology,” in *Reading in Calvin’s Theology*, ed. by Donald K. McKIM (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984), p.189.

<sup>661</sup> *Institutes* 3.8.51.



functions as a means for our sanctification by His Spirit.

#### 2.2.6.1.1.4 The Old Testament and the New Testament

Calvin criticized the Anabaptists for positing the Israelites as “nothing but a herd of swine...without any hope of heavenly immortality.”<sup>662</sup> To Calvin, those who wanted the Law to be cast out of the Church were some disgusting scoundrel, whose common slogan was “No more Law or Prophets for us!”<sup>663</sup> Their opinion to render God double-minded, fickle and inconstant was rejected by Calvin on the ground that the Law and the Prophets is a permanent and immortal truth.<sup>664</sup> Calvin insisted that God is constant in the sense that the Bible consists of a single covenant of grace. The Old Testament and the New Testament differ only “in clarity of manifestation,”<sup>665</sup> and in the mode of dispensation, but are actually the same in one covenant of salvation through Christ.<sup>666</sup> In this manner, Calvin accentuated the constancy of both Testaments.

He presupposed that every event and story in Scripture is useful for human edification. Thus, he used abundant passages of epidemic oratory, admiring or censuring Moses and David, and the prophets and apostles in his writings and preaching. Interestingly, Calvin’s evaluation of Abraham and Rebecca’s behaviour was different from Luther’s. While Luther advocated their immoral behaviour as steadfast adherence to God’s promise,<sup>667</sup> Calvin did not justify their illegitimate devices and regarded them as ethically in demerit due to deficiency of faith.<sup>668</sup> In contrast to Luther who made his Old Testament exegesis serve the history of salvation rather than ethical concern, Calvin maintained an ethical use of the Old Testament through his distinction between ends and means.<sup>669</sup>

After Christ’s redemption, in the application of God’s Word for Christian sanctification, the New Testament is superior to the Old Testament because revelation progressed. Calvin explicated it in the case of Peter. Peter hesitated when God commanded him to go to Cornelius because the Law prohibits a Jew from eating with a heathen, but he followed the direction of the living God.<sup>670</sup> As far as this topic is concerned, Calvin’s view that the New Testament clarifies the Old Testament is quite valid in terms of the progress of

---

<sup>662</sup> *Institutes* 2.10.1.

<sup>663</sup> Serm. on 2 Tim. 3:16-17, CO 54, 284.

<sup>664</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>665</sup> *Institutes* 2.9.4.

<sup>666</sup> *Institutes* 2.10.2. cf. For the distinction between the two, see I. John Hesselink, “Law & Gospel or Gospel & Law?: Calvin’s Understanding of the Relationship,” in *Calviniana*, p.20.

<sup>667</sup> *LW* 2, 293-296.

<sup>668</sup> *Comm.* on Gen. 16:1, CO 23, 223; *Comm.* on Gen. 27:12, CO 23, 375; cf. David F. Wright, “The Ethical Use of the Old Testament in Luther and Calvin: A Comparison,” *Scottish Journal of Theology*, Vol. 36, no.3 (1983): 465-467.

<sup>669</sup> David Wright, *ibid.*, pp. 467-468.

<sup>670</sup> *Comm.* on Acts 10: 17-21, CO 48, 234.

revelation, though Habib Badr's critique that Calvin interpreted the Old Testament in light of Paul's writing is notable.<sup>671</sup>

Briefly, rejecting the view that "we need neither the law nor the prophets any more," Calvin held that preachers must preach the Law and the prophets, and the Gospel for Christian sanctification as St. Paul used the Old Testament in this manner.<sup>672</sup> As far as the same topic is concerned, the New Testament is superior to the Old Testament in the light of the progress of revelation.

### 2.2.6.1.2 Sacraments

Calvin defined a sacrament in conjunction with its usefulness as follows: It is "an outward sign, by which the Lord seals on our consciences his promises of good will towards us, in order to sustain the weakness of our faith."<sup>673</sup> The sacraments are highly useful means "to foster and strengthen faith."<sup>674</sup> They are necessary for us to overcome "the infirmity and hard-heartedness" in us.<sup>675</sup> The sacraments help us to cherish, confirm and increase the true knowledge of Christ. We have communion with Christ in our participation in the sacraments.<sup>676</sup>

He stressed the necessity of preaching in a sacrament. Because a sacrament must be based upon 'a promise and a command of the Lord,' the Word should be preached in order to make us understand what the visible sign means.<sup>677</sup> The sacraments as seals confirm what the Word of God proclaims preceding the sacraments.<sup>678</sup> Their true office is to offer Christ to us and display the treasures of heavenly grace in Him.<sup>679</sup> He dismissed five of the seven sacraments of the Catholic Church on account of it being unbiblical and retained only baptism and the Lord's Supper.<sup>680</sup>

Calvin also emphasised the work of the Holy Spirit to make the sacraments effective. The whole efficiency of the sacraments lies in "the secret working of the Spirit."<sup>681</sup> The

---

<sup>671</sup> Rev. Habib Badr, "Medium Quiddam: The Problematic Relation of General Election and Individual Salvation in Calvin's Theology," *Theological Review*, Vol. 10, no.1-2 (Lebanon: The School, 1989): 45.

<sup>672</sup> *The Mystery of Godliness and Other Selected Sermons by John Calvin* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1950), p. 130, 134.

<sup>673</sup> *Institutes* 4.14.1.

<sup>674</sup> *Institutes* 4.1.1.

<sup>675</sup> Letter to the King of France; October 1557; LC 3, 480, 375.

<sup>676</sup> *Institutes* 4.14.6.

<sup>677</sup> *Institutes* 4.14.4.

<sup>678</sup> *Institutes* 4.14.5.

<sup>679</sup> *Institutes* 4.14.17.

<sup>680</sup> *Institutes* 4.19.1. These five sacraments are Confirmation, Penance, Extreme Unction, the Sacraments of Holy Orders and Marriage. *Institutes* 4.19.1-37.

<sup>681</sup> Letter to Henry Bullinger, 26<sup>th</sup> June 1548; LC 2, 224, 169. "their whole efficacy is due to the Holy Spirit."

sacraments are efficient for our sanctification only in Christ and the Holy Spirit.<sup>682</sup> The Spirit softens the stubbornness of our hearts so that the Word may not beat upon our ears in vain. He transmits those outward Words and sacraments from our ears to our souls.<sup>683</sup> Christ is present in the elements of the sacrament in such a way that only faith can discern it. This faith is generated by the Spirit.

To sum up, the sacraments are a means of our sanctification as well as the Word.<sup>684</sup>

#### 2.2.6.1.2.1 Baptism

Calvin understood baptism as a public demonstration of our loyalty to God in accordance with Zwingli.<sup>685</sup> Baptism “is the initiatory sign by which we are admitted into the fellowship of the Church, so that, engrafted in Christ, we may be reckoned among the children of God.”<sup>686</sup>

With regard to the benefit of baptism, Calvin said that Baptism arouses, nourishes, and confirms our faith.<sup>687</sup> It strengthens our weak faith in God’s promises in three respects. First, it signifies the removal of sin by the death of the Son of God. “When we are baptized, we are, once for all, washed, purged for our whole life.” By recalling the memory of our baptism, we can be “confident of the forgiveness of sins.”<sup>688</sup> Secondly, the performance of the rite means mortification and new life, a uniting of the person with the death and resurrection of Christ.<sup>689</sup> Baptism symbolizes our participation in the death of Christ, i.e. our mortification of flesh and sin. Calvin also connected baptism with suffering. Baptism is “a sign of the inevitable suffering that will accompany the Christian life.”<sup>690</sup> Thirdly, it is the sign of union with Christ himself, which leads to the fellowship with the Trinity. All believers are taught and encouraged in the Christian life to lift their heart to God in the sacrament of baptism.<sup>691</sup>

In the relationship between the baptism with water and the baptism of the Spirit, Calvin denied that “the external baptism of water” is identified with “the regeneration of the Spirit.”<sup>692</sup> The baptism with water is not necessary for our salvation but “the token of our union with Christ.”<sup>693</sup> Still, he acknowledged that whoever “receives baptism with true

---

<sup>682</sup> Letter to the King of France; October 1557; LC 3, 480, 375.

<sup>683</sup> *Institutes* 4.14.10.

<sup>684</sup> *Institutes* 4.14.17.

<sup>685</sup> *Institutes* 4.15.5.

<sup>686</sup> *Institutes* 4.15.1.

<sup>687</sup> *Institutes* 4.15.14.

<sup>688</sup> *Institutes* 4.15.3.

<sup>689</sup> *Institutes* 4.15.5.

<sup>690</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>691</sup> John D. Witvliet, “Baptism as a Sacrament of Reconciliation in the Thought of John Calvin,” *Studia Liturgica*, Vol. 27, no. 2 (1997): 159.

<sup>692</sup> Letter to John Clauburger, Geneva, 24th June 1556; LC 3, 438.

<sup>693</sup> *Institutes* 4.15.6.

faith” should be said to receive “the pardon of his sins” by his faith in Christ.<sup>694</sup>

Calvin viewed the practice of infant baptism as an authentic tradition of the early church, not a medieval development.<sup>695</sup> He recognized that infants can be regenerated by God’s power.<sup>696</sup> The seed of their repentance and faith lies hidden within them by the secret working of the Spirit.<sup>697</sup> The benefit of infant baptism is that because infant baptism is the sign that God will be with believers and their descendants, it floods their pious hearts with great happiness and makes them feel “a deeper love of their kind Father.”<sup>698</sup> Through infant baptism, believers are aroused to a surer confidence of the salvation of their children and the children are “engrafted into the body of the church” and rather “more commended to the other members.” It spurs them on “to an earnest zeal for worshiping God” when they grow up and recognize its meaning.<sup>699</sup> Seeds of their understanding and cherishing of God’s promise in faith are sown in infant baptism by the Holy Spirit so that “infants are baptized into future repentance and faith.”<sup>700</sup> The presence of Christ through the Spirit “is continually offered in Word and sacrament” until the child becomes “an effective incipient.” Baptism continually offers “the sealed promise that in Christ, sins are forgiven and justification continually applied.”<sup>701</sup>

#### **2.2.6.1.2.2 The Lord’s Supper**

Here we do not have to refer to the whole doctrine of the Lord’s Supper. Accordingly, we will deal with how the Lord’s Supper operates for our sanctification as a means of grace.

In contrast to Bullinger,<sup>702</sup> Calvin regarded the Lord’s Supper as an instrument of sanctification, which the Spirit uses to deepen our faith. We are quickened by the true partaking in the sacrament because Christ’s life is delivered to us in it. The life-giving body and blood of Christ are brought to us “by the secret and incomprehensible power of the Spirit,”<sup>703</sup> who “truly unites things separated by space.”<sup>704</sup> The Sacrament heightens our awareness and newness of life. By the Lord’s Supper, we grow into “one body with Christ” and partake in all His benefits, which are redemption, righteousness, sanctification,

---

<sup>694</sup> Letter to Henry Bullinger, 26<sup>th</sup> June 1548; LC 2, 224, 169.

<sup>695</sup> *Institutes* 4.16.8.

<sup>696</sup> *Institutes* 4.16.18.

<sup>697</sup> *Institutes* 4.16.20.

<sup>698</sup> *Institutes* 4.16.9.

<sup>699</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>700</sup> *Institutes* 4.16.20.

<sup>701</sup> Jill Raitt, “Three Inter-related Principles in Calvin’s Unique Doctrine of Infant Baptism,” *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 11, no. 1 (1980): 60.

<sup>702</sup> Paul Rorem, “Calvin and Bullinger on the Lord’s Supper: Part I. The Impasse,” *Lutheran Quarterly*(Sum, 1988): 183. Bullinger explicitly rejected “instrumentalism.”

<sup>703</sup> Letter to the King of France; October 1557; LC 3, 480, 376

<sup>704</sup> *Institutes* 4.17.10.

and eternal life.<sup>705</sup> Generally, the Supper was allowed to the baptized who could discern the body and blood of Christ.<sup>706</sup>

Calvin stressed that the Supper “can more forcefully than any other means quicken and inspire us both to purity and holiness of life, and to love, peace, and concord.”<sup>707</sup> Since He makes us one in his body, we become made one body by our participation in the Supper. To injure our fellows who believe in Christ is to abuse Christ. As we are one body of Christ, we should take care of our brethren’s bodies, as if they are ours. In this respect, the Supper is called “the bond of love.” There could be no sharper goad “to arouse mutual love among us” than the Lord’s Supper. In this sense, the Supper contributes to our collective sanctification.

In his *Institutes* 4.17.42, Calvin averred that the “sacred feast is medicine for the sick, solace for the sinners, alms to the poor” but that it brings “no benefit to the healthy, righteous, and rich if such could be found.” It was “ordained not for the perfect, but for the weak and feeble, to awaken, stimulate, and exercise the feeling of faith and love, indeed, to correct the defect of both.” In his sermon on Titus 1:1-15, Calvin insisted, “the Supper is a special witness to us that our God helps us.” When we are lazy, “it is to make us go on forward, to drive still to our God.” “The Supper is to correct and make an end of such things as are yet out of frame” (Spelling is modernized).<sup>708</sup>

Briefly, the Lord’s Supper is a means of sanctification to correct our defects and heighten newness of life, and inspire us to holy life and unite us as one.

### 2.2.6.1.3 Church Discipline

Calvin explained the necessity of church discipline as follows: “Discipline and the correction of vices” are indispensable to our sanctification as the nerves are essential to uphold the body in a healthful state.<sup>709</sup> Without this order which guarantees their safety and concord, churches are “wholly deformed and scattered.”<sup>710</sup> “There is no person of sound mind and unbiased disposition” that does not need the church discipline.<sup>711</sup>

Calvin saw three ways in which to explain the purpose of church discipline.<sup>712</sup> The first is to protect the honour of Christ and his Church by prohibiting impious men from being called Christians. The second purpose is that the good might be not corrupted by the

---

<sup>705</sup> *Institutes* 4.17.11.

<sup>706</sup> *Institutes* 4. 16.30.

<sup>707</sup> *Institutes* 4.17.38.

<sup>708</sup> *Sermons on the Epistle to Timothy & Titus by John Calvin*, (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth & Trust, reprinted in 1983, first published in 1579), p.1060.

<sup>709</sup> Letter to the protector Somerset; LC 2, 229, 197.

<sup>710</sup> *Institutes* 4.10.27.

<sup>711</sup> Letter to the pastors and doctors of the church of Zurich, 26<sup>th</sup> November 1553; LC 2, 335, 444.

<sup>712</sup> *Institutes* 4.12.5.

communion with the wicked. The third is that “those overcome by shame for their baseness begin to repent.” In addition, disciplinary measures “were directed especially against Roman Catholic practices such as praying to the Virgin and the use of altars and images.”<sup>713</sup> In this manner, for Calvin, church discipline was “a means of preserving the purity of the Church’s teaching and the believers’ efforts towards sanctification.”<sup>714</sup>

In terms of the stages of discipline, mutual encouragement, advice and warning were offered for tolerable offences including “fondness for idle theological speculation, neglect of the study of Scripture, levity, slander, stinginess, quarrelling and anger.”<sup>715</sup> In order “to awaken us from our indolence,”<sup>716</sup> Calvin chose the various church disciplinary programmes and devices, including the scheduling of times and places for worship.<sup>717</sup> A more severe means for correction is to bar immoral people from the communion of the Lord’s Supper.<sup>718</sup> As the severest punishment, excommunication was offered for “manifest adulterers, fornicators, thieves, robbers, seditious persons, perjurers, and false witnesses.”<sup>719</sup> Those who engaged in “immorality, drunkenness, gaming and dancing”<sup>720</sup> were included as well as the obstinate who do not acquiesce to admonition even though they were duly warned of their lighter vices.<sup>721</sup> Excommunication is “a holy and lawful discipline” stemmed from the word of God.<sup>722</sup> It is the key of the door of heaven by which the Church binds the sinner and loosens him when she receives him again into communion.<sup>723</sup> Excommunication is different from anathema in the sense that the latter is condemnation without pardon, and consigns a man to eternal destruction.<sup>724</sup>

Administration of justice is not in one man, but “in the hands of the assembly of the elders.” This is different from the Roman Catholic’s view of excommunication.<sup>725</sup> From Calvin’s viewpoint, the Roman Catholic’s practise was arbitrary, merciless and despotic.<sup>726</sup>

---

<sup>713</sup> Timothy E. Fulop, “The Third Mark of the Church? - Church Discipline in the Reformed and Anabaptist Reformations,” *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol. 19, no.1 (1995): 33.

<sup>714</sup> Wendel, *op. cit.*, p. 298.

<sup>715</sup> Calvin, ‘Draft Ecclesiastical Ordinances’ in *Theological Treatises*, pp. 60-61.

<sup>716</sup> *Institutes* 4.19.13. “If this discipline were in effect today, it would certainly arouse some slothful parents.”

<sup>717</sup> *Comm.* on Dan.9:18, CO 41, 157-160.

<sup>718</sup> *Institutes* 4.11.5; Letter to the protector Somerset; LC 2, 229, 197.

<sup>719</sup> *Institutes* 4.12.5.

<sup>720</sup> Those lists were regarded as intolerable offences. Calvin, ‘Draft Ecclesiastical Ordinances’ in *Theological Treatises*, pp. 60-61.

<sup>721</sup> Letter to the French Church of Frankfort, 23d February, 1559; LC 4, 524, 21.

<sup>722</sup> Letter to the pastors and doctors of the church of Zurich, 26<sup>th</sup> November 1553; LC 2, 335, 443 and 444; CO 14, 676.

<sup>723</sup> For formative process of this doctrine, see Robert White, “Oil and Vinegar: Calvin on Church Discipline,” *Scottish Journal of Theology*, Vol.38, no.1 (1985): 25-40.

<sup>724</sup> *Short Treatise on the Lord’s Supper* (1541) in *Theological Treatises*, p. 154.

<sup>725</sup> *Institutes* 4.11.5,6.

<sup>726</sup> *The Necessity of Reforming the Church* (I 544), in *Tracts and Treatises*, tr. by H. Beveridge (reprint).



Anabaptists were also too severe in their use of the ban.<sup>727</sup> In concert with Bucer, Calvin concluded that “the Anabaptists were more rigid than Paul.”<sup>728</sup> Church discipline can only be exercised by spiritual authority, in other words, it relies on the spontaneous perspicacity of faith. Calvin thought ministers and elders to be responsible for church discipline. The steps of discipline consist of individual, communal, and official admonition.

On the issue pertaining to tolerance, Castellio held that “tolerance in matters of faith is a good thing” and “persecution of supposed heretics is evil” according to the advice of Gamaliel.<sup>729</sup> Calvin rejected Castellio’s view for the reason that Gamaliel’s advice would destroy both civil and ecclesiastical order.<sup>730</sup> Of course, Calvin recognized the importance of toleration. He stressed gentleness and moderation in exercising excommunication. We should observe gentleness “lest we slip into some kind of hell-fire, and soon descend from discipline to butchery.”<sup>731</sup> “Yet all this should be done with such moderation, that there be no rigour by which anyone may be injured; for even corrections are only medicines of bringing back sinners to our Lord.”<sup>732</sup>

To sum up, church discipline is “a means of grace which, along with the Word, sacraments and prayer, Christ has given to his church, and which his Spirit uses for the sanctification and edification” of the believers.<sup>733</sup>

#### 2.2.6.1.4 Mutual Communion among Church Members

Calvin stressed the necessity of “mutual teaching and admonition” for edification as follows:<sup>734</sup> “As we are slow to what is good,” we need to be stimulated by mutual communion for edifying each other.<sup>735</sup>

He explicated the importance of mutual communion in comparison to the relationship

---

Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1958), Vol. I, pp. 205-256.

<sup>727</sup> Cf. *Institutes* 4.12.12. Timothy E. Fulop is the opinion that “Calvin’s views on discipline constituted a moderate position between the Lutherans and the Anabaptists on the practice of church discipline and between Zwingli and the Anabaptists on the state’s role in discipline.” “The Third Mark of the Church? - Church Discipline in the Reformed and Anabaptist Reformations,” *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol. 19, no.1 (Jan., 1995): 27. For the austerity of Anabaptists’ church discipline, see Kenneth Davis, “No Discipline, No Church: An Anabaptist Contribution to the Reformed Tradition,” *Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 13, no.4 (win., 1982): 43-58.

<sup>728</sup> Calvin, *Tracts and Treatises*, 2:181.

<sup>729</sup> Castellio, *Concerning Heretics*, tr. by Roland Bainton (1935; rpt., New York: Octagon, 1965), pp. 271-72, 279.

<sup>730</sup> *Refutatio Errorum Michaelis Serveti*, CO 8: 472-473.

<sup>731</sup> *Institutes* 4.12.10.

<sup>732</sup> ‘Draft Ecclesiastical Ordinances’ in *Theological Treatises*, pp. 70-71.

<sup>733</sup> Robert White, “Oil and Vinegar: Calvin on Church Discipline,” *Scottish Journal of Theology*, Vol. 38, no.1 (1985): 40.

<sup>734</sup> *Comm.* on Col. 3:16, CO 52, 124. “...mutuam doctrinam et admonitionem... ”

<sup>735</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Thess. 5:11, CO 52,171; *Comm.* on 1 Cor. 14:3, CO 49, 517.

of a tree and its branches. “As the root conveys sap to the whole tree, so all the vigour which we possess must flow to us from Christ.” He stated it in three ways. First, all the life which runs from Christ is dispersed through the members. The second is that on account of the limited share of each, the mutual communion among all the members is definitely necessary. The third is that the health of the body can be maintained only through mutual love. Accordingly, the man “who desires his own separate growth” is wrong.<sup>736</sup> This mutual participation in each other’s gifts within the Church is necessary for living a full Christian life because “God does not give the Spirit to every one in a detached way.”<sup>737</sup> Accordingly, for our sanctification, we must cleave to each other in the mutual distribution of gifts. Our mutual communion compensates our deficiency in the gifts of the Holy Spirit for our holy life. Through our participation in the Church, gifts are offered to us “according to the measure of grace.”<sup>738</sup>

### 2.2.6.2 Prayer

Calvin expounded prayer in his *Institutes* 3.20.1-52 in detail.<sup>739</sup> Calvin held that prayer was “the chief exercise of faith,” “by which we daily receive God’s benefit.”<sup>740</sup> That is to say, prayer is a means to receive grace for our sanctification. He also recognized prayer as a means of sanctification in the sense that “all things which God made are made holy to us through the word of God and prayers.”<sup>741</sup> John Kesley also claims that Calvin saw prayer “as a means for the Holy Spirit to increase and strengthen faith.”<sup>742</sup> His claim seems pertinent, given that Calvin described prayer as the only answer to doubt or questioning when we meet with overwhelming discouragements.<sup>743</sup>

In view of the efficiency of prayer to sanctification, Calvin admitted that prayer strengthened us: “If you feel in yourself more weakness than is desirable, have recourse to him (God) who has permitted that those who trust him shall be like a tree planted by the rivers.”<sup>744</sup> In prayer we lay open before God “our infirmities which we would be ashamed to confess before man.”<sup>745</sup> As proper prayer accompanies humility and the confession of

---

<sup>736</sup> *Comm.* on Eph. 4:16, CO 51, 203. “Fallitur ergo si quis seorsum crescere appetit.”

<sup>737</sup> *Comm.* on 2 Cor. 13:14, CO 50, 156. “...quia Deus non singulis seorsum largitur spiritum... .”

<sup>738</sup> *Comm.* on 2 Cor. 13:14, CO 50, 156. “...pro gratiae mensura cuique distribuit...”

<sup>739</sup> Calvin defined prayer as our “conversation with God” (*Institutes* 3.20.4), or “an expression and manifestation of internal feeling before him who is the searcher of the heart.” (*Institutes* 3.20.29).

<sup>740</sup> Title to *Institutes* 3.20.

<sup>741</sup> *Sermons on the Epistle to Timothy & Titus* by John Calvin, (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth & Trust, reprinted in 1983, first published in 1579), p. 366 b, n. 20.

<sup>742</sup> John Kesley, “Prayer and Ethics; Reflection of Calvin and Barth,” *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 82, no. 2 (Missoula, Scholars Press, 1989): 172.

<sup>743</sup> LC to Madeloiselle de..., January 12, 1549; LC 2, 233, 205.

<sup>744</sup> Letter to the Duchess of Ferrara, July 20, 1558; LC 3, 384, 129.

<sup>745</sup> Calvin’s Introduction to his *Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, p. xxxviii.

sin and the claim for forgiveness, prayer helps our sanctification.<sup>746</sup> Prayer based on the command and promise of God reinforces our faith and hope in God.<sup>747</sup> Proper prayer contributes to our sanctification by allowing God to accomplish his good plan for us.<sup>748</sup>

Calvin dwelt on the Lord's Prayer in connection with sanctification. Through prayer we gain the power to struggle with "the innumerable assaults of temptations" and to overcome "the guilt of their transgressions."<sup>749</sup> When we pray in order that God's name be hallowed, "our own hallowing in turn also comes about."<sup>750</sup> Our petition that God's Kingdom should come draws "us back from worldly corruptions, which so separate us from God that his Kingdom does not thrive within us." It "ought to instruct us in bearing the cross" and "to kindle zeal for mortification of the flesh."<sup>751</sup> By the third petition "that God's will may be done on earth as in heaven," we come to "renounce the desires of our flesh." "By this prayer we are formed to self-denial so God may rule us according to his decision" and "create new minds and hearts in us."<sup>752</sup> As a result, by the inner teaching of the Holy Spirit, "we may learn to love the things that please God and to hate those which displease him." The sixth petition to deliver us from evil helps us not to "be puffed up in prosperity" or not to "cast down in adversity."<sup>753</sup> In this way, the prayers of Christians ought to "look to the public edification of the church" and "the advancement of the believers' fellowship."<sup>754</sup>

Accordingly, given that prayer reinforces our faith and supports a new mood of Christian obedience, we can say that Calvin considered prayer as a means of sanctification.

## 2.2.7 The Relation to Other Doctrines

### 2.2.7.1 Justification and Sanctification<sup>755</sup>

According to the logical order of soteriology, justification precedes sanctification. Calvin

---

<sup>746</sup> *Institutes* 3.20.8, 9.

<sup>747</sup> *Institutes* 3.20.13.

<sup>748</sup> *Comm.* on Ps. 119:38, CO 32, 231.

<sup>749</sup> *Institutes* 3.20.28.

<sup>750</sup> *Institutes* 3.20.35.

<sup>751</sup> *Institutes* 3.20.42.

<sup>752</sup> *Institutes* 3.20.43.

<sup>753</sup> *Institutes* 3. 20. 46; Letter to Monsieur De Falais 16<sup>th</sup> of November, 1546 in LC 2, 178, 82. "Meanwhile, we must beseech him (God) that he would uphold us in steadfast courage, never permitting us to fall away because of lengthened on-waiting."

<sup>754</sup> *Institutes* 3.20.47.

<sup>755</sup> This part is connected with forensic and factual sanctification. See 2.2.4.2 on this thesis; Alister E. McGrath insisted that Calvin for the first time clearly distinguished between justification and sanctification, and there are strong grounds that the concept of forensic justification was influenced by the humanism of Erasmus. A. E. McGrath, "Humanist elements in the early Reformed doctrine of justification," *Archiv-fur-Reformations-geschichte* 73 (1982): 5-20.

however put sanctification before justification in his *Institutes* (1559). Some have examined this reasoning. H. Jackson Forstman views the reason as Calvin's attempt to "acquit the new movement of the charge of antinomianism."<sup>756</sup> Wilhelm H. Neuser holds that Calvin emphasised sanctification as the progress of faith, while "Luther did not accentuate sanctification, i.e., progress in faith," though both of them "agreed on certainty of faith."<sup>757</sup> Jesse Couenhoven is of the opinion that for Calvin, Christianity is essentially not a set of dogmas but a way of life and practical piety was put before theological understanding.<sup>758</sup> Jonathan H. Rainbow insists that the preaching and teaching of Calvin as a pastor were primarily "aimed at moving believers to holy life" rather than convincing people to believe the doctrine of justification.<sup>759</sup> Those arguments elucidate the reason why in contrast to Luther, Calvin emphasised sanctification rather than justification.<sup>760</sup>

Göhler stressed that the formal characteristic of Calvin's theology is the link of all doctrines without any *Zentrallehre*, and in which the *doppelte Gnade* of justification and sanctification is an undividable.<sup>761</sup> His view is legitimate given Calvin's claim that "the grace of justification is not separated from regeneration, although they are things distinct."<sup>762</sup> As Christ cannot be divided into parts, justification and sanctification are so united in Him that they are inseparable.<sup>763</sup> In this regard, Jonathan H. Rainbow's argument that for Calvin, "justification and sanctification are not root and branch but two branches from a common root" is germane.<sup>764</sup> For Calvin, justification and sanctification are both direct consequences of a believer's incorporation into Christ.<sup>765</sup> Through union with Christ,

---

<sup>756</sup> H. Jackson Forstman, *Word and Spirit: Calvin's Doctrine of Biblical Authority* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1962), p. 61. See 2.2.7 'Good Works and Sanctification' pertaining to whether Calvin was an antinomian or not.

<sup>757</sup> William. H. Neuser, "Calvin's Conversion to Teachableness," in *Calvin and Christian Ethics: Fifth Colloquium on Calvin & Calvin Studies*, ed. Peter De Klerk (Grand Rapids: Calvin Studies Society, 1987), p.70.

<sup>758</sup> Jesse Couenhoven, "Grace as Pardon and Power: Pictures of the Christian Life in Luther, Calvin, and Barth," *Journal of Religious Ethics*, Vol. 28, no. 1 (2000): 72.

<sup>759</sup> Jonathan H. Rainbow, "Double Grace: John Calvin's View of the Relationship of Justification and Sanctification," *Ex Auditu* 5 (1989): 100.

<sup>760</sup> Emil Doumergue compares Reformed with Lutheran as follows: "The Lutherans fought especially, against the false sanctity of Judaistic works; the 'Reformed' Church especially against the deification of creation –paganism. The Lutherans pursued a specifically religious interest; the 'Reformed' Church a moral interest. The Lutheran Reformation created a theology; the 'Reformed' Reformation created a church. Lutheran theology is more objective; 'Reformed' theology is more subjective" [Emil Doumergue, Vol. 4, book I, Chapter I, p.30, in *Jean Calvin, les hommes et les choses de son temps*, 7 vols. (Lausanne, 1899-1917)]. Quoted by T. H. L., "The Approach to Calvin," *The Evangelical Quarterly* 16 (1944): 166.

<sup>761</sup> A. Göhler, *Calvins Lehre von der Heiligung* (München, 1934), p. 81f.

<sup>762</sup> *Institutes* 3.11.11.

<sup>763</sup> *Institutes* 3.11.6; *Comm.* on Isa. 59:20, CO 37.351.7-3.

<sup>764</sup> Jonathan H. Rainbow, *op. cit.*, *Ex Auditu* 5 (1989): 103

<sup>765</sup> A. MacGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, 2 Vols. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 2: 37.

a believer is all at once justified and then commences sanctification.

We are justified in order to worship God in the holiness of life.<sup>766</sup> “Christ justifies no one he does not sanctify.”<sup>767</sup> Briefly, sanctification is the aim of justification.

In terms of a *double lavement* (twofold cleansing), Calvin explicated justification and sanctification. This *double lavement* means forensic i.e., positional purification imputed to us in our justification and an actual purification given by the process of sanctification.<sup>768</sup> Justification is what Christ has done for us (substitution), sanctification is what Christ does in us through the power of the Spirit.<sup>769</sup> Justification is God’s declaration that we are righteous before God’s judgment. Sanctification is the consecration and dedication of both our body and soul to God, as Christ consecrated and dedicated Himself to Father in the sacrifice of the Cross.<sup>770</sup>

### 2.2.7.2 Predestination, Election, Calling, and Sanctification

Predestination is defined as “the eternal decree of God, by which he determined what he wished to make of every man. God does not create everyone in the same condition but ordains eternal life for some and eternal damnation for others.”<sup>771</sup> The crucial function of the doctrine of predestination is to explicate the reason why some reply to the Gospel, and others do not.<sup>772</sup> Calvin allotted merely four chapters for the elucidation of predestination (3.21-24). It reflects an intention to connect it with Christian life that Calvin located the doctrine of predestination at the end of soteriology. Calvin explicated the relevance of the doctrine of predestination to the Christian life as follows:

This great subject...eminently adapted to the service of the godly: because it builds us up soundly in the faith, trains us to humility and lifts us up into an admiration of the unbounded goodness of God towards us. ...there “is not a more effectual means of building up faith than giving our open ears to the election of God, which the Holy Spirit seals upon our heart while we hear, showing us that it stands in

---

<sup>766</sup> *Comm.* Rom. 6:2, CO 49, 104. “...in hunc finem nos iustificari, ut deinde vitae puritate Deum colamus.”

<sup>767</sup> *Institutes* 3.16.1.

<sup>768</sup> *Serm.* on Gal. 2:17-18, CO 50, 438. “Ainsi ces deux graces (c’est à sçavoir nostre iustice et la remission de nos pechez) sont inviolablement coniointes avec ce renouvellement qui est fait par l’esprit de sanctification. Voilà donc deux graces inseparables: comme quand nous disons que le soleil est chaud, il ne laisse pas de luire...”

<sup>769</sup> *Institutes* 3.11.6.

<sup>770</sup> *Comm.* on 2Cor. 7:1, CO 50, 84. “Ergo ut te rite sanctifices Deo, et corpus et animam illi in solidum dicare oportet.”

<sup>771</sup> *Institutes* 3.21.5.

<sup>772</sup> Letter to Melancthon, 28<sup>th</sup> Nov. 1551, LC 2, 305, CO 14, 417.

the eternal and immutable good will of God towards us.<sup>773</sup>

“[P]redestination does not hammer “ethical activity” but “provides the true motivation for moral living.”<sup>774</sup> Namely, our gratitude of election promotes zeal and diligence to live holy,<sup>775</sup> because the goal of election is our sanctification. “If the object of election be holiness of life, it should rather awaken and stimulate us to a cheerful practice of it, than be used as a pretext for slothfulness.”<sup>776</sup> “Holiness, purity, and every excellence that is found among men are the fruit of election.” The eternal election of God is the source and cause of faith and sanctification.<sup>777</sup> Our sanctification “flows from the fountain of divine election.”<sup>778</sup>

In relation to assurance, predestination enables Christians to be assured of salvation, because the eternal election of God cannot be moved or altered by any storms of the world, by any assaults of Satan, by any changes, or by any fluctuations or weaknesses of the flesh.<sup>779</sup> Accordingly, Calvin’s doctrine of predestination renders believers to overcome moral scepticism and desperate doubt of salvation. It helps us struggle continuously for our sanctification. This is the strong point of Reformed Theology in contrast to Catholic uncertainty of salvation.<sup>780</sup> Augustine held that believers are discouraged from feeling confident about their salvation, and there can never be certainty that one is of the elect until one finds oneself safely in heaven, because God’s predestination is mysterious and seemingly arbitrary. Contrary to him, Calvin’s doctrine of predestination functions to provide the Christian with unshakeable certainty of salvation.<sup>781</sup> Due to God’s eternal predestination, the believer can rest assured that nothing can separate him from God’s love revealed in Christ.<sup>782</sup>

To sum up, predestination results in calling, justification, and sanctification<sup>783</sup> because

---

<sup>773</sup> De Aeterna Dei Praedestinatione, CO 8:260.

<sup>774</sup> *Institutes* 3.23.12.

<sup>775</sup> *Comm.* on Is.41:8, CO 37, 39. “...docemur vocationem nostram sufficere nobis debere, ut ab inquinamentis huius mundi cohibeamur.”

<sup>776</sup> *Institutes* 3.23.12.

<sup>777</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Cor. 1:2. CO 49, 308. “...Paulus causam sanctificationis dicat esse vocationem Dei...”

<sup>778</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Cor. 1: 2, CO 49, 308. “...sanctitatem nostrum ex fonte divinae electionis fluere...”

<sup>779</sup> *Comm.* on Lk. 10:20. CO 45, 316. “...aeterna electio, quae extra nos est, clarius demonstrat, in mera Dei bonitate fundatam esse salutem nostram.”

<sup>780</sup> The Catholic Church is of the opinion that the ordinary believer is not in a position to know “with the certitude of faith which cannot be subject to error” that he is in the grace of God, that even the ‘just’ man cannot be sure of his predestination to eternal salvation. H. Jedin, *A History of the Council of Trent*, Vol. 2 (Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson, 1961), p.308.

<sup>781</sup> Cf. *Institutes* 3.22.10. *Institutes* 4.1.3.

<sup>782</sup> Mark E. Vanderschaaf, “Predestination and certainty of salvation in Augustine and Calvin,” *Reformed Review*, Vol. 30, no.1 (New Brunswick: New Brunswick Theological Seminary & Holland: Western Theological Seminary, 1976): 1-7.

<sup>783</sup> OS 1:86-87.



the aim of election is sanctification.<sup>784</sup>

### 2.2.7.3 Regeneration, Repentance, Conversion, and Sanctification

For Calvin, regeneration, conversion, repentance, and sanctification are almost similar terms. Interestingly, David K. Winecoff explicates the subtle difference between sanctification and repentance in Calvin as follows:

Sanctification possibly refers to the process of becoming holy viewed as a whole both inwardly and outwardly. Repentance refers chiefly to the change of heart involved. Therefore, repentance is our response to Christ; whereas, sanctification is our whole participation in Christ.<sup>785</sup>

His opinion that repentance is mainly related to a change of heart is rather doubtful for a number of reasons. The first reason is that Calvin defined repentance as “the true turning of *our life* to God.”<sup>786</sup> The second is that Calvin stated, “no one can embrace the grace of the gospel without betaking himself from the errors of *his past life* into the right way and applying his whole efforts of his practice of repentance” (Italics are my emphasis).<sup>787</sup> The reason that Calvin stressed the importance of a change of heart in repentance was to object to the hypocrisy of the Roman Catholic Church, which emphasised external confession.

Winecoff analyzes that Calvin’s definition of sanctification is similar to the concept of regeneration, which is defined as “participation in Christ.” His analysis seems pertinent.<sup>788</sup> Calvin interpreted repentance as regeneration. In *ordo salutis*, Calvin held that initial regeneration is prior to faith. Faith flows from regeneration and not in the reverse order.<sup>789</sup> Regeneration is “the beginning of the spiritual life.”<sup>790</sup> Calvin in this sense is said to distinguish regeneration from sanctification, though for Calvin, repentance, conversion, and sanctification are almost synonymous.

### 2.2.7.4 Faith<sup>791</sup> and Sanctification

---

<sup>784</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Cor. 1: 2, CO 49, 308. “sanctitatem nostram...esse vocationis nostrae scopum.”

<sup>785</sup> David K. Winecoff, “Calvin’s Doctrine of Mortification,” *Presbyterion: Covenant Seminary Review* 13 (Saint Louis: Covenant Theological Seminary, Fall, 1987): 89.

<sup>786</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.5-6.

<sup>787</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.1

<sup>788</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.9.

<sup>789</sup> *Institutes* 3.1.4. “[F]aith itself has no other source than the Spirit.”

<sup>790</sup> *Institutes* 2.3.6.

<sup>791</sup> For Calvin, faith is defined as “a firm and certain knowledge of God’s benevolence towards us, founded upon the truth of the freely given promise in Christ, both revealed to our minds and sealed upon our hearts through the Holy Spirit” (*Institutes*, 3.2.7). *Fiducia* is the believer’s response to certain knowledge of God. *Fiducia* signifies trust or confidence. Trust emphasises the trustworthiness of the object of one’s belief; confidence points to the boldness of the one who believes. Thus, “the word ‘faith’ is very often used for

In the relationship between repentance and faith, Calvin held that the former is different from the latter, but the two are inseparable from each other and need be distinguished.<sup>792</sup> Repentance is “a turning unto God, when we frame ourselves and all our life to obey him; but faith is a receiving of the grace offered us in Christ.”<sup>793</sup> Calvin assumed a rather subtle approach as to which should be thought of as first. In his *Institutes* 3.3.1, Calvin stressed, “Repentance not only always follows faith, but also is produced by it.” He condemned the view that repentance precedes faith. In his commentary on John 1: 13, Calvin stated it in detail as follows: The Evangelists claimed that because “faith does not proceed from ourselves, but is the fruit of spiritual regeneration,” no man can believe without renewal by the Spirit of God. In contrast, Calvin thought they reversed the natural order and insisted that because regeneration is an effect of faith, regeneration follows faith. On the other hand, he acknowledged that both views perfectly agree for the following reason. Faith is “a work of the Holy Spirit, who dwells in none but the children of God.” Accordingly, faith is said to be “a part of our regeneration.” Since faith generates from “the illumination of our minds by the Holy Spirit,” faith is said to follow regeneration.<sup>794</sup> When we receive faith, God “regenerates us by some method that is hidden and unknown to us,” “after we have received faith, we perceive, by a lively feeling of conscience, not only the grace of adoption, but also newness of life and the other gifts of the Holy Spirit.” Briefly, in our hidden consciousness, the first regeneration precedes faith, but in our consciousness, faith precedes sanctification.

This faith is the only means by which God “leads us into the light of the Gospel.”<sup>795</sup> “God communicates himself to us in his Son, and offers himself to be enjoyed in him” by faith.<sup>796</sup> Repentance and forgiveness of sins as “both kinds of grace” are attained “by faith.”<sup>797</sup> Faith generates the real presence of the living Christ within the believer. By faith, Christ “ingrafts us into his body, and makes us not only partakers of all his benefits, but also of himself.”<sup>798</sup> It is “the sacred bond” to engraft us into Christ.<sup>799</sup> Faith enables us to

---

confidence” (*Institutes*, 3.2.15).

<sup>792</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.5; *Comm.* on Acts 20:21. “I grant, indeed, that they cannot be separate; because God doth illuminate no man with the Spirit of faith whom he doth not also regenerate unto newness of life.”

<sup>793</sup> *Comm.* on Acts 20:21, CO 48, 462-63. *Poenitentia enim est conversio ad Deum, quum nos totamque vitam nostram in eius obsequium componimus: Fides autem gratiae nobis in Christo exhibitae receptio est.*”

<sup>794</sup> *Comm.* on Jn. 1:13, CO 47, 13. “Quod enim spiritus mentes nostras illustrat, id iam ad renovationem nostri pertinet. Hoc modo ex regeneratione, tanquam ex fonte manat fides.

<sup>795</sup> *Institutes*, 3.1.4.

<sup>796</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Jn. 4:14, CO 55, 355. “...scilicet in filio se nobis communicat, ac fruendum offert.”

<sup>797</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.19. cf. In Richard Ngun’s quotation of Calvin’s *Institutes* there are some errors, for example, note no. 5, *Institutes* 4.6.17 must be changed to 3.3.19, and no.1, *Institutes* 3.1.1 to 3.1.4. Richard Ngun, “A Survey of the Role of the Law in Sanctification among Selected Calvinists,” *Stulos Theological Journal*, Vol. 8, no 1/2 (Bandung: Bandung Theological Seminary, 2000), p.46.

<sup>798</sup> *Institutes*, 3.2.24.

<sup>799</sup> *Institutes* 3.22.10.

possess the good things in Christ<sup>800</sup> that “is not in man’s possession.”<sup>801</sup> It also enables us to have a personal relationship with the living God by means of lifting us up to God’s presence in Christ.<sup>802</sup> This relationship transforms the life of believers. Our “holiness is the true evidence of our faith.”<sup>803</sup> Faith generates strength to practise God’s will. Faith engrafts us into the death of Christ in order that we might “derive from it a secret energy, as the twig does from the root.”<sup>804</sup> Faith cleanses our hearts “to dedicate ourselves wholly to God’s service.”<sup>805</sup> Calvin attacked monasticism for its passivity on the grounds of his conviction that action is the crucial product of spiritual life.<sup>806</sup> In that sense, faith is obedience<sup>807</sup> and “the sum of all piety.”<sup>808</sup> It is the “main hinge on which religion turns.”<sup>809</sup>

To sum up, faith precedes sanctification as repentance, though in our unconsciousness, the initial regeneration precedes faith.

### 2.2.7.5 Perseverance and Sanctification

Perseverance can be defined as the continuity of faith and sanctification during our life in spite of every temptation. Because our life is one unceasing battle with Satan, the Christian is asked to endure the trial of faith to the end.<sup>810</sup>

Calvin regarded perseverance as the gift of God because it is impossible without the help of the Spirit.<sup>811</sup> God’s Spirit nourishes “the very inclination to obedience that he first engendered, and strengthened its constancy to persevere to the very end.”<sup>812</sup> God works “in frail vessels” and manifests “his strength in the infirmity of his followers.”<sup>813</sup> God’s grace helps “the weakness of human will to move it unwaveringly and inseparably.”<sup>814</sup> Both the conversion of the human will to good and “its continuation in good” depend

---

<sup>800</sup> Serm. on Eph. 1:17-19; SEC, 110.

<sup>801</sup> *Comm.* on Hab. 2:4, CO 43, 529. “...fides quasi precario mutuatur quod non est penes hominem.”

<sup>802</sup> Serm. on Eph. 3:14-19; SEC, 295.

<sup>803</sup> Serm. Eph. 1:17-19; SEC, 101.

<sup>804</sup> *Comm.* on Gal. 2:20, CO 50, 199. “Itaque postquam docuit nos cruci affixos una cum Christo, hoc quoque nobis vitale esse subiicit.”

<sup>805</sup> Serm. on Eph. 1:17-18; SEC, 102.

<sup>806</sup> Cf. W. J. Bouwsma, ‘The Spirituality of John Calvin’, p. 330.

<sup>807</sup> Jesse Couenhoven, “Grace as Pardon and Power: Pictures of the Christian Life in Luther, Calvin, and Barth,” *Journal of Religious Ethics*, Vol. 28, no. 1 (2000): 73.

<sup>808</sup> *Institutes* 3.15.7.

<sup>809</sup> *Institutes* 3.11.1.

<sup>810</sup> Serm. on Deut. 20:2-9, CO 27, 673.

<sup>811</sup> *Institutes* 2.3.11. “Perseverance would without any doubt, be accounted God’s free gift.”

<sup>812</sup> *Institutes* 2.3.9.

<sup>813</sup> Letter to the women detained in prison at Paris at Geneva, September 1557; LC 3, 446, 363.

<sup>814</sup> *Institutes* 2.3.13.

exclusively upon God's will, not upon human merit.<sup>815</sup> The effective calling of God makes perseverance certain.<sup>816</sup>

On the other hand, Calvin admitted also that perseverance requires human effort because men willingly "fall away unless they are strengthened to persevere."<sup>817</sup> Christians must live in constant fear and humble trembling because nothing is so evanescent as faith and nothing fleet away so easily as love.<sup>818</sup> The human duty of perseverance is related to prayer. For example, David prayed, "Unite my heart to fear thy name." The believers in persecution were asked to pray for two things: "that they might be not tempted beyond their power," and that God should reinforce them with such courage so that they will not be not so distressed "by whatever may happen to them as to fall away from God."<sup>819</sup> Nevertheless, Calvin ascribed our efforts to God's Spirit in the sense that "it is God who works in us to will and to accomplish" for his pleasure (Phil. 2:13). He stressed, "The will is left nothing to claim for itself."<sup>820</sup> In this manner, Calvin attributed all merits in relation to perseverance only to God and not to man.

To sum up, for Calvin, it is possible for us to persevere because believers are efficiently disposed by God so that they might willingly pursue Him with staunch intention. It needs our prayer so that God might accomplish his promise of our salvation, though it is the gift of God.

## 2.2.8 Good Works and Sanctification

### 2.2.8.1 Good Works and Sanctification

First, the relationship between good works and faith will be observed. Calvin argued that only good works by faith are accepted by God, because without faith, "what seem to be good works are turned into sins."<sup>821</sup> After people received Christ by faith, their works are counted righteous "because whatever fault is otherwise in them is buried in Christ's purity."<sup>822</sup> In this sense, faith is the foundation of good works.

In his commentary on Mt 3:8, Calvin stressed that good works are called fruits of repentance in the sense that "*repentance* is an inward renewal of the man, which manifests

---

<sup>815</sup> *Institutes* 3.3.14.

<sup>816</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Jn. 2:19, CO 55, 322. "...ubi efficax est Dei vocatio, illic certam perseverantiam fore."

<sup>817</sup> *Institutes* 2.3.9; 2.3.11. "If they mean that after we have by the Lord's power once and for all been brought to obey righteousness, we go forward by our own power and are inclined to follow the action of grace, I do not gainsay it."

<sup>818</sup> Serm. on Lk. 1: 73-78, CO 46:187.

<sup>819</sup> Letter to the Church of Anger, 19<sup>th</sup> April 1556: LC 3, 432, 261.

<sup>820</sup> *Institutes* 2.3.11.

<sup>821</sup> *Institutes* 3.18.5.

<sup>822</sup> *Institutes* 3.17.10.

itself in the outward life, as a tree produces its fruit.”<sup>823</sup> “*Repentance* is an inward matter, which has its seat in the heart and soul, but afterwards yields its fruits in a change of life.” The repentance is “not attested by words” but “proved by the conduct.” Good works are the fruit of fulfilling one’s vocation.<sup>824</sup> Briefly, good works are the fruits of repentance. In his Commentary on Luke 3:10, Calvin claimed that we must distinguish between the pious and hypocrites by good works as follows.<sup>825</sup> A hypocrite pretends he is repentant by performing ceremonies to worship God. However, it is not “*the fruits worthy of repentance.*” The fruit worthy of repentance is to perform the duties of charity and of the second Table of the Law. Though God does not disregard “the outward profession of godliness and of his worship,” he regards this as “a surer mark of distinction.” This distinction leads us to fewer mistakes. Hypocrites are “either cruel to their neighbours, or addicted to falsehood and dishonesty.” Their discrepancy in life proves that they did not repent sincerely. To justly deal with men and to relieve the poor and to be generous to the wretched, and to “give liberally what the Lord has bestowed upon them” is a testimony of the piety of men. In other words, good works are the evidence to distinguish the sanctified from hypocrites who confess their faith by their words, but refuse by their behaviour.

Calvin understood the motive of our good works as our thankfulness for God’s grace in saving us from sin and reconciling us to himself. He also regarded the image of God in man as the reason why we do good work for our neighbours.<sup>826</sup> Our good works for our neighbours sometimes include exercising of the lawful judgment “to guard the weak from being unjustly injured.”<sup>827</sup> God promised his reward for good works to relieve the weakness of our flesh by some comfort.<sup>828</sup> He wants us to be disciplined by good works and to ponder on the awarding of “those things which he has promised.”<sup>829</sup> God delights in glorifying “those whom he has sanctified” by his reward as the gift of grace.<sup>830</sup> In order to goad our sloth, God has promised us that our suffering to the glory of his name “will not be in vain.”<sup>831</sup> For Calvin, God’s promise of reward for our good works motivates our continual sanctification.<sup>832</sup>

To sum up, good works are the end of justification by faith and the external evidence of

---

<sup>823</sup> *Comm.* on Mt. 3:8; Lk 3:8, CO 45, 118. “...poenitentia interior sit hominis renovatio, quae in externam vitam emergit, sicut ex se fructus producit arbor.”

<sup>824</sup> *Institutes* 3.14.9.

<sup>825</sup> *Comm.* on Lk. 3:10, CO 45, 119-120.

<sup>826</sup> *Institutes* 3.7.6.

<sup>827</sup> *Comm.* on Gen.18:19. CO 23, 259. “...dare operam ne debiles iniuste laedantur.”

<sup>828</sup> *Institutes* 3.18.4.

<sup>829</sup> *Institutes* 3.18.3.

<sup>830</sup> *Institutes* 3.18.3-4.

<sup>831</sup> *Institutes* 3.18.7.

<sup>832</sup> *Institutes* 3.18.3.

our sanctification.<sup>833</sup> Sanctification as repentance is proved by good works. Good works are a secondary evidence of our assurance. The reward of good works motivates our continual sanctification.

### 2.2.8.2 Assurance of Election and Good Works

In order to attain assurance of our election, Calvin appealed to the saints to focus our eyes only on Christ in whom the Father is well pleased.<sup>834</sup> Stas Cohen claims, “[Z]ealous activity on behalf of works is a sign of election.”<sup>835</sup> Thus, practically speaking, “to act as though called - by virtue of zealous activity in pursuit of good works - is to (hope to) be elect.”<sup>836</sup> Theodore Beza holds, “The testimony that one has been justified and sanctified is two-fold: good works and the witness of the Holy Spirit.”<sup>837</sup> Conversely, Calvin asserted, “For if they begin to judge it (the certainty of election) by good works, nothing will be more uncertain or more feeble; for indeed, if works be judged of themselves, by their imperfection they will no less declare God’s wrath than by their incomplete purity they testify to his benevolence.”<sup>838</sup>

Richard Baxter stated that “the most obedient will have the most assurance: and for the middle sort, their assurance will rise or fall, ordinary with their obedience...,”<sup>839</sup> and “we can be assured of our adoption” “through the fruit of the Spirit”<sup>840</sup> on the basis that “by their fruit you will recognize them” (Mt 7: 16). His statements are contrary to Calvin’s view. Though it is biblical, Calvin viewed it as “a very uncertain test” to take the fruits of life as standard of austere faith in his exposition of this passage,<sup>841</sup> because “the worst impostors” frequently pretended to lead a faithful life. “[T]hough only those predestined to

---

<sup>833</sup> *Institutes* 1.25.21.

<sup>834</sup> *Institutes* 3.24.5.

<sup>835</sup> Cf. This inclination came from Theodore Beza who wrote, “...[T]hat I am elect, is first perceived from sanctification begun in me, that is, by my hating of sin and my loving of righteousness.” Theodore Beza, *A Little Book of Christian Questions and Responses*, tr. by Kirk M. Summers (Allison Park, Pennsylvania: Pickwick Publications, 1986), pp. 96-7; John Knox, *The Works of John Knox*, 6 Vols., ed. by David Laing (Edinburgh: Johnstone and Hunter, 1846-64), 3:385. For more detail, see John S. Bray, “The Value of Works in the Theology of Calvin and Beza,” *Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol.4, no. 2 (1973): 77-86.

<sup>836</sup> Stas Cohen, “John Calvin on Predestination and Election: A Kantian Aid,” *Journal of Religious Studies*, Vol. 14, no.1-2 (Punjabi University, 1988):156, 153-154. There are many faults in his citation of the *Institutes*. His expression of “Election is in Christ” is not showed at *Institutes* 3.25.5, and 3.21.7 does not support his statement that “election manifests itself by clear and positive signs in the lives of the elect, by the calling and righteousness which expresses it in concrete reality.” *Institutes*, 3.21.7 explicates only his particular election of individuals among a nation. Also, ‘righteousness’ has to be replaced by ‘justification’

<sup>837</sup> Theodore Beza, *Tractationes* I, pp. 200-201; III, pp. 433-435.

<sup>838</sup> *Institutes* 3.14.19.

<sup>839</sup> Richard Baxter, *The Practical Works of the Rev. Richard Baxter*, 23 Vols., with a life of the author and a critical examination of his writings by the Rev. William Orme (London: James Duncan, 1830), Vol.9:34.

<sup>840</sup> *Ibid.*, p.53.

<sup>841</sup> *Comm.* on Mt. 7:16, CO 45, 226. “...valde incertum esset hoc examen.”



salvation receive the light of faith and truly feel the power of the Gospel, yet experience shows that the reprobate are sometimes affected by almost the same feeling as the elect, so that even in their own judgment they do not in any way differ from the elect (cf. Acts 13:48).<sup>842</sup> Though Calvin's view is logical and realistic, this leads us to doubt if Calvin's rejection of "by their fruit you will recognize them" is biblical.

Jeremy Talor (1613-1667) also held that "the performance of our duty is the best consignation to eternity, and the only testimony God gives us of our election" on the grounds that "[w]e know we are translated from death to life, by our love unto, the brethren" (1 Jn. 3:13).<sup>843</sup> His viewpoint seems to be biblical, but contrary to Calvin's. Calvin held that love does not justify us but is "a sure sign of regeneration since it is the necessary fruit of the Holy Spirit." In this sense, for Calvin, faith precedes love. Love is "not a foundation on which it (faith) rests."<sup>844</sup> Faith rests on Christ who is "a faithful guardian."<sup>845</sup>

However, Calvin did not deny that love is a secondary evidence for our election. In his commentary on 1 Jn. 4:17, Calvin recognized our works as a secondary support for our assurance. As "the effect of divine adoption," the newness of life testified by good works "serves to confirm confidence" as a secondary prop, while grace is primary support.<sup>846</sup> Love is only "accessory or an inferior aid, a prop to our faith."<sup>847</sup> Though the confidence of faith relies upon the grace of Christ alone, pious and holy life distinguishes true faith from false faith.<sup>848</sup> Calvin concluded, though the fruit of love cannot be separated from faith, "no one should hence conclude that we must look to our works in order that our assurance may be certain." In order that "we may cheerfully and joyfully go forth to meet Christ, we must have our faith fixed on his grace alone."<sup>849</sup>

Calvin also rejected the allowance of assurance to be directly bound to the sacraments not only because a superstitious reliance on the sacraments would cause a false sense of security but also because one's participation in the sacraments could be construed as a

---

<sup>842</sup> *Institutes*, 3.2.11.

<sup>843</sup> Jeremy Taylor, "Of Certainty of Salvation," in *The Whole Works of the Right Rev. Jeremy Taylor*, 15 vols., with a Life of the Author and a Critical Examination of his writings by Reginald Heber (London: J. Moyes, 1928), 3: 180.

<sup>844</sup> *Comm.* on 1Jn. 3:19, CO 55, 341-42. "...non fundamentum quo nititur."

<sup>845</sup> *Comm.* on Jn. 10:28, CO 47, 250. "...fidelis custos..."

<sup>846</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Jn. 4:17, CO 55, 357-58. "...vitae novitatem, quia divinae adoptionis est effectus, valere ad confirmandam fiduciam: sed tanquam secundarium (ut ita loquar) adminiculum."

<sup>847</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Jn. 3:19, CO 55, 341-42. "Est igitur caritas accessio vel adminiculum inferius ad fidei fulturam."

<sup>848</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Jn. 2:3, CO 55, 311. "Certitudo itaque fidei in sola Christi gratia residet: sed pietas et sanctitas vitae veram fidem a ficta et mortua Dei notitia discernit."

<sup>849</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Jn. 4:17, CO 55, 358. "...nos autem ut laeti et alacres obviam Christo prodeamus, in sola eius gratia fidem nostrum esse defixam oportet."

human meritorious act.<sup>850</sup> Calvin based his assurance only on God's promised Word.

Briefly, for Calvin, our assurance of election is primarily based on the inner calling of God<sup>851</sup> and our faith in Christ. Good works are a secondary evidence of our election.

### 2.2.8.3 A Legalist or an Antinomian?<sup>852</sup>

Ford Lewis Battles insisted that Calvin steered *via media* between a Spiritualist interpretation including Anabaptist, Libertine and a Papist interpretation.<sup>853</sup> The former is generally ascribed to antinomianism, the latter to legalism.

In a narrow sense, a legalist can be defined as one who holds that the obedience of the Law is essential for our salvation, an antinomian as one who states that our salvation is attained only by faith without our good works. From this viewpoint, as Holmes Rolston III writes,<sup>854</sup> Calvin was not a legalist, given his notion that our salvation is not by our good works but by our faith.<sup>855</sup> Still, he was not an antinomian, given his insistence that our justification is not without good works and our faith cannot be separated from our good works.<sup>856</sup> For him, true faith essentially accompanies good works,<sup>857</sup> As Holmes Rolston III observes, "Calvin is no antinomian" because he stressed the importance of the use of the law for Christian sanctification.<sup>858</sup> The following statement of Calvin's shows us his

---

<sup>850</sup> Cf. William Balke, "Revelation and Experience in Calvin's Theology," in *Towards the Future of Reformed Theology: Tasks, Topics, Traditions*, ed. by David Willis & Michael Welker (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999), p.364-365.

<sup>851</sup> Institutes 3.24.6. "The fact that, as we said, the firmness of our election is joined to our calling is another means of establishing our assurance." In other words, A warm wholehearted response to the preaching of the Gospel is a sign of election.

<sup>852</sup> For John Cotton's antinomian controversy, see Malcolm H. MacKinnon, "Part I: Calvinism and the infallible assurance of grace," *The British Journal of Sociology* 39 (Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul for the London School of Economics and Political Science, 1988): 159; Robert A. Pyne, "Antinomianism and Dispensationalism," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 153 (Jan. 1996):145. For further study, see Charles Francis Adams, *The Antinomian Controversy* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1976).

<sup>853</sup> Ford Lewis Battles, *Calculus Fidei: Some Ruminations on the Structure of the Theology of John Calvin* (Grand Rapids: Calvin Theological Seminary, 1978), p. 2; Donald K. McKim, "John Calvin: A Theologian for an Age of Limits," in *Reading in Calvin's Theology*, ed. by Donald McKim (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984), pp. 292-293.

<sup>854</sup> Holmes Rolston III, "Responsible Man in Reformed Theology: Calvin versus the Westminster Confession," *Scottish Journal of Theology*, Vol. 23, no. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970): 143.

<sup>855</sup> Institutes 3.11.13 and 18.

<sup>856</sup> Institutes 3.6.1.

<sup>857</sup> Institutes 3.16.1. "

<sup>858</sup> Holmes Rolston III, *op. cit.*, p. 143; cf. "Antinomianism so stresses Christian freedom from the condemnation of the law that it underemphasises the need of the believer to confess sins daily and to pursue sanctification earnestly. It may fail to teach that sanctification inevitably follows justification. Roman Catholics in effect charged the Reformation with antinomianism in claiming that the doctrine of justification by faith alone would lead to moral laxity." S. B. Ferguson, & J. Packer, *New dictionary of theology*

subtle balance between legalism and antinomianism. “[W]e dream neither of a faith devoid of good works nor of a justification that stands without them” “[H]aving admitted that faith and good works must cleave together, we still lodge justification in faith, not in works.”<sup>859</sup> In this manner, Calvin avoided both legalism and antinomianism.

In a broad sense, antinomianism can be said to be the view that for Christian life, we do not need the Law as early Luther did,<sup>860</sup> while legalism means that we must literally be obedient to the Law. Pierre Marcel’s explication of legalism and antinomianism may be helpful to us. “Legalism, with its interest concentrated on the moral life, makes justification depend on sanctification, religion on morality, our relation to God on our relation to our neighbor. Conversely, antinomianism giving pre-eminence to the demands of the religious life puts justification first, and often never reaches the point of sanctification.”<sup>861</sup> Since Calvin clearly distinguished between the two and emphasised sanctification on the basis of justification, he was neither a legalist nor an antinomian.

On the other hand, *New Dictionary of Theology* defines legalism or moralism as follows:<sup>862</sup> Legalism stresses human responsibility to the extent that “obedience becomes more than the fruit or evidence of faith. Rather obedience comes to be seen as a constituent element of justifying faith.” It is inclined to “undermine Christian assurance and joy.”<sup>863</sup> Calvin may be called a legalist in the sense that he so stressed Christian responsibility. Still, though Calvin accentuated excessive self-examination, it did not “undermine Christian assurance and joy.” Accordingly, strictly speaking, Calvin cannot be called a legalist even by this definition. He believed a Christian could be sure that he is elected by looking to Christ. Calvin can be said to avoid these two extremities by insisting on the use of the Law for Christian life, though he is closer to a legalist rather than an antinomian.

---

(electronic ed.). Downers Grove (IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 2000, c1988), p.379.

<sup>859</sup> *Institutes* 3.16.1.

<sup>860</sup> Early Luther held that “the one who has been justified by Christ, who has died to sin and been raised in righteousness, has no need for the law. Rather, he or she knows and does spontaneously, that is, without instruction or encouragement - what the law previously required.” David J. Lose, “Luther and Calvin on Preaching to the Human Condition,” *Lutheran Quarterly*, ns. 10 (Autumn, 1996): 291; *LW* 25: 326. Notably, Reinhard Hütter observes that while early Luther strenuously taught Antinomianistic thought “because people in those days were so oppressed, terrified, miserable, anxious, and afflicted that there was no need to inculcate the law,” late Luther criticized the Antinomians for their dissolute life, e.g., slothful, adulterate, blasphemous, and selfish life caused by peaceful time when there was no hangman, the pope. Reinhard Hütter, “(Re)Forming Freedom: Reflection after ‘Veritas Splendor’ on Freedom’s Fate in Modernity and Protestantism’s Antinomian Captivity,” *Modern Theology*, Vol. 17, no. 2 (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2001): 140-141; *WA* 39/1, 571ff.

<sup>861</sup> Pierre Marcel, “The Relation between Justification and Sanctification in Calvin’s Thought,” *The Evangelical Quarterly* 26 (London, 1954): 132.

<sup>862</sup> S. B. Ferguson, & J. Packer, *New Dictionary of Theology* (electronic ed.). Downers Grove (IL: Inter-Varsity Press. 2000, c1988), p.379.

<sup>863</sup> *Ibid.*

To sum up, Calvin was neither a legalist nor an antinomian, though he was closer to a moralist than an antinomian in the sense that he accentuated self-examination in light of the law.

### 2.2.9 The Sphere of Sanctification: Calvin's Practice

While Luther emphasised the liberation of the troubled individual conscience within a works-orientated catholic piety, Calvin understood some problems in connection with church structures, disciplines and the transformation of social structure which are appropriate to the needs of urban societies.<sup>864</sup> For the purpose of the reformation of cities from a catholic atmosphere to a protestant one, Calvin stressed the obedience of all spheres, i.e., "all things including the church, the state, society, and economics must be reformed according to the Word of God."<sup>865</sup> He energetically and audaciously criticized "corruption in the church, tyranny in the polity, and inequitable wealth in the economy."<sup>866</sup>

William J. Bouwsma views Calvin's thought as his response to the thoroughly "real and quite particular problems of his own time" rather than "as a set of timeless abstractions."<sup>867</sup> For example, Calvin condemned Copernicus' theory that the earth revolves around the sun.<sup>868</sup> He thought his theory was as a result of being possessed by the devil.<sup>869</sup> In Calvin's day, those who robbed, stole or committed murder received capital punishment.<sup>870</sup> In accordance with the Caroline Laws, pornography, immorality and heresy were also punishable by death.<sup>871</sup> In our times, religious crimes are not regarded as deserving of severe punishment. Accordingly, we admit both to the universal validity of his thoughts and its limitation due to his historical situation.

---

<sup>864</sup> A. E. McGrath, "Justification and the Reformation: The Significance of the Doctrine of Justification by Faith to Sixteenth-Century Urban Communities," *ARG* 81 (1990).

<sup>865</sup> John C. Koedyker, "Theocracy is not Dead: Calvin and Khomeini," *Reformed Review* Vol. 34, no. 2 (1981), p. 74.

<sup>866</sup> Nicholas Wolterstorff, "The Wounds of God: Calvin's theology of social injustice," *The Reformed Journal* Vol. 37, no. 6 (June, 1987), p. 21.

<sup>867</sup> William J. Bouwsma, "The *Quest* for the Historical Calvin," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 77 (1986): 47.

<sup>868</sup> Richard Stauffer, "Calvin et Copernic," *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 179 (1971): 37ff; Christopher B. Kaiser, "Calvin, Copernicus, and Castellio," *Calvin Theological Journal*, Vol.21, no.1 (1986): 5; Calvin's *Eighth Sermon on 1 Corinthians 10-11*. Though Kaiser sides with Calvin by his insistence that Calvin's antigeodynamic remark was anti-Castellian, not anti-Copernican, the fact that Calvin did not know of the rotating and revolving of the earth must be recognized. Of course, Calvin's view is biblically and theologically based.

<sup>869</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>870</sup> Jansie van der Walt, *Calvin and His Times*, Wetenskaplike Bydraes of the Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education Series F: Institute for Reformational Studies F2 Brochures Number 32 (Potchefstroom: PUP, 1985), p.120.

<sup>871</sup> *Ibid.*, p.126.

### 2.2.9.1 The Sanctification of the Church

The sanctification of the church in Calvin will be dealt with in terms of communal sanctification, the abolition of papacy, the purity and unity of the church, for the sanctification of the church has communal character, and papacy was regarded as anti-Christ, and the purity and unity of the church was regarded as the fruits of sanctification.

In regard of the communal character of sanctification, Calvin pointed out that the Holy Spirit always works communally rather than individually because he lies in the body of Christ. Implanting into Christ always means our assimilation into his community. Accordingly, Calvin radically ruled out all religious individualism.<sup>872</sup> In this respect, Calvin is distinguished from all mystics pursuing individual spirituality. Calvin's emphasis on communal sanctification is more reinforced in K. Barth's doctrine of sanctification.<sup>873</sup> Furthermore, the church should serve a bigger community, her society. The church takes responsibility for the common public sincerity and compassion of the entire society.<sup>874</sup> Christian community should take care of people in need of their love, e.g., the disabled, refugees, the homeless, those suffering racial discrimination, and so on.

Considering the need for the abolition of the papacy, Calvin argued: The papacy neglected the gifts of the Spirit and the Word. The bishops were lacking in carrying out their apostolic functions of setting a good example and of preaching and teaching the Word of God. The Pope is an Antichrist because he deprived Christ of His glory and authority.<sup>875</sup> The "papacy itself was directly contrary to church order."<sup>876</sup> The Roman pontiffs "no more become vicars of Christ because of the see which they occupy than an idol...set in God's temple "is to be taken for God."<sup>877</sup> Accordingly, Calvin viewed popery as abominations which ought to be cleaned from the Christian realm. The abolition of popery is the way to the true order of Christ's church, in other words, the way to the sanctification of the church.

On the purity and unity of the church, Calvin unfolded his view as follows: On the essential issues of faith and doctrines, the church must keep purity, but on unessential issues, she must pursue unity.<sup>878</sup> We should maintain unity as far as the declaration of the Word, the duly administration of the sacraments, and the exercise of church discipline are maintained. This could be an answer to '5.2.1.2.3.3 Separatism' and will be reflected in

---

<sup>872</sup> William Balke, "Revelation and Experience in Calvin's Theology" in *Towards the Future of Reformed Theology: Tasks, Topics, Traditions*, ed. by David Willis & Michael Welker (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999), p.359.

<sup>873</sup> See 4.2.10.3 on this thesis.

<sup>874</sup> *Institutes*, 4. 12.5.

<sup>875</sup> *Institutes* 4.7.25.

<sup>876</sup> *Institutes* 4.7.26; 4.12.6.

<sup>877</sup> *Institutes* 4.7.29.

<sup>878</sup> Letter to the Bretheren of Wezel, 13<sup>TH</sup> March 1554; LC 3, 366, 31.

‘5.3.2.4.2 Self-Denial for Unity and Cooperation.’ Church discipline is connected with the order of the church, without which the church cannot be sustained.<sup>879</sup> In order to keep the church, Calvin established ministers, teachers, elders and deacons.<sup>880</sup> When they faithfully practise their offices, the church will be healthy and regulated.

### 2.2.9.2 Political Sanctification

For Calvin, political sanctification can be said to be the submission of the power of all rulers to Christ that only Christ “may tower over all.”<sup>881</sup> It is to make worldly rulers serve the people as the representatives of God according to his will.

With respect to the origin of the authority of the state, Calvin regarded it not as derived from the will of the people but primarily given by God.<sup>882</sup> He called magistrates “vicars of God” on earth, and regarded the calling of the civil magistrate as “the highest gift of God to preserve the safety of men.”<sup>883</sup> The authority of a ruler is divinely legitimated and he can receive the peculiar gift of the Holy Spirit for ruling in accord with the will of God.<sup>884</sup> His authority is limited to the positive Law, which is based on the Law of nature whose core is fairness.<sup>885</sup> The Law of nature is related to the order of creation, which stems from the Creator God. It establishes the boundaries of all positive Laws.<sup>886</sup>

With reference to the duty of the state to citizens, civil power is “to adjust our life to the society of man; to form our social behavior to civil righteousness, to reconcile us with one another, and to promote general peace and tranquility.”<sup>887</sup> The state should protect the poor and the needy, support students, manage the salaries of teachers, suppress cruelty, theft and violent behaviour, and build hospitals and boarding houses. For this purpose, the administration needs law, justice and military force. Therefore, people should accept the authority of the state and obey it as part of their obedience towards God. People should honour and obey the rulers, pay their taxes, pray for rulers, and render military and other service as needed. Calvin criticized the Anabaptists for their denial of the authority of the state, private property, and all social hierarchies.<sup>888</sup>

In terms of the duty of the state to the church, Pilgram Marpeck stated, “Earthly power in all its works has no place in the kingdom of Christ...and that all who seek to support the

---

<sup>879</sup> *Institutes* 4.3.10.

<sup>880</sup> *CO* 10/1, 15-17; *Institutes* 4.3.4-9.

<sup>881</sup> *Institutes* 4.20.5

<sup>882</sup> *CL*, 169, 171.

<sup>883</sup> *Institutes* 4.20.6; 4.20.14.

<sup>884</sup> *CL*, 12.

<sup>885</sup> Josef Bohatec, *Calvin und das Recht* (Graz: Hermann Böhlhaus. 1934), p.24.

<sup>886</sup> *Ibid.*, p.101.

<sup>887</sup> *Institutes*, 4.20.2.

<sup>888</sup> *Institutes* 4.20.2; Calvin, *Briève instruction*, *CO* 7, 81, 83, 90, and 91.



kingdom of Christ through authority will be punished and destroyed.”<sup>889</sup> In contrast, Calvin averred that if any state does not obey the church of God, God’s curse will fall upon it.<sup>890</sup> He maintained that the duty of the state is “to cherish and protect the outward worship of God, to defend sound doctrine, piety, and the position of the church.”

Calvin understood the need of coercion and its strength to transform the city. Eugene P. Heideman holds the view that “in his recognition of the need for coercive action, Calvin emphasised the unity of the Old Testament teaching with the New.”<sup>891</sup> To put it in detail, in the purpose of coercive power, he followed the Old Testament while he did the New Testament in the strength of coercive power. As in the times of David, in our times the church and the civil government have the same goal “in defending good men from the wicked, giving aid and comfort to the oppressed, and punishing criminals.”<sup>892</sup> The primary distinction between Old Testament times and the present is in the toleration of ruler of evil people. Calvin stressed that the authorities should be clement.<sup>893</sup> Such clemency stems from Christ’s atonement for sinners. Violent penalty is the ultimate means against the evildoer. In this respect, Calvin asked the city council to be clement to Servetus, who was an anti-Trinitarian. His execution was entirely by the city council.<sup>894</sup> The punishments of his times were much more severe than those of our times.<sup>895</sup> Heideman confesses that it is difficult to judge whether the execution of about ten people a year is higher than the cities surrounding Geneva.<sup>896</sup>

The role of the church for the state is to help rulers realize that “they are deputies of God” and “must render account of the administration of their charge” before God on the last day<sup>897</sup> to pray for them to be faithful to their mission,<sup>898</sup> to cooperate with the rulers by obeying their command, and to refuse it when the command of the state is against

---

<sup>889</sup> Donald J. Ziegler, “Marpeck versus Bucer; a sixteenth century debate over the uses and limits of political authority” in *Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies 2* (St. Louis: Foundation for Reformation Research, 1971): 106.

<sup>890</sup> *Comm.* on Dan. 2:44-45, CO 40, 607.

<sup>891</sup> Eugene P. Heideman, “Theocracy in the Reformation,” *Reformed Review*, Vol. 34, no. 2 (Holland, Michigan: A Theological Journal of Western Theology Seminary, 1981), p. 85.

<sup>892</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>893</sup> *Institutes* 4.20.10.

<sup>894</sup> Chaunu, Pierre and François Dosse, *L’instant éclaté. Entretiens* (Paris: Aubier -Histoires, 1994), p.116.

<sup>895</sup> For the reason of Calvin’s severe punishments, Höpfl interprets it as stemming from his fear of the menace of the Anabaptists and apostates, which was regarded as an anarchistic disorder. In order to prevent this schism and keep order, Geneva needed an austere law applied by magistrates [Harro Höpfl, *The Christian Polity of John Calvin* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), p. 212]. Suzanne Selinger suggests that Calvin’s coldness and harshness against dissent and disorder, and his despising of the human body might stem from the early loss of his mother [Suzanne Selinger, *Calvin against Himself: An Inquiry in Intellectual History* (Hamden, Ct.: Archon [The Shoestring Press], 1984), pp.56-58].

<sup>896</sup> Eugene P. Heideman, *op. cit.*, pp. 85-86.

<sup>897</sup> *Institutes* 4.20.6.

<sup>898</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Tim. 2:2, CO 52, 266.

God.<sup>899</sup>

### 2.2.9.3 Social Sanctification

#### 2.2.9.3.1 Family and Sex

In these modern days, divorce and sexual debauchery have been increasing by degrees. Calvin's view of husband and wife and sexual purity would be useful to solve these problems to some extent because his view is based on the biblical principle, though our context and his context are quite different.

Calvin viewed the family as a creation ordinance established by God, with Christ as its head.<sup>900</sup> In the order of God, the husband is the head of the wife but both of them should be obedient to the Law of God, viz., Christ. Calvin believed the whole human community is based on the divinely ordered monogamy in which two persons become one body and soul.<sup>901</sup> The purpose of marriage is to produce progeny and to control free-floating urges.<sup>902</sup> Wives should rule "their own house in a sober and orderly manner" rather than wander about in public places. They ought to be chaste, and at the same time modest, so as to be subject to the dominion of their husbands. Calvin warned, "Those who excel in other virtues sometimes act haughtily, so as to be disobedient to their husbands."<sup>903</sup> Husbands should take pains with their work for the family and support their wives at home, and encourage them and help them care for their infants, remembering that enduring all this is acceptable as a sacrifice to God.<sup>904</sup> Calvin considered the ruling of fathers in the family as the "servitude" of love.<sup>905</sup> Their authority depends upon God's command. Accordingly, children submit to their parents in the Lord. If a father commands unrighteous things, they can deny it.

From the viewpoint of sexual purity, Calvin deemed fornication, lasciviousness and libertinism to be punished by the community because they endanger the marriage relationship. Sexual corruption infringes the principle set by God in the original creation.<sup>906</sup> Given that adulterers and whores are banished from the kingdom of God, they

---

<sup>899</sup> *Institutes* 4.20.31.

<sup>900</sup> Sermon on Deut.24:1-4, CO 28, 148; G. Joseph Gatis, "The Political Theory of John Calvin," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 153 (1996): 454.

<sup>901</sup> *Comm.* on Gen. 2:18, CO 23, 46.

<sup>902</sup> *Comm.* on Gen.1:28, CO 23, 28-29.

<sup>903</sup> *Comm.* on Titus 2:4, CO 52, 420. "...quae aliis virtutibus pollent, interdum ferociendi inde occasionem arripiunt ut maritis parum sint morigerae."

<sup>904</sup> Sermon on 1 Tim. 2:13-15. *Sermons on the Epistle to Timothy & Titus by John Calvin* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth & Trust, reprinted in 1983, first published in 1579), p.232.

<sup>905</sup> Sermon on Eph. 5:18-21; SEC, p.561.

<sup>906</sup> *Comm.* on Lev. 18:20, CO 24, 644..

should not be tolerated in the Church.<sup>907</sup> In his commentary on John 8:11, Calvin alluded that an adulteress should be punished by death. “They who infer from this that adultery ought not to be punished with death must, for the same reason, admit that inheritances ought not to be divided because Christ refused to arbitrate in that matter between two brothers.” Christ “does not overturn political order, or reverse the sentences and punishments appointed by the laws.”<sup>908</sup> In any event, nowadays, we cannot agree with Calvin’s austere punishment for adultery. His literal application of punishments in the Old Testament cannot be adequate for contemporary church discipline. The penalties in the Old Testament should be relieved in the light of Christ’s atonement.

### 2.2.9.3.2 Female Liberalism

J. D. Douglass considers Calvin as an advocator for female rights on the ground of “his argument that both “father” and “mother” are metaphors for God in Scriptures which God chose to describe diverse aspects of the divine nature.”<sup>909</sup> For example, commenting on Is 42:13-14, Calvin threw light upon the image of God as a woman in labour, and commenting on Is 46:3, she depicted Israel borne by God and carried from the womb.<sup>910</sup> In fact, Calvin was more open to women’s public role in the church than other Reformers. He believed that there were women in the public office of deacon in the early church.<sup>911</sup> Marie Dentièrè criticized Paul’s argument for subordinating women to men because of Eve’s sin and creation order, quoting the Galatians’ teaching that male or female became one through baptism in Christ (Gal. 3:28).<sup>912</sup> Conversely, Henri Blocher refuted the thesis of Douglas and Dentièrè on the basis of Calvin’s commentary on 1 Timothy 2 that “the eternal and inviolable appointment of God” is presented as an order of creation which determines that woman should be subject to man. Calvin accepted that “women may perform the ministry of the word with authority” in an emergency regiment, but he did not approve their participation in “the constant and ordinary system of government.”<sup>913</sup> Calvin’s concern was not with female emancipation in the political sphere but in a more religious dimension. The reason why Calvin preferred the masculine imagery for God is not only that it is biblical but also that it implied the separation from the leading goddesses of the nature religions which have prevailed all over the world.<sup>914</sup> This view of Northrop

---

<sup>907</sup> Letter to the protector Somerset; LC 2, 229, 197.

<sup>908</sup> *Comm.* John 8:11, CO 47, 191.

<sup>909</sup> Jane Dempsey Douglass, “Calvin’s Teaching What Still Remains Pertinent?” *The Ecumenical Review* 39 (Ja, 1989): 27

<sup>910</sup> *Church Ordinances*, 37. 19, 68-70.

<sup>911</sup> Cf. *Institutes*, 4.3. 9.

<sup>912</sup> *Ibid.*, 378-380; Jane D. Douglass, *Women. Freedom and Calvin*, Philadelphia (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1985), pp. 100-103.

<sup>913</sup> Henri Blocher, “Response: Authentic Humanum,” *The Ecumenical Review* 39 (Ja., 1989): 36.

<sup>914</sup> Northrop Frye, *The Great Code: the Bible and Literature* (Toronto: Academic Press Canada, 1982), pp.

Frye is very noteworthy.

### 2.2.9.3.3 Vocation

Calvin criticized the sharp distinction between clergy and laity, which was drawn by the medieval church. What is important is not whether one serves within a special area, but whether in the field where he is working he serves God heartily through his activity in the respect of God's calling.<sup>915</sup> God has given all human beings "excellent talents," which they should use to further his kingdom.<sup>916</sup> With such recognition, to act in his area is his sanctification in society. Work is understood as worship in the daily life of the world in overcoming all impediments and temptations.<sup>917</sup> Calvin asserted the equal value of all work that serves human society, e.g., raising children within the family, teaching, public or private administrative duties, and so on.<sup>918</sup>

He regarded occupational calling as a remedy for being human. The Lord assigned each person "a sort of sentry post so that he may not needlessly wander about throughout life."<sup>919</sup> Those who are ignorant of it incline to trespass on the others, or to be enslaved by ambition and wander in a maze.<sup>920</sup> Calvin believed that God gives us the ability to play the role he has assigned us as in the case of Jeremiah.<sup>921</sup> It is moderation to enable Christians to pursue a calling.<sup>922</sup> We must one day render account of it before God.

### 2.2.9.3.4 Economy

Economics is very important in the sphere of sanctification because human greed for money is the root of every sin. André Biéler is of the opinion that Calvin's social ethics could be an example for theology and Christian ethics for all time because it is based on a strict knowledge of biblical revelation and a clear analysis of social and economic reality.<sup>923</sup> Conversely, Max Weber asserted that Calvin is connected with the development

---

107ff.

<sup>915</sup> Robert D. Knudsen, "Calvinism as a Cultural Force," in *John Calvin: His Influence in the Western World*, ed. by W. Stanford Reid (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1982), p.22; *Institutes* 3.10.6.

<sup>916</sup> *Institutes* 2.2.16.

<sup>917</sup> Cf. *Comm.* on Mt. 20:1-16, CO 45, 547-48.

<sup>918</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Tim. 5:10, CO 52, 310.

<sup>919</sup> *Institutes* 3.10.6.

<sup>920</sup> *Comm.* on Ps. 131:1, CO 32, 340. "...vel in alienas functiones involant...quosunque vero ambitio sollicitat, necesse est in labyrintho vagari."

<sup>921</sup> *Comm.* on Jer. 1:6, CO 37, 477.

<sup>922</sup> *Comm.* on Jn 4:1, CO 47, 77. "Hanc porro mediocritatem vere colent, quicunque in suam vocationem erunt intenti."

<sup>923</sup> A. Bieler, *Gottes Gebot und der Hunger der Welt - Calvin, Prophet des industrie-llen Zeitalters. Grundlage und Methode der Sozialethik Calvins*, tr. by A. Dobli (Zurich: EVZ Verlag, 1966). Original edition: *Calvin, prophète de l'ère industrielle* (Geneva: Editions Labor et Fides S.A., 1961).

of capitalism, and his theory has been adopted by many Marxists “as a means of discrediting both religion and capitalism.”<sup>924</sup> W. Stanford Reid contends that Calvin “is a critic of an existing (capitalistic) system, rather than an advocate or founder of a new” capitalism.<sup>925</sup> Max Weber’s view that ascribed capitalism’s development only to Calvin’s teaching of “predestination and certainty of salvation” is not germane, for other elements affected it.<sup>926</sup> Calvin’s economic thought will be considered in more detail.

Contrary to Luther who condemned usury,<sup>927</sup> Calvin permitted the charging of interest at the rate of 5.0-6.6 percent for a loan for production<sup>928</sup> He viewed it as a means of realizing equitable relations as charity on the part of all. It is the rule that everyone’s rights should be safely preserved.<sup>929</sup> Charity should spontaneously be accomplished for their brethren.<sup>930</sup> The poor serve as a type of barometer of the faith and charity of the Christian community.<sup>931</sup> Calvin established the office of deacons to take care of the needy and poor, which is interrelated with the work of city officials.<sup>932</sup> The love of money as an end in itself was censured by Calvin because it led us to squeeze out the cash and eventually

---

<sup>924</sup> W. Stanford Reid, “John Calvin: the father of capitalism?,” *Themelios*, Vol.8, No. 2 (January, 1983): 19ff; see the following resources for a complex debate of this issue. Max Weber, *Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus*. 1904-1905, tr. Parsons, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (London: George Allen & Unwin. 1978), pp. 55-79ff; 109-111. André Biéler, *La Pensée économique et sociale de Calvin* (Geneva: George, 1961), p. 337. W. Fred Graham, *The Constructive Revolutionary: John Calvin and His Socio-Economic Impact* (Atlanta: John Knox Press. 1978). p.193. W. Stanford Reid, “John Calvin: the father of capitalism?” *Themelios*, Vol.8, no. 2 (January, 1983), pp.23-25. W. Stanford Reid, “John Calvin, Early Critic of Capitalism (1),” *The Reformed Theological Review* 43 (1984): 78.

<sup>925</sup> W. Stanford Reid, “John Calvin, Early Critic of Capitalism (1),” *The Reformed Theological Review* 43 (1984): 77.

<sup>926</sup> W. Stanford Reid, “John Calvin: the father of capitalism?” *Themelios*, Vol.8, no. 2 (January, 1983), p.23-25.

<sup>927</sup> *LW* 45, 273, 280, 281, 289.

<sup>928</sup> Concerning interest rate, several directives were suggested. For example, “Money lending for interest should not be made into a profession unto itself. No interest may be charged to the poor or economically distressed. Interest-bearing capital investments may be carried out only when they do not restrict the capacity to help the needy. Interest agreements may be finalized only according to natural fairness and the Golden Rule of Christ (Matt. 7:12).”<sup>928</sup> Briefly, interest was allowed within a limit that would not do injury to any one. Hans-Helmut Esser, “The Contemporary Relevance of Calvin’s Social Ethics,” in *Towards the Future of Reformed Theology: Tasks, Topics, Traditions*, ed. David Willis & Michael Welker (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999), p.383; see CO 28, 115-123 for more detail.

<sup>929</sup> *Sermons on the Ten Commandments*, ed. and tr. by Benjamin Wirth Farley (Grand Rapids: Baker Book house, 1980), p.191.

<sup>930</sup> *Comm.* on Ex.16:17, CO 24, 171. “...dum aequalitatem statuit...ut divites sponte et liberaliter fratrum inediae succurant, non autem ex necessitate vel tristitia.”

<sup>931</sup> Sermon. 95 on Deut. 15:11-15, CO 27, 338.

<sup>932</sup> Cf. J. D. Douglass, “Calvin’s Relation to social and Economic Change,” *Church and Society*, Vol. 74, no. 4 (1984), p.78; W. F. Graham, *The Constructive Revolution: John Calvin and his Socio-Economic Impact* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1971), pp. 98-104.

cannot satisfy.<sup>933</sup> The “insatiable desire for gain” was regarded as a “deadly plague.”<sup>934</sup> Calvin considered the lust for excessive possessions and severe poverty as detrimental to our spiritual life.<sup>935</sup>

On economic injustice, Calvin warned again a self-chosen revolutionary liberation from poverty. He acknowledged that various states ranged between rich and poor, but did not try to compel everyone into egalitarianism. Poverty should be solved by trade and the right to associate. He warned about the lavish and merciless waste of wealth. For Calvin, the two provisions for economic justice are “not dealing in violence, extortion, or fraud with respect to goods,” and not being extravagant or treacherous or wasteful.<sup>936</sup> For Calvin, moderate inner asceticism was the important kernel in Christian ethics. His solutions for social problems in a city that was experiencing radical social change have affected the world for over four centuries.

Calvin’s view of economy can be an answer to ‘2.1.2.2.4 Materialism’ and will be applied to ‘6.3.2.2 Simple and Moderate Life.’

## 2.3 Conclusion

### 2.3.1 Abstract

Calvin used the terms, sanctification, regeneration, repentance, and conversion almost identically. Regeneration is accentuated as an aspect of divine initiation, and repentance as an aspect of human participation. Sanctification is defined as the restoration to the image of God by the regeneration of the Holy Spirit. The image of God is defined as true knowledge, righteousness, and holiness. It comprises proper relationships with God, neighbours, and nature. Regretfully, it was lost by Adam’s fall, which was caused through his unfaithfulness and pride. On the contrary, Christ assumed our humanity in humility and faithfulness. By his redemption, Christ restored the image of God in us, though it is still incomplete in this world until the Lord comes again. Christ progresses our sanctification by his Spirit. The Holy Spirit generated faith in us and by our faith, united us with Christ. In our union with Christ, we are continually sanctified. After the fall of Adam, nobody could be reconciled with God by himself. Thus, the instantaneous initial regeneration of the Holy Spirit is necessary for our sanctification.

---

<sup>933</sup> *Comm.* on Mt. 28:11-15, CO 45, 800. “Homines ergo lucro addicti, imo quaestum undique captantes...rationem novam excogitant emungendae pecuniae.”

<sup>934</sup> *Comm.* on Mt. 6:19, CO 45, 203. “Pestis haec capitalis passim regnat in mundo, ut homines inexplebili habendi cupiditate insaniant.”

<sup>935</sup> *Institutes* 3.20.46.

<sup>936</sup> *Sermons on the Ten Commandments*, ed. and tr. by Benjamin Wirth Farley (Grand Rapids: Baker Book house, 1980), p. 168.



Our sanctification consists of mortification and vivification through our participation in the death and resurrection of Christ. Calvin did not recognize any human role in sanctification for fear that it should effect justification by human works. This reflects the context in which he lived in the struggle with the Roman Catholic Church. Still, he acknowledged human responsibility in sanctification. It was ascribed to prayer, watchfulness, obedience, and discipline. These were also the gifts of the grace of God in the sense that God disposed men to do so. Our forensic sanctification is based on the sanctification of Christ. Christ assumed human nature in his incarnation. As our high priest, Christ sanctified his soul and body and offered it as a sacrifice. His offering cleansed our filth and guilt once and forever. By his sanctification, we are forensically sanctified before God. We are reconciled with God in our union with Christ. This union is the presupposition of our sanctification. It is accomplished by the Holy Spirit. He generates our faith and by faith we receive Christ. In Christ, we are sanctified. The Spirit regenerates us in our hidden consciousness and gives us faith, and induces us to repent of our sins. He leads the whole process of sanctification. Thus, sanctification is called his work rather than ours.

The Holy Spirit sanctifies by means of the Word and the Sacraments. Calvin interpreted the Word in light of the resurrected Christ and analysed our situation with the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The Word is neither applied literally nor mechanically, but it is organically applied by the Holy Spirit. Thus, Christians need the help of the church, which offers them the interpretation and application of the Bible. Preachers should exclaim both the Old Testament and the New Testament as Paul did. It is useful for our sanctification. The law contributes to our sanctification as a goad to overcome our indolence. Repentance can lead men to Christ because in Him forgiveness is promised. Though the law points out our sins, it cannot give us life and forgiveness. The gospel provides us with God's life. The law is fulfilled in Christ, who is the true interpreter of the law. The Decalogue is regarded as a standard of righteousness to reform our society. It is interpreted in the light of the Holy Spirit, Christ's instruction and the teaching of the Apostles. The Old Testament should be interpreted by the light of the New Testament. Calvin rebuked those who neglected the meeting of the church because God put all grace in the church, the Body of Christ. The church is the instrument of God's grace in Christ.

The sacraments are the signs of invisible grace, which is effective in the presence of Christ by the Spirit. It needs preaching to explain its meaning. It is a comfort for the poor and correction for the wicked. To protect the honour of the church and the Lord, the impious were prohibited from participating in the Lord Supper's Supper. By excommunication, the church purifies its members and reinforces the faith in Christ. Infant baptism was supported by Calvin for the reason that it strengthens the faith of believers and their infants. Baptism signifies our participation in the death and resurrection of Christ.

It indicates the mortification of our flesh and sinful desires, and the longings for our resurrection. It endorses our union with Christ.

Our repentance progresses in three stages: self-denial, bearing the cross, and meditation on the future, which are the stages in the process of our mortification and vivification. Self-denial is to mortify our desires by our participation in the death of Christ. It is based on the principle that we do not belong to ourselves but to God. We must not desire any other thing but that which God gives us. We must be happy with the joy of Christ. The enticement of this world is so great that God uses suffering so that it might not captivate us. In the comparison between heavenly life and the suffering of this world, we reject the inheritance of this world and long for the life to come. Christian life is to expect the glory of resurrection in Christ. Though our good works are incomplete, God will reward us with good things for our good works. Our assurance is based on God's calling and his promise in Christ. Accordingly, we must put our assurance on Christ, not on good works. Our good works are a secondary evidence to distinguish us from the wicked and to detect hypocrites who confess their faith by mouth, yet deny it by their behaviour. Our sanctification is rather visible. It is manifested as the fruit of the Holy Spirit, which are visible to others.

The sphere of sanctification is the whole arena of this world in the sense that Christ rules over the world. Calvin struggled to reform the entire city of Geneva in accordance with the law of God. He is therefore called a theonomist. He was not a theocrat in the strict sense because he did not want the government of the church over the city. Polity, economy, education, and religion were reformed in conformity with the will of God.

## **2.3.2 Assessment**

### **2.3.2.1 Positive Assessment**

1 Calvin maintained the balance between the Word and the Spirit in the means of sanctification. He avoided the two extremities of the Roman Catholic Church and the Spiritualists. He rejected both the legalism of the Roman Church and the antinomianism of the Spiritualists. He stressed the work of the Spirit through the Word. The Spirit works with His Word for our sanctification. This can be an answer to '5.2.1.2.4.1 Antinomianism,' '5.2.1.2.4.2 A Legalistic Tendency,' '5.2.1.2.4.3 Mysticism,' '5.2.1.2.4.4 Spiritual Enthusiasm' in Korean context. Calvin's view will be reflected in '5.3.1.3 Maintaining the Balance between Antinomianism and Legalism' and '5.3.3.3 Maintaining the Balance between Institutionalism and Individualism.'

2 He stressed the spheres of sanctification from individual life and the church to culture and the world. He was convinced that the whole world should be sanctified by God's will. His view that the role of church is to co-operate with the state and to watch it is valid. His emphasis on the creation order of husband and wife, and sexual purity may to some extent

hold good in our days. This view of Calvin can be an answer to ‘5.2.1.2.3.2 Evasion from Reforming the World and Compromising with It’ and will be reflected in ‘5.3.3 Sanctification in Political, Social Life.’

3 For the first time, he clearly distinguished between justification and sanctification, in contrast to the Roman Catholic Church, which included sanctification in justification.<sup>937</sup>

4 He stressed the sovereign work of God in our sanctification. At the same time, he excluded human merit in our sanctification, though he emphasised human duty as our response to God’s initiative work for our sanctification. This could be an answer to 5.2.1.2.4.2 A Legalistic Tendency and will be reflected in ‘5.3.2.1 The Balance between the Grace of God and Human Responsibility.’

5 He saved the assurance of our salvation by means of the doctrine of predestination. God’s calling and our faith in Christ is the sign of our election.

6 He derived the doctrine of sanctification from the Bible rather than philosophy or experience. This could be an answer to ‘2.1.2.3.1 Minjung Theology’ and will be reflected in ‘5.3.4.1 Preserving the Truth of the Bible.’

7 He influenced Geneva and Western Europe through his life in accordance with his doctrine.<sup>938</sup> This can be a counter example to “5.2.1.2.2.1 The Discrepancy between Faith and Life.”

8 He maintained a balanced attitude between theocracy and anarchy in the relationship between state and church. His efforts to accomplish God’s will in the city of Geneva by means of the lawful progress were notable. His method can be a countermeasure to Minjung theology which accepted the Marxist analysis of the socioeconomic structures (see 5.2.1.2.3.1).

9 He maintained the balance between individual pietism and communal faith life. The Christian is not saved by the institutional device of the church as the Roman Catholic Church insisted, but needs to learn the sound teaching of the Bible by the pastors of the Church and be disciplined by the program of the Church. His view will be reflected in ‘5.3.3.3 Maintaining the Balance between Institutionalism and Individualism.’

10 He maintained a balanced view between invisibility and visibility of sanctified life. The reality of our sanctification is hidden in the resurrection of Jesus Christ. However it is visible in the world by our good works and the fruit of the Holy Spirit. Though it is

---

<sup>937</sup> I concur with Otto Gründler. “We have noted...Calvin’s sensitivity to the distinction between the objective givenness of his theme and its subjective appropriation while refusing to separate the two.” This is one of “the originality of Calvin.” “John Calvin: Ingrafting in Christ,” in *The Spirituality of Western Christendom*, introduction by Jean Leclercq, ed. by E. Rozanne Edler (Kalamazoo in Michigan: Cistercian Publications, Inc., 1976), pp. 186-87.

<sup>938</sup> John H. Leith states that “John Calvin’s influence in Geneva and western Europe has been attributed to the fact that he was never corrupted by money” at his article, “John Calvin and Stewardship,” *Journal-for-Preachers*, Vol. 9, no. 1 (1985): 2.

imperfect, it shows the evidence of our adoption by God. Our good works function as an evidence of our sanctification. Our faith is the primary evidence and good works are the secondary evidence.

11 He had room for neither asceticism nor quietism and stressed on human freedom to enjoy earthly things. He urged believers to enthusiastically participate in this world fulfilling their occupational calling.<sup>939</sup> His view could be a countermeasure to the ascetic influence of Taoism and Buddhism (see 5.2.1.2.5.3 and 5.2.1.2.5.4).

12 He maintained the balance between this life and the next life. He emphasised that while a Christian must be faithful to his/her occupational calling, he/she should also meditate on the next world. Thus he avoided the two extremities.<sup>940</sup> This can be a countermeasure to the fatalistic view of Buddhism on sanctification.

13 He emphasised both instantaneousness and gradualness in the nature of sanctification, whereby, he maintained the balance between God's extraordinary grace for sanctification and incessant human cooperative efforts with the means of grace. His view can be a corrective proposal to "5.2.1.2.4.3 A Bias to Gradualness of Sanctification."

### 2.3.2.2 Negative Assessment

1 Calvin's definition of sanctification is too broad. It includes regeneration, repentance, conversion, and sanctification. Though the theologians of his times generally worked in this manner, his conception needs a more clear distinction because "great confusion arises from this ambiguity of terms." According to Charles Hodge's definition, "μετάνοια is repentance, change of mind, turning to God, and conversion, which is what man is called upon to do; ἀναγεννησις, regeneration is the act of God."<sup>941</sup> Regeneration is "not the whole work of sanctification, nor the first stages of that work comprehended in conversion," but it is "the instantaneous change from spiritual death to spiritual life." It is "the beginning of new life" and being "born again" to "a new creature."<sup>942</sup> It is the act of God and "an act of his almighty power" not that of man.<sup>943</sup> It comprises the change of the whole soul; "the mind is illuminated, the eyes of understanding are opened; the heart is

---

<sup>939</sup> R. H. Bremmer, "Enkele karakteristieke trekke van Calvljns theologie," *Gereformeerde Theologiese Tijdschrift* 44 (1943): 552

<sup>940</sup> J. H. van Wyk, "John Calvin on the Kingdom of God and Eschatology," *In die Skriflig*, Vol. 35, no.2 (2001): 190.

<sup>941</sup> Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology* III (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1977), p.4. In the Bible, born again is translated from ἀναγεννησις (1Pet 1:3). This word is used to describe the initial act of renewal. Regeneration is from παλιγγενεσία (Mat 19:28; Tit 3:5). Renewal is from ἀνακαινώσεως (Rom. 12:2 ; Tit. 3:5), which denotes a making anew or renewing. J. D. Douglas, ed., *The New Bible Dictionary*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Downers Grove: Inter Varsity Press, 1980), p.1015.

<sup>942</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.

<sup>943</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 31.

renewed; the will is conquered.”<sup>944</sup> Though Calvin sometimes admitted that regeneration is “the beginning of the spiritual life,”<sup>945</sup> he generally identified regeneration with sanctification. Briefly, Hodge insisted that repentance and conversion are human work, while regeneration is God’s work. Sanctification is “the work of God’s free grace, whereby we are renewed in the whole man after the image, and are enabled more and more to die unto sin and live unto righteousness.”<sup>946</sup> Hodge’s definition of sanctification is very similar to Calvin’s definition of repentance. Hodge understood that sanctification is the whole process, while regeneration is the beginning of new life.

According to the *Westminster Confession* (Chapter 13), sanctification is defined as the work of God’s grace, by which the regenerated “are further sanctified really and personally, through the virtue of Christ’s death and resurrection, by his Word and Spirit dwelling in them, the dominion of the whole body of sin is destroyed, and the several lusts thereof are more and more weakened and mortified, and they more and more quickened and strengthened in all saving graces, to the practice of true holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.”<sup>947</sup> This definition is also very similar to Calvin’s one of repentance.<sup>948</sup> The *Westminster Confession* classified repentance and sanctification into the two terms. Repentance is a human act but sanctification is the work of God. Repentance is a human act, by which a sinner, “out of the sight and sense, not only of the danger holy nature and righteous law of God, and upon the apprehension of holy nature and righteous law of God, and upon the apprehension of his mercy in Christ to such as are penitent, so grieves for and hates his sins, as to turn from them all unto God, purposing and endeavouring to walk with him in all the ways of his commandments.”<sup>949</sup> This definition of repentance stressed human, active participation in repentance due to God’s grace from the Gospel, while Calvin regarded repentance as wholly the work of God’s grace. To sum up, Calvin comprised regeneration, conversion, sanctification as repentance in view of the *Westminster Confession*. Calvin’s definition of sanctification needs a more concrete differentiation in order to avoid confusion.

2 Calvin’s teaching on the image of God is rather narrow. Though Calvin denied that the image of God includes human dominion, in accordance with Chrysostom and Hodge, we may regard our dominion over creatures as the image of God in the sense that the

---

<sup>944</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 36.

<sup>945</sup> *Institutes* 2.3.6.

<sup>946</sup> Charles Hodge, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

<sup>947</sup> “Chapter XIII Of Sanctification,” in *The Westminster Confession of Faith: Being an account of the Preparation and Printing of Its Seven Leading Editions To which is appended a Critical Text of the Confession with Notes Thereon by S. W. Carruthers* (8<sup>th</sup> ed. Manchester: R. Aikman & Son, 1923), p.115.

<sup>948</sup> “Some (Reformers) defined repentance as consisting, 1st, of mortification, or dying unto sin; and, 2nd, of vivification, or living unto God. This corresponds to our view of sanctification.” A. A. Hodge, *Outlines of Theology* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1880), Chap. 32, Q. 10.

<sup>949</sup> *The Westminster Confession of the Faith*, “Chapter XV Of Repentance unto Life,” *op. cit.*, p.115.

image of God relates no less to our right relationship with creatures than to our right relationship with God. In addition, Calvin's view that the image of God lies in the human soul rather than the human body needs to be corrected. Firstly, God prohibited the killing of human beings. It implies that the human body has the image of God because man is a unity of soul and body. Secondly, the Bible says that our body is God's holy instrument for his righteousness and the temple of the Holy Spirit.

3 His dualistic anthropology was strongly influenced by Platonism rather than by the Bible. The Bible teaches the unity of both soul and body.<sup>950</sup>

4 Calvin's standpoint that Christ "has presented us to his Father in his own person"<sup>951</sup> can be legitimate only when his humanity comprises, represents and substitutes our corrupt humanity. However, Christ's humanity represented and substituted our corrupt humanity but did not comprise it, in the sense that his humanity was sinless and ours is sinful. That as our Head, Christ comprises us in his Body happens when he engrafts us into his Body through the work of the Holy Spirit, after his incarnation and redemption. His incarnation can never be said to embrace our corrupt nature, for then, his atoning sacrifice cannot be perfectly accomplished. Accordingly, the sanctification of Christ must be understood as our forgiveness by his atonement through his High Priesthood. It is not true that we were sanctified when Christ consecrated himself because we are his Body and he is our Head. Our factual sanctification as human beings is accomplished through the work of the Holy Spirit and not by Christ's sanctification for his atoning sacrifice. Though we are consecrated as a royal priesthood in Christ,<sup>952</sup> our human nature is not sanctified in Christ's incarnation and sacrifice. The expression that Christ is our sanctification means that in our union with Christ, his holiness became ours. That he presented us to his Father can mean our sanctification in the respect that we were united with him spiritually and sat at the right hand of God with him. This sanctification implies the elevation of our state as God's children, not the sanctification of our nature in the sense that our corrupt nature is transformed into sinless humanity. Hence, the sanctification of Christ is connected only with forensic sanctification of our status but not factual of the inner transformation of our nature.

5 In the relationship between the Law and the Spirit, the dynamic role of the Spirit needs to be stressed more, though Calvin admitted that the Spirit "also convinced [us] without the Word, for we know how powerful are the secret instincts of the Spirit."<sup>953</sup> A Christian needs the help of his pastor in order to do God's will in his particular situation, but no pastors can exactly know God's will in any individual and particular situation. The

---

<sup>950</sup> J. H. van Wyk, "John Calvin on the Kingdom of God and Eschatology," *In die Skriflig*, Vol. 35, no.2 (2001): 202.

<sup>951</sup> Jn.17:19.

<sup>952</sup> *Comm.* on 1 Pet. 2: 9; CO 55, 240.

<sup>953</sup> *Comm.* on Mt. 15:23; CO 45, 816.



complex problems of our times cannot be solved only by the interpretation of the Decalogue. It depends upon the wisdom of the Holy Spirit more than ever before. Pastors can present only the general principle, i.e., the love and justice of God in accordance with the Bible. Hence, we should emphasise more often the dynamic guidance of the Holy Spirit in concordance to the Bible and open its possibility to the saints. My view of this issue will be reflected in “6.3.1.2 Harmony between Spirituality and Rationality.”

6 Pertaining to occupational calling, the situation of our times is very different from Calvin’s times when vocations were relatively stable. Modern society is “no longer a static, but a mobile system” governed by an unavoidable mobility between occupations.<sup>954</sup> Job changes accompanying endemic unemployment, which happens because rapid industrial development demotes many jobs and promotes other jobs, and makes no sense as static occupational calling. We had better adapt ourselves to changing society and make use of it as a good chance for fundamental evangelical mission work than wish to stay in a stable job by reason of occupational calling.

7 In Calvin’s theology, the cosmic dimension of sanctification, i.e. the renewal of the universe as the new heaven and the new earth is underexposed. As Wurth claims, “The kingdom enters into the earthly reality by transforming, renewing, sanctifying, and purifying it.”<sup>955</sup> In his *Institutes* 3.25.1-12, Calvin referred to the final resurrection, but he did not deal with the new heaven and the new earth. As J. H. van Wyk points out, Calvin never mentioned it as an independent theme; he did not write his commentary on Rev. 21:1 or he did not refer to it in *Institutes*.<sup>956</sup> Still, van Wyk’s view must be compensated by the statement that Calvin dwelled on the new heaven and the new earth in his commentary on 2 Peter 2:10-14. According to P. F. Theron, Calvin tackled eschatology in his commentary on *the Harmony of the Gospels, the Epistle to the Hebrews, De Scandalis, and Psychopannychia*.<sup>957</sup> The Lord’s Prayer,<sup>958</sup> Calvin’s sermon on Isaiah 53:4-6 and commentary on Micah 4:3, and Calvin’s letter to Farel in 1538 may be added to it.<sup>959</sup>

---

<sup>954</sup> Klaus Bockmuehl, “Protestant Ethics: The Spirit and the Word in Action,” *Evangelical Review of Theology* 12 (1988):100.

<sup>955</sup> G. B. Wurth, “Calvijn en het koninkrijk Gods,” in *Vier redevoeringen over Calvijn* (Kampen: Kok, 1959), pp. 62, 67-68. Quoted by J. H. van Wyk, “John Calvin on the Kingdom of God and Eschatology” of *In die Skriflig*, Vol. 35, no.2 (2001): 203.

<sup>956</sup> Conversely, Timothy George is of the opinion that Calvin was preoccupied with the theme of the Kingdom of God. *op. cit.*, p. 213.

<sup>957</sup> P. F. Theron, “The kingdom of God and the theology of Calvin”: Response to the paper by prof. J. H. van Wyk of *In die Skriflig* Vol. 35, no.2 (2001): 208-209, footnote no.3; Timothy George is of the opinion that Calvin’s motif of the Kingdom of God set forth in his early writings from about 1535 to 1539. “John Calvin and Menno Simons: Reformation Perspectives on the Kingdom of God,” in *Calvianism: Ideas and Influence of Jean Calvin*, ed. Robert V. Schnucker, Volume X of Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies (Ann Arbor in Michigan: Edward Brothers, 1988), pp. 196-197.

<sup>958</sup> *Institutes* 3.20.42.

<sup>959</sup> Cf. Timothy George gathered the fragments of Calvin’s thoughts of the Kingdom of God from his entire

Beizer contends that “Calvin never tried to translate the kingdom of God into a programme of social ethics.”<sup>960</sup> His contention seems rather germane in the sense that Calvin did not pursue literal theocracy. Nonetheless, Calvin is said to have struggled for the kingdom of God in the city of Geneva, given that he transformed the city in accordance with the law of God. In any event, for Calvin, the theme of the kingdom of God was not yet completely developed.

8 Calvin’s insistence that evil rulers are raised by God in order to punish the wickedness of people is unsound.<sup>961</sup> We know evil rulers have oppressed the righteous and the good in history, though Calvin presented Nebuchadnezzar as an instrument of God to punish Israel’s sin against God. The doctrine of God’s absolute and secret providence should not be applied to the justification of evil rule. We must pray and act against evil rulers according to the guidance of the Spirit rather than unconditionally endure their oppression. This is my countermeasure to “5.1.1.2.3.2 Evasion from Reforming the World and Compromise with It.” It will be reflected in “5.2.2.3.3 Participation in Social Justice.”

9 Calvin thought that obstinate believers in false religions deserve to be repressed by the sword.<sup>962</sup> The important distinction between Calvin’s times and our times is not to use coercion in order to convert unbelievers to God. Gary Scott Smith criticizes Calvin’s idea that the state should “enforce observance of the Christian faith” and punish religious sinners. In that sense the New Testament does not support such an attitude but “directs believers to use persuasion in their attempt to win others to Christ.”<sup>963</sup> Smith’s critique that “Calvin did not distinguish sharply enough between the way which God related to Israel in the Old Testament (especially through the theocracy) and the church in the New Testament” is notable.<sup>964</sup> The view that Gentiles are “to be won for evangelical doctrine through the working of the government”<sup>965</sup> is not convincing in today’s society. Mission should not depend on the sword but the conversion of the Holy Spirit and Christian service. Furthermore, the government of our times, with a few exceptions, does not compel anyone to adhere to or support any particular religion. Heideman’s view that we have “to pursue for our times the search for a theocracy which surpasses that which Calvin recognized” is remarkable in the sense that this world is under the sovereignty of God.<sup>966</sup> Accordingly,

---

writings. *Calvianism: Ideas and Influence of Jean Calvin*, pp.195-214.

<sup>960</sup> F. Beizer, *Hoffnung und Vollendung* (Mohn: Gütersloh, 1993), p.117.

<sup>961</sup> *Institutes* 4.20.25.

<sup>962</sup> *Institutes* 4.20.3; 4.20.10; Hans-Helmut Esser considers this attitude of Calvin as medieval *corpus christianum*. Hans-Helmut Esser, *op. cit.*, p.376.

<sup>963</sup> Gary Scott Smith, “The Reformation: Luther, Calvin, and the Anabaptists” in *Building a Christian World View*, Vol.2, *The Universe, Society and Ethics*, ed. by W. Andrew Hoffecker (Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1988), p.239.

<sup>964</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>965</sup> *Ibid.*; cf. *Institutes* 4.20.2.

<sup>966</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 88.

though theocracy may be almost impossible, given our political situation to support the religious freedom and pluralism, we should do our best to accomplish the kingdom of God in our society<sup>967</sup> by moving towards politico-social sanctification.

---

<sup>967</sup> John C. Koedyker stresses that “theocracy is not dead in Iran today.” He compared Calvin with Khomeini in his article. See John C. Koedyker, “Theocracy is not Dead: Calvin and Khomeini,” *Reformed Review*, Vol. 34, no. 2 (1981): 74-80.