

AUTHOR 이양호 (Yang Ho Lee)

TITLE The Young Calvin and Later
Calvin-Changes in His Theology

IN Theology and Modern Times
vol.24 no.1 (Summer, 1997):333-369

devant le juge-magistrat qui est le procureur, Félix lui-même. Il faut donc attendre que les plaintes soient portées par les Juifs. En attendant l'arrivée des accusateurs, Félix donne l'ordre de garder Paul dans le prétoire d'Hérode (Ac 23:35b). Ainsi, avec le transfert à Césarée, le théâtre de son procès se déplace du milieu juif vers une scène païenne. C'est là que Paul sera soumis à un interrogatoire et un jugement en règle.

Jusqu'ici nous avons suivi très étroitement le récit de Luc. Au terme de cette étude, nous voulons mentionner quelques remarques sur la véacité de la fresque historique d'une partie du procès de Paul brossée par Luc. Les scènes de l'apparition de l'apôtre sont montées d'une façon impressionnante par l'auteur. L'histoire est si vivante que l'on est tenté de la considérer comme le vrai rapport juridique de l'affaire. Mais, comme nous l'avons déjà noté, divers éléments contradictoires nous empêchent d'avoir une telle illusion. Dans la scène de l'apparition et l'interrogatoire devant le Sanhédrin suscitent certains doutes à l'égard de la réalité. Et encore, comme la conspiration des Juifs contre Paul est trop minutieusement rapportée, on pourrait se poser des questions sur sa valeur historique.

L'ensemble de ces faits nous amène à nous interroger sur la véacité du récit de Luc. Il est certain que le récit lucanien ne peut pas être utilisé comme un document sûr. Cependant, bien que les détails des événements soient forcément colorés par l'art littéraire de l'auteur, nous croyons qu'il y a certains noyaux des faits qui sont indéniables : l'arrestation de Paul dans le temple par les Romains, le statut de citoyen romain de Paul, l'intervention du Sanhédrin dans l'affaire de processus de Paul. C'est surtout autour de ces faits centraux que l'auteur a construit l'histoire de procès de Paul en la revêtant de sa couleur littéraire.

The Young Calvin and Later Calvin - Changes in His Theology**

Yang-Ho Lee*

Part I. Changes in Calvin's Theology

1.

Calvin's thought had been changed from the earlier days to the later days. First of all, the beginning sentence of the *Institutes of the Christian Religion* has been changed as follows.¹⁾

1536	1539
Nearly the whole of sacred doctrine consists in these two parts : the knowledge of God and of ourselves. (italics added)	Nearly all the wisdom we possess, that is to say, true and sound wisdom, contains of two parts : the knowledge of God and of ourselves. (italics added)

Here we can find notable change from "sacred doctrine" to "wisdom". T. H. L. Parker explained this change from "narrow" sacred doctrine to "comprehensive" wisdom. He said as follows.

* 연세대학교 연합신학대학원 교학부장 겸 신과대학 교회사 교수
** 이 논문은 1998년도 연세대학교 학술연구비 지원에 의하여 이루어진 것이며, 제 7차 세계권민학술대회(1998. 8. 25 - 29)에서 발표한 논문임.

1) *Ioannis Calvinii opera quae supersunt omnia*, eds. G. Baum, E. Cunitz, and E. Reuss (59 vols.; Brunsvigae : Schwetschke et Filium, 1863-1900), 1:27 [hereafter cited as *CO* with volume and column number]. "Summa fere sacrae doctrinae duabus his partibus constat : Cognitione Dei ac nostri." *CO* 1:279. "Tota fere sapientiae nostrae summa, quae vera demum ac solida sapientia censi debebat, duabus partibus constat : cognitione Dei, et nostri."

The change, which he introduced in 1539, is significant. . . . But more to our present point, although *sapientia* had a long ecclesiastical use, going back to the Old Testament chochmá, it possessed also a classical pedigree in the *σοφία* of the Greek philosophers. In the sixteenth century, that stormy stretch of water where the two seas met, *sapientia* bore both a Christian and a secular connotation, and was therefore a word of comprehensive scope. Both the Church and the world were interested in wisdom, and each believed this pearl of great price to be in its own possession. Now, the first edition of the *Institutio* was tied to Calvin's *apologia* to the King of France on behalf of the persecuted French Protestants, and hence served the purpose of presenting Protestant teaching as manifestly not heretical but within the tradition of the Patristic Church. In accordance with this aim, *sacra doctrina* means "Christian doctrine", the theology of the Church and not of a sect. In the second edition, however, we may suggest that Calvin is dissatisfied with his claim as being too narrow. If almost the whole of *sacra doctrina* consists in the knowledge of God and of ourselves, the question at once thrusts itself forward: Is there then a *profana doctrina*, a secular philosophy, which can demand a place alongside *sacra doctrina*? Is *sacra doctrina* only one branch of *doctrina*, and have other branches an equal validity? More generally, is Christianity just one sect in a universal pantheon?²⁾

Parker continues to say.

Calvin therefore changes the term to the comprehensive *sapientia*, and so cuts the ground from under the feet of the many neo-philosophes of his day. . . . It is true that Calvin makes use of non-Christian philosophies; but he has no intention of attempting a synthesis. What in fact follows *sapientia nostra* throughout the four books of the *Institutio* is a statement of Christian doctrine, of *sacra doctrina*. Moreover, by beginning the work with this sentence, he speaks directly not only to the Protestants, not only to the rest of the orthodox Christian world, but also to the philosophers, the humanists and even the atheists, and declares to them the comprehensiveness of the Biblical teaching on God, man, and the universe - such a comprehensiveness that, although "nature" and "heathen philosophers" may confirm it, they can add nothing to it.³⁾

2) T. H. L. Parker, *Calvin's Doctrine of the Knowledge of God* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1969), pp. 15-16.

On the contrary, William J. Bouwsma explained this change from "a traditional conception of theology as *God's* truth rather than ours" to "the best sort of knowledge we limited creatures can manage." He said as follows.

He understood, at least sometimes, that theology, as a human enterprise, does not state truths in an absolute sense, from *God's* standpoint. Its truths are as limited as the human beings who develop them. It may be that he did not himself immediately or fully recognize this. The first sentence in the first edition of the *Institutes* reads: "Almost the whole of sacred doctrine [*sacra doctrina*] consists of two parts: knowledge of God and of ourselves," a formula he had taken from Cicero. This rather absolute wording suggested that he held, in 1536, a traditional conception of theology as *God's* truth rather than ours. But the second edition, three years later, made an interesting change, as though something had troubled him about the earlier wording. Now, for "sacred doctrine," he substituted "our wisdom [*sapientia nostra*]," that is, the best sort of knowledge we limited creatures can manage.⁴⁾

As we will consider in the following, Calvin estimated astronomy or philosophy more positively in his later days. In this respect, the thought of the later Calvin became more comprehensive. It seems that Calvin wanted to change his *Institutes* from narrow sacred doctrine to comprehensive wisdom.

2.

As stated above, Calvin spoke highly of astronomy or philosophy in his later days. In 1554, he said, in the *Commentary on the Book of Genesis*, "For astronomy is not only pleasant, but also very useful to be known: it cannot be denied that this art unfolds the admirable

3) *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.

4) William J. Bouwsma, *John Calvin: A Sixteenth Century Portrait* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), p. 160.

wisdom of God.”⁵⁾ Also Calvin admired philosophers in the 1559 edition of the *Institutes*, saying “I, indeed, agree that the things they teach are true, not only enjoyable, but also profitable to learn, and skillfully assembled by them. And I do not forbid those who are desirous of learning to study them.”⁶⁾ In the same edition of the *Institutes*, he said, “Hence Plato’s opinion is more correct, because he considers the image of God in the soul.”⁷⁾

3.

In the doctrine of the providence, Calvin, in the 1539 edition of the *Institutes*, rejected the doctrine of universal providence. However, in the 1559 edition of the *Institutes*, he said, “I do not wholly repudiate what is said concerning universal providence.”

1539

Therefore, as we rightly rejected a little above the opinion of those who imagine a universal providence of God, which does not stoop to the especial care of any particular creature, yet first of all it is important that we recognize this special care toward us.⁸⁾(italics added)

5) *Commentary on the Book of Genesis* 1:16 [hereafter cited as *Comm. Gen.* followed by chapter and versel], *CO* 23:22. “Nan astrologia non modo iucunda est cognitu, sed apprime quoque utilis: negari non potest quin admirabilem Dei sapientiam explicet ars illa.”

6) John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 1559 edition, 1.15.6 [hereafter cited as *Inst.* followed by book, chapter, and section], *Joannis Calvini opera selecta*, eds. P. Barth and W. Niesel (5 vols. : Monachi in Aedibus : Chr. Kaiser, 1926-1936), 3:183.19-23 [hereafter cited as *OS* with volume, page, and line number]. “Vera quidem esse, nec iucunda modo cognitu, sed etiam utilis esse fateor, dextereque ab illis collecta quae docent : nec vero ab eorum studio prohibeo qui disceant cupidi sunt.”

7) *Inst.* 1.15.6, *OS* 3:182.21-22. “Inde autem Platonii rectoris sententia, quod imaginem Dei in anima considerat.” Also cf. Francois Wendel, *Calvin : The Origins and Development of His Religious Thought*, trans. Philip Mairet (Glasgow : William Collins Sons & Co. Ltd., 1950), p. 115. “Plato, whom he seems hardly to have known before, now [1539] becomes one of the writers to whom he most often refers, although he generally avoids doing so by name.”

1559

Yet I do not wholly repudiate what is said concerning universal providence, provided they in turn grant me that the universe is ruled by God, not only because he watches over the order of nature set by himself, but because he exercises especial care over each of his works.⁹⁾(italics added)

It seems to be natural that the later Calvin, who spoke highly of astronomy or philosophy, did not wholly repudiate the doctrine of universal providence.

4.

In the first edition of the *Institutes*, Calvin spoke only of a two-fold messianic unction.

We also believe that Christ himself was sprinkling with all the graces of the Holy Spirit. These are called “oil” (Ps. 45; 89) because without these we waste away, dry and barren. And as the Spirit has rested upon him, and has poured itself out wholly upon him, in order that we may all receive from his fullness (that is, whoever of us are partners and partakers of him through faith) (Jn. 11; 61; John 1), so do we believe in short that by this anointing he was appointed king by the Father [p. 130] to subject all power in heaven and on earth (Ps. 2), that in him we might be kings, having sway over the devil, sin, death, and hell (1 Pet. 2). Then we believe that he was appointed priest, by his self-sacrifice to placate the Father and reconcile him to us, that in him we might be priests, with him as our Intercessor and Mediator, offering our prayers, our thanks,

8) *CO* 1:895. “Quoniam itaque merito supra mihi permisi explodere eorum opinionem, qui universalem Dei providentiam comminiscuntur, quae non speciatim ad curam uniuscuiusque creaturae se demittit, in primis tamen specialem hanc curam erga nos recognoscere operae pretium est.”

9) *Inst.* 1.16.4, *OS* 3:194.9-13. “Neque tamen quod de universali providentia dicitur in totum repudio : modo vicissim hoc mihi concedant, mundum a Deo regi, non tantum quia positum a se naturae ordinem tueretur, sed quia peculiarem uniuscuiusque ex suis operibus curam gerit.”

ourselves, and our all to the Father (Rev. 1; Ps. 110; Heb. 5; 13).¹⁰⁾ (italics added)

In the 1539 edition of the *Institutes*, however, Calvin began to refer to the prophetic office of Christ.

The name 'Christ' is added, which, though not inappropriately attributed to others, is none the less His by a peculiar right. For the Lord anoints all on whom He sheds the grace of His Spirit. And there is no one faithful, nor has there been any, whom He did not fill with His unction. Therefore it is accomplished that all the faithful were anointed. The prophets have their own unction also, and the kings have it, and the priests, not in the manner of outward ceremony but spiritually. . . . Therefore the oil whereby prophets as well as priests and kings were consecrated was not a useless symbol but a sacrament of His true and unique anointing.¹¹⁾

In the 1559 edition of the *Institutes*, Calvin said.

Now it is to be noted that the title "Christ" pertains to these three offices : for we know that under the law prophets as well as priests and kings were anointed with holy oil. Hence the illustrious name of

10) *CO* 1:68-69. "Credimus et Christum ipsum esse, hoc est, omnibus sancti spiritus gratis perfusum : quae oleum ideo dicitur (Psal. 45. 89), quod sine his aridi et steriles tabescimus, sique, ut spiritus super ipsum requieverit, ac sese totum in eum effuderit : ut de plenitudine eius omnes accipiamus, quicumque simus per fidem eius consortes ac participes (Ies. 11. 61. Ioan. 1) : hac denique unctione constitutum esse a parte [p. 130] regem, qui omnem sibi potestatem in coelo et in terra subiceret (Psal. 2), ut in ipso reges essemus, imperium habentes supra diabolum, peccatum, mortem et inferos (1 Petr. 2). Deinde sacerdotem, qui suo sacrificio patrem nobis placaret ac reconciliaret, ut in ipso sacerdotes essemus : ipso intercessore ac mediatore, patri preces, gratiarum actiones, nosmetipsos, et nostra omnia offerentes (Apoc. 1. Psal. 110. Hebr. 5. 13).

11) *CO* 1:513-514. "Christi elogium annectitur, quod tametsi aliis non absurde attribuitur, illi tamen peculiariter quodam iure competit. Ungit enim omnes Dominus quibus spiritus sui gratias instillat. Aequi nemo est fidelium, nec unquam fuit, quem non eiusmodi unctione irrigaverit. Omnes igitur fideles unctos esse conficitur. Habent suam quoque unctionem prophetae; habent et suam tum reges, tum sacerdotes; non illam modo caeremonialem et externam sed spiritualem. . . . Quare oleum illud quo tam prophetiae quam sacerdotes et reges inaugurabantur, non inane erat symbolum, sed verae illius et unice unctionis sacramentum."

"Messiah" was also bestowed upon the promised Mediator. As I have elsewhere shown, I recognize that Christ was called Messiah especially with respect to, and by virtue of, his kingship. Yet his anointing as prophet and as priest have their place and must not be overlooked by us.¹²⁾

Concerning this change John Frederick Jansen said, "We need to ask ourselves whether the formula represents a peripheral or an essential theological change. . . . I would contend that the change is peripheral rather than essential. . . . The essential structure of his doctrine of Christ's work remains two-fold. If such be the case, then the *munus triplex* is not the truest expression of his theology."¹³⁾ Jansen rightly said, "the change is peripheral rather essential." However, when he said, "The essential structure of his doctrine of Christ's work remains two-fold," he did not rightly comprehend Calvin's thought form which we will consider in Part II. It seems that for Calvin the two-fold messianic offices of Christ were central and the prophetic office was peripheral.

5.

The thesis of R. T. Kendall, who argued that for Calvin faith was intellectual,¹⁴⁾ incurred a heated controversy among Calvin scholars. Calvin, however, in the 1536 edition of the *Institutes*, like Luther, said

12) *Inst.* 2.15.2, *OS* 3:473.6-12. "Porro notandum est ad haec tria munera Christi pertinere elogium: scimus enim sub Lege sacro oleo tam Prophetas quam sacerdotes ac reges fuisse unctos. Unde et celebre Messiae nomen promissio Mediatori fuit impositum. Eisi autem fateor peculiariter regi intuitu et ratione dictum fuisse Messiam (ut etiam alibi ostendi) prophetica tamen et sacerdotalis unctio gradum suum obtinent, neque sunt a nobis negligendae."

13) John Frederick Jansen, *Calvin's Doctrine of the Work of Christ* (London : James Clarke & Co., Ltd., 1956), p. 51.

14) R. T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1981), p. 19.

that first of all faith was hope and trust.

The other is the faith whereby we not only believe that God and Christ are, but also believe in God and Christ, truly acknowledging Him as our God and Christ as our Savior. Now this is not only to adjudge true all that has been written or is said of God and Christ; but to put all *hope and trust* in one God and Christ, and to be so strengthened by this thought, that we have no doubt about God's good will toward us.¹⁵⁹(italics added)

On the other hand, Calvin, in the 1539 edition of the *Institutes*, emphasized the intellectual nature of faith, criticizing the implicit faith of the Scholastics.¹⁶⁰

Is this what believing means - to understand nothing, provided only that you submit your feeling obediently to the church? *Faith rests not on ignorance, but on knowledge*. . . . For when the apostle says, "With the heart a man believes unto righteousness, with the mouth makes confession unto salvation" (Rom. 10:10), he indicates that it is not enough for a man implicitly to believe what he does not understand or even investigate. But he requires explicit recognition of the divine goodness upon which our righteousness rests.¹⁷⁰(italics added)

15) *CO* 1:56. "Aeterna est : qua non modo Deum et Christum esse credimus, sed etiam in Deum credimus, et Christum, vere ipsam pro Deo nostro ac Christum pro salvatore agnoscentes. Hoc vero est, non modo verum reputare id omne, quod de Deo ac Christo vel scriptum est, vel dicitur, sed spem omnem ac fiduciam in uno Deo ac Christo reponere, hacque cogitatione sic firmatos esse, ut de bona Dei erga nos voluntate nihil dubitemus."

16) Cf. Wendel, *Calvin*, pp. 240-241. Wendel said, "But from 1539 onwards, Calvin was no longer content with this definition which identified faith with confidence and hope." (p. 241). Also cf. Jean-Daniel Benoit, "The History and Development of the *Institio* : How Calvin Worked," *John Calvin*, ed. G. E. Duffield (Appleford : The Sutton Courtenay Press, 1961), p. 104. "For example in the 1536 *Institio* Calvin, like Luther, insisted that above all faith was trust and hope. In 1539 he made more of the intellectual nature of faith. Not that one can accuse him of intellectualism, but, in insisting that understanding is linked together with faith, he simply meant to reject all confusion with the implicit faith of the schoolmen."

17) *CO* 1:473. "Hocine credere est, nihil intelligere, modo sensum tuum obedienter ecclesiae submittas? Non in ignorantia, sed in cognitione sita est fides : . . . Nam quum dicit apostolus (Rom. 10, 10), corde credi ad justitiam, ore confessionem fieri ad salutem, non satis esse indicat, si quis implicite credat quod non intelligat, nec etiam inquirat; sed explicitam requirit divinae bonitatis agnitionem, in qua consisti nostra iustitia."

In the meantime, he, in the same edition of the *Institutes*, made an effort to keep the balance between the volitional side and the intellectual side of faith.

Now we shall possess a right definition of faith if we call it a firm and certain knowledge of God's benevolence toward 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.¹⁸⁰(italics added)

In the same edition of the *Institutes*, however, he emphasized the volitional side of faith than the intellectual side.

That very assent itself - as I have already partially suggested, and will reiterate more fully - is more of the heart than of the brain, and more of the disposition than of the understanding.¹⁹⁰(italics added)

6.

In the doctrine of the church, Calvin insisted the invisible aspect of the church in the first edition of the *Institutes* as follows.

This is what we mean when we say, "we believe the church." For by faith are believed things that cannot be seen with the naked eye. By this it is made plain that it is not a physical thing which ought to be subjected to our sense perception, or enclosed within a definite space, or fixed in some spot.²⁰⁰(italics added)

18) *CO* 1:456. "Nunc iusta fidei definitio nobis constabit, si dicamus esse divinae erga nos benevolentiae firmam certamque cognitionem, quae gratuita in Christo promissionis veritate fundata per spiritum sanctum et revelatur mentibus nostris et cordibus obsignatur."

19) *CO* 1:472. "Siquidem assensionem ipsam cordis esse magis quam cerebri, et affectus magis quam intelligentiae, iam expositum est."

20) *CO* 1:77. "Quin potius nihil horum nisi fide, intelligitur, quod ipsum significamus, cum dicimus : nos ipsam credere. Creduntur enim quae praesenti oculo spectari nequeunt. Quo planum fit, non rem esse carnalem, quae sensibus nostris subici, aut certo spatio circumscripti, aut in sede aliqua figi debeat."

Meanwhile, Calvin mentioned both the invisible church and visible church in the 1543 edition of the *Institutes*.

For we have said that Holy Scripture speaks of the church in two ways. Sometimes by the term "church" it means that which is actually in God's presence, into which no persons are received but those who are children of God by grace of adoption and true members of Christ by sanctification of the Holy Spirit. Then, indeed, the church includes not only the saints presently living on earth, but *all the elect* from the beginning of the world. Often, however, the name "church" designates the *whole multitude of men* spread over the earth who profess to worship one God and Christ.... In this church are mingled many hypocrites who have nothing of Christ but the name and outward appearance.²¹⁾(italics added)

In the 1559 edition of the *Institutes*, Calvin used the phrase, "not only... but also" as follows.²²⁾

1536	1559
This is what we mean when we say, "we believe the church." For by faith are believed things that cannot be seen with the naked eye. By this it is made plain that it is not a physical thing which ought to be subjected to our sense perception, or enclosed within a definite space, or fixed in some spot.	The article in the Creed in which we profess to "believe the church" refers <i>not only to the visible church</i> (our present topic) <i>but also to all God's elect</i> , in whose number are also included the dead (italics added)

21) *CO* 1:542. "Bifariam enim de ecclesia sacrae litterae loquuntur. Interdum enim, quam ecclesiam nominant, eam intelligunt quae revera est coram Deo, in quam nulli recipiuntur, nisi qui et adoptionis gratia filii Dei sunt, et spiritus sanctificatione, vera Christi membra. Ac tunc quidem non tantum sanctos qui in terra habitant comprehendit, sed electos omnes, qui ab origine mundi fuerunt. Saepe autem ecclesiae nomine universam hominum multitudinem in orbe diffusam designat, quae unum se Deum et Christum colere proficitur.... In hac autem plurimi sunt permixti hypocritae, qui nihil Christi habent praeter titulum et speciem."

22) *Insr.* 4.1.2, *OS* 5:2.5-8. "In Symbolo, ubi profitemur nos credere Ecclesiam, id non solum ad visibilem, de qua nunc agimus, refertur, sed ad omnes quoque electos Dei, in quorum numero comprehenduntur etiam qui morte defuncti sunt."

7.

Calvin did not distinguish between the outer call and the inner call of the minister in the first edition of the *Institutes*. He, however, distinguished them from 1543 onwards as follows.

1536

This is the place to explain the meaning of the call. It consists of two things, namely, that we should understand who are the ones to institute bishops or presbyters, and by what rite or ceremony to initiate them. Evidence for lawful institution cannot be sought from the institution of the apostles, who awaited no human call, but by the command of the Lord alone girded themselves for their task. It is clear enough that the apostles themselves did not hold this order, except that Paul, whom we cited a moment ago in that passage, stated that he left Titus in Crete to appoint bishops in every city (Titus 1).²³⁾

1543

I am speaking of the *solemn call* which has to do with the public order of the church. I pass over that *secret call*, of which each minister is conscious before God, and which does not have the church as witness.²⁴⁾(italics added)

1559

I am speaking of the *outward and solemn call* which has to do with the public order of the church. I pass over that *secret call*, of which each minister is conscious before God, and which does not have the church as witness.²⁵⁾(italics added)

23) *CO* 1:186. "Porro quae sit ratio vocacionis, nunc docendi locus est. Ea in duobus versatur: nempe ut habeamus et a quibus instituendi sint episcopi seu presbyteri, et quo ritu quae caeremonia initiandi. Legitimae institutionis documentum ex apostolorum institutione peti non potest, qui humana vocatione non expectata, sed solo Domini mandato instructi, operi se acceperunt. Nec quem ipsi apostoli ordinem tenuerint satis constat: nisi quod Paulus, eo quem nuper citavimus loco tradit, se reliquisse Titum in Creta ut episcopos per civitates constitueret (Tit. 1), et alibi Timotheum admonet, ne cui tenere manum imponat (1 Tim. 5)."

24) *CO* 1: 568. "De solenni vocatione loquor, quae ad publicum ecclesiae ordinem spectat: arcanam vero illam, cuius sibi quisque minister coram Deo conscius est, ecclesiam testem non habet, omitto."

8.

In the doctrine of the sacraments, Calvin, like Luther, emphasized God's act in the 1536 edition of the *Institutes*. In the 1543 edition of the *Institutes*, however, he, like Zwingli, mentioned the man's attestation.²⁶⁾

1536	1543
First, we must consider what a sacrament is. An outward sign by which the Lord represents and attests to us his good will toward us to sustain the weakness of our faith.	First, we must consider what a sacrament is. It seems to me that a simple and proper definition would be to say that it is an outward sign by which the Lord seals on our consciences the promises of the good will toward us in order to sustain the weakness of our faith; and we in turn attest our piety toward him in the presence of the Lord and of his angels and before men. (italics added)

9.

Concerning the three forms of the government, that is to say, monarchy, aristocracy and democracy, Calvin, in the first edition of

25) *Inst.* 4.3.11, *OS* 5:52.21-24. "De externa et solenni vocatione loquor, quae ad publicum ecclesiae ordinem spectat; arcanam vero illam, cuius sibi quisque minister coram Deo conscius est, ecclesiam testem non habet, omitto."

26) *CO* 1:102. "Principio animadvertere convenit, quid sit sacramentum. Est autem signum externum, quo bonam suam erga nos voluntatem Dominus nobis repraesentat ac testificatur, ad sustinendam fidei nostrae imbecillitatem." *CO* 1:937-938. "Principio animadvertere convenit, quid sit sacramentum. Videtur autem mihi haec simplex et propria fore definitio, si dixerimus externum esse symbolum, quo benevolentiae erga nos suae promissiones conscientis nostris Dominus obsignat, ad sustinendam fidei nostrae imbecillitatem: et nos vicissim pietatem erga eum nostram apud homines testamur." Cf. John W. Riggs, "Emerging Ecclesiology in Calvin's Baptismal Thought, 1536-1543," *Church History*, 64 (1995): 29-43.

the *Institutes*, said, "it is not easy to distinguish which one of them excels in usefulness." On the contrary, in the 1543 edition of the *Institutes* he said, "aristocracy, or a system compounded of aristocracy and democracy, far excels all others."²⁷⁾

1536	1543
And if you compare the forms of government among themselves apart from the circumstances, it is not easy to distinguish which one of them excels in usefulness, for they contend on such equal terms. The fall from kingdom to tyranny is easy; but it is not much more difficult to fall from the rule of the best men to the faction of a few; yet it is easiest of all to fall from popular rule to sedition. (italics added)	And if you compare the forms of government among themselves apart from the circumstances, it is not easy to distinguish which one of them excels in usefulness, for they contend on such equal terms. The fall from kingdom to tyranny is easy; but it is not much more difficult to fall from the rule of the best men to the faction of a few; yet it is easiest of all to fall from popular rule to sedition. For if the three forms of government which the philosophers discuss be considered in themselves, I will not deny that aristocracy, or a system compounded of aristocracy and democracy, far excels all others: (italics added)

27) *CO* 1:232-233. "tum etiam simpliciter id defini nisi temere non potest, cum praecipua huius disputationis ratio in circumstantiis posita sit, et si ipsos etiam status circa circumstantias inter se compares, non facile sit discernere, quis utilitate praeponderet adeo aequis conditionibus contendunt. Proclivis est a regno in tyrannidem lapsus; sed non multo difficilior, ab optimatum potestate in paucorum factionem; multo vero facilissimus a populari dominatione in seditionem." *CO* 1:1105. "tum etiam simpliciter id defini nisi temere non potest, quam magna huius disputationis ratio in circumstantiis posita sit. Et si ipsos etiam status, circa circumstantias, inter se compares, non facile sit discernere, quis utilitate praeponderet, adeo aequis conditionibus contendunt. Proclivis est a regno in tyrannidem lapsus; sed non multo difficilior, ab optimatum potestate in paucorum factionem. Multo vero facilissimus a populari dominatione in seditionem. Equidem si in se considerentur tres illae, quas ponunt philosophi, regimini formae, minime negaverim vel aristocratiam, vel temperatum ex ipsa et posita statum aliis omnibus longe excellere."

In the meantime, in 1555 Calvin said, in the *Sermon on the Deuteronomy*, "if we discuss about human government, we can say that it is far better condition to live in free state than under a prince."²⁸⁾

10.

As stated above, the thought of Calvin had been changed from the earlier days to the later days. Generally speaking, the change was from either/or to both/and. Here both/and is not both/and of the equals, but both/and of the central and the peripheral. Calvin, in the first edition of the *Institutes*, explained narrow sacred doctrine. He, however, from 1539 onwards, wanted to explain our comprehensive wisdom. He, therefore, in the later days, spoke highly of astronomy and philosophy. Also the young Calvin rejected the doctrine of the universal providence, but the later Calvin did not wholly repudiate it. The young Calvin spoke only of two messianic offices, but the later Calvin mentioned three messianic offices. The young Calvin emphasized trust and hope in the Christian faith, but the later Calvin mentioned both the volitional side and the intellectual side of faith. The young Calvin did not distinguish between the visible church and invisible church, but the later Calvin distinguished between them. The young Calvin spoke only of outer call of minister, but the later Calvin mentioned outer call and inner call. The young Calvin followed Luther's doctrine of the sacrament, but the later Calvin accepted both Luther's idea and Zwingli's idea. The young Calvin preferred aristocracy, but the later Calvin favored a mixture of aristocracy and democracy. In short, the thought of the later Calvin was much more

28) *Sermon on the Deuteronomy*, 17:14-18, CO 27:458. "si on disputoit des gouvernements humains, qu'on pourroit dire, que d'estre en un estat libre, c'est une condition beaucoup meilleure, que d'estre sous un prince : ..."

comprehensive. The later Calvin's system was a great synthesis; that is to say, a great synthesis of theology and philosophy, of Roman Catholicism and Protestant radicalism, of Lutheran idea and Zwinglian idea. He, therefore, deserves the great name of the father of modern ecumenical theology.

Part II. The Structure of Theology in the Later Calvin

1.

Calvin scholars have been puzzled by the problems involved in identifying the structure of Calvin's theology. Some Calvin scholars have attempted to find his governing intention in the construction of his theology. Others have tried to find the structure of Calvin's theology by analyzing the final edition of his *Institutes*.

To Ernst Troeltsch, the central doctrine of Calvin's theology is the idea of the predestination of God. "The first distinctive feature of Calvinism, and the most important one, is the idea of predestination, the famous central doctrine of Calvinism."²⁹⁾ In the idea of predestination Calvin is "trying to express the character of God as absolute sovereign will."³⁰⁾ For Calvin "the chief point is not the self-centered personal salvation of the creature, and the universality of the Divine Will of Love, but it is the Glory of God."³¹⁾ In short, to Troeltsch Calvin was a theocentric thinker who emphasized the

29) Ernst Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*, trans. Olive Wyon (2 vols. : London : George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1931), 2:581.

30) *Ibid.*, p. 582.

31) *Ibid.*, p. 583.

predestination, sovereign will, and glory of God.

On the other hand, Wilhelm Niesel regards Calvin as a Christocentric thinker. "In every aspect of doctrine Calvin is concerned only about one thing : namely, the God revealed in flesh."³² He goes on to say, "Jesus Christ controls not only the content but also the form of Calvinistic thought."³³

Differently again, Benjamin B. Warfield regards Calvin as "the theologian of the Holy Spirit."³⁴ "But in the same sense in which we may say that the doctrine of sin and grace dates from Augustine, the doctrine of satisfaction from Anselm, the doctrine of justification by faith from Luther, - we must say that the doctrine of the work of the Holy Spirit is a gift from Calvin to the Church."³⁵ He also says, "In his hands, for the first time in the history of Church, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit comes to its rights.... But, above everything else, it is the sense of the sovereign working of salvation by the almighty power of the Holy Spirit which characterizes all Calvin's thought of God. And above everything else he deserves, therefore, the great name of the theologian of the Holy Spirit."³⁶

Here one comes to ask whether Calvin is a theocentric thinker, or a Christo-centric thinker, or a Pneumato-centric thinker. If one investigates the writings of Calvin, one learns that the above-mentioned interpretation are all possible. As Calvin himself says, "When, therefore, we treat of the merit of Christ, we do not place the beginning in him, but we go back to God's ordination, which is the

32) Wilhelm Niesel, *The Theology of Calvin*, trans. Harold Knight (Philadelphia : The Westminster Press, 1956), p. 246.

33) *Ibid.*, p. 247.

34) Benjamin B. Warfield, *Calvin and Augustine*, ed. Samuel G. Caig (Philadelphia : The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1971), p. 484.

35) *Ibid.*, p. 485.

36) *Ibid.*, p. 487.

primary cause :"³⁷ "Christ, apart from God's good pleasure, could not merit anything :"³⁸ Certainly, these expressions show that Christ is subordinated to the sovereign will of God. On the other hand, Calvin says in the *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, "from the beginning of the world all the patriarchs drew whatever gifts they had from Christ."³⁹ And in the *Institutes* he says, "through him alone we escape the imputation of our sins to us."⁴⁰ But, at the same time, the work of the Holy Spirit is much emphasized in the theological system of Calvin. It is the Holy Spirit who gave inspiration to the writers of the Scriptures, and gives inner testimony to the readers of the Scriptures, and gives us graces through the sacraments. By the secret efficacy of the Spirit, "We come to enjoy Christ and all his blessings."⁴¹

If we consider these passages, we have to say that God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit are all emphasized in the theology of Calvin. In other words, the central theme of Calvin's theology is the trine God. For instance, God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit are all mentioned in the following short definition of faith.

Now we shall have a right definition of faith if we say that it is a firm and certain knowledge of the divine benevolence toward us, founded upon the truth of the free promise in Christ, both revealed to our minds and sealed upon our hearts through the Holy Spirit.⁴²

37) *Inst.* 2.17.1, *OS* 3:509.15-17. "Quum ergo de Christi merito agitur, non statuitur in eo pricipium : sed consensendum ad Dei ordinationem, quae prima causa est."

38) *Inst.* 2.17.1, *OS* 3:509.25-26. "Nam Christus nominis ex Dei beneplacito quicquam mereri potuit."

39) *Comm. Jn.* 1:16, *CO* 4:7:17. "omnes ab initio mundi patres a Christo hausisse quiddam habuerint donorum."

40) *Inst.* 2.16.3, *OS* 3:485.6-7. "ut revera per ipsum solum consequimur ne imputentur nobis peccata. . . ."

41) *Inst.* 3.1.1, *OS* 4:1.22-24. "ac de arcana Spiritus efficaciac inquirere, qua fit ut Christo bonisque eius omnibus fruamur."

42) *Inst.* 3.2.7, *OS* 4:16.31-35.

We can find many such trinitarian schemes in the writings of Calvin. Calvin thinks that this trinitarian scheme roughly agrees with the four causes of Aristotle. In our salvation, the efficient cause is God the Father, the material cause Christ, the formal or instrumental cause faith, and the final cause the glory of God.⁴³ Also in the *Commentary on the Acts* he says, "Therefore when we treat of the remission of sins, we must look for no other originator of it than the Heavenly Father; we must imagine no other material cause than the blood of Christ. But when it comes to the formal cause, the Holy Spirit indeed plays the leading role, but an inferior instrument is added, the preaching of the Gospel and baptism itself."⁴⁴ Generally speaking, Calvin thinks that God is the efficient cause, Christ the material cause, and the work of the Holy Spirit the formal cause. In the case of the final cause, however, Calvin does not mention it in the commentary on the Acts 22:16. Therefore, it seems that though Calvin thought that his trinitarian scheme roughly agreed with the four causes of Aristotle, he did not try to make the four causes the fundamental basis of his doctrine. They merely furnish him with a subsidiary argument.

In 1917 Louis Goumaz attempted such an interpretation in his *La Doctrine du salut d'après les commentaires de Jean Calvin sur le Nouveau Testament*. According to him, God the Father is the efficient cause of the salvation, Christ the material cause of the salvation, the action of the Holy Spirit the formal cause of the salvation, and the glory of God the final cause of the salvation.⁴⁵ As we mentioned,

43) *Instr.* 3.14.17, OS 4:235.

44) *Comm. Act.* 22:16, CO 48:496. "Ergo quum de remissione peccatorum agitur, non alius quaerendus est eius autor quam coelestis pater; non alia materialis causa fingenda est quam Christi sanguis. Ubi vero ad formalem causam venitur, primas quidem tenet spiritus sanctus; sed accedit inferius organum, evangelii praedicatio et baptismus ipse."

however, Calvin did not try to base his doctrine on the four causes of Aristotle, as Goumaz tries to do in his book. In spite of this defect, it is unfortunate that Calvin scholars have not sufficiently noted the work of Goumaz.

In this connection, we can observe some defects in the studies of Calvin. Troeltsch misunderstood the efficient cause as if it were the whole of Calvin's theology. Niesel exaggerated the material cause as if it were the central theme of Calvin. Warfield overestimated the formal cause and therefore called Calvin "the theologian of the Holy Spirit." They emphasized only one aspect of Calvin's thought. Calvin, however, emphasized all three.

Meanwhile, Benjamin Charles Milner, Jr. insists that the unifying principle in Calvin's theology is the absolute correlation of the Spirit and the Word.⁴⁶ He argues that by the "theological" and the "christological" interpretation of Calvin "the work of the Holy Spirit is neither fully nor accurately gauged."⁴⁷ He is right when he emphasizes both the Spirit and the Word. However, his failure is that he does not fully consider the predestination and sovereign will of God the Father.

Recently, Charles Partee suggests that a central dogma in Calvin might be "Union with Christ" in an essay, "Calvin's Central Dogma Again." He says, "The purpose of this essay is to suggest that a newer quest for a central dogma in Calvin might well consider the doctrine of 'Union with Christ', which offers a useful way of summarizing the contents of the *Institutes*."⁴⁸ Though 'Union with Christ' might be

45) Louis Goumaz, *La Doctrine du salut d'après les commentaires de Jean Calvin sur le Nouveau Testament* (Lausanne: Librairie Payot C^e, 1917), pp. 129ff.

46) Benjamin Charles Milner, Jr., *Calvin's Doctrine of the Church* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970), p. 4.

47) *Ibid.*, pp. 191-192.

one of the important doctrines in Calvin, this opinion also cannot be escaped the same critique as Niesel encountered.

2.

As mentioned earlier, some Calvin scholars have tried to find the structure of Calvin's theology by analyzing his *Institutes*. The editors of the Geneva edition of Calvin's works interpret the *Institutes* as follows :

The author has a two-fold aim - *scopus duplex* - in this *Institutio Christiana* : the former the knowledge of God, by which we arrive at blessed immortality; the latter the knowledge of ourselves, determined to that former. For this purpose he makes use of the form of the Apostles' Creed, as being the most familiar to all Christians. For just as the Creed is in four parts (i.e. the first on God the Father, the second on the Son, the third on the Holy Spirit, and the fourth on the Church), so also our author has divided his *Institutio* into four books so as to accomplish both parts of the scope that we mentioned.⁴⁹

This interpretation has been generally accepted. In 1868, however, J. Köstlin insisted that the *Institutes* could be divided into two parts,⁵⁰ and in the present century, E. A. Doney developed further the opinion of Köstlin.⁵¹ According to Köstlin and Doney, the 1559 edition of the *Institutes* is arranged in the following way in accordance with the

48) Charles Pardee, "Calvin's Central Dogma Again," *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 18 (1987):191.

49) *Ioannis Calvinii Opera Omnia Theologica in Septem Tomos Digesta* (Genevae: Apud Johannem Vignon, Petrum & Iacobum Chouet, M. DC. XVII), Sig. **4a, quoted in T. H. L. Parker, *Calvin's Doctrine of the Knowledge of God* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1969), p. 8.

50) J. Köstlin, "Calvins Institutio nach Form und Inhalt, in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* (1868), pp. 6-62, 410-486.

51) Edward A. Doney, Jr., *The Knowledge of God in Calvin's Theology* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1964).

duplex cognitio Domini

1. The doctrines of God the Father, Son, and Spirit, and his creation and world government in general, apart from sin and the redemptive revelation and redemptive activity that sin makes necessary - and similarly of mankind, apart from sin and the necessity for salvation. (Book I).

2. The historical revelation and activity of God for the salvation of the sinner, as follows :

a. The establishing of salvation through the incarnate Son, for which preparation had already been made under the Old Covenant. (Book II).

b. The application through the Holy Spirit of the salvation given in Christ, as follows :

(1) The process of salvation which is realized inwardly by the Spirit in individuals, extending until the perfection of these persons in the resurrection. (Book III).

(2) The outer means which God uses in this activity of the Spirit. (Book IV).⁵²

François Wendel also says that the *Institutes* consists of two main parts.⁵³

The first is constituted by Book I, and is concerned with the doctrine of God (Trinity, Creator, Providence), the scriptural revelation and man (independently of sin and of the need for salvation). The second part extends over the other three books, and deals with the historic revelation and the plan of salvation. This in its turn is subdivided into two parts : firstly, preparation for the work of salvation, under the old covenant, and its accomplishment in the incarnation of the Son of God (Book II); and secondly, the attribution and application of salvation by the Holy Spirit, (a) by the intimate operation of the Holy Spirit within the believer, even to its completion in the future life (Book III); and (b) by the external means that the Holy Spirit employs to complete this operation and bring

52) *Ibid.*, p. 42.

53) Wendel, *Calvin*, p. 121.

it to its right end(Book IV).⁵⁴⁹

The analysis of A. Dakin is also not very different from the analysis of Doweiy and Wendel.⁵⁵⁰

However, since T. H. L. Parker thinks that the *Institutes* consists of four parts in accordance with the four parts of the Apostles' Creed, he criticizes the division of Doweiy. "Such a reordering of the material must be regarded as illegitimate textual criticism because in assessing the nature of the subject, it does not take the order itself into account (. . .) but imposes upon the order what is in fact a presupposition."⁵⁵¹ Recently, Parker persists in his viewpoint in his *Calvin : An Introduction to His Thought*. Parker says, "We may therefore complete our labelling of the recensions by calling this the 'creedal' *Instituto*."⁵⁵² However, as Richard C. Gamble points out, "Calvin scholarship has shown increasing unanimity that the [*duplex cognitio Dei*] must be reckoned with as either a controlling principle of his theology or the controlling principle."⁵⁵³

In short, although the final edition of the *Institutes* consists of four books, it can be divided into two parts : the knowledge of God the Creator and knowledge of God the Redeemer. This point is mentioned several times in the final edition of the *Institutes*, and the *locus classicus* of it is the following.

Since, therefore, the Lord first appears, as much in the fashioning of the world as in the general doctrine of Scripture, simply as the Creator, and

55) A. Dakin, *Calvinism* (London : Duckworth, 1940), pp. 247-248.

56) Parker, *Calvin's Doctrine*, p. 7.

57) T. H. L. Parker, *Calvin : An Introduction to His Thought* (Louisville, Kentucky : Westminster/John Knox Press, 1995), p. 8.

58) Richard C. Gamble, "Current Trends in Calvin Research, 1982-90," *Calvinus Sacrae Scripturae Professor*, ed. Wilhelm H. Neuser. (Grand Rapids, Michigan : William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994), p. 106.

afterwards as the Redeemer in the face of Christ : hence arises a twofold knowledge of him : of which the former is now to be considered, and the other will follow in its order.⁵⁵⁹

However, Milner objects to the opinion that the final edition of the *Institutes* was written according to the *duplex cognitio Domini*. Milner says in the above-mentioned book.

Now I would like to suggest that it is not the *duplex cognitio Domini* which underlies the final organization of the *Institutes*, but Calvin's conception of order as that is structured in the correlation of the Spirit and the Word. Thus, Book I describes the original order of creation, *i.e.*, the doctrines of God and man apart from sin; Book II. i - v the disruption of that order in the fall ; and books II. vi-IV the restoration of order, *i.e.*, the Word (Book II) brought to us by the Spirit (Book III) through the external means (Book IV).⁵⁶⁰

In this interpretation, the church as an institution for the restoration of order stands in the center : "... this understanding . . . confirms . . . the centrality of Calvin's doctrine of the church for his theology as a whole ; since the church is the restoration of order in the world, not only Book IV, but Book II. vi-IV must be understood as its exposition, with Book I (the conception of order), and Book II. i - v (the disruption of order), serving as its presupposition."⁵⁶¹ However, in this thesis, God who is creating even now is overlooked, and only God who is redeeming is emphasized. In the thought of Calvin, since creation includes preservation, creation is not simply a

59) *Ist.* 1.2.1, OS 3:34.21-25. "Quia ergo Dominus primum simpliciter creator tam in mundi opificio, quam in generali Scripturae doctrina, deinde in Christi facie redemptor apparet : hinc duplex emergit eius cognitio : quarum nunc prior tractanda est, altera deinde suo ordine sequetur."

60) Milner, *Calvin* 5, p. 193.

61) *Ibid.*, pp. 193-194.

past event. Calvin himself says, "Moreover, to make God a momentary Creator, who once for all finished his work, would be cold and barren; and we must differ from profane men especially in that we see the presence of divine power shining not less in the perpetual state of the world than in its first creation."⁶² In short, for Calvin God not only redeems us through the church, but also continues to create in the world. Therefore, the linear scheme of Milner's interpretation, the creation of order, followed by the disruption of order, followed in turn by the restoration of order, does not correspond to Calvin's scheme.

On the other hand, E. David Willis suggests the possibility of another interpretation, though he does not reject the *duplex cognitio* scheme.

...: there is "De Cognitione Dei Creatoris" and "De Cognitione Dei Redemptoris," but no "De Cognitione Spiritus Sancti." Even if it be decided that the *duplex cognitio* scheme and not the three articles of the Creed provides the primary instrument for structuring the final edition of the *Institutes*, still the subject of books III and IV is generally the work of the Holy Spirit, as the subject of Book I is generally God the Creator and of Book II generally the Redeemer.⁶³

Willis rightly recognizes that Calvin's *duplex cognitio Dei* is not *creatoris et Christi* but *creatoris et redemptoris*.⁶⁴ This is so "because for Calvin Christ is not only the redemptive Word of God but also the creative Word of God."⁶⁵ Since Christ also participates in creation

that is to say, since Christ is also creator, Willis rightly says that the two facets of our knowledge of God are not *creatoris et Christi* but *creatoris et redemptoris*. Unfortunately, however, Willis does not see that the knowledge of God the Father is included in "De Cognitione Dei Redemptoris," just as the knowledge of Christ is included in "De Cognitione Dei Creatoris," because he does not realize that Book II of the *Institutes* is "De Cognitione Dei Redemptoris," not "De Cognitione Christi." Moreover, even though Willis rightly says that "for Calvin Christ is not only the redemptive Word of God but also the creative Word of God, just as the Spirit is not only regenerative but also creative,"⁶⁶ he needs "De Cognitione Spiritus Sancti," because he does not comprehend that the knowledge of God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit is included in both "De Cognitione Dei Creatoris" and "De Cognitione Dei Redemptoris."

In short, for Calvin God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, that is, the trine God, is included in "De Cognitione Dei Creatoris." As Well, God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, that is, the trine God, is included in "De Cognitione Dei Redemptoris." In other words, Book I of the *Institutes* deals with the trine God as Creator, and Books II-IV deal with the trine God as Redeemer. That is to say, the subject of the *Institutes* is the work of the creation and redemption of the trine God. And we may say that the subject of Calvin's theology is the work of the creation and redemption of the trine God, because the *Institutes* is the most comprehensive and systematic work of Calvin.

Meanwhile, Partee divided the *Institutes* into two parts on the basis of his viewpoint that Calvin's central dogma is union with Christ.

62) *Inst.* I.16.1, *OS* 3:187.10-14. "Porro Deum facere momentaneum creatorem, qui semel duntaxat opus suum absolvit, frigidum esset ac ieiunum. Atque in hoc praecipue nos a profanis hominibus differre convenit, ut non minus in perpetuo mundi statu quam prima eius origine praesentia divinae virtutis nobis illuceat."

63) E. David Willis, *Calvin's Catholic Christology* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966), p. 123.

64) *Ibid.*, p. 121.

65) *Ibid.*

66) *Ibid.*

- A. God for us
 - I. As Creator (Book I)
 - a. His creation
 - b. His providence
 - II. As Redeemer (Book II)
 - a. The revelation
 - b. The natures and person
 - c. The offices
- B. God in us
 - I. As Individuals (Book III)
 - a. Faith
 - 1. Regeneration
 - 2. Justification
 - b. Election
 - II. As a Community (Book IV)
 - a. The ministry
 - b. The sacraments
 - c. The state⁶⁷⁾

However, the division of Partee cannot be tenable, because, as he himself says, "It cannot be demonstrated, and should not be asserted, that Calvin consciously organized the four books in an objective (God for us) / subjective (God in us) fashion."⁶⁸⁾

3.

If the subject of Calvin's theology is the work of the creation and redemption of the triune God, what, then, is the relation between the creation of the triune God and the redemption of the triune God? In this connection, we must deal with the thesis of Hermann Bauke.

67) Partee, "Calvin's," p. 195.
68) Ibid.

According to Bauke, the distinguishing features of Calvin's theology are "the formal-dialectical rationalism"⁶⁹⁾ and "the *complexio oppositorum*"⁷⁰⁾ on the basis of "the biblicism."⁷¹⁾ And so Bauke regards Calvin as "a dialectician rather than a systematizer, or at best a dialectic systematizer."⁷²⁾ "The single fundamental elements of dogmatic stand side by side and are bound together dialectically, not deductively deduced from one or two fundamental principles."⁷³⁾

While Bauke argues that Calvin was not a systematic theologian who deductively deduced his theology from one or two fundamental principles, Niesel attempts to find the one fundamental principle and he insists that this fundamental principle is Christ, as we have noted. On the contrary, Dowe argues that the relation of the knowledge of God the Creator to the knowledge of God the Redeemer remains a dialectic one.⁷⁴⁾ On the other hand, Karl Barth says, "It is true that, according to Calvin, the knowledge of God in Christ includes a real knowledge of the true God in creation. Includes! This means that it does not, as Brunner seems to think, bring forth a second, relatively independent kind of knowledge, so that the circle would become an ellipsis[el] after all. . . ."⁷⁵⁾ On the contrary, according to Emile Doumergue, the method and system of Calvin is a contradiction,⁷⁶⁾ and "the thought of Calvin is an ellipse with two foci."⁷⁷⁾ Also, whereas

69) Hermann Bauke, *Die Probleme der Theologie Calvins* (Leipzig : Verlag der J. C. Hinrichs'schen Buchhandlung, 1922), p. 13.

70) Ibid., p. 16

71) Ibid., p. 19.

72) Ibid., p. 16.

73) Ibid., p. 32.

74) Dowe, *Knowledge*, p. 238.

75) Karl Barth, "No! Answer to Emil Brunner," *Natural Theology*, trans. Peter Fraenkel (London : The Centenary Press, 1946), pp. 108-109.

76) Emile Doumergue, *Le Caractère de Calvin* (Neuilly : La Cause, 1931), p. 76.

77) Emile Doumergue, *Jean Calvin : Les hommes et les choses de son temps* (7 vols. : Lausanne : Georges Bridel & Co' Éditeurs, 1899-1927), 4:279.

Raymond K. Anderson says, "we have found relatively little support in the present study for the common caricature of his work as an eclectic or dialectic combination of diverse principles,"⁷⁸ Alexandre Ganoczy speaks of "the dialectical structure of the thought of Calvin."⁷⁹

Is the thought form of Calvin an ellipse (according to Doumengeue), or not (according to Barth)? Is it dialectic (according to Dowey), or deductive (according to Niesel)? In this connection, we do well to consider the so-called *extra Calvinisticum*. *Extra Calvinisticum* is the doctrine that the Eternal Son of God, even after the Incarnation, was united to the human nature to form one Person but was not restricted to the flesh.⁸⁰ The doctrine received its name when Lutheran theologians, upon hearing the Calvinists insist that the Son's existence also beyond the flesh of Jesus Christ (*etiam extra carnem*) was being threatened by the Lutheran version of the *communicatio idiomatum*, labelled the Reformed contention "that Calvinistic 'beyond'" (*illud extra Calvinisticum*).⁸¹ Calvin says, "Marvelously, the Son of God descended from heaven in such a way that he did not leave heaven: marvelously, he willed to be born in the Virgin's womb, to live on the earth, and to hang upon the cross, and yet always filled the world as from the beginning."⁸² Even though Niesel says, "It might be objected that it is false to regard the *extra Calvinisticum* as the most

78) Raymond K. Anderson, *Love and Order: The Life-Structuring Dynamics of Grace and Virtue in Calvin's Ethical Thought* (Chambersburg: Wilson College, 1973), p. 395.

79) Alexandre Ganoczy, *Calvin: Théologien de l'église et du ministère* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1964), p. 59.

80) Cf. Willis, *Calvin's*, p. 1.

81) Cf. *Ibid.*

82) *Instr.* 2.13.4, OS 3:458.9-13. "Mirabiliter enim e caelo descendit Filius Dei, ut caelum tamen non relinquere: mirabiliter in utero Virginis gestari, in terris versari, et in cruce pendere voluit, ut semper mundum impletet, sicut ab initio."

essential feature of Calvinistic Christology,"⁸³ the *extra Calvinisticum* is very important in Calvin's theology, as Heiko A. Oberman points out.⁸⁴

The thought form of Calvin in the so-called *extra Calvinisticum* is neither an ellipse with two foci nor a circle with one center, but two concentric circles in which two different objects are related as core and shell. What, then, is the structure of Calvin's theology? The subject of Calvin's theology is the work of the creation and redemption of the triune God, and the relation between the creation of the triune God and the redemption of the triune God is a relation of concentric circles, that is, a relation of core and shell. In other words, the creation of the triune God is peripheral, and the redemption of the triune God is central.

In the meantime, according to B. G. Armstrong the structure of Calvin's thought is a hypothetical structure. "[T]he whole general tenor and structure of Calvin's theology is built around a hypothetical or conditional base."⁸⁵ Armstrong argues "that Calvin lived intimately in the two worlds of Renaissance and Reformation, and that he never was able to resolve the conflict of fundamentally different ideologies, and that his theology was accommodated to conflicting ideologies in such a way that there will always be two poles, two aspects, two dialectical and conflicting elements in each theological topic which he discusses."⁸⁶ Also he said, "The

83) Niesel, *Theology*, p. 119.

84) Heiko A. Oberman, "The 'Extra' Dimension in the Theology of Calvin," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 21 (1970):43ff.

85) B. G. Armstrong, "The Nature and Structure of Calvin's Thought According to the Institutes: Another Look," *John Calvin's Institutes His Opus Magnum* (Potchefstroom: Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education, 1986), pp. 64-65.

86) *Ibid.*, p. 56.

hypothetical and actual, the ideal and the real, structure which characterizes Calvin's theology is nowhere more clearly seen than in the discussion of the doctrine of Justification by Faith and its relationship to the doctrine of Sanctification."⁸⁷ Armstrong's argument that Calvin lived in the two worlds of Renaissance and Reformation, and accommodated to conflicting ideologies in such a way that there will always be two poles in each theological topic which he discusses seems to be partly right. However, Armstrong failed to grasp the fact that Calvin did not the same value on Renaissance and Reformation but put a great (central) value on Reformation and a little (peripheral) value on Renaissance.

According to William J. Bouwsma, two Calvins coexist uncomfortably within the same historical personage. "One of these Calvins was a philosopher, a rationalist and a schoolman in the high Scholastic tradition represented by Thomas Aquinas, a man of fixed principles, and a conservative."⁸⁸ "The other Calvin was a rhetorician and humanist, a skeptical fideist in the manner of the followers of William of Ockham, flexible to the point of opportunism, and a revolutionary in spite of himself."⁸⁹ Bouwsma's argument that there are two Calvins within the historical Calvin seems to be right. However, the two Calvins are not "philosophical Calvin" and "humanistic Calvin" but Calvin the Reformer and Calvin the humanist. Bouwsma overestimated Calvin's humanism. In fact, Calvin the Reformer is in the center, and Calvin the humanist is in the periphery.

87) *Ibid.*, p. 74.

88) William J. Bouwsma, *John Calvin: A Sixteenth Century Portrait* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), p. 230.

89) *Ibid.*, p. 231.

4.

As stated above, the subject of Calvin's theology is the creation and redemption of the triune God, and these two works of God are in a relation of shell and core, or a relation of the peripheral and the central. Now let us consider the doctrines of the later Calvin's theology in this standpoint.

First of all, according to Calvin God is the Creator and Redeemer. As stated above, Calvin's statement of the twofold knowledge of the Lord can be found in many places of the *Institutes*. And the titles of the Book I and Book II of the *Institutes* show clearly the twofold knowledge of the Lord. The fact that the knowledge of the Redeemer is central and the knowledge of the Creator is peripheral in Calvin's theology comes out in his concern and the spaces which he allowed in the *Institutes*. Dowsy rightly says, "Calvin's thought has a soteriological center which dominates all his theology."⁹⁰ Also as stated above, there is a distinction between 'Christ in the flesh' and 'Christ who is also beyond the flesh' in Calvin's theology. In this distinction, 'Christ in the flesh' is central and 'Christ who is also beyond the flesh' is peripheral. Because Calvin's theology has a soteriological center, the Crucifixion and Resurrection of Jesus Christ must be central. Also according to Calvin there are two kinds of the Grace of the Holy Spirit, that is to say, Special Grace and General or Common Grace. Calvin says about "the general grace of God"⁹¹ as follows.

90) Edward A. Dowsy, Jr., "The Structure of Calvin's Theological Thought as Influenced by the Two-fold Knowledge of God," *Calvinus Ecclesiae Genevensis Custos*, ed. Wilhelm H. Neuser (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Peter Lang, 1984), p. 137.

91) *Inst.* 2.2.17, OS 3:259.33. "generalem Dei gratiam."

If we regard the Spirit of God as the sole fountain of truth, we shall neither reject the truth itself, nor despise it wherever it shall appear, unless we wish to dishonor the Spirit of God. . . . Shall we deny that the truth shone upon the ancient jurists who established civic order and discipline with such great equity? Shall we say that the philosophers were blind in their fine observation and artful description of nature? . . . No, we cannot read the writings of the ancients on these subjects without great admiration. . . . But shall we count anything praiseworthy or noble without recognizing at the same time that it comes from God?⁹²⁾

If one observes these passages, Calvin seems to be a humanist as Erasmus. However, if one observes the *Institutes* as a whole, one can find that Calvin rejected the viewpoint of Erasmus about man and his free will.

One can find in many doctrines of Calvin's theology his thought form which distinguishes the central from the peripheral. Now we are going to consider some of them. First of all, we are about to consider the problem of natural revelation. The problem of natural theology in Calvin is one of hot issues in Calvin scholarship. According to Calvin, from nature we know the hands and feet of God, though through Christ we know not only God's heart, but also God's hands and feet. Calvin says :

There, in short, the invisible kingdom of Christ occupies with all things and his spiritual grace is diffused through all. Yet this does not prevent us from applying our senses to the consideration of heaven and earth, that we may thence seek confirmation in the true knowledge of God. For Christ is that image in which God presents to our view, not only his heart,

92) *Inst.* 2.2.15, OS 3:258,14-30. "Si unicum veritatis fontem, Dei Spiritum esse reputamus, veritatem ipsam neque respuemus, neque contemnemus, ubicunde apparebit : nisi velimus in Spiritum Dei contumeliosi esse : . . . Veritatem affulsisse antiquis iureconsultis negabimus, qui tanta aequitate civilem ordinem et disciplinam prodiderunt? Philosophos caecutisse dicemus cum in exquisita ista naturae contemplatione, tum artificiosa descriptione? . . . Imo ne sine ingenti quidem admiratione, veterum scripta legere de his rebus poterimus : . . . Porro laudabilene aliquid aut praeclearum censebimus, quod non recognoscamus a Deo provenire?"

but also his hands and his feet. I give the name of his heart to that secret love with which he embraces us in Christ : by his hands and feet I understand those works of his which are displayed before our eyes.⁹³⁾

According to these sentences, the knowledge of God from nature is peripheral, and the knowledge of God from Christ is central.

Secondly, we are about to consider the problem of *indicia*. Warfield says, "we find the surest indication that he thought of the *indicia* as co-working with the testimony of the Spirit to this result."⁹⁴⁾ Of course, Calvin thought of the *indicia* as co-working with the testimony of the Spirit, but the *indicia* are peripheral, and the testimony of the Spirit is central. Calvin says, "Unless this certainty, higher and stronger than any human judgment, be present, it will be vain to fortify the authority of Scripture by arguments, to establish it by common agreement of the Church, or to confirm it with other helps."⁹⁵⁾ Also Calvin says, "Scripture will ultimately suffice for a saving knowledge of God only when its certainty is founded upon the inward persuasion of the Holy Spirit. Indeed, these human testimonies which exist to confirm it will not be vain if, as secondary aids to our feebleness, they follow that chief and highest testimony."⁹⁶⁾ In short,

93) *CO* 23:9-12. "Denique illic invisible Christi regnum omnia occupat, et spiritualis eius gratia per omnia diffusa est. Verum hoc non obstat quominus sensus nostros ad coeli terraeque considerationem applicantes, inde etiam petamus quae nos in vera Dei notitia confirmant. Christus enim imago est, in qua non modo pectus suum nobis Deus conspicuum reddit, sed manus quoque et pedes. Pectus appello arcannum illum amorem quo nos in Christo complexus est : per manus autem et pedes, quae oculis nostris exposita sunt opera intellego."

94) Warfield, *Calvin*, p. 89.

95) *Inst.* 1.7.1, OS 3:71.39-72.2. "Haec nisi certitudo adsit quolibet humano iudicio et superior et validior, frustra Scripturae auctoritas vel argumentis munietur, vel Ecclesiae consensu stabilietur, vel alitis praesidis confirmabitur : . . ."

96) *Inst.* 1.7.13, OS 3:81:22-28. "Quare tum vere deum ad salvificam Dei cognitionem Scriptura satisfacet, ubi interiori Spiritus sancti persuasione fundata fuerit eius certitudo. Quae vero ad eam confirmandam humana extant testimonia, sic inania non erunt, si praecipuum illud et summum, velut secundaria nostrae imbecillitatis adminicula, subsequantur."

the inward persuasion of the Holy Spirit is central, *indicia*, human testimonies, are peripheral.

Thirdly, let us consider the problem of the inspiration and inerrancy of the Scripture. Warfield says, "In point of fact, Calvin not only asserts the freedom of Scripture as given by God from all error, but never in his detailed dealing with Scripture allows that such errors exist in it."⁹⁷ However, Calvin found some errors in the Scriptures. Calvin says, in the commentary on Matthew 27:9, "How the name of Jeremiah crept in I cannot confess to know nor do I make much of it: obviously Jeremiah's name is put in error for Zechariah (13:7)."⁹⁸

In short, according to Calvin one can find some errors in travail problems in the Scriptures, but one cannot find any error in the doctrine, that is to say, the central. Calvin says, "For we must always distinguish, when we speak of the prophets and the apostles, between the truth, which was pure, free from every imperfection, and their own persons, as they commonly say, or themselves. . . . Yet his doctrine was absolutely free from every defect. . . ." ⁹⁹

Fourthly, Calvin distinguishes between the central doctrines and the peripheral doctrines. Calvin says :

For not all the articles of true doctrine are of the same sort. Some are so necessary to know that they should be certain and unquestioned by all men as the proper principles of religion. . . . Among the churches there are other articles of doctrine disputed which still do not break the unity of faith. . . . Does this not sufficiently indicate that a difference of opinion

97) Warfield, *Calvin*, p. 65.

98) *Comm. Mat.* 27:9, *CO* 45:749, "Quomodo Ieremiae nomen obrepserit, me nescire factor, nec anxie laboro : certe Ieremiae nomen errore positum esse pro Zacharia (13, 7). . . ."

99) *Comm. Jer.* 15:18, *CO* 38:231, "Nam semper distinguere oportet, quum agitur de prophetis et apostolis, inter ipsam doctrinam, quae pura fuit ab omni sorte, et inter ipsorum personas, ut vulgo loquuntur, hoc est inter ipsos. . . . interea doctrina prorsus caruit omni naevo : . . ."

over those nonessential matters should in no wise be the basis of schism among Christians?¹⁰⁰

In short, in the Christian doctrines, there are essential doctrines and nonessential doctrines.

Fifthly, let us consider his doctrine of the church. Calvin distinguishes between invisible church and visible church. Invisible church which consists of the elect is a small invisible church in the visible church [*ecclesiola in ecclesia*]. In the visible church "are mingled many hypocrites who have nothing of Christ but the name and outward appearance."¹⁰¹

Sixthly, as stated above, the later Calvin distinguishes outer call and inner call. Calvin says, "I am speaking of the outward and solemn call which has to do with the public order of the church. I pass over that secret call, of which each minister is conscious before God, and which does not have the church as witness."¹⁰² Also Calvin says, "But two things are required in anyone who would be heard in the church and occupy the position of a teacher, he must be called by God to that office, and be faithful in carrying out its duties."¹⁰³ The inner call is central, and the outer call is peripheral.

Seventhly we are about to consider the doctrine of the sacraments. According to Calvin, the sacrament is "an outward sign by which the

100) *Instr.* 4.1.12, *OS* 5:16:6-21, "Non enim unius sunt formae omnia verae doctrinae capita. Sunt quaedam ita necessaria cognita, ut fixa esse et indubitata omnibus oporteat, ceu propria religionis placita : . . . Sunt alia, quae inter Ecclesias controversa, fidei tamen unitatem non dirimant. . . . Annon satis indicat, dissensionem de rebus istis non ita necessariis, dissidii materiam esse non debere inter Christianos?"

101) *Instr.* 4.1.7, *OS* 5:12:19-21, "In hac autem plurimi sunt permixti hypocritae, qui nihil Christi habent praeter titulum et speciem : . . ."

102) *Instr.* 4.3.11, *OS* 5:52:21-24.

103) *Comm. I Cor.* 1:1, *CO* 49:303, "Duo autem requiruntur, ut quis in ecclesia audiat docendique locum habeat. Nam vocatum esse a Deo oportet ad id munus, et in eo exsequendo bona fide versari."

Lord seals on our consciences the promises of his good will toward us." ¹⁰⁴⁾ And "I say that Christ is the matter or (if you prefer) the substance of all the sacraments; for in him they have all their firmness, and they do not promise anything apart from him." ¹⁰⁵⁾ What, then, the relation between the outward sign and the substance of the sacraments? Calvin says, "Hence that distinction (if it be duly understood), often noted by the same Augustine, between a sacrament and the matter of the sacrament. For the distinction signifies not only that the figure and the truth are contained in the sacrament, but that they are not so linked that they cannot be separated; and that even in the union itself the matter must always be distinguished from the sign, that we may not transfer to the one what belongs to the other." ¹⁰⁶⁾ Therefore, Calvin criticizes Roman Catholics: "that false doctrine is removed by which the cause of justification and the power of the Holy Spirit are enclosed in element, just as in vessels of vehicles." ¹⁰⁷⁾ On the other hand, Calvin criticized Protestant radicals, "Fanatical men (like Schvincfeldius) pervert this testimony ridiculously by wanting to take away from sacraments all their power and effect." ¹⁰⁸⁾ In the sacraments, outward sign is peripheral, and the substance is

104) *Iust.* 4.14.1, *OS* 5:259.3-5. "... externum esse symbolum, quo benevolentiae erga nos suae promissiones conscientibus nostris Dominus obsignat,"

105) *Iust.* 4.14.16, *OS* 5:273.15-17. "Christum Sacramentorum omnium materiam, vel (si mavis) substantiam esse dico: quando in ipso totam habent suam soliditatem, nec quicquam extra ipsum promittunt;"

106) *Iust.* 4.14.15, *OS* 5:272.15-20. "Hinc illa, si rite intelligatur, inter Sacramentum et rem sacramenti ab eodem Augustino saepius notata distinctio, neque enim significat dumtaxat figuram et veritatem illic contineri, sed non ita cohaerere quin separari queant: ac in ipsa etiam coniunctione oportere semper discerni rem a signo, ne ad alterum transferamus quod alterius est."

107) *Iust.* 4.14.17, *OS* 5:275.23-25. "Interim illud tollitur figmentum quo justificationis causa virtusque Spiritus sancti elementis ceu vasculis ac plausuris includitur:"

108) *Comm. I Per.* 3:21, *CO* 55:268. "Caeterum hoc testimonium perperam detorqueant fanatici homines (ut Schvincfeldius) dum sacramentis omnem vim et effectum detrabere volent."

central.

Lastly, let us consider Calvin's political thought. According to Chenevière, "Calvin... was a determined adversary of modern democracy, that is to say, of the political doctrine which makes the people the only possible and legitimate holder of power and sovereignty." ¹⁰⁹⁾ On the other hand, according to Hudson, "The thought of Calvin provided the potential basis for the elaboration of democratic ideas. Not only did he provide a basis for resistance to the exercise of arbitrary power, but his thought did not preclude the formulation of a definitively democratic philosophy of government." ¹¹⁰⁾ As stated above, Calvin says, "I will not deny that aristocracy, or a system composed of aristocracy and democracy, far excells all others." ¹¹¹⁾ Also Calvin says, "Lord confirmed it by his authority when he ordained among the Israelites an aristocracy bordering on democracy, since he willed to keep them in best condition" ¹¹²⁾ As McNeill says, "his notion of 'aristocracy tempered by democracy' approaches our conception of representative democracy." ¹¹³⁾ In other words, Calvin advocates the form of political government by the best men among the people. The people are the outer circle, and the best men the inner circle.

109) Marc-Edouard Chenevière, *La Pensée politique de Calvin* (Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1970), p. 10, n. 4.

110) Winthrop S. Hudson, "Democratic Freedom and Religious Faith in the Reformed Tradition," *Church History*, 15 (1946):179.

111) *Iust.* 4.20.8, *OS* 5:478.23-24.

112) *Iust.* 4.20.8, *OS* 5:479. 3-6. "... tum sua quoque autoritate Dominus confirmavit quum aristocratiam politiae vicinam apud Israelitas instituit, quum optima conditione eos habere vellet,"

113) John T. McNeill, "The Democratic Element in Calvin's Thought," *Church History*, 18 (1949):169.