

After Merit

John Calvin's Theology of Works
and Rewards



Academic Studies

34

Charles Raith II, After Merit

V&R Academic

Refo500 Academic Studies

Edited by
Herman J. Selderhuis

In Co-operation with
Günter Frank (Bretten), Bruce Gordon, (New Haven),
Mathijs Lamberigts (Leuven), Barbara Mahlmann-Bauer (Bern),
Tarald Rasmussen (Oslo), Johannes Schilling (Kiel),
Zsombor Tóth (Budapest), Günther Wassilowsky (Linz),
Siegfried Westphal (Osnabrück), David M. Whitford (Waco)

Volume 34

Charles Raith II

After Merit

John Calvin's Theology of Works and Rewards

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data available online: <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

ISSN 2198-3089
ISBN 978-3-525-55248-3

You can find alternative editions of this book and additional material on our Website: www.v-r.de

© 2016, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Theaterstraße 13, D-37073 Göttingen/
Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht LLC, Bristol, CT, U.S.A.
www.v-r.de

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or utilized in any form
or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information
storage and retrieval system, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Printed in Germany.

Typesetting by Konrad Triltsch GmbH, Ochsenfurt

Printed and bound by Hubert & Co GmbH & Co. KG, Robert-Bosch-Breite 6, D-37079 Göttingen

Printed on aging-resistant paper.

Contents

Preface	7
Abbreviations	9
Journals	9
Compilations	9
Works of Calvin	10
Other Works	11
Introduction	13
1. Calvin’s Theology as a Soteriological Alternative to Merit	16
1.1 Calvin’s Unique Position on Merit, Works, and Reward	17
1.2 The Centrality of Calvin’s Polemic against Merit	22
1.2.1 Calvin’s Commentary on Romans	25
1.2.2 The Institutes of the Christian Religion	30
2. Plan for the Work	32
Chapter 1: The Lineaments of the Medieval Development of Merit	37
1. Thomas Aquinas	40
2. John Duns Scotus	48
3. William of Ockham	55
4. Gabriel Biel	61
5. Conclusion	65
Chapter 2: Calvin’s Opponents (as Calvin Understood Them)	67
1. An Issue of Competitive Causality	69
2. An Issue of Justification	74
3. An Issue of Meriting Perseverance	82
4. An Issue of “Worth” and “Due”	83
5. Conclusion	87

Chapter 3: Justification <i>sola Dei misericordia</i> : Creating Space for a Proper Understanding of Works and Reward	91
1. The Effects of Adam’s Fall: Total Spiritual Incapacity	92
2. Clarification of Calvin’s Criticism of “Free Will”	98
3. Double Predestination Contextualized	100
4. The Role of Prevenient Grace	104
5. Conclusion: The Extrinsicism of Justification	106
Chapter 4: The Christian Life and Struggle in the Spirit	109
1. Noncompetitive Causality and Participation	111
2. Partial Sanctification and the Divided Christian	115
3. The Nature-Grace Distinction	119
4. The Nature of Perfection	121
5. The Damnworthiness of Concupiscence	125
6. Rejecting the Venial-Mortal Sin Distinction	129
7. Conclusion	130
Chapter 5: God’s Will to Reward	133
1. The Foundation of Faith in Receiving Rewards	134
2. The Worthless Worth of Works	137
3. God’s <i>acceptatio</i> of Damnworthy Works	141
4. The Liberality of Rewards	144
5. Conclusion	146
Chapter 6: The Content of Rewards	149
1. The Purpose of Rewards and God’s Accommodation	150
2. Grace for Grace	152
3. Eternal Life Both Is and Is Not Obtained through Works	157
4. Degrees of Heaven	169
5. Conclusion	172
Chapter 7: Conclusion – Retrieving Calvin’s Doctrine of Reward for Works	175
Bibliography of Modern Works	181

Preface

The focus of this study is John Calvin's theology of works and reward, and the approach is to contextualize his thought in light of both medieval theological developments surrounding the doctrine of "merit" and his polemics against the doctrine as he understood it in his day. But this study also strives for something much more. The book, by analyzing this particular part of Calvin's thought—his doctrine of works and reward—illuminates the whole in fresh ways. It provides a framework for reading and interpreting Calvin's theology that strives to do justice to the reformational context in which it developed. It is able to do so because Calvin's polemic against the merit-based soteriology of his "opponents" drives the vast majority of Calvin's positive theological constructions (as we shall see). So while the book is not a full-on reinterpretation of Calvin, by emphasizing the centrality of this doctrine in Calvin's historical and polemical context, it does reorganize the constellation of the rest of his teaching somewhat, allowing the various elements of his theology to fall more naturally into place and thus highlighting the function other various doctrines do—and don't—fulfill. Without this proper framework, misinterpretations of Calvin on topics like predestination, free choice, sin, justification, sanctification, works, and eternal life—all topics related to merit—will necessarily result. We have certainly witnessed many readings of Calvin in which these topics have been extracted from the medieval developments in Calvin's past and the polemics in his present, with disastrous results. Given the 500th anniversary of the Reformation era on the horizon, a volume committed to reading texts from within this reformational context seems most fitting.

More thanks are due for this volume than space allows. Herman Selderhuis deserves special thanks for encouraging me to write this book and for being a guiding light in my understanding of Calvin. Ward Holder and Jordan Ballor graciously organized conference sessions that gave me the opportunity to present some of the material found in this volume; thank you also to the *Sixteenth Century Society*, *RefoRC*, and *ASCH* for facilitating those conferences and for those who participated in the sessions and offered helpful feedback. Thanks are

due to *Pro Ecclesia* for publishing two articles that form the substance of chapter 2: “Calvin’s Critique of Merit, and Why Aquinas (Mostly) Agrees,” *Pro Ecclesia* XX (2011): 135–66, and “Aquinas and Calvin on Merit, Part II: Condignity and Participation,” *Pro Ecclesia* XXI (2012): 195–210. I am also grateful to John Brown University for awarding me the J. Vernon McGee Chair of Biblical and Theological Studies to facilitate the completion of this volume. Special thanks are due to Jeff Reimer for his painstaking editorial work—it is a rare gift to find someone who so ably combines editorial proficiency with theological acumen.

I dedicate this book to my son, Zeb, who was born in the final stages of its composition, and to my other children, Charles, Paul and Elizabeth. As my wife and I are keenly aware, a good theology of works and reward becomes quite practical whilst in the throes of parenthood.

Ash Wednesday, 2016

Charles Raith II

Abbreviations

Journals

ACPQ	<i>American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly</i>
ATI	<i>American Theological Inquiry</i>
ARG	<i>Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte</i>
CTJ	<i>Calvin Theological Journal</i>
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
IJST	<i>International Journal of Systematic Theology</i>
JEMC	<i>Journal of Early Modern Christianity</i>
JETS	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
JHP	<i>Journal of the History of Philosophy</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
MAJT	<i>Mid-America Journal of Theology</i>
PE	<i>Pro Ecclesia</i>
RR	<i>Reformation & Renaissance Review</i>
RHE	<i>Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique</i>
SJT	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
SCJ	<i>The Sixteenth Century Journal</i>
WTJ	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
ZD	<i>Zeitschrift für Dialektische Theologie</i>
ZK	<i>Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte</i>

Compilations

CHI	<i>Calvin and His Influence, 1509–2009</i> . Edited by Irene Backus and Philip Benedict. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011
CCJC	<i>Cambridge Companion to John Calvin</i> . Edited by Donald K. McKim. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004

- CCO *Cambridge Companion to Ockham*. Edited by Paul Vincent Spade. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999
- CSEMP *Church and School in Early Modern Protestantism: Studies in Honor of Richard A. Muller on the Maturation of a Theological Tradition*. Edited by Jordan J. Ballor, David S. Sytsma, and Jason Zuidema. Leiden: Brill, 2013
- DS *Enchiridion Symbolorum: Definitionum et Declarationum de Rebus Fidei et morum*. Edited by H.J. Denzinger and A. Schönmetzer (Barcinone: Herder, 1965
- JCET *John Calvin and Evangelical Theology: Legacy and Prospect*. Edited by Sung Wook Chung. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2009
- NPNF¹ A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. Series 1. 14 vols. Edited by Philip Schaff et al. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature, 1887–1894. Several reprints; also accessible online at www.ccel.org
- PL *Patrologia Latina [= Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Latina]*. Edited by Jacques-Paul Migne. 217 vols. Paris, 1844–1864

Works of Calvin

- Antidotes Paris* *Articles by the Theological Faculty of Paris, with Antidotes*. In *Tracts Relating to the Reformation*. Translated by Henry Beveridge. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1844
- Antidotes Trent* *Acts of the Synod of Trent, with Antidotes*. In *Tracts Relating to the Reformation*. Translated by Henry Beveridge. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1844
- BLW *The Bondage and Liberation of the Will: A Defense of the Orthodox Doctrine of Human Choice against Phighius*. Translated by Graham I. Davies. Edited by A.N.S. Lane. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996. This work is cited by chapter and paragraph number, with page number following in parentheses.
- CO *Corpus Reformatorum: Ioannis Calvini Opera quae supersunt omnia*. Edited by W. Baum et al. Brunswick: C.A. Schwetschke & Filium, 1863–1900
- Com.* *Commentarius super*. Contained in CO, unless otherwise noted
- Com. Rom.* *Commentarius in Epistolorum Pauli ad Romanos*. Edited by T.H.L. Parker. Leiden: Brill, 1981
- CTS Calvin Translation Society. *Calvin's Commentaries*. 22 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1989.

<i>Inst.</i>	<i>Institutes of the Christian Religion</i> . Translated by Henry Beveridge. 1845. Reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2008
<i>Interim</i>	<i>The True Method for Giving Peace to Christendom and Reforming the Church</i> . In <i>Tracts Relating to the Reformation</i> . Translated by Henry Beveridge. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1844
OS	P. Barth <i>et al.</i> (eds), <i>Johannis Calvini Opera Selecta</i> . Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1926–68
<i>Reform</i>	<i>The Necessity of Reforming the Church</i> . In <i>Tracts Relating to the Reformation</i> . Translated by Henry Beveridge. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1844

Other Works

Gabriel Biel

Sent. (B) Gabriel Biel. *Collectorium circa quattuor libros Sententiarum*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1973–1984

Martin Bucer

Ep. ad Eph. *Epistola D. Pauli ad Ephesios*. ... 1527

Ep. ad Rom. *Metaphrasis et Enarrationes Perpetuae ... in Epistolam ad Romanos*. ... 1536

Erasmus

CWE *Collected Works of Erasmus*. Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1974–

Martin Luther

WA *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe*. Edited by K. Drescher et al. Weimar: Verlag Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger, 1883–

Philip Melancthon

Apology *Apology for the Augsburg Confession (1530)*. In *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*. Edited by Robert Kolb and Timothy J. Wengert. Translated by Charles Arand et al. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000

C. Rom. Philipp Melancthon. *Commentary on Romans*. Translated by Fred Kramer. St. Louis: Concordia, 1992

Duns Scotus

Lect. *Lectura**Ord.* *Ordinatio**Quod.* *Quodlibetum**Vatican* *Opera omnia studio et cura Commissionis Scotisticae ad fidem codicum edita praeside Carolo Balic.* Vols. 1–10, 16–21. Vatican: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1950–*Wadding* *Joannis Duns Scoti Doctoris Subtilis Ordinis Minorum Opera omnia.* Edited by Luke Wadding. 12 vols. Lyons, 1639*Wolter* *Duns Scotus on the Will and Morality.* Translated by Allan B. Wolter. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1986

Thomas Aquinas

S. ep. Col. *Super Epistolam B. Pauli ad Colossenses lectura.* Latin text and English translation in *Commentary on the Letters of Saint Paul to the Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and Philemon.* Edited by J. Mortensen and E. Alarcón. Translated by F.R. Larcher, OP. Lander, WY: Aquinas Institute for the Study of Sacred Doctrine, 2012*S. ep. Rom.* *Super Epistolam B. Pauli ad Romanos lectura.* Latin text and English translation in *Commentary on the Letter of Saint Paul to the Romans.* Edited by J. Mortensen and E. Alarcón. Translated by F.R. Larcher, OP. Lander, WY: Aquinas Institute for the Study of Sacred Doctrine, 2012*ScG* *Summa contra Gentiles**ST* *Summa Theologiae*

William of Ockham

Quodl. *Quodlibeta septem una cum tractatu de sacramento altaris.* Argentinae, 1491*Sent. (O)* *In libros Sententiarum.* Used for both the *Scriptum* (on book 1) and the *Reportatio* (on books 2–4). References to the *Scriptum* are to the prologue or distinction and question numbers; for the *Reportatio* to book and question. *Opera philosophica et theologica.* Edited by Geodeon Gál et al. 17 vols. St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 1967–1988

Introduction

The theologian's task is not to divert the ears with chatter
but to strengthen consciences by teaching things true, sure, and profitable.

—*Inst.* 1.14.4

Few, if any, in the sixteenth century denied the necessity of faith, the centrality of God's grace, and the work of Jesus Christ for salvation. The questions people did tend to ask, however, pertained, on the one hand, to the mediatory role of the Church in God's giving of grace, and on the other hand, how human ability and activity relates to divine activity in the appropriation of God's saving grace.¹ By the sixteenth century, God's grace was conceived in a deeply institutionalized and highly economized manner, with the sacramental structures of the Church being understood as the key mechanism for God's dispensing of his grace, and with a great deal of emphasis put on human responsibility for appropriating this grace.² As Aquinas had noted centuries before, "Faith requires that [the Christian] should seek to be justified from his sins through the power of Christ's Passion *which operates in the sacraments of the Church.*"³ The indulgence controversy sparked by

-
- 1 On the prevailing medieval options for relating God's causality to created causes—occasionalism, mere conservationism, and concurrentism—see Alfred J. Freddoso, "God's General Concurrence with Secondary Causes: Pitfalls and Prospects," *ACPQ* 68 (1994): 131–35. Even within concurrentism, which was the most widely held view among Christian theologians, debates existed as to how to relate God's *immediate* causal activity to secondary causes (like human willing) in the production of a single effect.
 - 2 Joseph Wawrykow notes that among sixteenth-century Catholic interlocutors the topic of merit was often approached primarily as a way of asserting the contribution of human beings to their own salvation, whereas it had been for someone like Thomas Aquinas a theocentric doctrine that served the proclamation of the salvific work of the Christian God; Joseph Wawrykow, "John Calvin and Condign Merit," *ARG* 83 (1992): 73–90, at 83–85; Wawrykow, *God's Grace and Human Action: "Merit" in the Theology of Thomas Aquinas* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995). On the increasing importance of the Sacrament of Penance for the high and late Middle Ages, see John Mahoney, *The Making of Moral Theology: A Study in the Roman Catholic Tradition* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 1–22.
 - 3 Aquinas, *ST* III, q. 84, a. 5, ad. 2 (emphasis added), addressing the sacrament of penance. There was, to be sure, debate among the schoolmen around how to relate the sacraments to God's giving of grace, such as that between Aquinas's more intrinsic connection and Scotus's more circumstantial connection. For medieval sacramental theology in connection with the dispensing the blessings of the covenant, see Martin Greschat, "Der Bundesgekanke in der Theologie des späten Mittelalters," *ZK* 81 (1970): 45; James Preus, *From Shadow to Promise: Old*

Martin Luther, for example, hinged on an understanding of the Church's sacramental role in dispensing grace to forgive penitential punishment due to sin.⁴ And while the Reformers raised questions pertaining to the Church's mediatory role in dispensing grace,⁵ this concern was intimately intertwined with a proper conception of human activity in the appropriation of God's grace. Simply positing a less robust role for the Church in mediating God's grace did not address the issue of how human action functioned in relation to God's action in the dispensing of grace. Again Aquinas, for example, had earlier legitimized the sacrament of penance—that is, the activity of contrition, confession and absolution, and penitential works for obtaining forgiveness of sins—as the means of obtaining grace based on Augustine's dictum, "He who created you without you will not justify you without you."⁶ The issue here is not whether faith is necessary for justification, nor whether justification is a result of Christ's grace; both of these Aquinas affirms. The issue, rather, is the role of human activity in relation to divine activity and ordination in obtaining God's grace for the forgiveness of sins.

This central issue, namely the role of human activity in appropriating God's grace brings us to one of the principle disputed topics in sixteenth-century: merit. If the Church's treasury was grace and its sacramental structures the means of dispensing it, merit was the mechanism by which a person's activity tapped into the treasury in order to obtain soteriological goods: justification, the forgiveness of sins, the grace of perseverance, and ultimately the reward of eternal beatitude.⁷ But caught in the middle of the sacramental structures, on the one side, and the meritorious activities prescribed for appropriating God's grace, on the other side, stood the late-medieval Christian, many of which had an increasing awareness both of the self as weak and sinful and of the lofty requirements that must be met to

Testament Interpretation from Augustine to the Young Luther (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969), 130–32, 162. For the Augustinian underpinnings of this view, see Steven Ozment, *The Age of Reform 1250–1550: An Intellectual and Religious History of Late Medieval and Reformation Europe* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), 22–31.

4 See John O'Malley, *Trent: What Happened at the Council* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013), for the ways that the Tridentine Fathers did and did not address the issue of indulgences.

5 With some exaggeration, de Greef states, "Reformation [for Calvin] is above all reformation of the church" (Wulfert de Greef, "Calvin's Writings," in *CCJC* 46).

6 Aquinas, *ST* III, q. 84, a. 5; see Augustine, *Sermones*, clxix, 13 (PL 38.923): *Qui ergo fecit te sine te, non te iustificat sine te*. For the reception of this phrase in the Middle Ages, see Alister McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 92–117.

7 See the description from Ozment: "The penitent, like the baptized, soon succumbed to the temptation to sin and found himself, if earnest, returning to the sacrament of penance in what became a recurring cycle of sin and absolution" (*Age of Reform*, 30).

merit one's salvation.⁸ The result was often that "people were urgently looking for the security of salvation, but in the late medieval system they could not find it."⁹ Since by the sixteenth century one acceptable view of human action, such as that of Luis de Molina, framed human free action as standing outside divine governance and direct causality,¹⁰ persons seeking salvation could imagine a God waiting on them to do their part—possibly waiting in anger on account of their sin—before he would step in and do his part to save. But one could never know if they had actually done their part; nor could they ever know if grace actually indwelt them.

The Reformers by and large felt a major source of the problems was the prevailing meritorious framework of salvation. Martin Bucer's comments in the second chapter of both his 1536 and 1562 exposition on Paul's Letter to the Romans are telling: "the principal religious disagreements in the whole world have arisen and been sustained from the fact that very few indeed have yet paid attention to the status that should be accorded to our works and why it is they have the nature of merits and earn the wages of eternal life."¹¹ The Reformers understood that addressing these problems would require a thorough rethinking of the economics of salvation.¹² Luther's denouncement of indulgence trade beginning with his Ninety-Five Theses reflects an early attempt at this rethinking—a rethinking that would shift and develop throughout the sixteenth century.¹³

8 Berndt Hamm, *Der frühe Luther. Etappen reformatorischer Neuorientierung* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 38–41.

9 Theodor Dieter, "The Early Luther and His Theological Development," *Ecclesiology* 9 (2013): 254–61, at 255. There has been considerable debate as to the extent of any "crisis" in early sixteenth-century spirituality. See Hans J. Hillerbrand, *The Division of Christendom: Christianity in the Sixteenth Century* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007), 11–25, 65–69.

10 Steve A. Long, *Natura Pura: On the Recovery of Nature in the Doctrine of Grace* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2010), 37–41; Thomas P. Flint, "Two Accounts of Providence," in *Divine and Human Action: Essays in the Metaphysics of Theism*, ed. Thomas V. Morris (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988), 156–62. The seeds of this position had been sown many years before; see the comment from Thomas Bradwardine regarding his days as a student: "In the philosophical faculty I seldom heard a reference to grace. . . . What I heard day in and day out was that we are masters of our own free acts, that ours is the choice to act well or badly" (cited in Heiko A. Oberman, *Forerunners of the Reformation: The Shape of Late Medieval Thought* [Cambridge: James Clarke, 1967], 135).

11 Cited in Brian Lugioyo, *Martin Bucer's Doctrine of Justification: Reformation Theology and Early Modern Irenicism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 39.

12 "It is the concept of merit that prompts or forces persons to reflect on themselves and their inner state of affairs instead of living the relation to the beloved (God)," (Dieter, "Early Luther," 257).

13 David Steinmetz points to Staupitz's reinterpretation of *gratia gratum faciens* not as the grace that makes us acceptable to God but rather the grace that makes God acceptable to us as forming the background of the first of Luther's theses regarding penance as a lifelong mark of the Christian (*Misericordia Dei: The Theology of Johannes von Staupitz in Its Late Medieval Setting* (Leiden: Brill, 1968), 84–85. Garcia notes that the "need" to relate Christian obedience

Luther's theses flows from his post-1515 break from any attempt to reconcile the *meritum de congruo* of the *doctores moderni* with God's unmerited mercy in the *pactum misericordiae*.¹⁴ In Brian Gerrish's words, "Luther finds himself attacking reason in characteristically Nominalist style precisely in order to destroy the other characteristic of Nominalist thought, its optimism concerning the powers of human will."¹⁵ Later, Luther's *De liberate christiana* (1520) and *De servo arbitrio* (1525) worked as a two-edged sword to carve out what the Christian did not have to do, on the one hand, and what the Christian could not do, on the other.¹⁶ Both of these served the broader purpose of reenvisioning salvation along a different set of lines than the prevailing meritorious framework.¹⁷

1. Calvin's Theology as a Soteriological Alternative to Merit

Into this scene steps John Calvin, who at some point began to be driven by a desire to rethink salvation over against the merit-based framework of his "opponents."¹⁸ Benefiting from the work already done by the likes of Luther, Melancthon, and Bucer, but also leaving his unique stamp, Calvin reconceived an understanding of salvation, works, and reward that would combine a largely Augustinian-Thomistic approach to human and divine action with a nominalist-voluntarist emphasis on God's will and human worthlessness.

In light of recent Calvin scholarship, two particular points require exposition and defense: (1) the uniqueness of Calvin's position on merit, works, and reward when compared to his predecessors and contemporaries, and (2) the centrality of his polemic against merit in shaping his soteriology.

to justification in a theologically satisfying manner was "acutely felt" by the Reformers—a need that "was simply part of Luther's legacy, and belonged as a defining characteristic of a period of transition." It is within this "rapidly moving stream" that Garcia believes Calvin's thought on these issues is best understood (Mark A. Garcia, *Life in Christ: Union with Christ and Twofold Grace in Calvin's Theology* [Carlisle, UK: Paternoster, 2008], 86).

14 Heiko Oberman, *Dawn of the Reformation: Essays in Late Medieval and Early Reformation Thought* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 64.

15 Brian Gerrish, *Grace and Reason: A Study in the Theology of Luther* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962), 56.

16 For the controversies surrounding his *De libertate christiana*, see Steven E. Ozment, "Homo Viator: Luther and Late Medieval Theology," *HTR* 57 (1969): 275–87.

17 I agree with Fink's thesis that "the first-generation reformers, galvanized by Luther's protest against the indulgence trade, adopted a common 'rhetoric of dissent' aimed at critiquing the regnant Catholic orthopraxy of salvation in the interest of a common set of primarily existential-religious concerns" (David Fink, "Was There a 'Reformation Doctrine of Justification?'," *HTR* 103 [2010]: 205–35, at 206).

18 On discussion surrounding Calvin's conversion to the Protestant cause, see Bernard Cottret, *Calvin: A Biography*, trans. M. Wallace McDonald (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 65–70; Alexandre Ganoczy, "Calvin's life", in *CCJC* 9–10.

1.1 Calvin's Unique Position on Merit, Works, and Reward

In light of contemporary Calvin scholarship, it is necessary to ask: (1) why study *Calvin* on this topic (i. e., merit, works, and reward), and (2) why study Calvin on *this* topic?

First, Calvin scholarship has gone far in helping us recognize Calvin's overall lack of theological originality, either due to his overarching desire to be "catholic" and therefore intentionally unoriginal¹⁹ or due to the influences of other Reformers, most notably Bucer and Melancthon, such that many of Calvin's ideas are merely representations of another's (more original) positions.²⁰ Such scholarship has rightly contributed to a certain "demotion" of Calvin, which is actually a promotion of the true, historical Calvin—that is, a Calvin not dropped from the heavens but one who often either merely passed on what he had received from the tradition (even from the medieval tradition) or borrowed from other Reformers when articulating his positions.²¹ What is it about *Calvin*, then, that deserves attention on the topic of merit?

Regarding the second, Calvin scholarship has highlighted that outside of the topics of the Eucharist, predestination, and policies addressing religious dissent—the three loci historically most commonly associated with the term "Calvinist" or "Calvinism"²²—there seems to be little reason for a study on the theological

19 J. Todd Billings, "The Catholic Calvin," *PE* 20 (2011): 120–34; Michael Horton, *Calvin and the Christian Life: Glorifying and Enjoying God Forever* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2014), 33–35; David Steinmetz, "The Scholastic Calvin," in *Protestant Scholasticism*, ed. Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark (Carlisle, UK: Paternoster 1999), 16–30.

20 See, e. g., Timothy Wengert, "Philip Melancthon and John Calvin against Andreas Osiander: Coming to Terms with Forensic Justification," in *Calvin and Luther: The Continuing Relationship*, ed. R. Ward Holder (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 71–72: "No one can truly appreciate Calvin's contribution to the debate without coming to terms with the fact that what he had to say others had said before him and that he borrowed and reshaped their arguments." David Wright emphasizes Bucer's influence on Calvin, claiming that while some scholars have interpreted Bucer as a "Calvinist," "it is surely far nearer the mark historically to describe Calvin as a 'Buceran'" ("Introduction," in *Common Places of Martin Bucer*, ed. and trans. D.F. Wright [Appleford: The Sutton Courtney Press, 1972], 17).

21 The term "demotion" is taken from Richard Muller's now well-known essay, "Demoting Calvin: The Issue of Calvin and the Reformed Tradition," in *John Calvin, Myth and Reality: Impact and Images of Geneva's Reformer*, ed. Amy Nelson Burnett (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2011), 3–17; see also Muller, *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition: On the Work of Christ and the Order of Salvation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012).

22 The first written instance of the term "Calvinism" occurs from the hand of Calvin himself in a letter to Bullinger (June 26, 1548), in which Calvin reports on conflicts surrounding the Eucharist leading up to the *Consensus Tigurinus* (CO 12:730). During the Bolsec and Arminian controversies, the term began to be associated with his particular teaching on God's predestinating will to save some and damn others. And after Calvin's treatment of Castellio and Servetus, his name became associated with those who opposed religious freedom; for a short history of the concept, see Irena Backus and Philip Benedict, "Introduction," in *CHI* 2–12.

loci of merit, works, and reward. In other words, even while recognizing that Calvin does present unique positions on certain topics, what does Calvin have to say uniquely on *these* topics? Is this study, then, just another unhistorical analysis of Calvin on a topic lacking any broader significance—a study perhaps reflecting the interests of a Calvin scholar but without a historical justification for the relevance of such a study?

As to the first, there is no theological locus that better illustrates the *non-Catholic* Calvin than his attack on the worth of works. No one in the Church's tradition is outside the scope of Calvin's criticism for their overvaluation of human works. While in *On the Bondage and Liberation of the Will* Calvin focuses his criticism on Ockham's statement, "God does not deny his grace to one who does what he can,"²³ in *Inst.* 2.2.4 Calvin chastises Chrysostom and Jerome for making claims quite similar to Ockham. Chrysostom erroneously claimed, according to Calvin, "As the whole is not done by divine assistance, we ourselves must of necessity bring something," and Chrysostom frequently said, "Let us bring what is our own, God will supply the rest." Jerome likewise claimed, "It is ours to begin, God's to finish: it is ours to offer what we can, his to supply what we cannot." Even Augustine does not escape criticism on this point. In *Inst.* 3.18.5 Calvin addresses 2 Tim 4:8 and intentionally goes further than Augustine regarding the impurity of works done even in grace. After quoting Augustine's claim regarding God's unearned grace as prior to the earned crown, Calvin states, "But I also add [*sed aliud etiam addo*], how could he impute righteousness to our works unless his indulgence hides [*absconderet*] the unrighteousness that is in them?"²⁴ A few lines down, Calvin first notes how Augustine gives the name of grace to eternal life, "because, while it is recompensed for works, it is bestowed by the gratuitous gifts of God." But Calvin then adds, "But Scripture humbles us more." It not only demonstrates that good works are gratuitous gifts of God but also shows that "they are always defiled by impurity, so that they cannot satisfy God when they are tested by the standard of his justice."²⁵ For works to receive reward, they must be first purified, which God graciously does for those in Christ. Since this is the case, merit clearly is not based on the "worth" of the work, and believers can never think anything is "due" to them from God.²⁶ In the end, we

23 *BLW* 6.397 (234). A.N.S. Lane points out in a footnote on this quote that the statement most likely came from Biel, *Sent.* 2, d. 27, a. 3, dubium 4 (Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1973–1984), 2:523–24.

24 *Inst.* 3.18.5.

25 *Inst.* 3.18.5.

26 Calvin does not deny that there is goodness to the work of the saints, but rather he denies that the works are wholly good or perfectly good, able to stand up to the lofty judgment of God. In his commentary on Phil 1:11, "Being filled with the fruits of righteousness," Calvin claims that believers bring forth good and pleasant fruits of righteousness "according to their measure [*pro suo modo*]," but no one gives "full and complete [*plena et solida*] obedience to the Law"

find that Calvin cites *no one* in the Church's theological tradition that resonates with his view of the worth of works and their corresponding reward. Hence Brian Lugioyo's comment that "if there is *any real significant* innovation [in the Protestant doctrine of salvation], it is in regard to the radicalization of sin,"²⁷ and Barbara Pitkin's assertion that one of the "most significant" departures of the Reformers from the dominant consensus on sin was Luther's claim, followed by Calvin, that postbaptismal concupiscence was sin.²⁸ There is, then, very little that is "catholic" about Calvin's position on human works. And the uncatholic Calvin arises precisely from a passion to undermine teachings on merit in his day.

Even when compared to his contemporaries, Calvin holds a unique position on merit, works, and reward. For starters, there is no one who disdained the doctrine of merit more than Calvin. While Bucer, as noted above, singles out merit as "the principle religious disagreement," the so-called ecumenical reformer also embraces the role of merit in salvation through his doctrine of the *duplex iustitia* and his emphasis on sanctification and love over justification and faith.²⁹ He straightforwardly affirms that the works of the saints "are rightly called merits, just as what God repays to them is called wages"³⁰—as long as the reward is not understood as something owed [*pro mercede quae debetur operi*] but as something given freely [*pro ea mercede quae liberalitate donantis facienti aliquid offertur*].³¹ Similarly Melanchthon, when he has put proper boundaries in place, freely employs merit language in his account of reward. He states quite boldly of believers, "works are truly meritorious,"³² and these meritorious works produce what he calls "different degrees of return."³³ Bucer's and Melanchthon's accounts of the value of human works are bolstered by their acceptance of the distinction between venial and mortal sin such that Bucer understands remaining sin in the

(In *epistolam ad Philippenses*, cap. 1, §11, in *The Digital Library of Classic Protestant Texts*, <http://solomon.tcpt.alexanderstreet.com>).

27 Lugioyo, *Martin Bucer*, 63n131.

28 Barbara Pitkin, "Nothing but Concupiscence: Calvin's Understanding of Sin and the *Via Augustini*," *CTJ* 34 (1999): 367.

29 E.g., John T. McNeill, *Unitive Protestantism: The Ecumenical Spirit and Its Persistent Expression* (London: Epworth, 1964); James Atkinson, "Martin Bucer (1491–1551): Ecumenical Pioneer," *Churchman* 79 (1965): 19–28; Wright, "Martin Bucer", 15–74.

30 Lugioyo, *Martin Bucer*, 211.

31 Bucer, *Ep. ad Eph.*, cap 2, p. 69, where Bucer shows how Bernard of Clairvaux always connects merit to mercy and cites Bernard, stating, "It is foundational to meriting to know that meriting is not foundational."

32 *Apology* 171.

33 *Apology* 171, citing 1 Cor 3:8. Melanchthon claims that works are meritorious of both "bodily and spiritual rewards, which are bestowed in this life and in the life to come" (*Apology* 171; *C. Rom.* 45).

believer—with the one exception of apostasy³⁴—to be compatible with being a just person, and Melancthon calls remaining venial sin “tolerable” and thus unable of itself to separate us from God.³⁵

The situation is quite different with Calvin. He has very little tolerance whatsoever either for merit language or for any distinctions that might bolster value in human works. Like Bucer, he is aware of the use of the term “merit” within the Christian tradition, but rather than trying to work with the term he pens a brief diatribe against it (*Inst.* 3.15.2). He laments that the term was ever introduced into the Christian theological lexicon and hopes it disappears altogether from Christian discourse: “He, whoever he was, that first applied [the term merit] to human works when viewed in reference to the divine tribunal consulted very ill for the purity of the faith.”³⁶

Even if works are properly understood as occurring *due* to God’s grace—rather than in any way adding to God’s grace—Calvin prefers to emphasize their unworthiness rather than their worth. He rejects the venial-mortal distinction, claiming, “All sin is a violation of the law, upon which God’s judgment is pronounced without exception,”³⁷ so that every work performed by the believer is actuality mortally sinful and thus not only does not “deserve” a reward but in actuality deserves shame and death.³⁸

Calvin’s positive position on the relationship between works and reward also has unique characteristics. In general, Calvin’s bark against merit tends to be worse than his bite, and he often gives back in another form what he takes away from a previous one. So while in one place he might deny that we merit eternal life, in another place he grants works a causal role in obtaining it. If we placed Calvin on a continuum with Bucer and Melancthon in accounting for the role of works in salvation, with Bucer being the most inclusive and Melancthon being the least, Calvin would be situated somewhere in the middle. Bucer’s unwillingness to draw a hard distinction between justification and sanctification (unlike Calvin), or between law and gospel (unlike Melancthon), disposes his theology to include the role of works in salvation more substantially.³⁹ Since for Bucer justification is not a wholly extrinsic act of imputation distinguished from sanctification but rather includes within it an element of transformation, it

34 Euan Cameron, *Reformation of the Heretics* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984), 204. Cf. *Ep. ad Rom.* 283.

35 *C. Rom.* 173.

36 *Inst.* 3.15.2; cf., Lane, *Justification by Faith*, 38–39.

37 *Inst.* 2.8.58–59.

38 *Com. Rom.* 84.74–76.

39 Wright comments, “The love and good works which for Luther remain the fruits of justifying faith tend to be embraced [by Bucer] within the very concept of justifying faith” (“Martin Bucer,” 21).

comes as no surprise that he speaks more positively of the role of the law in salvation and maintains a stronger connection between works and receiving eternal life.⁴⁰ Melancthon, however, argues that Scripture presents us with two *kinds* of righteousness, rather than, say, two *ways* of (hypothetically) obtaining a single kind of righteousness, as Aquinas argues.⁴¹ For Melancthon, one kind is the righteousness of the law, which corresponds to the Aristotelian notion of a quality that results from the indwelling of the virtues.⁴² The other kind is the righteousness of the gospel, which is a relational concept corresponding to being accepted by another, that is, being placed in a right relationship to the other. This occurs not through ontological transformation but through forgiveness of sins and Christ's imputed righteousness.⁴³ With this distinction in place, Melancthon is able to categorize all passages of Scripture that connect obedience, virtue, and justification as "law righteousness," which he then contrasts with passages that speak of the grace of justification, which he categorizes as "gospel righteousness." To be sure, Melancthon clearly includes good works as intrinsic to the Christian life, stating that "obedience is necessary as a necessary effect following justification."⁴⁴ But his law-gospel framework allows him to isolate the reception of eternal life from good works.⁴⁵

Though I unpack Calvin's position on the relationship between works and eternal life at great length below (chapter 7), in anticipation of that analysis I

40 To give but one example: when addressing the thief on the cross—the example often used to illustrate a person *not* having any good works but still obtaining eternal life—Bucer states quite remarkably, "In this [i. e., his actions on the cross], he now has good works according to which he may be justified, that is, for which he may be judged to deserve admission to the inheritance of eternal life" (*Ep. ad Rom.*, 105). For an excellent analysis of Bucer's doctrine of justification, which demonstrates on the one hand that the "double justification" theory does not fit Bucer and on the other hand that a distinction between justification and sanctification also does not fit his thought, see Lugioyo, *Martin Bucer*, chap. 3.

41 For Aquinas, righteousness comes either through the law, which does not actually occur due to the human need for grace (which the law does not dispense), or through the gospel; see Charles Raith II, *Aquinas and Calvin on Romans: God's Justification and Our Participation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 22–53.

42 *C. Rom.*, 56.

43 Timothy Wengert, *Defending Faith: Lutheran Responses to Andreas Osiander's Doctrine of Justification, 1551–1559* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 75, 339–40. Wengert emphasizes the difference between a relative-relational understanding of righteousness and an absolute-ontological understanding of righteousness. This "relative" understanding, Wengert argues, is akin to what English speakers mean by relationship or experience, so that Melancthon "was not simply talking about a mental construct, a fictive judicial 'as if,' but an actual turn of events before God's judgment seat" (*ibid.*, 341).

44 *C. Rom.*, 176.

45 For the law-gospel distinction, see Timothy J. Wengert, *Law and Gospel: Philip Melancthon's Debate with John Agricola of Eisleben over Poenitentia* (Grand Rapids: Baker; Carlisle, UK: Paternoster, 1997); Carl E. Maxcey, *Bona Opera: A Study in the Development of the Doctrine in Philip Melancthon* (Nieuwkoop: D. de Graaf, 1980).

merely note here that in Calvin we find a blending of Melanchthon's and Bucer's positions.⁴⁶ On the one hand, Calvin aligns more closely with Melanchthon than with Bucer by drawing a sharp distinction between justification and sanctification, such that Calvin makes the basis for obtaining eternal life the purely imputed, nontransforming reality of justice *extra nos*. On the other hand, he is closer to Bucer than Melanchthon in the way he includes the role of good works in obtaining eternal life, describing good works as "inferior causes" for obtaining salvation. As he explains in *Inst.* 3.18.1, God "leads believers into possession of eternal life through the grace of good works in order to fulfill his own work in them according to the order that he has laid down"; these works "prepare" believers to receive the crown of immortality. Calvin further explains when commenting on Rom 8:17 ("if we suffer with him [*compatimur*], in order that also we might be glorified with him") that since Christ went to the eternal inheritance through the cross "we must therefore go to it in the same way."⁴⁷ The role of good works as inferior causes is part of the process of God's conforming his people to the image of Christ in order that they might possess heaven through this transformation, and enjoy heaven as a result of transformation.⁴⁸ Both Calvin's "uncatholicity" and his uniqueness among his contemporaries on the issue of merit, works, and reward warrant this study.

1.2 The Centrality of Calvin's Polemic against Merit

The conviction of the present work is that Calvin's theology is best read as a soteriologically driven enterprise, with his view of salvation being shaped by his polemics against his "opponents'" merit-based view of salvation. Calvin scholars have occasionally searched for a "central dogma" in Calvin's thought, such as predestination, union with Christ, or justification by faith, but such proposals have come short, if for no other reason than their modern projections of a

46 It is well known that when it came to the 1547 Regensburg Colloquy article on justification (article 5), Calvin was more positive in its reception than other Reformers, being for Neuser the Protestant theologian most willing to concede a *iustitia operum*; see W.H. Neuser, "Calvins Utreil über den Rechfertigungsartikel des Regensburger Buches," in *Reformation und Humanismus*, eds. M. Greschat and J.F.G. Goeters (Witten: Luther-Verlag, 1969), 178–83; see A.N.S. Lane, *Justification by Faith in Catholic-Protestant Dialogue: An Evangelical Assessment* (London: T&T Clark, 2002), 57. A contrast is typically drawn between Calvin's positive remarks about Regensburg expressed in a letter to Farel (CO 11:215–16) and Luther's negative letter to Friedrich (WA 9.406–9, no. 3616); see, e.g., Garcia, *Life in Christ*, 81–85; Lane, *Justification by Faith*, 53; Alister McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 247–48.

47 *Com. Rom.* 162.1

48 *Com. Rom.* 162.16–17.

theological “system” constructed around a central dogma back onto Calvin’s loci-based theological reflection.⁴⁹ But another reason the central-dogma thesis comes short is that all of these topics—predestination, union with Christ, justification by faith, and so on—are shaped by and work together to serve a *central polemic*, namely, Calvin’s attempt to counter the doctrine of merit and the theological and anthropological judgments connected to it.⁵⁰ What is helpful in the central-dogma accounts is that they rightfully indicate the importance of these loci in his theology. But their function is best understood within his broader polemic against a meritorious framework of salvation.

The same holds true for studies that look to the *form* of Calvin’s teaching as its defining mark. Alexandre Ganoczy, for example, highlights the dialectical form of Calvin’s theology, in which Calvin juxtaposes the divine and human, the transcendent and immanent.⁵¹ These juxtapositions are indeed pervasive in Calvin’s theology, yet their importance is best understood as contributing to Calvin’s broader attempt to counter soteriologies emphasizing human contribution to salvation: contrasting the divine with the human, for example, enables Calvin to set forth God’s work *as opposed to* the human work in the obtaining of salvation. Wilhelm Niesel’s counter to Ganoczy, in which he makes “the exaltation of the Mediator Jesus Christ” the guiding framework, also makes sense within Calvin’s broader strategy to undermine human-based conceptions of salvation: Calvin is able to shift our attention away from human acts to the centrality of Christ and *his* work (even *his* merit) in enabling salvation.⁵²

These proposals, then, rightly identify important features of Calvin’s thought. But they isolate their insight from broader considerations that would have pro-

49 For a list of studies seeking a “central dogma,” see Cornelius P. Venema, *Accepted and Renewed in Christ: The “Twofold Grace of God” and the Interpretation of Calvin’s Theology* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 15–16; for problems with this approach, see Richard A. Muller, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition*, Oxford Studies in Historical Theology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 63–80. As B.B. Warfield astutely noted years ago, if there is a “central truth” to the Reformed theology, it is “complete dependence upon the free mercy of a saving God.” Only within this context does predestination have its proper place. B.B. Warfield, “Calvinism,” in *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, ed. Samuel Macauley Jackson (New York: Funk and Wagnall’s, 1908), 359–64. Of course for Calvin, such “complete dependence upon the free mercy of God” was posited over against merit-based conceptions of salvation.

50 Telling is Lavelle’s study of Calvin’s criticism of scholastic theology, which pervades each edition of his *Institutes*. When Lavelle summarizes the main points of Calvin’s criticisms, almost all of them center on issues related to the topic of merit (e.g., dividing “credit” between God and man, Christ’s merit as the only occasion for human merit, improper understanding of appropriating grace, etc.); see Armand Aime LaVallee, “Calvin’s Criticism of Scholastic Theology” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1967), 254–57.

51 Alexandre Ganoczy, *Calvin, Théologien de l’Eglise et du Ministère* (Paris: Cerf, 1964).

52 Wilhelm Niesel, *The Theology of Calvin*, trans. H. Knight (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1956), 138–39.

vided a fuller picture of the way these features functioned in Calvin's theology. Each of these insights makes sense and can be incorporated if, again, we keep in mind the polemical context in which Calvin formulated his theology. The advantage of focusing on Calvin's polemic is that we avoid manipulating Calvin's thought into a theological "system" around a central dogma, since a polemic may require engagement with a number of relevant topics in order to advance an alternative position.⁵³ Moreover, this approach does more justice to the context in which Calvin constructed his theology, since it incorporates the back-and-forth dynamic that characterizes Reformation theological development in the sixteenth century.⁵⁴

On the surface, it may seem I am overstating the case regarding the centrality of merit in Calvin's theological program. If one were to focus merely on the appearance of the term "merit" in Calvin's writing, one might get the impression that while it is important, it is not as central as I am arguing here since many other theological terms appear much more frequently. Yet when one considers Calvin's concern with correcting problematic teachings regarding the relationship between divine and human activity in salvation and how God's work and human work relate to one another, which shapes his approach to free choice, sin, predestination, justification, sanctification, grace, good works, and glorification, a fuller picture emerges. Thus by focusing on Calvin's overall polemic against merit, we are able to draw together a number of theological loci into a coherent whole (rather than a "system") that enables the reader to see the inner *ratio* for much of Calvin's theology. Failing to appreciate his all-pervasive polemic against

53 It also goes some way to explaining the various *forms* Calvin's teaching takes. Ganoczy, for example, highlights the dialectical form of Calvin's theology, in which Calvin juxtaposes the divine and human, the transcendent and immanent. These juxtapositions are indeed pervasive in Calvin's theology, but their importance is best understood as contributing to Calvin's broader attempt to counter soteriologies emphasizing the human contribution to one's salvation (Ganoczy, *Calvin*). Niesel's counter to dialectical theology and his arguing instead that Calvin's theology "is concerned to exalt the Mediator Jesus Christ" also makes sense given Calvin's strategy in countering human-based conceptions of salvation, and shifts our attention to the centrality of Christ and *his* work (even *his* merit) in enabling salvation (Niesel, *Theology of John Calvin*, 138–39). Given the multiplicity of doctrines that need to be engaged in order to counter merit-based soteriologies, it also makes sense why others have dismissed any neat systemization of Calvin's teaching, emphasizing instead its diversified content. While all of these studies are now considered dated, we cannot dismiss them as being totally off base. They rightly saw important features of Calvin's thought, though they isolated their insight from broader considerations that would have provided a fuller picture. Each of these insights makes sense and can be incorporated if, again, we keep in mind the polemical context in which Calvin formulated his theology.

54 David Fink has provided a helpful account of the dynamic development of the doctrine of justification in the sixteenth century; see David Fink, "Divided by Faith: The Protestant Doctrine of Justification and the Confessionalization of Biblical Exegesis" (PhD diss., Duke University, 2010).

merit (and related topics) has lead scholars to place undue emphasis on teachings that are for Calvin *subservient* to this polemic.⁵⁵

But rather than reside solely in the abstract, I want to turn to Calvin's Romans commentary to illustrate the centrality of Calvin's polemic against merit in the shaping of his theology. I am choosing Calvin's Romans commentary strategically due to the foundation of this work in shaping Calvin's theology and the interconnection between this work and the development of the *Institutes*, which I also address below.

1.2.1 Calvin's Commentary on Romans

The polemic appears front and center at the beginning of the commentary, in his *argumentum in epistolam*. Here Calvin claims the principle *questio* of the entire epistle is this: "We are justified by faith."⁵⁶ As I have argued elsewhere,⁵⁷ since Calvin famously claims in his *Institutes* that the doctrine of justification is "the main hinge on which religion turns,"⁵⁸ readers of Calvin's commentary on Romans have been disposed to think that justification in and of itself is the key concept in Romans.⁵⁹ On this reading, the central disputation is couched in terms of the proper formulation of justification: imputed versus infused, declarative versus transformative, or juridical versus covenantal. A close reading of Calvin's commentary reveals, however, that the emphasis is not on justification per se; rather, it is on justification *by faith*. Disputes about the proper formulation of

55 Henri Blocher, for example, speaks of Calvin's "unflagging warfare" against "free will," and claims that this emphasis in Calvin is due to the fact that free will emphasizes human independence in the act of choosing (Henri Blocher, "Calvin's Theological Anthropology," in *JCET*, 74). But Blocher never connects this "warfare" to the way Calvin understood how his opponents' teaching on free will (i. e., independence in choosing) fed into a conception of salvation that makes human contributions something independent of God's grace (see chap. 2 below). By failing to properly contextualize Calvin's polemic, Blocher presents Calvin's desire for human "total dependence" on God as a thing in and of itself—as if Calvin simply wants a big God and weak human beings—rather than seeing such "total dependence" in the service of his soteriology, i. e., as a way of upholding the sheer God-centeredness of Christian salvation. Admittedly, it could be argued that it's the other way around, namely, that Calvin's radicalization of the disparity between Creator and creature, verging on a dualism, led to his rejection of merit (as he understood it). But this would underappreciate the contextual nature of Calvin's theology. Calvin first found himself within an ecclesial context that placed a premium on human contributions to salvation, and he sought to counter this conception with a theology that emphasized divine action and grace. The disparity between creature and Creator served this emphasis.

56 *Com. Rom.* 5.19.

57 Raith, *Aquinas and Calvin on Romans*, 22–23.

58 *Inst.* 3.11.1; Battles translation.

59 E. g., Thomas L. Wenger, "The New Perspective on Calvin: Responding to Recent Calvin Interpretation," *JETS* 50, no. 2 (2007): 322.