

VIEWING JUSTIFICATION THROUGH CALVIN'S EYES: AN ECUMENICAL EXPERIMENT

WILLIAM M. THOMPSON

Duquesne University, Pittsburgh

WHEN ATTENTION turns to justification, that central distinctive doctrine of the Protestant Reformation, Roman Catholics typically think of Luther's views. This study, however, published on the eve of the 450th anniversary of the Council of Trent's decree on justification in 1547, looks rather to John Calvin's thought on justification as a guide toward rethinking the substance of this distinctive Reformation teaching. Calvin seems to have regarded Luther as one of those special "evangelists" the Holy Spirit sends the Church at moments of severe crisis. Calvin participated actively in Luther's attempts to clarify the meaning of justification for the Church. But he participated from the perspective of a second generation, with the reflective distance that offered. His thought can make a claim to bringing out some or much of the inner direction of this doctrine so central to the Reformation. At the same time, Calvin learned from possible dangers which had surfaced in connection with the doctrine during the passage of time. Calvin's lens might offer special, ecumenical possibilities of widened understanding at this anniversary time. Roman Catholics are likely to approach the doctrine of justification through the lens of Trent. Calvin's thought may enable them to approach it from another angle, one that has an inner sympathy for Luther, and yet critical distance as well. This is the wager of this article. I stumbled onto this insight from my study of Karl Barth's *Church Dogmatics* which introduced me sympathetically to Calvin and led me to Calvin's works in a more sustained way.

DOCTRINAL DIFFERENTIATION AMONG THE REFORMERS

Calvin's teaching on justification represents a theological differentiation which, using the grid of the movement from compactness to differentiation, is relatively less compact and more differentiated than that of the Fathers, the medieval theologians, and even the Fathers of Trent.¹ I do not claim that those who are less differentiated are necessarily wrong. What others expressed in relatively more compact terms, Calvin the Reformer expressed in a more differentiated manner. I find him less unclear than Luther, and in some ways a corrective to potential misunderstandings of Luther and to doctrinal derailments.

¹ See Eric Voegelin, *Order and History 1: Israel and Revelation* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1956) 1-11.

At the same time, Calvin's inner sympathy for Luther's position enabled him in important ways to clarify key aspects of the Reformation's thinking on this topic. Roman Catholics may be somewhat surprised to find Calvin more differentiated than Trent. Typically, doctrinal differentiation has been a characteristic of Rome. Cardinal Ratzinger, for example, has characterized Roman Catholic teaching on purgatory as more developed than that of the Orthodox Church. He does not say that the Orthodox are wrong, but rather than on this issue they maintain "a somewhat archaic conception."² Think, also, of the Marian doctrines, as well as those of papal primacy and infallibility. In these cases, believing Roman Catholics typically accord the "laurel" of doctrinal differentiation to themselves. I am suggesting that, on the question of justification, Calvin presses for the greater doctrinal differentiation. Catholics raised in the post-Tridentine era might not be accustomed to entertaining such a possibility.

Calvin wrote of justification as the "remission of sins and the imputation of Christ's righteousness."³ Like Melancthon apparently and the later Luther, he distinguishes between justification and sanctification or regeneration. Calvin simply distinguishes justification from sanctification; he does not separate the two realities. To do so would be to separate justifying faith from all forms of Christian works. And then one would run the danger of a works-righteousness or moralism, which possibly was a worry for Calvin in regard to Zwingli and others. Or one would run the danger of antinomianism or quietism, which relies simply upon a passive faith with no active human-Christian response. Thus, in what Alister McGrath regards as an act of "genius,"⁴ Calvin distinguished but did not separate justification and sanctification. In the final edition of the *Institutes*, the very placement of the theme of justification within Book 3, whose theme is participation in Christ

² Joseph Ratzinger, *Eschatology: Death and Eternal Life*, Dogmatic Theology 9, trans. Michael Waldstein, trans. ed. Aidan Nichols (Washington: Catholic University of America, 1988) 228.

³ *Institutes* III.xi.2. References are to John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 2 vols., Library of Christian Classics 20-21, ed. John T. McNeill, trans. Ford Lewis Battles (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960); this is a translation chiefly from the 1559 Latin edition, the one normally regarded as "authoritative" in the eminent sense. For Calvin's view of Luther, see *ibid.* 2.1057 n. 4. For an antidote or important caution against Calvin-stereotyping, see Basil Hall, "The Calvin Legend," in *John Calvin, Centenary Studies in Reformation Theology* 1, ed. G. E. Duffield (Appleford: Sutton Courtenay, 1966) 1-18. Clearly my study needs to be complemented by a more genetic analysis from earlier Latin versions of the *Institutes*, as well as from the significant French translations. The primary sources I have consulted are: for the *Institutes*, *Joannis Calvinii Opera Selecta*, vols. 3-5, ed. Petrus Barth and Gulielmus Niesel (Munich: Kaiser, 1926-36; 3rd ed.: vol. 3 [1967], vol. 4 [1968], vol. 5 [1974]); for the other citations, *Joannis Calvinii opera quae supersunt omnia*, 59 volumes, *Corpus Reformatorum*, vols. 29-98, ed. Wilhelm Baum, Edward Cunitz, and Edward Reutz (Brunswick: C. A. Schwetscke, 1863-1900).

⁴ Alister E. McGrath, *Justification by Faith*, Academie Books (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1988) 57.

through the Spirit, signals the unity between justification and sanctification.

Here is a key text from Calvin with a Chalcedonian style of thinking, which appeals, as in Christ, to distinction rather than separation.

This alone is of importance: having admitted that faith and good works must cleave together, we still lodge justification in faith, not in works. We have a ready explanation for doing this, provided we turn to Christ to whom our faith is directed and from whom it receives its full strength.

Why, then, are we justified by faith? Because by faith we grasp Christ's righteousness, by which alone we are reconciled to God. Yet you could not grasp this without at the same time grasping sanctification also. For he is "given unto us for righteousness, wisdom, sanctification, and redemption" [1 Corinthians 1:30]. Therefore Christ justifies no one whom he does not at the same time sanctify. These benefits are joined together by an everlasting and indissoluble bond, so that those whom he illumines by his wisdom, he redeems; those whom he redeems, he justifies; those whom he justifies, he sanctifies.

But, since the question concerns only righteousness and sanctification, let us dwell upon these. Although we may distinguish them, Christ contains both of them inseparably in himself. Do you wish, then, to attain righteousness in Christ? You must first possess Christ; but you cannot possess him without being made partaker in his sanctification, because he cannot be divided into pieces [1 Corinthians 1:13]. Since, therefore, it is solely by expending himself that the Lord gives us these benefits to enjoy, he bestows both of them at the same time, the one never without the other. Thus it is clear how true it is that we are justified not without works yet not through works, since in our sharing in Christ, which justifies us, sanctification is just as much included as righteousness.⁵

Calvin seemed quite conscious of formulating a new differentiation. Hence he wrote that even Augustine "still subsumes grace under sanctification," at least in "his manner of stating it."⁶ He wrote of this two-in-one reality of justification and sanctification as a "double grace"⁷ but, as if to emphasize the distinction, did not write of a double justification/righteousness, at least in the *Institutes*. Likewise, to bring home the distinction, he made clear that "as regards justification, faith is something merely passive, bringing nothing of ours to the recovering of God's favor but receiving from Christ that which we lack."⁸ Calvin also wrote repeatedly and movingly in this section of our "coming empty (handed)" before God, perhaps in order to stress again the "passive nature" of this justifying faith.⁹

Calvin, in my judgment, does not regard Augustine as guilty of works-righteousness. He does not fully favor Augustine's manner of expressing the complex reality of grace and sanctification, finding him and other Church Fathers ambiguous at times.¹⁰ I believe that Calvin, with the Reformation, saw the need to bring to greater clarification

⁵ *Institutes* III.xvi.1.

⁷ *Ibid.* III.xi.1.

⁹ *Ibid.* III.xi.7, 10, 18; see also II.vii.8.

⁶ *Ibid.* III.xi.15.

⁸ *Ibid.* III.xiii.5.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* II.ii.9.

and differentiation what seemed more compactly present in Augustine's thought. One might say that Augustine was in this matter somewhat typical of the Fathers, even those of the East. This is not to claim that Eastern divinization is fully translatable into Augustine's thought, but it is a similarly compact but distinct mode of expressing the reality of grace-justification-sanctification. The East has not had a Reformation and so it has not experienced the need to undergo this further differentiation, although certain issues involved in Palamite theology may represent something akin to the Reformation's teaching on justification.

In some respects, Calvin's formulation and the Reformation effort begun by Luther, of which Calvin's formulation is a part, might be compared to Nicaea's *homoousios*. That was also a needed differentiation at a particular moment in the Church's history to help the Church remain faithful to the Scriptures. And it possesses a perennial significance, to the extent that it captures an authentic faith dimension. In some respects, one might even argue that Calvin's differentiation and that of the Reformation, inasmuch as they are in agreement, represent an authentic soteriological and anthropological correlate to the Nicene christological *homoousios* and in that sense carry a proportionately similar weight. That is, because the incarnate Word is true God (Nicaea), salvation comes only through him, and not through a Pelagian works-righteousness with the soteriology and anthropology that implies.

What are some characteristics of Calvin's differentiation that would authorize one to name it a differentiation rather than a distortion of doctrine? The Chalcedonian pattern of thought shaped Calvin's thinking. In other words, his own participation in Christ led him in this direction: "As Christ cannot be torn into parts, so these two which we perceive in him together and conjointly are inseparable—namely, righteousness and sanctification."¹¹ But while the two are inseparable, they are to be distinguished, not unlike the two natures of Christ.¹²

If one were to think in terms of the Apostles' Creed and seek its guidance—which I prefer to do, because its trinitarian structure and ecclesial provenance guide us toward discovering the christological, trinitarian, and ecclesial dimensions of theological issues—one might say that Calvin's formulation of justification and sanctification corresponds to the second and third parts of the creed, those of the Son and the Holy Spirit. As the Son and Spirit are distinct but not separate, so are justification and sanctification. Likewise, it is the saving work of the Son, his obtaining remission of our sins and imputation to humankind of his righteousness, which is the nature of justification, that unleashes the Spirit and brings about sanctification. In other words, the Son sends the Spirit; the third part of the creed flows from the

¹¹ *Ibid.* III.xi.6.

¹² *Ibid.* III.xvi.1.

second part. Our next two sections will deal with these ideas in greater detail.

THE SON AND JUSTIFICATION

The second part of the creed deals not only with the Son but also with the work of the cross. The Nicene Creed amplifies the Apostles' Creed by indicating that the cross was "for our salvation." By distinguishing justification from sanctification, the Reformers, one might argue, stressed the once-for-all and fully adequate nature of Christ's cross. Our remission of sins and being reckoned righteous have truly been accomplished. We are not waiting for God to save us finally. God has fully embraced us, sins and all, and saved us (2 Corinthians 5:21). Justification points to this great "once for all," the *ephapax* of Hebrews 9:12 and 10:10, the "great exchange" celebrated by tradition. The justifying "remission of sins" is really Christ's work on the cross, and through "imputation" we are "clothed in it."¹³ In other words, salvation does not depend upon our works, even our very good works, although it cannot be separated from them.

Thus, following the clues provided by viewing justification from the perspective of the second part of the creed, I have now emphasized the christological dimension involved in justification/salvation. Both Calvin and Luther view righteousness as the imputed gift of Christ's saving work, over against a Pelagian or neo-Pelagian works-righteousness. Imputation emphasizes for us that forgiveness and righteousness are Christ's gift, not something we earn by ourselves. At the same time, justification itself is not a reality which can be adequately captured in terms like "imputation" or "forensic." Calvin wrote that "by faith we grasp Christ's righteousness," that we "first possess him" (in justification), that we "share in Christ."

Calvin has a developed theology of the *insitio in Christum*, the believer's ingrafting into Christ (Christ's indwelling) which underlies not only sanctification but also justification. This is not unrelated to the Spirit who is the "bond by which Christ effectually unites us to himself."¹⁴ Under the aspect of justification Calvin's focus is upon Jesus Christ as the one who sends the Spirit: "Christ so 'came by water and blood' in order that the Spirit may witness concerning him [1 John 5:7-8], lest the salvation imparted through him escape us."¹⁵ Our "sacred wedlock" with Christ is involved in justification itself.¹⁶ Calvin declares, in what is perhaps his strongest statement on this matter,

that joining together of Head and members, that indwelling of Christ in our hearts—in short, that mystical union—are accorded by us the highest degree of importance, so that Christ, having been made ours, makes us sharers with him in the gifts with which he has been endowed. We do not, therefore, con-

¹³ See *ibid.* III.xi.4 and III.xi.2.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.* III.i.1.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* III.i.3.

template him outside ourselves from afar in order that his righteousness may be imputed to us but because we put on Christ and are engrafted into his body—in short, because he deigns to make us one with him. For this reason, we glory that we have fellowship of righteousness with him.¹⁷

Texts such as this indicate that it would be simplistic to equate justification with the forensic or imputed dimension of saving grace, or to equate sanctification with the intrinsic or transforming, sanative dimension.¹⁸ Justification is already intrinsic and transformative. This section of Calvin's *Institutes* reminds one of Karl Barth's declaration on justification: "It is a declaring righteous which without any reserve can be called a making righteous."¹⁹ Calvin, in other words, follows the biblical, patristic, and medieval tradition of the *admirabile commercium*, the sacred exchange through which we come to participate in Christ's righteousness. As he stated in a striking text: "[T]o separate [Jesus] from ourselves is not permissible and not even possible without tearing him apart."²⁰

Ambiguous Texts

Ambiguous texts are found in Calvin's writings. These are made more difficult by commentators who align the forensic with justification and the intrinsic with sanctification.²¹ For example, Calvin refers to the merely passive nature of faith in justification, whereby we bring nothing of ours to the recovering of God's favor. But one must read the way in which Calvin completes the thought: this faith is a "receiving from Christ that which we lack."²² Passivity is the other side of reception, and this would seem to cohere easily with Calvin's communion Christology and soteriology.

Perhaps the most difficult and ambiguous text I have found in Calvin comes in the section where he is critiquing Osiander: "Osiander explains 'justify' as 'to make righteous'."²³ This resembles the transformative interpretation of justification. Yet Calvin argued against Osiander's charge that Calvin thought of justification only as a kind of forensic reckoning. In the passage on the "mystical union," he wrote that "Osiander's slander is refuted, that by us faith is reckoned righteousness." Osiander apparently was seen by Calvin as teaching a sort

¹⁷ *Ibid.* III.xi.10.

¹⁸ For an apparent example of this, see McGrath, *Justification by Faith* 56, and his *Justitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1986).

¹⁹ Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, 4 vols., ed. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, trans. Bromiley, Torrance, et al. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936–75 [1/1, 2nd rev. ed., 1975]) 4/1, 95.

²⁰ *Institutes* III.xxv.3.

²¹ See where at least an ambiguity on this issue can plausibly be argued in François Wendel, *Calvin: Origins and Development of His Religious Thought*, trans. Philip Mairet (New York: Harper and Row, 1963; reprint, Durham, N.C.: Labyrinth, 1987) 258.

²² *Institutes* III.xiii.5.

²³ *Ibid.* III.xi.6.

of "essential righteousness" or "gross mingling of Christ with believers,"²⁴ probably a form of pan-Christism that reduced Jesus to an autonomous possession of believers. An autonomous "becoming righteous" seems to be the target.

Guides and Insights along the Way

For Roman Catholics it is not easy to entertain an intrinsic and transformative view of Calvin's teaching on justification, since they were raised on the Tridentine view that the Reformers taught simply forensic justification. My judgment is that it is not any easier for many Protestants, who have come to hold a simply forensic interpretation on the matter as well. As we can see from the citations above, Calvin himself already seems to have been worried by this tendency in his own time. The initial and fundamental key to avoiding this extreme forensicism is Calvin's stress on the indwelling of Christ in the believer in justification through the instrumentality of justifying faith itself, the latter itself an aspect of the transforming reality of justification.²⁵ As Calvin indicated, salvation is truly communicated to the believer. It is hard to see how there could be any real this-worldly justification without this transforming indwelling. In that case, justification would run the danger of becoming a merely "nominalistic" concept, vanishing into an empty concept. Instead of being a differentiation, it would be an illusory deformation.

A reading of Newman's work on justification²⁶ further reinforces our interpretation (although I obviously give more credit to Luther's and Calvin's working out of the nature of justification than he does). Newman, who later in life entered into full communion with the Roman Catholic Church, may be able to play the role of mediator in this matter. Newman's key theme is the divine indwelling as the basis of justification. A greater attentiveness to that indwelling, he thought, would overcome Protestant "extrinsicism" and Catholic works-righteousness where and when they occur. It is precisely such an at-

²⁴ *Ibid.* III.xi.10.

²⁵ Barth's guidance in interpreting Calvin was crucial to me; see *Church Dogmatics* 4/1, 95; 4/3/2/, 539–54. Charles Partee, "Calvin's Central Dogma Again," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 18 (1987) 191–99, helpfully proposes the "union with Christ" theme as unusually central and rich in the *Institutes*.

²⁶ John Henry Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*, 7th ed. (London: Longmans, Green, 1897). McGrath offers a critical interpretation of Newman's work (*Justitia Dei* 2.121–34), but see Ian Ker, *Newman on Being a Christian* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1990) 52–58. So far as I can tell from my own reading of this seminal work, Newman favored the traditional Augustinian view, seemed rather harsh with and unfair to Luther, and regarded the distinction between justification and sanctification as unnecessary. He was willing to grant that in some of the Reformers justification, when joined with sanctification, is at least nominally the same as his own view. I have the impression that he regards justification in Reformation thought as purely imputational and forensic. Still, his view of the central role of the divine indwelling as the key seems exactly right.

tentiveness that Calvin seems to display. John Wesley is also helpful; his work mediates here as well. I have discovered that Roman Catholics instinctively find him appealing. The patristic theme of divinization is clearly strong in various of his writings as well as the teaching of the christological mystics of the 17th century. Accordingly, Wesley articulated a clearly transformative interpretation of justification: "You are really changed; you are not only accounted, but actually made, righteous."²⁷

Like Wesley and Newman, Calvin was imbued with the teaching of the Greek Fathers and he considered the teaching on divinization to be, rightly understood, biblically grounded. He also linked it with justification, as his commentary on 2 Peter 1:4, the locus classicus on divinization, makes clear: "We should notice that it is the purpose of the Gospel to make us sooner or later like God; indeed, it is, so to speak, a kind of deification." And Calvin continues by making the connection with justification: "The image of God in holiness and righteousness is reborn in us on the condition of our sharing in eternal life and glory, so far as is necessary for complete blessedness."²⁸

Recent Finnish research on Luther further underscores my interpretation.²⁹ It highlights, partly as a result of dialogue with the Orthodox Church, the stress on divinization in Luther, seeing it as present within justification, thus arguing for a transformative or sanative dimension within justification. Reflections of this thinking are particularly strong in Luther's impressive *Commentary on Galatians*. Luther's exegesis of 2 Peter 1:4, the locus classicus referred to a moment ago, may serve as representative:

Through the power of faith, [Peter] says, we partake of and have association or communion with the divine nature. This is a verse without parallel in the New and the Old Testaments, even though unbelievers regard it as a trivial matter that we partake of the divine nature itself. But what is the divine nature? It is eternal truth, righteousness, wisdom, everlasting life, peace, joy, happiness, and whatever can be called good. Now he who becomes a partaker of the divine nature receives all this, so that he lives eternally and has everlasting peace, joy, and happiness, and is pure, clean, and righteous, and almighty against the devil, sin, and death.³⁰

²⁷ John Wesley, "The Menace of Antinomianism," in *John Wesley*, Library of Protestant Thought, ed. Albert C. Outler (New York: Oxford University, 1964) 381; see *John and Charles Wesley: Selected Writings and Hymns*, Classics of Western Spirituality, ed. Frank Whaling (New York: Paulist, 1981).

²⁸ For this text, see *Calvin's New Testament Commentaries* 12, ed. David W. Torrance and Thomas F. Torrance, trans. William B. Johnston (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963) 330-31.

²⁹ See Tuomo Mannermaa, "Theosis as a Subject of Finnish Luther Research," *Pro Ecclesia* 4 (1995) 37-48; Reinhard Messner, "Rechtfertigung und Vergöttlichung—und die Kirche: Zur ökumenischen Bedeutung neuerer Tendenzen in der Lutherforschung," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 118 (1996) 23-35. I borrow the term "sanative" from Messner (29).

³⁰ I cite from the English translation of *Luther's Works*, 55 vols., ed. Jaroslav Pelikan,

Luther used participatory language, terms such as "communion," "partaking," and "becoming"; he associated them with "righteousness." Any attempt to conceive of justification in simply forensic terms breaks down here. So, consequently, does any attempt to associate the intrinsic dimension of participation exclusively with sanctification.

Luther scholar David Yeago, a disciple of the Finnish line of interpretation, has commented that, for Luther the imputation and forensic themes are temporary: they describe Christ's necessary work as long as we remain sinners. Sin is temporary; it is neither a constitutive dimension of humanity nor everlasting. What remains permanently is communion with Christ. This communion entails our difference in unity with Christ and has the characteristic of being both grace and gift for us.³¹ Yeago proposes this as an interpretation which, despite some ambiguous texts, seems to account best for the data.

I am inclined to think the same should be said for Calvin. The following text will have to serve by itself as representative. Note the "until" qualifying the imputational work of Christ:

For Christ's righteousness, which as it alone is perfect alone can bear the sight of God, must appear in court on our behalf, and stand surety in judgment. Furnished with this righteousness, we obtain continual forgiveness of sins in faith. Covered with this purity, the sordidness and uncleanness of our imperfections are not ascribed to us but are hidden as if buried that they may not come into God's judgment, until the hour arrives when, the old man slain and clearly destroyed in us, the divine goodness will receive us into blessed peace with the New Adam.³²

At this point, I would recommend a rereading of Barth's observations on the "completion" of justification, especially his beautiful meditation on the Psalms and their role in justification theology. We are not dealing with a *progressus in infinitum*, Barth tell us. We look forward to a "decision in which the relativity and contradiction and provisional nature of the decisions in consequence of which [we] now [exist] are taken away."³³

THE SPIRIT AND SANCTIFICATION

The third part of the creed deals with both the Holy Spirit and the sanctifying work of the Spirit in the Church and among individual

Hilton C. Oswald, Helmut T. Lehmann et al. (St. Louis: Concordia; and Philadelphia: Fortress, 1955-86) 30.155.

³¹ In private correspondence.

³² *Institutes* III.xiv.12.

³³ Barth, *Church Dogmatics* 4/1, 603. For the meditation on the Psalms in reference to justification, see *ibid.* 605-8. Here Barth suggests that Luther went from the Psalms to Romans, Galatians, and Hebrews. And not accidentally this occurred in prayer, for which the Psalms were composed. Guilt, forgiveness, pardon in history and its completion—all are the great themes here. "Ps. 23 is a summary of the whole Psalter, and therefore the explanation of the clear songs of triumph with which the book closes from Ps. 145 onwards. It is the self-documentation *in nuce* of the existence of the sinner justified by the gracious God" (608).

believers. Calvin's distinction between sanctification and justification might be said to point to the Spirit's real distinctiveness from the Son as well as to that Spirit's work within us. If justification points to the christological dimension of salvation, then sanctification points to the pneumatological dimension of the same, which brings about our own subjective acceptance of the salvation event. We have seen that, for Calvin, it is Christ's dwelling within us (even through a "mystical union"³⁴ and "sacred wedlock"³⁵) which bridges justification and sanctification, insuring that the forensic imputation of justification also somehow becomes truly ours in a real and not extrinsic way. But the Holy Spirit is at work here as well: "The Holy Spirit is the bond by which Christ effectually unites us to himself," or he is the "secret energy" through which "communion with Christ" becomes possible.³⁶ Through the Spirit, the God who is "outside" becomes "inside." "We must understand that as long as Christ remains outside us, and we are separated from him, all that he has suffered and done for the salvation of the human race remains useless and of no value for us."³⁷

These texts are complicated. They indicate that the Spirit is at work in both justification and sanctification. Thus, just as I have argued that one cannot simplistically distinguish justification from sanctification by thinking of the first as extrinsic and the second as intrinsic, so one cannot say simplistically that only Christ is present in justification and only the Spirit in sanctification. Each person of the Trinity is always present in each of the triune God's actions. But each is present in a manner appropriate to the person and mission. If we keep that in mind, can we suggest that justification results from the incarnately "Worded" nature of the Spirit, while sanctification results from the "Spirited" nature of the Word? Or, less vaguely, that justification signifies the mission of the Son, which involves his saving work of sending the Spirit, while sanctification signifies the mission of the Spirit, which is the work of sanctifying through leading back to the Son? The unity in distinction of justification and sanctification presents us with an economic analogy of the unity in distinction of the Father's Son and Spirit.

Here I take seriously the trinitarian hypostases, while also trying to maintain their perichoretic unity. That is, it belongs to the mission of the Son to become incarnate and Justifier; it belongs to the mission of the Spirit to be sent as the Sanctifier. There seems to be a strong "fittingness" here with respect to the economic Trinity. Thus the Spirit is present in justification, but as Sanctifier, not Justifier. Similarly, the Son is present in sanctification, but as Justifier, not Sanctifier. Calvin appears to manifest strong sensitivity to the distinction and interplay between the incarnate Word and the Spirit throughout his writings. Their interplay enables him to avoid enthusiast libertinism on the one

³⁴ *Institutes* III.xi.10.

³⁶ *Ibid.* III.i.1.

³⁵ *Ibid.* III.i.3.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

hand (the Spirit unnormed by the incarnate Word), and works-righteousness and rigorism on the other (the incarnate Word severed from the Spirit). This text may serve as representative:

God works in his elect in two ways: within, through his Spirit; without, through his Word. By his Spirit, illuminating their minds and forming their hearts to the love and cultivation of righteousness, he makes them a new creation. By his Word, he arouses them to desire, to seek after, and to attain that same renewal. In both he reveals the working of his hand according to the mode of dispensation.³⁸

Similar sensitivity can be found in Luther's thought as well; Yves Congar has brought out that this interplay between incarnate Word and Spirit is a very traditional theme in the Fathers and medieval writers.³⁹ Luther and Calvin are tributary to them.

The Church and the individual believer within the Church are traditionally linked with the creed's third part on the Holy Spirit. The sanctifying work of the Spirit quite simply brings the Church about. The common experience of sanctification is the ground of the Church. Here again the distinction between justification and sanctification might be said to point to the distinction, not separation, of Christ from the Church, so that Christ cannot be swallowed up by the Church and controlled by it—one of the major complaints of the Reformation against Catholics. The Church, through the Spirit, is under Christ.

The Spirit leads us to Christ, as it is the Son who sends the Spirit, not the Spirit who sends the Son. Hence Calvin's celebrated and fruitful emphasis on the relationship between Spirit and Word. The Spirit leads to the Word, not vice versa. Hence, the refusal of the Reformation to put the word of the Scriptures under the absolute control of the Church, or to say that the Church's postbiblical tradition norms the word of Scripture. There is tradition as surely as there is the Spirit and Church.⁴⁰ But authentic tradition is Word-normed. Hence, too, the enormous emphasis upon the sacramentality of the word and the role of preaching/sermon as witness to the Word's normativity. Communion (sanctification), yes—but with the Word, who while one with us is also unique and distinct and not simply reducible to us (the Word who comes to us through proclamation and justification). At least, I think

³⁸ Ibid. II.v.5.

³⁹ See Luther's *Schmalkaldic Articles* (viii); and Yves Congar, *The Word and the Spirit*, trans. David Smith (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1986).

⁴⁰ I intend these statements in a sense which can be legitimately acceptable to the Roman Catholic tradition. In a true sense Scripture is an aspect of tradition, but tradition is a differentiated reality, with the scriptural moment occupying the status of "un-normed norm," but the latter only able to be properly interpreted in and through the Spirit and the Spirit's guidance in the Church, with and under the authoritative magisterium. We must equally reverence Scripture and (postscriptural) tradition, as we must equally reverence Son and Spirit, but in the manner appropriate to each mission. See Vatican II's Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, *Dei Verbum* nos. 9–10.

this is the deepest source of the Reformation's thinking on this matter, which I have tried to express, sympathetically, in its own terms.

But sanctification also points to what can be called the Christian's personal or "subjective" appropriation of the event of salvation, "objectively" realized in Christ's life, especially the cross, and in justification. Thus, the justification-sanctification distinction not only avoids reducing Christ to either Church or individual Christians; it also highlights the distinctive vocation of the Christian as one of faithful discipleship and freely accepted union with Christ. "Paul shows the Spirit to be the inner teacher by whose effort the promise of salvation penetrates into our minds"; that Spirit is the one "regenerating us that we become new creatures."⁴¹ Consequently, "actual holiness of life . . . is not separated from free imputation of righteousness"; "repentance not only constantly follows faith, but is also born of faith."⁴²

Therefore, there is a christological and trinitarian character to the justification-sanctification formulation of Calvin and others who agree with him, and this character is explicit, or, to use the term I began with, "differentiated." Now I think it is fairly agreed that the Fathers, rich and suggestive as they are on the issues of salvation/divinization, properly understood, simply present us with a more compact and less differentiated understanding of the matter under consideration.⁴³ Trent, I would say, still remains—prefers to remain, and there are doctrinal advantages to this—with the earlier tradition as well, not differentiating as sharply justification from sanctification, but keeping them somehow closer and indistinct. However, I would say that Trent represents the beginnings of greater differentiation than the early Fathers expressed on this issue.

THE COUNCIL OF TRENT: ON THE WAY TO DIFFERENTIATION

I do not intend to study Trent's teaching at length. As a Roman Catholic I subscribe to its teachings. Furthermore, I think it is possible to attribute to Trent interpretations which would put it within the family of interpretations characteristic of the Fathers, albeit with much scholastic, aristotelian-like formation in the background. In other words, I suggest that the Reformation churches should treat Trent much as Calvin treated Augustine: not as teaching a works-righteousness, but as keeping justification and sanctification in a state of theological compactness and thus maintaining relatively more "in-

⁴¹ *Institutes* III.i.4.

⁴² *Ibid.* III.iii.1. For important observations on justification and sanctification as two aspects of the one salvation event of Jesus, see Barth, *Church Dogmatics* 4/1, 145 ff.

⁴³ See Robert B. Eno, "Some Patristic Views on the Relationship of Faith and Works in Justification," and William G. Rusch, "How The Eastern Fathers Understood What the Western Church Meant by Justification," in *Justification by Faith*, Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue 7, ed. H. George Anderson, T. Austin Murphy, and Joseph A. Burgess (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1985) 111–30, 131–41.

distinctness" than the churches of the Reformation saw fit to develop under the pressure of their reforming experiences. Trent, in other words, is not a regression from the standard reached earlier by the Fathers: it returns back to that earlier tradition. In this sense it was perhaps more balanced and mediating than is often recognized. At the same time, from a Roman Catholic point of view it set forth certain limits within which any genuine further differentiation on this issue would have to work.⁴⁴ I am persuaded that the above formulation influenced by Calvin would meet most if not practically all the truly crucial limits.

Perhaps the most fundamental issue is that of the distinction but not separation between justification and sanctification. Where the Reformers consider it appropriate and even necessary to distinguish sharply, Trent does not. But it would be going too far to say that Trent presents simply an undifferentiated, utterly compact, and blurry view of the issue at hand. The challenges posed by the Reformers called for some further clarification, and not everything involved in what Trent calls justification is simply identical or on the same level. In other words, there are distinctions found in the Tridentine view, inner distinctions, so to speak. These inner distinctions within the justification complex as articulated at Trent find an alternative but not necessarily incompatible formulation in the thought of Calvin. Trent seems to favor the view, wrongly, I think, that the Reformers actually separate rather than only distinguish justification and sanctification, and that they hold a simply forensic-extrinsicist view of justification.⁴⁵

Perhaps one example, taken from Chapter 8 of Trent's Decree on Justification (sixth session) may be suggestive in this regard. The decree says that it wants to interpret Paul's words that we are "justified by faith and freely" in the "sense in which the uninterrupted unanimity of the Catholic Church has held and expressed them." It then goes on to say that we are "justified by faith, because faith is the beginning of human salvation, the foundation and root of all justification." Works, and even "faith" apart from the gratuitous faith that comes from grace, do not save.⁴⁶ Of course, Trent keeps justification and sanctification closely united and even relatively indistinct by maintaining that our works themselves are an aspect of justification (Chapter 7). Still, in Chapter 8, the faith that comes from grace is described as the "foun-

⁴⁴ See Avery Dulles, "Justification in Contemporary Catholic Theology," *ibid.* 256-77.

⁴⁵ See Otto Hermann Pesch, "Die Canones des Trienter Rechtfertigungsdekretes: Wen trafen sie? Wen treffen sie heute?" in *Lehrverurteilungen—kirchentrennend? 2: Materialien zu den Lehrverurteilungen und zur Theologie der Rechtfertigung*, ed. Karl Lehmann (Freiburg: Herder; and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989) 243-82.

⁴⁶ I am using *Creeeds of the Churches: A Reader in Christian Doctrine from the Bible to the Present*, 3rd ed., ed. John H. Leith (Louisville: John Knox, 1982) 413. See the complete text in *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, trans. H. J. Schroeder (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1941; reprint, Rockford, Ill.: TAN, 1978). I have also checked translations against the Latin text in Denzinger-Schönmetzer (1965).

dation and root" of all justification. Here we have a distinction of aspects, surely. What Trent calls "foundation and root," the Reformers more or less reserve to justification; what flows from that root, they call "sanctification." A reading of Trent's Decree on Justification will also reveal a distinction between the work of the Son and the Holy Spirit (see especially Chapter 7), and it seems to me that it is this distinction within unity that the Reformers bring to more emphatic expression. If you will, Trent stresses the unity between them; perhaps much of the later Protestant tradition stresses the distinction; Calvin (not so differently from some of Luther's texts and even John Wesley much later) stresses the distinction in unity.

That one can argue for such inner distinctions in the Tridentine decree stems from the fact that not everything in its view of justification is on the same level. The work of the Holy Spirit, the grounding reality of grace, and justifying faith in its gifted quality—none of these are simply on the same level as our human response through our good works, real and essential as the latter are. The first is ground, in the foundational sense; the latter, the effect of the ground. All of these realities, simply by virtue of their ontological reality, can be said to exert an ontological pressure to find their appropriate linguistic articulation. Under the pressure of the Reformation, Trent could not be satisfied with leaving these realities in a simple undifferentiated compactness. In terms of present-day ecumenical discussion, it is important to move beyond contrasting verbal shells in a nominalistic fashion. Rather, one should look to the realities compactly present in Trent, and ask whether those realities find their equivalent affirmation, albeit in a different and perhaps more differentiated form, in the thought of the Reformers.

At the same time, one may suggest that it is not always necessarily opportune to bring doctrine to a more differentiated articulation. There is something to be said for a kind of doctrinal reserve, which deliberately prefers to leave further articulations to the theologians, but without the doctrinal weight. This allows room for healthy debate and authentic pluralism, recognizing the complexity of the mysteries of faith. Also, the celebration of the faith in liturgy and unofficial prayer enables the fullness of the faith to be adhered to and participated in, but more through biblical narrative and liturgical gestures and art than through severely precise propositions. Once the more compact is doctrinally differentiated in a more precise way—and at times this is necessary for the Church's welfare—then the precision achieved can, given certain pressures, obscure other mysteries left unfocused upon by the new articulation.

Trent's refusal to move in the direction of Calvin's expression of justification as distinguished (but not separated) from sanctification has the merit of stressing the transforming nature of saving grace, which as transforming truly issues forth in the response of our good works. The greater the stress upon the distinction between saving

grace and works, the greater the danger of landing in a separation between them, and then eventually of a denial of works as our participation in grace. And this, of course, leads either to simple quietism or to secularistic moralism. What is meant to be a distinction ends up, at times and given certain pressures, becoming a separation. Something analogous happens in Christology when one overstates the duality of Christ's natures at the expense of the unity of his person.

On the other hand, one can turn the table and argue that Trent's refusal to move in the direction of Calvin presents its own possible dangers, namely, a works-righteousness. The more obscure one leaves the difference between grace as the saving ground and our response in works, the greater the danger of obscuring the difference. One might argue that quietism, as it surfaced in post-Reformation Catholicism, was an extreme reaction to a works-righteousness tendency. The more careful reaction, I think, would be the active passivity taught by the great mystics of the Catholic Reformation, like John of the Cross, Teresa of Avila, Ignatius Loyola, Pierre de Bérulle, Vincent de Paul, Louise de Marillac, and Jane de Chantal. If you will, these Roman Catholic saints and mystics are part of the way in which Trent's teaching was meant to be received and understood in the Church. They represent a living commentary on that council. The radical passivity taught by these mystics, which is actually a radical activity, is a way of articulating the mystery of justification which brings out, I think, much compatibility between the concerns of Trent and those of the Protestant Reformers, yet by way of differing articulations and sensibilities.

Moving closer to our times, Thérèse of Lisieux can fairly be said to represent the active passivity of which I write. In her moving "Act of Oblation to Merciful Love," one can sense the action (the act of oblation) and the passion/passivity (merciful love). Thérèse writes, "I want to work for Your *Love* alone with the one purpose of pleasing You, consoling Your Sacred Heart, and saving souls who will love You eternally." One could not ask for more active sentiments. No denial of good works here! And yet she immediately continues with sentiments of wonderful passivity, cauterizing any works-righteousness in the sentiments just expressed. "In the evening of this life, I shall appear before You with empty hands, for I do not ask You, Lord, to count my works." And she does not mention the theme of works without immediately moving to that of justice. "All our justice is stained in Your eyes. I wish, then, to be clothed in Your own *Justice* and to receive from Your *Love* the eternal possession of *Yourselves*."⁴⁷

Beautiful sentiments, these, and not far removed from Calvin's own: "The children of God . . . come to realize that they stand and are upheld by God's hand alone; that, naked and empty-handed, they flee to his

⁴⁷ *Story of a Soul: The Autobiography of St. Thérèse of Lisieux*, trans. John Clarke (Washington: ICS, 1976) 277.

mercy, repose entirely in it, hide deep within it, and seize upon it alone for righteousness and merit."⁴⁸

CONNECTED ISSUES CALLING FOR STUDY

Our interpretation carries important implications for related questions in ecumenical dialogue. Two of those areas may be briefly touched on here: the issues of original sin and of assurance of salvation.

Original Sin and Depravity

Moving backwards, so to speak, toward themes presupposed by the doctrine of justification, one thinks of original sin and total depravity as issues requiring clarification in the light of the above. After all, justification only becomes necessary as a response to our plight. Typically the Catholic suspicion that works are either denied or undervalued by the Reformers in their view of justification finds its correlate in the Catholic suspicion that the Reformers teach a radical view of the effects of the fall, namely, that it was totally devastating, even to the extent of destroying God's creation in its very being.

Might Calvin's lens be of help here also? A recent Calvin commentator, William Bouwsma, has written that "if human being is an undifferentiated unity, sin has vitiated every part of it"; thus "no privileged area of the personality can be depended on for salvation. This is what Calvin meant by 'total depravity.'" Another Calvinist theologian, John Leith, had offered a similar interpretation of this matter even before Bouwsma: "Total depravity did not mean that man was totally evil but that he was crippled by sin and that at the crucial point of turning to God he was totally unable to do so apart from God's grace." Still earlier, Karl Barth, who was greatly influenced by Calvin, had interpreted total depravity along similar lines: "There is no territory which has been spared and where [man] does not sin, where he is not perverted, where he still maintains the divine order and is therefore guiltless. . . . There are in fact no spheres that are neutral. . . ." But he adds this important clarification: "The Bible accuses man as a sinner from head to foot, but it does not dispute to man his full and unchanged humanity, his nature as God created it good, the possession and use of all the faculties which God has given him."⁴⁹

⁴⁸ *Institutes* II.vii.8. The biblical image of the "empty hands" (Mark 12:3: a kenosis reality) is a *cantus firmus* in Calvin, e.g. *Institutes* III.xi.7, 10, 18; xii.8; xiv.5; xx.16, 29, 39; xxv.7; IV.xix.2. Barth was very fond of it (*Church Dogmatics* 1/1, 463; 1/2, 315; 3/3, 252, etc.; 3/4, 97, etc.; 4/1, 628, etc.). And Karl Rahner turned to Thérèse of Lisieux's phrasing of it in one of his own attempts to understand Reformation teaching on justification ("Justified and Sinner at the Same Time," in *Theological Investigations* 6, trans. Karl-H. and Boniface Kruger [Baltimore: Helicon, 1969] 230).

⁴⁹ William J. Bouwsma, *John Calvin: A Sixteenth Century Portrait* (New York: Oxford University, 1988) 139; and see 141-42; John H. Leith, *Introduction to the Reformed*

Of course, this matter could be interpreted along the lines of the Catholic suspicion mentioned above, because the *Formula of Concord* of 1577 goes to great lengths to clarify the matter, ending up with an interpretation nearly identical to that of Bouwsma, Leith, and Barth.⁵⁰ Calvin may have sensed these difficulties, for he presents what I think is a nuanced view. "The whole man is of himself nothing but concupiscence." And he cites Paul: "By nature all are children of wrath [Ephesians 2:3]." But then he cautions: "Obviously, Paul does not mean 'nature' as it was established by God, but as it was vitiated in Adam." Calvin's aim, it seems, is to avoid a Pelagian works-righteousness: "Paul . . . teaches that corruption subsists not in one part only, but that none of the soul remains pure or untouched by that mortal disease."⁵¹ This sounds like Barth and Bouwsma. There is no spared area to which the sinner can retreat to save him/herself.

Roman Catholics may be surprised to learn that a similar view is found within their own tradition. *Tota natura humana erat per peccatum corrupta*, declared Thomas Aquinas (*Summa theologiae* 3.1.2.2). Thomas's exegesis of Ephesians 2:3 is nearly identical with Calvin's: "Thus [Paul] says we were by nature, that is, from the earliest beginning of nature—not of nature as nature since this is good and from God, but of nature as vitiated—children of an avenging wrath, aimed at punishment and hell, even as the rest, that is, the Gentiles."⁵² Before Thomas we have the Council of Orange (529), which teaches a kind of "totality" of sin as well: "The whole man, that is, both body and soul, . . . was 'changed for the worse' through the offense of Adam's sin." Thinking that "only the body was made subject to corruption" is to be "deceived by the error of Pelagius."⁵³ And after Thomas we have Trent's teaching that "the entire Adam [*totumque Adam*] through that offense of prevarication was changed in body and soul for the worse."⁵⁴ Simply recalling these texts goes a long way toward helping Roman Catholics appreciatively receive the texts from the Protestant side which seem similar if not identical on this question of the total extent of original sin's influence, even if identical conclusions are not always drawn from this seemingly common teaching regarding the continuing effects of original sin. But this common teaching, if such it truly is,

Tradition: A Way of Being the Christian Community (Atlanta: John Knox, 1981) 39; Barth, *Church Dogmatics* 4/1, 496, 492.

⁵⁰ See "The Formula of Concord," in *The Book of Concord*, trans. and ed. Theodore G. Tappert (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1959) 508–10, 514–17.

⁵¹ *Institutes* II.i.8, 6, 9.

⁵² Thomas Aquinas, *Commentary on Saint Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, Aquinas Scripture series, vol. 2, trans. Matthew L. Lamb (Albany: Magi, 1966) chap. 2, lect. 1, 89.

⁵³ Council of Orange, no. 1, in *The Church Teaches: Documents of the Church in English Translation*, trans. John F. Clarkson et al. (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1955) 157.

⁵⁴ *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* 21; DS 1511. Clearly, of course, total corruption in what seems to be the sense of a destruction of nature was condemned by Trent (session 5, chapter 1; session 6, canon 5); see *The Catechism of the Catholic Church* (Liguori, Mo.: Liguori, 1994) 102 no. 405.

seems a promising place to begin a new evaluation of apparent differences on this other question of the continuing effects of original sin.

Assurance of Salvation

Moving forwards, so to speak, from justification, that is, casting a glance at the effects of justification, we would single out as requiring further clarification the theme of assurance, a theme so crucial to Luther, Calvin, and later to John Wesley. Calvin is very much the teacher of the "peaceful rest and serene tranquillity" that comes with justification.⁵⁵ The only way in which "the conscience can be made quiet before God" is through the "unmerited righteousness . . . conferred upon us as a gift of God." In this sense, then, "to have faith is to strengthen the mind with constant assurance and perfect confidence, to have a place to rest and plant your foot [cf. 1 Corinthians 2:5; 2 Corinthians 13:4]."⁵⁶

The Fathers of Trent seem to have thought that the Reformers were teaching, as an ordinary matter of faith, that the individual Christian believer knows with unfailing certainty of his or her salvation.⁵⁷ One might ask whether Trent has a more rationalistic view of faith than the Reformers on this matter; such would imply more clarity on one's salvation than a view of faith which is not less than, but also more than simple rational awareness. In terms of our present study, we may ask whether Trent, following the older tradition of not distinguishing justification from sanctification, adequately understands the sensibility of the Reformation on this matter.

Calvin, at any rate, explicitly warns against "overconfidence in our own strength," contrasting this with the "full assurance of God's mercy" in the substitutionary atonement of Jesus.⁵⁸ At the same time, he seems to recognize that there can be a certain variation in the concrete manifestation and shape of this faith of assurance as it is lived out in our life of sanctification: "Faith seems to be shaken or to bend." But never so much "that it does not at least lurk as it were beneath the ashes."⁵⁹ At least these texts seem to indicate that assurance primarily looks to justification (in Calvin's sense) rather than to sanctification. Trent conflates the two, while Calvin seems to sense certain consequences flowing from a distinction between the two. The once-for-all reality of the atonement brings full assurance, he seems to say. Believers are "assured" that Christ has acted lovingly to save them. Sanctification, on the other hand, which looks to our subjective appropriation through the Spirit of the atonement, can shake or bend, and thus admit of a certain variability, but never to the extent of negating the saving effects of the atonement. If this be the case, I believe the possibilities of compatibility with Trent are enhanced.

⁵⁵ *Institutes* III.xiii.1.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.* III.xiii.3.

⁵⁷ See session 6, chapter 9, and canons 12, 13, 16.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* III.ii.22.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.* III.ii.21; see III.xx.11.

CONCLUSION: CONNECTING WITH SCRIPTURE

Biblical exegesis forms the crucial foundation in the Reformers' thought. Calvin seems to have been aware of the forensic, legal background to justification terminology in the Hebrew.⁶⁰ This undoubtedly fortified him in his resolve to stress the imputation dimension of justification, over against a view of justification as a sort of autonomous possession of works-righteousness. If justification as *justum facere* means that (as he thinks he finds it in Osiander), then he opposes it. Yet we have also seen that Calvin accepts the transformative, intrinsic nature of justification as well, through the *insitio in Christum*. In that sense, he cannot really be said to be against a *justum facere* view of justification. Accordingly, if we follow Calvin, we do not have to choose between a simply forensic and a transformational view of justification in the Scriptures. The divine indwelling transcends those choices.

Perhaps that helps explain why historically both Catholic and Protestant believers could claim Paul's support, for there do seem to be both imputational and transformative dimensions to justification in Paul. The text which Calvin regarded as "the best passage of all" concerning justification is 2 Corinthians 5:18–20, but it needed to be read along with v. 21.⁶¹ Calvin appears to read it as entailing both an imputational dimension ("in Christ . . . not counting their trespasses against them" [v. 19]) and a transformative dimension ("God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ . . . so that in him we might become the righteousness of God" [vv. 18, 21]). "You see that our righteousness is not in us but in Christ, that we possess it only because we are partakers in Christ; indeed, with him we possess all its riches," says Calvin, commenting on v. 21.⁶²

Calvin, of course, appeals to Scripture as the warrant for the distinction between justification and sanctification: "Yet Scripture, even though it joins them, still lists them separately in order that God's manifold grace may better appear to us. For Paul's statement is not redundant: that Christ was given to us for our righteousness and sanctification [1 Corinthians 1:30]."⁶³ As Scripture supports both the forensic and transformative dimensions of justification, so here Scripture will probably support both a distinction and a more "compact" use in which aspects of justification seem attributed to sanctification as well. For example, the important text about "faith working through love"

⁶⁰ *Ibid.* III.xi.3.


⁶¹ *Ibid.* III.xi.4; see also III.xi.23 and II.xvi.5–12.

⁶² *Ibid.* III.xi.23. Joseph Fitzmyer points to 2 Corinthians 5:21 as a "bold" indication by Paul that we actually become righteous; as a Roman Catholic he features the text's transformative dimension ("Pauline Theology," in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, ed. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy [Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1990] 1397). Calvin can be just as bold, but also adds the imputational reference in 2 Corinthians 5:19.

⁶³ *Institutes* III.xi.6.

(Galatians 5:6) can be read as supporting either; so can the New Testament generally. What appears ruled out is a separation between justification and sanctification.

But, as we have argued, a separation is quite different from a distinction within unity (in analogy with the trinitarian and Chalcedonian distinctions within unity). In the end, Calvin is moving from what he believes is a trinitarian and Chalcedonian hermeneutic, stimulated by the Reformation experiences. While Scripture may not always be as differentiated as Calvin thinks, nonetheless one might argue, under Calvin's inspiration, that texts which can support such a distinction are to be treated as a hermeneutical key in the light of which the rest of Scripture may be understood. In any case, the compact as well as possibly differentiated uses under consideration would seem to offer support for this study's main contention.

	<p>Lindsay Wilson Realistic Hope or Imaginative Exploration? The Identity of Job's Arbiter</p> <p>Rosemary Williams Suffering has a Smooth Shape</p> <p>Andrew Hamilton Theodosius and Ambrose: The Church Reconciled and Reconciling</p> <p>Duncan Reid The Defeat of Trinitarian Theology: An Alternative View</p> <p>Gregory W. Dawes Derrida Among the Teachers of the Law</p> <p>Andrew Irvine "Antichristologies": Segundo and Mack</p>
<p>Editor: John Honner S.J. http://vicnet.net.au/~pacifica/</p> <p>Manuscripts, enquiries and subscriptions to: PACIFICA P.O. Box 271, Brunswick East Victoria 3057, Australia</p>	<p>AUSTRALIAN THEOLOGICAL STUDIES: JOURNAL OF THE MELBOURNE COLLEGE OF DIVINITY</p>