

Please note, direct quotations (in italics) and page and line references are from *Institutes of the Christian Religion* by John Calvin. Edited by John T McNeill. Used by permission of Westminster John Knox Press. www.wjkbooks.com

PREPARATION

1. I recommend surveying the chapter titles in the remainder of book 2 & observing how Calvin paces himself through this section. We might think that he would, in response to the questions he raises about why God became a man, move straight into his sufferings and death, **but he doesn't deal with that for another 5 chapters.**
2. It is important, therefore, in order to interact properly with Calvin in these chapters, to move at the same pace as he does.
3. Compare the section headings in McNeill with those in Beveridge:

Section	Beveridge	McNeill
1.	Necessary, not absolutely, but by divine decree, that the Mediator should be God, and become man. Neither man nor angel, though pure, could have sufficed. The Son of God behoved to come down. Man in innocence could not penetrate to God without a Mediator, much less could he after the fall.	(Reasons why it was necessary that the Mediator should be God and should become man, 1-3) Only he who was true God and true man could bridge the gulf between God and ourselves
2.	A second reason why the Mediator behoved to be God and man—viz. that he had to convert those who were heirs of hell into children of God.	The Mediator must be true God and true man
3.	Third reason, that in our flesh he might yield a perfect obedience, satisfy the divine justice, and pay the penalty of sin. Fourth reason, regarding the consolation and confirmation of the whole Church.	Only he who was true God and true man could be obedient in our stead
4.	First objection against the orthodox doctrine: Answer to it. Confirmation from the sacrifices of the Law, the testimony of the Prophets, Apostles, Evangelists, and even Christ himself.	(Objections to this doctrine answered, 4-7) The sole purpose of Christ's incarnation was our redemption
5.	Second objection: Answer: Answer confirmed. Third objection: Answer. Fourth objection by Osiander: Answer.	Would Christ have also become man if Adam had not sinned?
6.	Fifth objection, forming the basis of Osiander's errors on this subject: Answer. Nature of the divine image in	Osiander's doctrine of the image of God

	Adam. Christ the head of angels and men.	
7.	Sixth objection: Answer. Seventh objection: Answer. Eighth objection: Answer. Ninth objection: Answer. Tenth objection: Answer. Eleventh objection: Answer. Twelfth objection: Answer. The sum of the doctrine.	Point-by-point refutation of Osiander

EXPLORATORY

1. Calvin declares his position in an ongoing debate: Was the incarnation and subsequent death of Christ the *only* way God could have saved or was it simply the way that God *chose* to save? For Calvin the fact that the Mediator was God and man was, *of the greatest importance* (464, 11) but, *there has been no simple or absolute necessity* (464, 13f). This implies that God had other options but that he chose this one because, *Our most merciful Father decreed what was best for us* (464, 16f).

Calvin does not offer any support for his view nor engage in debate with those evangelicals who think otherwise. In his commentary on John 15:13 (NKJV: *Greater love has no one than this, than to lay down one's life for his friends*) he makes the same assertion: *God could have redeemed us by a word or a wish, save that another way seemed best for our sakes: that by not sparing His own and only-begotten Son He might testify in His person how much he cares for our salvation.* (This comment expresses a beautiful thought, don't you think?)

What is the source of this view? According to Derek WH Thomas (*A Theological Guide to Calvin's Institutes*, p207) its basis is the view that God possesses the power of noncontradiction, which means that he can only be constrained in any of his actions by his need to act consistently with own nature. Thomas articulates Calvin's position thus: *To suggest that God was "bound" to act in a certain way in salvation limits the freedom of his will.*

Others, both before and after Calvin, have thought this thought. Drawing on the words of Carl Trueman (*The Claims of Truth: John Owen's Trinitarian Theology*, p105, quoted in *A Theological Guide to Calvin's Institutes*, p208, footnote 18) Thomas notes that John Owen once held to it but subsequently changed his position. According Trueman Owen came to regard this view as, *a half-way house to the Socinians' complete denial of the necessity of the incarnation and atonement.*

The point at issue seems to be whether atonement could only come about on the basis of *satisfaction* for our sins or if the presence of such a necessity would place a limitation on God other than the limitations that arise from his power of non-contradiction. If satisfaction was necessary, the atonement was necessary. If it was not, God could have chosen another way – which then leads to the question, *Why did he choose this particular way?* In Calvin's view God wanted to do more than merely save us. He chose to save us in a way that demonstrated his deep personal commitment to us and to our salvation.

Although I note, above, that Calvin does not debate this point with other evangelicals, much of this chapter is polemic in nature. He deals with historical and contemporary (for him) heresies in the later sections.

To sum up Calvin's position outlined above: When it came to saving his people God had options. He was not constrained by his nature to choose the particular method that he did. He chose it because, out of the various options available to him, it was the one that would be the most encouraging to us. It was, for God, the most costly of the options available and thus demonstrated to us his deep personal commitment to our salvation. It is also the most enticing way to us because it enables us to relate to God, in Christ, as a true man and a true brother.

While I enjoy thinking these heart-warming thoughts and thank God for the broader understanding of salvation that is implied in them, I'm not sure I accept them completely. Romans 3:24ff seems to imply that the death of Christ was necessary in order to demonstrate that salvation did not come at the expense of God's commitment to his own righteousness – in other words that it came in the particular way that it did precisely because that was the only way that was non-contradictory. *...being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God set forth to be a propitiation by his blood, through faith, to demonstrate his righteousness, because in his forbearance God had passed over the sins that were previously committed, to demonstrate at the present time his righteousness **that he might be just and the justifier of the one who had faith in Jesus.***

We need to think about who might have been qualified for the role of mediator. Why could the mediator not have been, *any one of Adam's children?* (464, 21f; 465 3ff)

- a. *...like their father, all of them were terrified at the sight of God [Gen 3:8]*
- b. *Even if man had remained free from all stain, his condition would have been too lowly for him to reach God without a Mediator.*
- c. *What, then, of man (ie man as he has now become – IJ): plunged by his mortal ruin into death and hell, defiled with so many spots, befouled with his own corruption, and overwhelmed with every curse?*

(IJ: The statement: *Even if man had remained free from all stain, his condition would have been too lowly for him to reach God without a Mediator*, is probably a new thought to many of us. It is worth copying this statement and pasting it into Google's search window. I found the results very interesting even though I never exhausted the first page.

Obviously, if mankind had never sinned Christ would not have had to redeem. This leads to a distinction in the way we think about Christ's mediatorial (?) roles. Christ had a role as *cosmic* mediator that is logically prior to his role as *redemptive* mediator. It is held that this is what Paul is referring to in Colossians 1:15ff, which reads: *He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn over all creation. For by Him all things were created that are in heaven and that are on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers. All things were created through Him and for Him. And He is before all things, and in Him all things consist.*

The statements made in these verses would be true of Christ whether he had become the redeemer or not.)

Could the mediator have been, *one of the angels?* (464, 22ff)

- a. *They also had need of a head, through whose bond they might cleave firmly and undividedly to their God [cf. Eph. 1:22; Col. 2:10]. (Eph. 1:22: And He put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be head over all things to the church; Col. 2:10: and you are complete in Him, who is the head of all principality and power.)*

How does Calvin describe our plight, *had the very majesty of God not descended to us, since it was not in our power to ascend to him?* (464, 25)

- a. *...hopeless*

What necessity did this hopelessness give rise to? (464, 27ff)

- a. *Hence, it was necessary for the Son of God to become for us "Immanuel, that is, God with us" [Isa. 7:14; Matt. 1:23]*

What would have been the outcome, had the redeemer not have been both divine and human? (464, 31ff)

- a. *...the nearness would not have been near enough, nor the affinity sufficiently firm, for us to hope that God might dwell with us. So great was the disagreement between our uncleanness and God's perfect purity!*

After observing the need for a mediator, *Even if man had remained free from all stain*, in what way does Calvin describes our present highly stained condition? (465, 5ff)

- a. *...plunged by mortal ruin into death and hell, defiled with so many spots, befouled with his own corruption, and overwhelmed with every curse.*

Due to the vastly increased distance between God and us that was brought about by the fall, how is Paul careful to describe the mediator in 1 Timothy 2:5? (465, 10)

- a. *...the **man** Christ Jesus*

What has Paul omitted in his description of the Lord Jesus in 1 Timothy 2:5? (465, 11f)

- a. *He...omitted...the word "God".*

What options did Paul have when writing, *One mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus?* (465, 11ff)

- a. *He could have said "God"*
- b. *...or he could have omitted the word "man" just as he did the word "God".*

Given these options, why did Paul, inspired by the Holy Spirit, use the word, *man*? (465, 12ff)

- a. *...because the Spirit speaking through his mouth knew our weakness, at the right moment he used a most appropriate remedy to meet it: he set the Son of God familiarly among us as one of ourselves. Therefore, lest anyone be troubled about where to seek the Mediator, or by what path we must come to him, the Spirit calls him "man,"² thus teaching us that he is near us, indeed touches us, since he is our flesh.*

In what way is Hebrews 4:15 (*We have not a high priest who is unable to sympathise with our weaknesses, but one who in every respect has been tempted as we are, yet without sinning*) a parallel passage to 1 Timothy 2:15? (465, 19f)

- a. *Here he surely means the same thing that is explained elsewhere at greater length: "We have not...yet without sinning" [Heb 4:15].*

2. It was necessary for the mediator to be God in order to achieve his objectives, which were - what? (465, 26ff; 466,5ff)

- a. *...So to restore us to God's grace as to:*
 - i. *...make of the children of men, children of God;*
 - ii. *...Make...of the heirs of Gehenna, heirs of the heavenly kingdom.*
- b. *It was his task to:*
 - i. *...swallow up death;*
 - ii. *...conquer sin;*
 - iii. *...rout the powers of world and air;*

How does Calvin link Christ's being truly God and truly man at the same time with his objectives and tell us how divine incarnation was necessary in order to achieve those objectives? (465, 29ff)

- a. *Who could have done this had not the self-same God become the Son of man, and had not so taken what was ours as to impart what was his to us, and to make what was his by nature ours by grace?*

(IJ: As we read the above statement, the emphasis should fall on, so. Calvin is going to go on to become more precise about *the way* in which Christ joined himself to us and what that enabled him to achieve.)

What does Christ speak of, that emphasises the thoroughness of his identification with us? (465, 38ff)

- a. *...that holy brotherhood which he commends with his own lips when he says: "I am ascending to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God" [John 20:17].*

How does our brotherhood with Christ assure us of the heavenly kingdom? (465, 41ff)

- a. *...the only Son of God, to whom it wholly belongs, has adopted us as his brothers. "For if brothers, then also fellow heirs with him." {Rom 8:17 p.}*

466, 8f: *Who but a power higher than world and air could do this?* Do what? (466, 6ff)

- a. *...swallow up death;*
- b. *...conquer sin;*
- c. *...rout the powers of world and air;*

Who alone could swallow up death? (466, 6)

- a. *Who but the Life could do this?*

Who alone could conquer sin? (466,7f)

- a. *Who but very Righteousness could do this?*

Who alone could rout the powers of world and air? (466, 8f)

- a. *Who but a power higher than world or air could do this?*

Why does the answer to the three questions above lead us to recognise the divinity (the God-ness) of our Redeemer? (466, 10f)

- a. *...where does life or righteousness or lordship and authority of heaven lie but with God alone?*

How did God, in redeeming us, respond to this fact? (466, 11ff)

- a. *Therefore our most merciful God, when he willed that we be redeemed, made himself our Redeemer in the person of his only-begotten Son [cf. Rom 5:8]*

3. The **second requirement** of our reconciliation with God was... What was the first? (464, 11ff)

- a. *Now it was of the greatest importance for us that he who was to be our Mediator be both true God and true man. If someone asks **why this is necessary**, there has been no simple (to use the common expression) or absolute necessity. Rather, **it has stemmed from a heavenly decree, on which men's salvation depended.***

So far, Calvin has not yet dealt in this chapter with the atonement, the subject to which he now turns. Why was it necessary for the mediator who by nature was divine to become human in order to atone for our sin? (466, 15ff)

- a. *...Man, who by his disobedience had become lost should:*
 - i. *...By way of remedy counter it with obedience;*
 - ii. *...Satisfy God's Judgment;*
 - iii. *...Pay the penalties for sin.*

How did the Lord Jesus – as God and man – do these three things? (466, 17ff)

- a. *Accordingly, our Lord came forth as true man and took the person and the name of Adam in order to:*
 - i. *...take Adam's place in obeying the Father;*
 - ii. *...to present our flesh as the price of satisfaction to God's righteous judgment*
 - iii. *...in the same flesh, to pay the penalty that we had deserved.*

Do you know the name of the doctrine that Calvin expresses in these words, *neither as God alone could he feel death*? (466, 22)

- a. Divine Impassability

(IJ: There is controversy about Divine Impassability. Some feel that it is more Greek than Biblical. According to Greek mythology the Gods dwelt on Mount Olympus, concerned only about what directly affected them and entirely transcending the experiences of mere humans. Some think that Divine Impassability must mean that God is emotionless and does not come alongside us in our emotional experiences and reactions, which would be a notion that owes more to Greek mythology than it does to the teaching of scripture.

According to Open Theists and/or Process Theologians God is wholly immanent (the opposite of transcendent). He shares our experiences and supports us in them because he goes through them with us in exactly the same way as we do – learning along with us as life's circumstances unfold, even to the extent of being buffeted by them in the same way as we are.

We need to bear in mind the Biblical position is that God is both immanent and transcendent.)

Calvin continues the statement quoted above with another that shows why the Redeemer had to be God as well as man. What is that statement? (466, 22f)

- a. *...nor as man alone could he overcome (death)*

How did the way that Christ combined both divine and human natures in his one person enable him to redeem us? (466, 23ff)

- a. *...he coupled human nature with divine that to atone for sin he might submit the weakness of the one to death; and that, wrestling with death by the power of the other nature, he might win victory for us.*

How do, *Those who despoil Christ of either his divinity or his humanity*, do him an injustice? (466, 26ff)

- a. *Those who despoil Christ of either his divinity or his humanity diminish his majesty and glory, or obscure his goodness.*

How do, *Those who despoil Christ of either his divinity or his humanity...weaken and overthrow*, saving faith? (466, 28ff)

- a. *...they do just as much wrong to men whose faith they thus weaken and overthrow, because it cannot stand unless it rests upon this foundation.*

What further benefit do Godly minds derive from recognising Jesus of Nazareth as the son of Abraham and David whose coming was foretold in the Old Testament? (466, 34ff)

- a. *...on the basis of his descent from David and Abraham they are more certain that he is the Anointed One who had been hailed by so many oracles.*

Over and above this, what should we especially espouse? (466, 38ff)

- a. *...our common nature with Christ is the pledge of our fellowship with the Son of God; and clothed with our flesh he vanquished death and sin together that the victory and triumph might be ours,*

What did Christ accomplish by offering as a sacrifice the flesh he received from us? (466, 41ff)

- a. *He offered as a sacrifice the flesh he received from us, that he might wipe out our guilt by his act of expiation and appease the Father's righteous wrath.*

4. Sections 4-7 contain Calvin's responses to specific objections. According to Beveridge, there are twelve. What is the first? (467, 6f)

- b. *...Christ would still have become man, even if no means of redeeming mankind had been needed.*

What argument do the proponents of this speculation use? (467, 8f)

- a. *...in the original order of creation and the unfallen state of nature Christ was set over angels and men as their Head.* (Calvin acknowledges this to be a true statement, but obviously does not accept the conclusion that his opponents draw from it.)

Calvin doesn't say so in so many words but they may also use one scripture that he quotes, which is – what? (467, 10)

- a. *...“the first born of all creation” [Col. 1:15]*

What does, *all scripture*, teach us about why Christ came in the flesh? (467, 11ff)

- a. *...to become our redeemer he was clothed with flesh.*
- b. *We well know why Christ was promised from the beginning: to restore the fallen world and to succour lost men.*

Calvin turns to five sources of testimony about the purpose for which the son of God became a man. What are they? (467, 15, 22f, 35; 468, 13, 19f, 20)

- a. *...the law*

- b. *...the prophets*
- c. *...he himself*
- d. *The apostles*
- e. *...all titles that Scripture bestows upon him*

Under the testimony given by the law, what two things does Calvin note? (467, 15ff)

- a. *...under the law, Christ's image was set forth in sacrifices to give believers the hope that God would be gracious towards them, after having been reconciled to them through atonement made for their sins.*
- b. *...since, in every age, even when the law had not yet been published, the Mediator never was promised without blood, we infer that he was appointed by God's eternal plan to purge the uncleanness of men; for shedding of blood is a sign of expiation [cf. Heb. 9:22].*

How does Calvin sum up the testimony of the Old Testament prophets? (467, 22ff)

- a. *...the prophets in preaching about him promised that he would be the reconciler of God and man.*

Which passage in particular does Calvin draw on to support this conclusion? (467, 25ff)

- a. *Isaiah's famous one..."He was to be smitten by God's hand...for the transgression of the people...that the chastisement of peace should be upon him" [Isa. 53:4-5], and he would be the high priest who would offer himself as a victim [Heb. 9:11-12]; "from his stripes there would be healing for others"; because "all...have gone astray" and been scattered "like sheep," it pleased God to afflict him that he might bear "the iniquities of us all" [Isa/ 53:5-6 p.]*

Bearing in mind the clarity of the prophetic testimony, as exemplified in the verses quoted from Isaiah 53, what are they doing who want to find another reason for the incarnation? (467, 33f)

- a. *...whoever leaps over these bounds too much indulges foolish curiosity.*

Turning now to Jesus, what did he declare that relates to the purpose of his coming? (467, 35ff)

- a. *...he himself...declared that the reason for his advent was by appeasing God to gather us from death to life*
- b. *"God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whoever believes in him may not perish but have eternal life" [John 3:16]*
- c. *"The hour has come that the dead may hear the voice of the Son of God, and that those who hear may live" [John 5:25 p.]*
- d. *"I am the resurrection and the life; he who believes in me, though he has died, yet shall he live." [John 11:25]*
- e. *"For the Son of Man came to save what has been lost." [Matt 18:11]*
- f. *"Those who are well have no need of a physician." [Matt 9:12 p.]*

Turning to the apostles, what did John tell of before making his statement, *the Word was made flesh*? (468,1)

- a. *...man's rebellion*

What further arguments and citations does Calvin produce from the writings of the apostles that demonstrate that Christ came solely for the purpose of saving us by dying in our place? (468, 14ff)

- a. *Surely, if he had not come to reconcile God and man, the honour of his priesthood would have fallen away, since a priest is appointed as an intermediary to intercede between God and men [Heb. 5:1]*
- b. *...he would not be our righteousness, for he became a sacrifice for us that "God might not count our trespasses against us" [2 Cor. 5:19 p.]*

Calvin's final line of evidence for his contention that Christ came expressly for the purpose of suffering and dying in our place is drawn from the titles (descriptions) given to him (468, 20). However, before starting to list Christ's titles, he refers back to two statements of Paul, which are...? (468, 20ff)

- a. *"To make satisfaction in our behalf, God has sent his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh – something the law could not do" [Rom 8:3-4 p., with omissions].*
- b. *...in this mirror "the goodness of God" and his boundless love "appeared to...men" when Christ was given as our Redeemer [cf. Titus 2:11].*

What descriptions does he cite? (468, 29ff)

- a. *"Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer...and that repentance...should be preached in his name" [Luke 24:46-47.]*
- b. *"For this reason the Father loves me, because I lay down my life for my sheep...This commandment he gave me." [John 10:17,15, 18 p.]*
- c. *"As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of Man be lifted up." [John 3:14.]*
- d. *"Father save me from this hour...But for this purpose I have come to this hour. Father glorify the Son" [John 12:27-28, conflated with v.23].*
- e. *In the same way Sechariah declares that He came in accordance with the promise made to the patriarchs "to give light to those who sit in ...the darkness of death" [Luke 1:79].*

Before citing these statements how does Calvin sum up their meaning? (468, 26ff)

- a. *...the only reason given in Scripture that the Son of God willed to take our flesh, and accepted this commandment from the Father is that he would be a sacrifice to appease the Father on our behalf.*

Why should, *the only reason given in Scripture*, be enough for us?

- a. *We remember that all these things have been said of the Son of God, "in whom" – as Paul elsewhere testifies – "are hid all the reassures of knowledge and wisdom" [Col 2:3], and apart from whom Paul glories that he himself knows nothing [1 Cor 2:2].*

5. According to Beveridge, this section contains three objections to the position Calvin has been advancing. Let's see if we can find them. (469, 3ff, 24f; 470, 9ff)

- a. *...none of these things prevent Christ – who has redeemed condemned men – from being able also to show his love toward those who are saved and safe, by taking on their flesh.*
- b. *Suppose our adversary again objects that this plan of God depended on the ruin of man, which he foresaw.*
- c. *Osiander...accuses of presumption those who deny that the Son of God would have appeared in the flesh if Adam had not fallen, because no testimony of Scripture refutes this fabrication.*

Turning to the first objection first, how does Calvin deal with it? (469, 6ff)

©Ian Jemmett. You may share or distribute this document freely, provided you make no alterations to the quotations from Calvin's Institutes, which are used by permission of Westminster John Knox Press.

- a. *My answer is brief: Since the Spirit declares that these two were joined together by God's eternal decree, **it is not lawful to inquire further** how Christ became our Redeemer and the partaker of our nature.*

Having established his position on the sufficiency of Scripture, in what way does Calvin go further and get to the heart of the matter? (469, 9ff)

- a. *...he who is tickled with desire to know something more, not content with God's unchangeable ordinance, also shows that **he is not even content with this very Christ who was given to us as the price of our redemption.***

Beveridge tells us that Calvin, having made this response, goes on to confirm it. How does he do this? (469, 13ff)

- a. *From scripture – Paul, indeed, not only recounts for what purpose he was sent, but soars to the lofty mystery of predestination and fitly restrains all the wantonness and itching curiosity of human nature. “The Father has chosen us in Christ before the foundation of the world” [Eph. 1:4] to adopt us as sons “according to the purpose of his will” [Eph. 1:6, cf. KJV], “in whom we have redemption through his blood” [Eph. 1:7, Vg.]*

(IJ: In lines 20-23 Calvin's remarks take us into the realm of a theological controversy known as supralapsarianism/infralapsarianism. The 'laps' in both of these words refers to the fall, or lapse, of mankind, recorded in Genesis 3. The Supralapsarian holds to the view that, in the decree of God, Salvation by the death of Christ preceded the fall. The Infralapsarian holds to the view that the fall came first and salvation and its means (*ie* the death of Christ) was God's response to the need that the fall created.)

In the passages quoted from Ephesians 1:4-7 the blessings of salvation are stated – we are, *adopted as sons*, we are, *made accepted in his beloved Son* and, *we have redemption*. All these blessing arise from – what? (469, 16f)

- a. *The Father has chosen us in Christ before the foundation of the world.*

God's eternal choice is the fundamental reason for our redemption but what is the means whereby redemption came? (469, 19f)

- a. *...his beloved Son...through his blood*

Not only was God's purpose to save fixed before creation but also the means whereby salvation would come. The means *required* the incarnation of the Son of God because God, purely as God, has no blood to shed. According to the view that Calvin is here opposing, God's eternal decree included the incarnation of the Son as an expression of the love of God. His becoming our redeemer by the shedding of his blood was added later, once the fall had made redemption necessary. How does Calvin respond to that view of the order of events involved in our salvation? (469, 20ff)

- a. *Here, surely, the fall of Adam is not presupposed as preceding God's decree in time; but it is what God determined before all ages that is show, when he willed to heal the misery of mankind.*



6. We have met Osiander before, in I.xv.3. In terms of space given to Osiander's views Calvin concentrates mainly on errors in his doctrine of justification (III.xi.5-12)

According to Osiander, Christ would have come in human form whether mankind sinned or not. Although Adam preceded Christ, it was the person of the incarnate Christ, body and soul, on which Adam was modelled.

By what route did Osiander arrive at his conclusion that Christ would have been incarnated whether man sinned or not? (470, 33f)

- a. Starting point - the image of God in Adam consisted in his likeness to the incarnate Christ.
- b. This makes the incarnation something that would have happened anyway, otherwise how could the image of God in Adam have arisen from something that might never appear?

If true, this would have made Adam identical with Christ, even to the extent of sharing - what? (471, 2f)

- a. The essence of God.

What does Calvin mean when, in 471, 4f, he speaks of Adam being *...joined to God*? (471, 6)

- a. *...this likeness...*

Who also shared this likeness? (471, 16f)

- b. Angels

If angels shared God's image, derived from Christ, their head in the same way as Adam derived God's image from the incarnate Christ, what does that imply about Christ? (471, 32ff)

- c. He must also have taken upon himself the nature of angels.

What inference can we draw from the fact that Christ did not take the nature of angels? (471, 24f)

- a. Likeness to God (God's image) comes from sharing qualities with him, not from participating in the same essence.

7. Osiander fears - what? (471, 35ff; 472, 1ff)

- b. *...unless there was in (God's) mind a fixed and immutable decree concerning the incarnation of the Son, God can be made out a liar.*

- c. If there was not an immutable decree of God that Christ would be born as the first man, his incarnation would be a consequence of human actions and would in that sense be something that man's behaviour controlled, meaning he would, in effect be made in the image of Adam. In Osiander's mind this seems to have implied that Christ, like Adam, would be mutable.

How does Calvin deal with Osiander's second fear? (472, 7ff)

- d. By pointing out that the very thing Osiander is anxious to avoid is what scripture clearly teaches.

Which two classes of being would, according to Osiander, have lacked Christ's headship over them if he had not become incarnate? (472, 34f & 473, 4ff)

- a. Angels and men.

What words of Adam indicated to Osiander that all who came after him were made in his image? (473, 22)

- a. *...this is now bone of my bone & flesh of my flesh.*

Osiander asserts that these words of Adam are a prophecy - why? (473, 23f)

- a. Because, in Matthew 19, Christ attributes these words to God.

To what words of God does Calvin allude in order to demonstrate that not all God's words are prophecies? (473, 26)

- a. ...*the several precepts of the law*.

In summary, what is Calvin's view of Osiander's thinking? (474, 3)

- a. ...*rubbish*...

FOR REFLECTION

This is one of those chapters in which it is easy to get lost in the detail. Just so that doesn't happen, review the chapter title and section headings to remind yourself of Calvin's *overall* objective in this chapter.

1. What do you think of: *Even if man had remained free from all stain, his condition would have been too lowly for him to reach God without a mediator?* (465, 3ff) What are the implications of this statement for the view that it was the original intention of the Covenant of Works to provide secure eternal life?