

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 AND CHAPTER OVERVIEW

At the outset of the Institutes Calvin told us that almost everything we can usefully know falls under one of two headings – the knowledge of God and the knowledge of ourselves. Our knowledge of God informs and shapes our knowledge of ourselves and *vice versa*. When we learn what God is like, we learn what we *should* be like and what we were made to be. When we learn about ourselves in light of what we know about God, we discover afresh God's goodness to all and his grace to his elect.

The data we acquire under these two branches of knowledge are so intertwined that it is not possible for us to say which comes first. Calvin started with the knowledge of God that we derive from creation, from the vague sense of the divine possessed by all, from the physical creation, from ourselves, from the Word of God that was initially verbal only but is now inscripturated. With the aid of the Word our understanding becomes much clearer, like vision corrected by spectacles.

In this chapter Calvin turns to our knowledge of ourselves. The first thing we need to recognise is the purity of the state in which we were originally created. This enables us to recognise that every departure from our original purity is something that we bring upon ourselves.

We need also to understand our makeup – that we consist of both body and soul.

We were made in God's image and we need to recognise those things in us that still reflect God.

Not surprisingly, human beings have reflected on themselves and what it means to be human. All such reflection will be unhelpful if it does not take our original condition and our subsequent fall from that condition into account.

Also, in this chapter, Calvin introduces the subject of free will and the part it played in the fall.

EXPLORATORY

1. *...knowledge of ourselves is twofold*. What are the two branches of self-knowledge? (183, 7ff)

- a. *...to know what we were like when we were first created*
- b. *...and what our condition became after the fall of Adam.*

When thinking about ourselves, what is the first temptation we face? (183, 15ff)

- a. *...singling out only those natural evils of man* (Beveridge translates this: *there is need of caution, lest we attend only to the natural ills of man*)

Why might we do this? (183, 15ff)

- a. *...we must guard against singling out only those natural evils of man, lest we seem to attribute them to the Author of nature. For in this excuse, impiety thinks it has sufficient defence, if it is able to claim that whatever defects it possesses have in some way proceeded from God.*

Why must we avoid this attribution at all costs? (183, 24f)

- a. *...if any defect were proved to inhere in nature, this would bring reproach upon him.*

How must we deal with our flesh's, *panting for every subterfuge by which it thinks that the blame for its own evils may in any way be diverted from itself to another* (please answer both negatively and positively)? (183, 28ff)

- a. *...we must diligently oppose this evil intent*

- b. *...we must so deal with the calamity of mankind that we may cut off every shift, and may vindicate God's justice from every accusation.*

In his original state of innocence, what thought would have kept Adam's pride in check? (184, 3f)

- a. *...he was taken from earth and clay*

What was Adam's sole reason for glory? (184, 7ff)

- b. *...God not only deigned to give life to an earthen vessel, but also willed it to be the abode of an immortal spirit*

2. Of what does man consist? (184, 11)

- a. *...a soul and a body*

What is person's soul? (184, 12f)

- a. *...an immortal yet created essence, which is his nobler part*

How do we know the soul has essence? (184, 35ff)

- a. *...the body is not affected by the fear of spiritual punishment, which falls upon the soul only; from this it follows that the soul is endowed with essence.*

How do we know that the soul is immortal? (184, 38ff)

- a. *...the very knowledge of God sufficiently proves that souls, which transcend the world, are immortal, for no transient energy could penetrate to the fountain of life.*

What is the soul sometimes called in scripture? (184, 13f)

- a. *...sometimes it is called "spirit".*

Do "soul" and "spirit" always mean the same thing? (184, 14ff)

- a. *...when these terms are joined together, they differ from one another in meaning; yet when the word "spirit" is used by itself, it means the same thing as soul.*

In what way do some people stupidly blunder when it comes to the nature of the soul? (184, 21ff)

- a. *Some imagine the soul to be called "spirit" for the reason that it is breath, or a force divinely infused into bodies, but that it nevertheless is without essence*

What shows the holders of such a view to be, stupidly blundering? (184, 24)

- a. *...both the thing itself and all scripture*

How does, *the thing itself*, show the opinion that the soul does not have essence to be a stupid blunder? (184, 31ff, 41ff; 185, 5ff)

- a. *Surely the conscience, which, discerning between good and evil, responds to God's judgment, is an undoubted sign of the immortal spirit. For how could a motion without essence penetrate to God's judgment seat, and inflict itself with dread at its own guilt?*
- b. *...many pre-eminent gifts with which the human mind is endowed proclaim that something divine has been engraved upon it; all these are testimonies of an immortal essence.*
- c. *...the nimbleness of the human mind in searching out heaven and earth and the secrets of nature, and when all ages have been compassed by its understanding and memory, in*

arranging each thing in its proper order, and in inferring future events from past, clearly shows that there lies hidden in man something separate from the body.

How does, *all scripture*, show the opinion that the soul does not have essence to be a stupid blunder? (185, 21ff)

- a. *...unless the soul were something essential, separate from the body, Scripture would not teach that we dwell in houses of clay [Job 4:19] and at death leave the tabernacle of the flesh, putting off what is corruptible so that at the Last Day we may finally receive our reward, according as each of us has done in the body.*
- b. *...these passages...not only distinguish the soul from the body, but by transferring to it the name "man" indicate it to be the principal part.*
- c. *...when Paul urges believers to cleanse themselves of every defilement of flesh and spirit [2Cor 7:1], he points out the two parts in which the filth of sin resides.*
- d. *Peter, also, calling Christ "shepherd and bishop of...souls" [1Pet 2:25], would have spoken wrongly if there had not been souls on whose behalf he might fulfil this office.*
- e. *If souls did not have their own proper essence, there would be no point in Peter's statement about the eternal "salvation of...souls" [1Pet 1:9], or in his injunction to purify our souls and ascertain that "wicked lusts...war against the soul" [1Pet 2:11]*
- f. *The same applies to the statement of the author of Hebrews, that the pastors "stand watch...to render account for our souls" [Heb 13:17].*
- g. *The fact that Paul, upon his soul, calls God to witness [2Cor 1:23] points to the same conclusion, because it would not become guilty before God unless it were liable for punishment.*
- h. *This is expressed even more clearly in Christ's words, when he bids us be afraid of him who, after he has killed the body, can send the soul into the Gehenna of fire [Matt 10:28; Luke 12:5]*
- i. *...the author of...Hebrews distinguishes the fathers of our flesh from God, who is the one "Father of spirits" [Heb 12:9]*
- j. *...unless souls survive...it would be absurd for Christ to induce the soul of Lazarus as enjoying bliss in Abraham's bosom, and again, the soul of the rich man sentenced to terrible torments [Luke 16:22-23]*
- k. *Paul confirms this same thing, teaching us that we journey away from God so long as we dwell in the flesh, but that we enjoy his presence outside the flesh [2Cor 5:6, 8]*
- l. *...among the errors of the Sadducees it is mentioned that they did not believe in spirits and angels [Acts 23:8]*

3. In this section Calvin introduces Osiander. By the time of the publication of this edition of the *Institutes* (1559) Osiander had been dead for some seven years. From Calvin thus far we would get the impression that Osiander's main error was in relation to the image of God but if we read evangelical Lutheran theologians (Osiander was a Lutheran) we learn that Osiander's fundamental disagreement with evangelicalism was over the doctrine of justification. In fact we will encounter him again in Book 3.

Osiander was a leading Lutheran pastor and a well-known and influential man in his day. He was the publisher of Copernicus's *On the Revolution of the Celestial Spheres* (to which he added a

preface suggesting Copernicus's ideas were not true!). He is often described as the first prominent Protestant to begin to undo the Reformation by betraying it at its very heart – the doctrine of justification through faith alone, in Christ alone, by grace alone.

The essence of Luther's discovery that led to the Reformation was that justification is purely a *declaration* that we are righteous, that is based on Christ's death and resurrection on our behalf. The mere fact that we are justified implies nothing about our own righteousness. In Romans 4:5 God is: *Him who justifies the ungodly*. Progressive sanctification is one of the accompaniments of justification (Heb 6:9). It does not form the basis of justification nor contribute to it in any way.

Stressing that justification is merely a declaration is not meant to imply that it is unimportant. Its importance as the basis of all that follows – right through to heavenly glorification – cannot be overstated (Hence Luther's description of it as the hallmark of a standing or a falling Church). But, *considered apart from its effects*, it is *solely* a declaration.

Osiander did not believe this. He believed that our justification came about through Christ dwelling in us and through that indwelling making us like himself. In this, Osiander showed that he had never really moved away in principle from Catholicism. A later renowned Catholic apologist called Möhler (1768-1838) declared that properly interpreted and explained, Osiander's doctrine was, *identical with the Roman Catholic doctrine*.

This is the Catholic teaching. The (Catholic) Church, as the guardian and administrator of the sacraments, imparts Christ to the faithful believer. Christ changes the person to whom he is imparted *via* the sacraments so that that person becomes more like Christ. This likeness to Christ in the individual, in other words the person's own good works, is the basis of our justification.

So, Osiander and Catholicism agreed on the fundamental thing – that we are justified through our own works – but disagreed on some details. For Roman Catholicism, the power to carry out good works comes through Christ's indwelling in us as a result of our sacramental participation. For Osiander, it came through hearing the Word of God preached and responding to it appropriately. Taking part in a dispute In 1550 Osiander declared:

The entire fullness of the deity dwells in Christ bodily, hence in those also in whom Christ dwells.... Therefore we are just by His essential righteousness.... Whoever does not hold this manner of our justification is certainly a Zwinglian at heart, no matter what he may confess with his mouth.... They also teach things colder than ice [who hold] that we are regarded as righteous only on account of the forgiveness of sins, and not on account of the [essential] righteousness of Christ who dwells in us through faith.

They are errorists who say, teach, and write that the righteousness is outside of us.

The [essential] righteousness of Christ is indeed, imputed to us, but only when it is in us.

Applying this to where we are in the Institutes, Osiander taught that Adam's original righteousness and pre-fall relationship with God was based on the same thing – the indwelling of God in him. *Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness...* (Gen 1:26) meant, according to Osiander, that the divine essence and all three persons of the Trinity indwelt Adam. Indeed, this was the purpose behind mankind's creation – to experience the indwelling of God. The supreme example of this was the incarnation of Christ, which would have occurred whether mankind had fallen into sin or not, because humanity itself had been created to make this indwelling possible.

For Osiander, the image of God was God himself, dwelling in Adam.

Turning now to Calvin:

In which of our two parts – body and soul – does Calvin locate the image of God? (186, 27)

- a. *...the proper seat of his image is in the soul.*

Some have included man's body in the image of God. Why is this? (186, 31ff)

- a. It has been observed that *...while all other living things being bent over look earthward, man has been given a face uplifted, bidden to gaze heavenward and to raise his countenance to the stars* (Ovid)

Calvin has no wish to, *contend too strongly*, with this observation, noting that, *our outward form, in so far as it distinguishes and separates us from brute animals, at the same time more closely joins us to God*. How does Calvin view these distinguishing human characteristics in relation to the image of God? (186, 36)

- a. *...outward marks*. In other words Calvin sees these characteristics as pointers to the image of God, not part of the image itself, which *...is spiritual*.

In what way does Osiander show himself to be, *perversely ingenious in futile inventions*? (187, 2f)

- a. *...indiscriminately extending God's image both to the body and to the soul, (he) mingles heaven and earth.*

In what way does Osiander do this? (187, 3ff)

- a. *He says that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit place their image in man, because however upright Adam might have remained, yet Christ would have to become man.*
- b. *...according to them, the body that was destined for Christ was the exemplar and type of that corporeal figure which was then formed.* (This means that Christ's body was the pattern for Adam's body.)

What problem does Calvin identify with this view? (187, 8ff)

- a. *But where will he (ie, Osiander) find that Christ is the image of the Spirit?*
- b. *...how will the Eternal Word be called the image of the Spirit, whom he precedes in order?*
- c. *...the distinction between Son and Spirit is overthrown if the latter calls the former the image of himself.*

- d. *I should like to know from him how in the flesh that he took upon himself Christ resembles the Holy Spirit, and by what marks or lineaments he expresses his likeness.*
- e. *...since that saying "Let us make man," etc. [Gen 1:26], is common also to the person of the Son, it would follow that he is the image of himself. This is repugnant to all reason.*
- f. *...if Osiander's fabrication is accepted...the pattern from which Adam was taken was Christ in so far as he was to be clothed with flesh. But scripture teaches in a far other sense that he was created in God's image.*

In the second paragraph in this section, Calvin moves on to another error, which is – what? (187, 28ff)

- a. *..."image" and "likeness"...interpreters seek a non-existent difference between these two words.*

How do those interpreters who seek this difference understand, *image*, and, *likeness*? (188, 3f)

- a. *...they either apply zelem, that is, image, to the substance of the soul, and demuth, that is, likeness, to its qualities; or they adduce something different.*

What do we need to bear in mind when we encounter, in the Old Testament in particular, repetition of this sort (the technical term is, *parallelism*) in the Old Testament? (187, 31f)

- a. *...repetitions were common among the Hebrews, in which they express the same thing twice*

What scriptural evidence does Calvin adduce to show that no difference in meaning is intended between *image* and *likeness*? (188, 10ff)

- a. *Moses, a little after, **reciting the same thing**, repeats "image of God" twice without mentioning "likeness."*

Osiander objected to the assertion that the image of God resided in the soul. According to him, it resided equally in the body. To what did Osiander point in support of his position? (188, 12f)

- a. *...not a part of man – say, the soul with its endowments – is called God's image, but the whole Adam, whose name was given him from the earth whence he was taken.*

Calvin describes this as, *Trivial*, and feels it can be easily disposed of. How does he do that? (188, 16ff)

- a. *...while the whole man is called mortal, the soul is not thereby subjected to death*
- b. *...nor does reason or intelligence belong to the body merely because man is called a "rational animal."*
- c. *Therefore, although the soul is not man, yet it is not absurd for man, in respect to his soul, to be called God's image*

When in mankind's history, did the image of God appear most clearly? (188, 25ff)

- a. *...when he had full possession of tight understanding, when he had his affections kept within the bounds of reason, all his senses tempered in right order, and he truly referred his excellence to exceptional gifts bestowed upon him by his Maker...there was no part of man, not even the body itself, in which some sparks did not glow.*

What exists in mankind's relationship with all other creatures, as a result of the image of God? (188, 34ff)

- a. *...a tacit antithesis...which raises man above all other creatures and, as it were, separates him from the common mass.*

Is mankind the only thing (species?) created in God's image? (188, 36f)

- a. *...we ought not to deny that angels were created according to God's likeness*

Why ought we not deny this? (188, 37ff)

- a. *...our highest perfection, as Christ testifies, will be to become like them [Matt 22:30]*

4. What is necessary for us to properly understand and appreciate the image of God in humankind? (189, 3ff)

- a. *...we do not have a full definition of "image" if we do not see more plainly those faculties in which man excels, and in which he ought to be thought the reflection of God's glory.*

Where do we need to look in order to, *see more plainly those faculties in which man excels, and in which he ought to be thought the reflection of God's glory?* (189, 6f)

- a. *That, indeed, can be nowhere better recognised than from the restoration of his corrupted nature.*

Why is it important that we look here in particular, and not at ourselves and our contemporaries? (189, 7ff)

- a. *Adam, when he fell from his state, was by this defection alienated from God*
- b. *...even though we grant that God's image was not totally annihilated and destroyed in him, yet it was so corrupted that whatever remains is frightful deformity*
- c. *...the beginning of our recovery of salvation is in that restoration which we obtain through Christ, who also is called the Second Adam for the reason that he restores us to true and complete integrity*

How do we know that the restoration of God's image in us is something that Christ accomplishes? (189, 15ff)

- a. *Paul, contrasting the life-giving spirit that the believers receive from Christ with the living soul in which Adam was created [1 Cor 15:45], commends the richer measure of grace in regeneration, yet he does not remove that other principal point, that the end of regeneration is that Christ should reform us to God's image.*
- b. *...elsewhere he teaches that "the new man is renewed...according to the image of his Creator" [Col 3:10]*
- c. *With this agrees the saying, "Put on the new man, who has been created according to God" [Eph 4:24].*

Moving into this section's second paragraph *...Now we are to see what Paul chiefly comprehends under this renewal* (in other words, now we are going to get into the detail of what this actually means). What does Paul *chiefly comprehend* under this renewal? (189, 26ff – note the order, which Calvin will follow as he develops this theme.)

- a. *In the first place he posits knowledge*
- b. *...then pure righteousness*
- c. *...and holiness*

What do we conclude from this order? (189, 27ff)

- a. *From this we infer that, to begin with, God's image was visible in the light of the mind, in the uprightness of the heart, and in the soundness of all the parts.*

Calvin confesses *that these forms of speaking are synecdoches* (a figure of speech in which a part is used for the whole or the whole for a part, the special for the general or the general for the special, as in *ten sail* for *ten ships* or *head* for *cattle*.)

Notwithstanding the fact that *...these forms of speaking are synecdoches*, Calvin still feels that his fundamental principle is intact. What is that fundamental principle? (189, 31ff)

- a. *...what was primary in the renewing of God's image also held the highest place in the creation itself.*

Who or what is the most perfect image of God? (190, 1)

- a. *Christ*

It seems from the reference to *...Osiander's fancy concerning the shape of the body*, and what follows that Osiander felt justified in interpreting 1 Cor 11:7 in a way that excluded women from being God's image bearers. What does Calvin think of that? (190, 5ff)

- a. *...the statement in which man alone is called by Paul "the image and glory of God" [1 Cor 11:7] and woman excluded from this place of honour is clearly to be restricted, as the context shows, to the political order.*
- b. *...I now consider it sufficiently proved that whatever has to do with spiritual and eternal life is included under "image"*

How does John, in different words, confirm that the image of God was located in the faculties of the soul, not in the body (and, by implication, that it is possessed by women as well as men)? (190, 12ff)

- a. *By, declaring that "the life" which was from the beginning in God's eternal Word "was the light of men" [John 1:4]*

How does this declaration show mankind to be separate from the animals? (190, 16f)

- a. *...he attained no common life, but one joined with the light of understanding.*

How visible is the image of God to us now, as we look around our world? (192, 20ff)

- a. *...so vitiated and almost blotted out that nothing remains after the ruin except what is confused, mutilated, and disease-ridden.*

Based on what we have looked at from the scriptures concerning the restoration of God's image, where do we now see it, and to what extent? (190, 23f)

- a. *...in some part it is now manifest in the elect, in so far as they have been reborn in the spirit* (NB. spirit, not Spirit).

Where will the image of God be ultimately restored? (190, 24f)

- a. *...it will attain its full splendour in heaven*

We still have not discussed in detail *of what parts this image consists*. What do we need to do in order to gain more detailed knowledge? (190, 27)

- a. *...discuss the faculties of the soul*

Why is Calvin not comfortable with locating the image of God in those abilities that enable man to exercise dominion over creation? (190, 33ff)

- a. *God's image is properly to be sought within him, not outside him, indeed, it is an inner good of the soul.*

5. What is ...*the delusion of the Manichees*? (191, 1f)

- a. ...*they thought the soul to be a derivative of God's substance*

If the soul is ... *a derivative of God's substance*, what would that imply about the soul's origin? (191, 2f)

- a. ...*some portion of immeasurable divinity had flowed into man*

Calvin feels this view implies obvious absurdities that are ...*crass and foul*. What are they? (191, 5ff)

- a. ...*if man's soul be from the essence of God through derivation, it will follow that God's nature is subject not only to change and passions, but also to ignorance, wicked desires, infirmity, and all manner of vices.*

Why would that conclusion be inevitable? (191, 8ff & 12ff)

- a. *Nothing is more inconstant than man. Contrary motions stir up and variously distract his soul. Repeatedly he is led astray by ignorance. He yields, overcome by the slightest temptations. We know his mind to be a sink and lurking place for every sort of filth.*
 b. *All these things one must attribute to God's nature, if we understand the soul to be from God's essence, or to be a secret inflowing of divinity.*

Paul, quoting Aratus, asserted that we are God's offspring. Does this imply that we derived some of God's substance from him? (191, 16ff)

- a. ...*we are God's offspring [Acts 17:28], but in quality, not in essence, inasmuch as he, indeed, adorned us with divine gifts.*

If souls are not fragments of the divine essence, what does this teach us about their origin? (191, 20f)

- a. ...*souls...are just as much created as angels are.*

What is creation? (191, 22f)

- a. ...*creation is not outpouring, but **the beginning of essence out of nothing.***

Paul, discussing the restoration of God's image in us, uses a phrase that excludes the idea that God's image in us is God himself. What is that phrase? (192, 2ff)

- a. ...*beholding Christ's glory, we are being transformed into his very image...as through the Spirit of the Lord [2 Cor 3:18]*

6. Calvin's fundamental point in this section, which he goes on to illustrate with various examples, is stated in the first sentence. What is it? (192, 6f)

- a. *It would be foolish to seek a definition of "soul" from the philosophers*

In 193, 16ff Calvin concedes that *the philosophers* (by which he means the more famous of the ancient Greek philosophers such as Socrates, Plato and Aristotle) discuss matters relating to the soul in a way that is, *true, not only enjoyable, but also profitable to learn*, and that their observations and conclusions are, *skillfully assembled*. He does not, *forbid those who are desirous of learning to study them*. Finally he admits in 193, 33 that certain things that the philosophers have propounded, *are true, or at least probable*. Nonetheless, he feels that it suits his purpose in the Institutes if these things are, *passed over*. Why is that? (193, 34)

- a. *I fear they may involve us in their own obscurity*

What does Calvin feel will best aid, *the upbuilding of godliness*? (193, 15f)

- a. *...a simple definition*

Why are the philosophers misled? (194, 20ff)

- a. *...the philosophers, ignorant of the corruption of nature that originated from the penalty of man's defection, mistakenly confuse two very diverse states of man.*

7. In the previous section Calvin assessed the thoughts of the philosophers as too obscure to be useful for the upbuilding of godliness (*ie* they are too vague and therefore too debatable). In this section he opens by making the point that what they wrote was based on the false belief that what we observe all around us is normality (*cf* 'It was ever thus'). What alternative does he propose? (194, 3)

- a. *...a division within the capacity of all* (by *division* Calvin means a scheme of classification, IJ)

In this ... *division within the capacity of all*, under what headings are the faculties of the soul to be classified? (194, 23f)

- a. *...the human soul consists of two faculties, understanding and will.*

What is the role of understanding? (194, 25f)

- a. *...to distinguish between objects, as each seems worthy of approval or disapproval.*

What is the role of the will? (194, 27f)

- a. *...to choose and follow what the understanding pronounces good, but to reject and flee what it disapproves.*

How does Calvin describe the relationship between these two faculties? (194, 32ff)

- a. *...the understanding is, as it were, the leader and governor of the soul; ...the will is always mindful of the bidding of the understanding, and in its own desires awaits the judgment of the understanding.*

Are all of the soul's faculties related either to the understanding or to the will? (195, 4f)

- a. *...no power can be found in the soul that does not duly have reference to one or the other of these members.*

8. Calvin opens this section by referring to the mind. I understand this as another way of referring to the understanding, rather than something in addition to it because:

- a. The function of the mind was to shine the light of reason (195, 14f) on objects of contemplation, which he had already described as the function of understanding, in 194, 25f.
- b. In 195, 17 Calvin writes *...to this he joined the will*. This suggests that in the soul the mind is on an equivalent level to the will and he has already told us that there are only two things on that level, *ie* the will and the understanding, to one or the other of which all of the soul's abilities are related.

In this section Calvin describes the role of the mind more fully than he did in section 7. What functions does this fuller description ascribe to the mind? (195, 13ff)

- a. *...to distinguish good from evil, right from wrong; and, with the light of reason as a guide, to distinguish what should be followed from what should be avoided.*

The will is joined with the mind. What does the will control? (195, 18)

- a. *...choice*

In what way did man **as originally constituted** excel in these pre-eminent endowments? (195, 19ff)

- a. *...his reason, understanding, prudence and judgment not only sufficed for the direction of his earthly life, **but by them men mounted up even to God and eternal bliss.***
- b. *Then was choice added, to direct the appetites and control all the organic motions, and thus make the will completely amenable to the guidance of the reason.*

(Note from IJ, 195, 17: **hegemonikon** (ηγemonικόν) [hay-geh-mon-ee-KON]

The command centre of a human soul. That part which is capable of making choices. It has four essential abilities: presentation, impulse, assent, and reason (Logos). (Stoic Glossary & Pronunciation Guide ©2012))

What additional quality pertaining to the will before the fall, does Calvin introduce in 195, 25?

- a. Freedom

How free was man's will in his original state? (195, 25f)

- a. *In this integrity man by free will had the power, if he so willed, to attain eternal life.*
- b. *Adam could have stood if he wished*

Adam fell because his will lacked – what? (195, 32)

- a. *...the constancy to persevere*

What aggravated Adam's guilt? (195, 32ff)

- a. *...his choice of good and evil was free*
- b. *...the highest rectitude was in his mind and will*
- c. *...all the organic parts were rightly composed to obedience*

Into what state did Adam bring the freedom of his will, his perfect understanding and even the contributions to his behaviour that arose from his bodily parts (*...the organic parts*)? (195, 35f)

- a. *...in destroying himself he corrupted his own blessings*

What powerful and vivid illustration does Calvin employ to show the difficulty faced by those psychologists whose presupposition is that what is observable today is normal? (196, 1f)

- a. *...seeking in a ruin for a building, and in scattered fragments for a well-knit structure*

Why did the ancient philosophers (and why do modern psychologists and educationalists) ascribe free will to man as he is today? (196, 2ff)

- a. *They held this principle, that man would not be a rational animal unless he possessed free choice of good and evil*
- b. *...also it entered their minds that the distinction between virtues and vices would be obliterated if man did not order his life by his own planning*

Calvin describes these conclusions as *...well reasoned so far – if... If what?* (196, 6f)

- a. *...if there had been no change in man.*

What are those folk who assert human free will doing? (196, 9f)

- a. *...playing the fool...compromising between the opinions of the philosophers and heavenly doctrine*

What is the key thing for us to remember at all times when we are thinking about humanity? (196, 14f)

- a. *...man was far different at the first creation from his whole posterity*

In what way was the first man different from all his descendants? (196, 15ff)

- a. *...his whole posterity...deriving their origin from him in his corrupted state, have contracted from him a hereditary taint.*

What specific differences does Calvin mention between Adam and us? (196, 17ff)

- a. *...the individual parts of his soul were formed to uprightness*
- b. *...the soundness of his mind stood firm*
- c. *...his will was free to choose the good*

In what way could God have endowed man with a more excellent nature? (196, 23)

- a. *A nature that ...either could not or would not sin at all. Such a nature would have been more excellent.*

Does this mean that God in some way bears a responsibility for man's turning to sin? (196, 19ff)

- a. *If anyone objects that his will was placed in an insecure position because its power was weak, his status should have availed to remove any excuse;*
- b. *...nor was it reasonable for God to be constrained by the necessity of making a man who either could not or would not sin at all.*
- c. *...to quarrel with God on this precise point, as if he ought to have conferred this upon man, is more than iniquitous*

Why is it *...more than iniquitous* to accuse God of not doing all he could to prevent man from sinning? (196, 26f)

- a. *...it was in his own choice to give whatever he pleased*

Why did God not make man with a resolute will that was inclined to do only what God instructed? (196, 27f, 34ff)

- a. *...the reason...lies hidden in his plan.*
- b. *...no necessity was imposed upon God of giving man other than a mediocre and even transitory will, that from man's Fall he might gather occasion for his own glory.*

What, therefore, is the appropriate attitude for us to adopt when pondering the question of why God made mankind as he did? (196, 29)

- a. *...sobriety*

Was Adam able not to sin? (196, 29ff)

- a. *Man, indeed, received the ability provided he exercised the will; but he did not have the will to use his ability*

Why was man not given the will that would enable him to use his ability? (196, 30ff)

- a. *...he did not have the will to use his ability, for this exercising of the will would have been followed by perseverance.*

It would appear that God withheld from man a resolute will. Does this give mankind an excuse for their fallen condition? (196, 32ff)

- a. *...he is not excusable, for he received so much that he voluntarily brought about his own destruction.*

FOR REFLECTION

1. If the *end of regeneration* is to renew us in God's image/renew God's image in us, does that have any implications for the importance we should attach to living obediently to God's revealed will?
2. Is Christ called the Second Adam because he restores us to true and complete integrity?
3. Section 4 locates the image of God pretty much exclusively in the elect. Is this right. What characteristics do we usually think of as reflecting the image of God? Are these characteristics confined to the elect, or are they even seen pre-eminently in Christians? If not, it would seem from Calvin's reasoning, supported by the scriptures he cites, that we are looking at the wrong things.
4. To what extent can we really claim that our choices are governed by our understanding of what is right and what is wrong?
5. To what extent have we learned to live with a disconnect between the understanding and the will, so much so that we think of that as normal?
6. Think about this question and answer, substituting 'because' for 'for' in the answer:

Why was man not given the will that would enable him to use his ability? (196, 30ff)

- a. *...he did not have the will to use his ability, **for** this exercising of the will would have been followed by perseverance.*

Why did God not want man's to attain to perseverance by the exercise of his own will?